

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION OF NOLIN)	
RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE)	CASE NO.
CORPORATION FOR PASS-THROUGH OF)	2021-00114
EAST KENTUCKY POWER COOPERATIVE,)	
INC. WHOLESALE RATE ADJUSTMENT)	

ORDER

On April 1, 2021, Nolin Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation (Nolin RECC) 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, Nolin RECC 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, Nolin RECC's proposed rates were suspended up to and including October 5, 2021. Nolin RECC responded to two requests for information from Commission Staff. This matter now stands submitted for a decision.

LEGAL STANDARD

The review of Nolin RECC's application is governed by KRS 278.455, which provides that authorized increases and decreases in a generation and transmission

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 April 6, 2021).

(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 Nolin RECC'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), Nolin RECC is one of the 16 owner-member cooperatives of EKPC, and in accordance with KRS 278.455, Nolin RECC 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), Nolin RECC 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

Nolin RECC is a not-for-profit, member-owned, rural electric distribution cooperative organized under KRS Chapter 279. Nolin RECC is engaged in the business of distribution retail electric power to 36,167 members in Breckinridge, Bullitt, Grayson,

Green, Hardin, Hart, Larue, Meade, and Taylor counties, Kentucky.² Nolin RECC does not own any electric generating facilities and is one of the 16-member cooperatives that own and receive wholesale power from EKPC. Nolin RECC's last general rate adjustment was effective June 21, 2017, in Case No. 2016-00367.³

PROPOSED PASS-THROUGH RATE ADJUSTMENT

Nolin RECC proposed to pass through EKPC's proposed wholesale rate increase based upon the 2019 billing information for each rate class in Nolin RECC's Commission-approved tariffs. Nolin RECC 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 Nolin RECC allocated EKPC's revenue increase first to each rate class 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

² *Annual Report of Nolin Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation to the Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Kentucky for the Calendar Year Ended December 31, 2020* at 44 and 52.

³ Case No. 2016-00367, *Application of Nolin Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation for a General Rate Increase* (Ky. PSC June 21, 2017).

⁴ Application, Direct 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.

⁶ Wolfram Testimony at 3.

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 Nolin RECC.⁹

Nolin RECC 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 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

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.

¹³ *Id.*

percentage is then applied to the total of the distribution cooperative's portion of the G&T increase.¹⁴

Nolin RECC 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 Nolin RECC 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 Nolin RECC 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 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

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ Wolfram Testimony at 4–5.

¹⁶ *Id.* at 5 and Nolin RECC's Response to Commission Staff's First Request for Information (Staff's First Request) (filed May 26, 2021), Item 2.

¹⁷ Wolfram Testimony at 5–6.

¹⁸ *Id.* at 8.

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, Nolin RECC'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, Nolin RECC 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 Nolin RECC 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, 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

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.

altering the approved allocation and rate design. Based upon this review, the Commission finds that Nolin RECC'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. 2018-00407²⁰ will apply the methodology outlined in the Kenergy Order.

In reviewing Nolin RECC's proposed revenue increase allocation under the settlement, the Commission notes that the proposed increase, \$2,488,281, differs from the \$2,477,324 increase allