

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION OF)	
CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC, INC. FOR)	CASE NO.
PASS-THROUGH OF EAST KENTUCKY)	2021-00107
POWER COOPERATIVE, INC. WHOLESALE)	
RATE ADJUSTMENT)	

ORDER

On April 1, 2021, Cumberland Valley Electric, Inc. (Cumberland Valley Electric) filed an application to pass through any wholesale rate adjustment granted to East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. (EKPC) in Case No. 2021-00103¹ pursuant to KRS 278.455(2) and 807 KAR 5:007. On July 30, 2021, Cumberland Valley Electric filed a revised schedule of proposed rates for its pass-through of EKPC's wholesale rate adjustment based upon the Stipulation, Settlement Agreement and Recommendation filed in Case No. 2021-00103.

There are no intervenors in this proceeding. By Order entered April 15, 2021, Cumberland Valley Electric's proposed rates were suspended up to and including October 5, 2021. Cumberland Valley Electric responded to two requests for information from Commission Staff. This matter now stands submitted for a decision.

¹ Case No. 2021-00103, *Electronic Application of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. for a General Adjustment of Rates, Approval of Depreciation Study, Amortization of Certain Regulatory Assets, and Other General Relief* (filed Apr. 6, 2021).

LEGAL STANDARD

The review of Cumberland Valley Electric's application is governed by KRS 278.455, which provides that authorized increases and decreases in a generation and transmission (G&T) cooperative's rates may be flowed through to the customers of a distribution cooperative. Specifically, KRS 278.455(2) states, in relevant part, that an authorized increase or decrease in a G&T cooperative's rates:

[M]ay, at the distribution cooperative's discretion, be allocated to each class and within each tariff on a proportional basis that will result in no change in the rate design currently in effect. In the event of an increase in the wholesale rates and tariffs of the wholesale supplier by the Public Service Commission, the rates and tariffs of the distribution cooperative that have been revised on a proportional basis to result in no change in the rate design shall be authorized and shall become effective on the same date as those of the wholesale supplier.

The review of Cumberland Valley Electric's application is also governed by Commission regulation 807 KAR 5:007, which establishes the filing and notice requirements for a distribution cooperative when rates change to reflect a change in the rates of its wholesale supplier. Specifically, pursuant to 807 KAR 5:007, Section 1(3) and Section 2(2), Cumberland Valley Electric is one of the 16 owner-member cooperatives of EKPC, and in accordance with KRS 278.455, Cumberland Valley Electric seeks to pass-through the increase in EKPC's wholesale rates. In accordance with 807 KAR 5:007, Sections 1(4), 2(1), and 2(2), Cumberland Valley Electric included with its application proposed tariffs, a comparison of current and proposed rates, and a billing analysis to demonstrate that the rate change does not alter the rate design currently in effect and the revenue change has been allocated to each class and within each tariff on a proportional basis.

BACKGROUND

Cumberland Valley Electric is a not-for-profit, member-owned, rural electric distribution cooperative organized under KRS Chapter 279. Cumberland Valley Electric is engaged in the business of distribution retail electric power to 23,871 members in Bell, Clay, Harlan, Knox, Laurel, Leslie, Letcher, McCreary, and Whitley counties, Kentucky.² Cumberland Valley Electric does not own any electric generating facilities and is one of the 16-member cooperatives that own and receive wholesale power from EKPC. Cumberland Valley Electric's last general rate adjustment's final Order was issued December 31, 2020, with rates effective on and after March 23, 2021, in Case No. 2020-00264.³

PROPOSED PASS-THROUGH RATE ADJUSTMENT

Cumberland Valley Electric proposed to pass through EKPC's proposed wholesale rate increase based upon the 2019 billing information for each rate class in Cumberland Valley Electric's Commission-approved tariffs. Cumberland Valley Electric choose 2019 because it corresponds to the 2019 test period used by EKPC in Case No. 2021-00103.⁴ After adjustments for riders, billing adjustments, and other non-base-rate billing items,⁵ Cumberland Valley Electric allocated EKPC's revenue increase first to each rate class

² *Annual Report of Cumberland Valley Electric to the Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Kentucky for the Calendar Year Ended December 31, 2020* at 47 and 55.

³ Case No. 2020-00264, *Electronic Application of Cumberland Valley Electric, Inc. for a General Adjustment of Rates Pursuant to Streamlined Procedure Pilot Program Established in Case No. 2018-00407* (Ky. PSC Dec. 30, 2020).

⁴ Application, Exhibit 6, Direct Testimony of John Wolfram (Wolfram Testimony) at 3.

⁵ These limited adjustments include a base energy charge adjustment due to a Commission-approved Fuel Adjustment Clause roll-in effective February 1, 2020, and a few large commercial or industrial retail members who either switched rates or received revised contract demand amounts since 2019. Wolfram Testimony at 4.

and then to the individual base rate billing components of each class in order to maintain the current rate design in effect.⁶ Except for retail members served under a special electric contract, no distinctions were made between retail rate classes taking service under EKPC's different wholesale rate classes. For special electric contracts, the retail rate increases were determined using specific data provided by EKPC and is consistent with the treatment applied to these particular classes in EKPC's last rate case, Case No. 2010-00167.⁷ For vacant rate classes, if the per-unit charges were identical to another existing rate class, the per-unit charge applied was equivalent.⁸ Otherwise, a vacant rate classes' increase to each per-unit charge was the same percentage as the overall base rate increase for Cumberland Valley Electric.⁹

Cumberland Valley Electric stated that it considered the recent Commission Order in Case No. 2020-00095¹⁰ (Kenergy Order), where the Commission clarified "proportional" in light of the language contained in KRS 278.455(2).¹¹ The Commission explained that proportional increases should result in an increase that would avoid undoing any past rate design and avoid distorting the current rate design while maintaining the spirit of the regulation.¹² The Commission stated the revenue generated

⁶ Wolfram Testimony at 3.

⁷ *Id.* at 9. Case No. 2010-00167, *Application of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. for General Adjustment of Electric Rates* (Ky. PSC Jan. 14, 2011).

⁸ Wolfram Testimony at 9.

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ Case No. 2020-00095, *Electronic Application of Kenergy Corp. for a Declaratory Order* (Ky. PSC Mar. 11, 2021).

¹¹ *Id.* at 4.

¹² Kenergy Order at 7.

from each class and each of the class's rate components must continue to contribute in the same proportion to the total distribution cooperative revenue.¹³ To accomplish this, the Commission explained that each class's revenue contribution percentage should be determined based upon the most recent Commission-approved revenue allocation. The revenue contribution percentage is then applied to the total of the distribution cooperative's portion of the G&T increase.¹⁴

Cumberland Valley Electric stated that the proposed rates were originally calculated based on the allocations from the last rate Order, but asserted that the Kenergy Order method produced self-evidently unreasonable results if the last approved revenue allocation was not consistent with the test year.¹⁵ Cumberland Valley Electric argued that due to changes in the customers mix within the rate calculation, specifically for those rates with a three-part rate design, the demand charge could actually decrease leading to the conclusion that it would be unreasonable to pass-through a wholesale increase in such a manner.¹⁶ Thus, the pass-through was allocated consistent with the method approved in the pass-through filings for EKPC's last two rate cases so not to run afoul of the proportionality standard in KRS 278.455(2).¹⁷ Cumberland Valley Electric further argued that although the Kenergy Order stated that any revenue distortions could be addressed through subsequent rate filings by a distribution cooperative, near-simultaneous rate

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ Wolfram Testimony at 4–5.

¹⁶ *Id.* at 5 and Cumberland Valley Electric's Response to Commission Staff's First Request for Information (Staff's First Request) (filed May 27, 2021), Item 2.

¹⁷ Wolfram Testimony at 5–6.

cases would be filed due to the possible skewing effect between retail customer classes and such a result would be inconsistent with the enactment of KRS 278.455, where the intent is to avoid the need for each distribution cooperative to file a rate case.¹⁸

DISCUSSION

Based upon the case record and being otherwise sufficiently advised, the Commission finds that, due to the \$36,355,254 annualized increase in EKPC's wholesale rates for service rendered on and after October 1, 2021, that was approved by the Commission in Case No. 2021-00103, Cumberland Valley Electric's request for approval of a pass-through rate increase pursuant to KRS 278.455(2) should be approved.

The Commission further finds that, based on sufficient evidence in the case records, Cumberland Valley Electric met its burden of proof, in accordance with KRS 278.455(2), that the rate change does not alter the rate design currently in effect, and that the revenue change has been allocated to each class and with each tariff on a proportional basis. This finding is based upon the Commission's review of the approach proposed by Cumberland Valley Electric to pass-through the increase of EKPC's wholesale rates and the allocation of such increase to its retail rates. The Commission recognizes the concern over using the last approved revenue allocation, especially given the anomalous results that are especially present in those distribution cooperatives that have not filed for a general rate increase for a substantial time.¹⁹ In the Kenergy Order,

¹⁸ *Id.* at 8.

¹⁹ For example, the last general rate increase for Salt River Electric Cooperative (Salt River Electric) was September 28, 1993; hence, the necessary information needed to obtain the appropriate revenue allocation was not readily available. See Case No. 2021-00116, *Electronic Application of Salt River Electric Cooperative Corporation for Pass-Through of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. Wholesale Rate Adjustment*, Salt River Electric's Response to Commission Staff's First Request for Information (filed May 26, 2021), Items 3 and 4.

the Commission expressed its concern that rate increases, particularly revenue neutral increases, may result in a change of revenue allocation due to the change in rate design. For example, if a distribution cooperative proposes a revenue neutral rate design based upon a test year that differs from a Commission-approved test year, the class revenue allocation may differ, thus altering the approved allocation and rate design. For Cumberland Valley Electric, the Kenergy Order method did produce reasonable results as the test year for Cumberland Valley Electric's last rate filing is the same as the instant case; hence, the results of the Kenergy Order and the preset test-year allocation method are identical.²⁰ Based upon this review, the Commission finds that Cumberland Valley Electric's approach complies with the provisions of KRS 278.455(2) and 807 KAR 5:007, Section 2(2), and therefore should be accepted. However, any revenue neutral case filed as a general rate case or under the Commission-approved streamlined process in Case No. 2018-00407²¹ will apply the methodology outlined in the Kenergy Order.

In reviewing Cumberland Valley Electric's proposed revenue increase allocation under the settlement, the Commission notes that the proposed increase, \$1,538,603, differs from the \$1,536,387 increase allocated to Cumberland Valley Electric by EKPC.²² Cumberland Valley Electric maintained that EKPC calculated member system rates on a wholesale rate class basis, and not by member system, while Cumberland Valley Electric's pass-through exhibit was prepared individually.²³ Cumberland Valley Electric

²⁰ Wolfram Testimony at 5.

²¹ Case No. 2018-00407, *A Review of the Rate Case Procedure for Electric Distribution Cooperatives* (Ky. PSC Dec. 20. 2019).

²² Cumberland Valley Electric's Response to Commission Staff's Third Request for Information (filed Sept. 17, 2021), Item 1.

²³ *Id.*

further maintained that the difference was due to rounding and calculation of the fuel adjustment charge and environmental surcharge, and was negligible.²⁴ In its response, Cumberland Valley Electric did not provide adequate support to explain why the proposed increase for the member system differed from EKPC's calculation. While rounding errors may occur in rate design, the Commission expects Cumberland Valley Electric to explain and support why inputs differ between the wholesale provider and the member system.²⁵

Based upon the Commission's authorization of a \$36,355,254 annualized increase in EKPC's wholesale rates effective for service rendered on and after October 1, 2021, Cumberland Valley Electric's wholesale power cost will increase by \$1,447,387, or 4.8 percent, annually.²⁶ Furthermore, based upon Cumberland Valley Electric's proposed pass-through analysis as filed on July 30, 2021, the Commission will maintain the dollar denominated differences between the estimated wholesale increase and member system increase in the determination of the rates.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. The rates and charges proposed by Cumberland Valley Electric are denied.
2. The approach proposed by Cumberland Valley Electric to allocate its portion of the increase in wholesale rates authorized in Case No. 2021-00103 is accepted.

²⁴ *Id.*

²⁵ For example, there is a billing determinant difference between the special contract rate for Owen Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Owen Electric) and EKPC which results in differing revenues. See Case No. 2021-00115, *Electronic Application of Owen Electric Cooperative, Inc. for Pass-Through of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc.'s Wholesale Rate Adjustment*, Owen Electric's Notice of Filing (filed July 30, 2021), Owen Electric filed Revised Exhibits of the proposed rates for the a pass-through of EKPC's wholesale rate adjustment, Staff 1-5-Owen-Settle-v2.xlsx, and Case No. 2021-00103, *EKPC*, EKPC's Response to Commission Staff's Post-Hearing Requests for Information (filed Aug. 18, 2021), Item 10.

²⁶ See Appendix A.

3. The rates and charges in Appendix B, attached hereto, are fair, just and reasonable for Cumberland Valley Electric to charge for service rendered on and after October 1, 2021.

4. Within 20 days of the date of this Order, Cumberland Valley Electric shall file with the Commission, using the Commission's electronic Tariff Filing System, its revised tariffs as set forth in this Order reflecting that they were approved pursuant to this Order.

5. This case is closed and removed from this Commission's docket.

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

By the Commission



ATTEST:


Executive Director

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX TO AN ORDER OF THE KENTUCKY PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION IN CASE NO. 2021-00107 DATED SEP 30 2021

Rate B				
EKPC Member	Present	Final	Change	As Percent
Big Sandy	\$ 341,987	\$ 350,744	\$ 8,757	2.6%
Blue Grass	\$ 10,757,845	\$ 11,035,263	\$ 277,418	2.6%
Clark	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Cumberland Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Farmers	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Fleming-Mason	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Grayson	\$ 1,733,635	\$ 1,778,438	\$ 44,803	2.6%
Inter-County	\$ 3,853,087	\$ 3,952,115	\$ 99,029	2.6%
Jackson	\$ 3,261,843	\$ 3,345,035	\$ 83,192	2.6%
Licking Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Nolin	\$ 1,546,266	\$ 1,587,786	\$ 41,520	2.7%
Owen	\$ 15,691,907	\$ 16,113,009	\$ 421,101	2.7%
Salt River	\$ 7,849,642	\$ 8,048,401	\$ 198,759	2.5%
Shelby	\$ 9,959,655	\$ 10,210,443	\$ 250,788	2.5%
South Ky	\$ 3,987,957	\$ 4,089,565	\$ 101,608	2.5%
Taylor	\$ 831,893	\$ 853,592	\$ 21,699	2.6%
Total	\$ 59,815,719	\$ 61,364,392	\$ 1,548,673	2.6%

Rate C				
EKPC Member	Present	Final	Change	As Percent
Big Sandy	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Blue Grass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Clark	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Cumberland Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Farmers	\$ 2,875,951	\$ 2,951,756	\$ 75,804	2.6%
Fleming-Mason	\$ 7,135,643	\$ 7,323,237	\$ 187,594	2.6%
Grayson	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Inter-County	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Jackson	\$ 1,001,698	\$ 1,027,537	\$ 25,839	2.6%
Licking Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Nolin	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Owen	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Salt River	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Shelby	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
South Ky	\$ 5,690,287	\$ 5,841,773	\$ 151,486	2.7%
Taylor	\$ 449,732	\$ 461,248	\$ 11,516	2.6%
	\$ 17,153,311	\$ 17,605,550	\$ 452,238	2.6%

Rate E				
EKPC Member	Present	Final	Change	As Percent
Big Sandy	\$ 15,194,682	\$ 15,929,940	\$ 735,258	4.8%
Blue Grass	\$ 75,472,253	\$ 79,160,079	\$ 3,687,826	4.9%
Clark	\$ 31,113,089	\$ 32,623,992	\$ 1,510,903	4.9%
Cumberland Valley	\$ 29,974,144	\$ 31,421,531	\$ 1,447,387	4.8%
Farmers	\$ 31,649,009	\$ 33,198,129	\$ 1,549,120	4.9%
Fleming-Mason	\$ 30,724,488	\$ 32,207,720	\$ 1,483,231	4.8%
Grayson	\$ 15,892,923	\$ 16,660,933	\$ 768,010	4.8%
Inter-County	\$ 29,674,742	\$ 31,124,764	\$ 1,450,022	4.9%
Jackson	\$ 58,279,094	\$ 61,105,989	\$ 2,826,895	4.9%
Licking Valley	\$ 17,298,143	\$ 18,132,437	\$ 834,294	4.8%
Nolin	\$ 43,686,325	\$ 45,822,867	\$ 2,136,542	4.9%
Owen	\$ 74,903,441	\$ 78,540,230	\$ 3,636,790	4.9%
Salt River	\$ 75,530,233	\$ 79,217,543	\$ 3,687,310	4.9%
Shelby	\$ 23,218,841	\$ 24,344,807	\$ 1,125,966	4.8%
South Ky	\$ 79,696,530	\$ 83,594,165	\$ 3,897,636	4.9%
Taylor	\$ 31,773,345	\$ 33,322,474	\$ 1,549,129	4.9%
	\$ 664,081,280	\$ 696,407,599	\$ 32,326,319	4.9%

Rate G				
EKPC Member	Present	Final	Change	As Percent
Big Sandy	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Blue Grass	\$ 5,730,294	\$ 5,874,687	\$ 144,393	2.5%
Clark	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Cumberland Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Farmers	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Fleming-Mason	\$ 13,625,132	\$ 13,976,173	\$ 351,041	2.6%
Grayson	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Inter-County	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Jackson	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Licking Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Nolin	\$ 6,160,848	\$ 6,328,734	\$ 167,886	2.7%
Owen	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Salt River	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Shelby	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
South Ky	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Taylor	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	\$ 25,516,274	\$ 26,179,595	\$ 663,320	2.6%

Contract				
EKPC Member	Present	Final	Change	As Percent
Big Sandy	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Blue Grass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Clark	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Cumberland Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Farmers	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Fleming-Mason	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Grayson	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Inter-County	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Jackson	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Licking Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Nolin	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Owen	\$ 41,786,791	\$ 42,872,821	\$ 1,086,030	2.6%
Salt River	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Shelby	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
South Ky	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Taylor	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	\$ 41,786,791	\$ 42,872,821	\$ 1,086,030	2.6%

Steam				
EKPC Member	Present	Final	Change	As Percent
Big Sandy	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Blue Grass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Clark	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Cumberland Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Farmers	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Fleming-Mason	\$ 10,716,264	\$ 10,994,937	\$ 278,674	2.6%
Grayson	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Inter-County	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Jackson	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Licking Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Nolin	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Owen	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Salt River	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Shelby	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
South Ky	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Taylor	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	\$ 10,716,264	\$ 10,994,937	\$ 278,674	2.6%

Rate TGP				
EKPC Member	Present	Final	Change	As Percent
Big Sandy	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Blue Grass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Clark	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Cumberland Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Farmers	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Fleming-Mason	\$ 3,422,394	\$ 3,422,394	\$ -	0.0%
Grayson	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Inter-County	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Jackson	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Licking Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Nolin	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Owen	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Salt River	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Shelby	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
South Ky	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Taylor	\$ 2,927,454	\$ 2,927,454	\$ -	0.0%
	\$ 6,349,849	\$ 6,349,849	\$ -	0.0%

Total				
EKPC Member	Present	Final	Change	As Percent
Big Sandy	\$ 15,536,669	\$ 16,280,684	\$ 744,015	4.8%
Blue Grass	\$ 91,960,392	\$ 96,070,029	\$ 4,109,637	4.5%
Clark	\$ 31,113,089	\$ 32,623,992	\$ 1,510,903	4.9%
Cumberland Valley	\$ 29,974,144	\$ 31,421,531	\$ 1,447,387	4.8%
Farmers	\$ 34,524,960	\$ 36,149,884	\$ 1,624,924	4.7%
Fleming-Mason	\$ 65,623,921	\$ 67,924,461	\$ 2,300,540	3.5%
Grayson	\$ 17,626,559	\$ 18,439,371	\$ 812,813	4.6%
Inter-County	\$ 33,527,829	\$ 35,076,879	\$ 1,549,051	4.6%
Jackson	\$ 62,542,635	\$ 65,478,561	\$ 2,935,926	4.7%
Licking Valley	\$ 17,298,143	\$ 18,132,437	\$ 834,294	4.8%
Nolin	\$ 51,393,440	\$ 53,739,387	\$ 2,345,948	4.6%
Owen	\$ 132,382,139	\$ 137,526,060	\$ 5,143,921	3.9%
Salt River	\$ 83,379,874	\$ 87,265,943	\$ 3,886,069	4.7%
Shelby	\$ 33,178,496	\$ 34,555,250	\$ 1,376,754	4.1%
South Ky	\$ 89,374,774	\$ 93,525,503	\$ 4,150,730	4.6%
Taylor	\$ 35,982,424	\$ 37,564,768	\$ 1,582,344	4.4%
	\$ 825,419,487	\$ 861,774,741	\$ 36,355,254	4.4%

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX TO AN ORDER OF THE KENTUCKY PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION IN CASE NO. 2021-00107 DATED SEP 30 2021

The following rates and charges are prescribed for the customers served by Cumberland Valley Electric. All other rates and charges not specifically mentioned herein shall remain the same as those in effect under the authority of this Commission prior to the effective date of this Order.

SCHEDULE R1

Sch 1 - Residential, Schools & Churches

Customer Charge	\$ 17.62
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.08515

SCHEDULE

Prepay Service Residential

Customer Charge	\$ 17.62 (\$0.59/day)
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.08515

SCHEDULE 1 TIME OF DAY

Sch I - Residential, Schools & Churches

Customer Charge	\$ 20.73
Energy Charge - On Peak per kWh	\$ 0.10115
Energy Charge - Off Peak per kWh	\$ 0.05796

SCHEDULE C1

Sch II - Small Commercial Small Power Single Phase

Customer Charge	\$ 19.69
Energy Charge - First 3000 per kWh	\$ 0.08533
Energy Charge - Over 3000 per kWh	\$ 0.08178

SCHEDULE C2

Sch II - Small Commercial Small Power Three Phase

Customer Charge	\$ 26.17
Energy Charge - First 3000 per kWh	\$ 0.09113

Energy Charge - Over 3000 per kWh	\$ 0.08739
Demand Charge per kW	\$ 4.37

SCHEDULE IB
Sch VII - Inclining Block Rate

Customer Charge	\$ 10.26
Energy Charge - First 200 per kWh	\$ 0.08742
Energy Charge - Next 300 per kWh	\$ 0.09260
Energy Charge - Over 500 per kWh	\$ 0.09779

SCHEDULE E1
Sch III - All Three Phase Schools & Churches

Customer Charge	\$ 46.64
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.07851

SCHEDULE L1
Sch IV – Large Power 50-2500 kW

Customer Charge	\$ 67.37
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.05877
Demand Charge per kW	\$ 4.37

SCHEDULE VI
Outdoor Lighting

175 Watt MV	7,000 Lumens	\$ 9.36
400 Watt MV	22,000 Lumens	\$ 13.78
100 Watt Colonial Post	9,500 Lumens	\$ 10.60
100 Watt Open Bottom	9,500 Lumens	\$ 9.38
100 Watt Directional Flood	9,500 Lumens	\$ 11.44
400 Watt Cobra Head	50,000 Lumens	\$ 18.07
400 Watt Directional Flood	50,000 Lumens	\$ 18.07
LED Open Bottom 6200 L	6,200 Lumens	\$ 9.27
LED Cobra Head 13,650 L	13,650 Lumens	\$ 15.73
LED Directional 18,800 L	18,800 Lumens	\$ 19.29

SCHEDULE V
Sch V – Large Power 1000-2500 kW

Consumer Charge	\$ 636.89
Demand Charge - Contract per kW	\$ 6.42
Demand Charge - Excess per kW	\$ 9.31
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.05422

SCHEDULE V-A
Sch V-A – Large Power

Consumer Charge	\$1,272.59
Demand Charge - Contract per kW	\$ 6.42
Demand Charge - Excess per kW	\$ 9.31
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.04664

SCHEDULE P1
Sch IV – Large Power Industrial

Customer Charge	\$ 103.65
Demand Charge per kW	\$ 6.79
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.04876

*L Allyson Honaker
Goss Samford, PLLC
2365 Harrodsburg Road, Suite B325
Lexington, KENTUCKY 40504

*David S Samford
Goss Samford, PLLC
2365 Harrodsburg Road, Suite B325
Lexington, KENTUCKY 40504

*Cumberland Valley Electric, Inc.
Highway 25E
P. O. Box 440
Gray, KY 40734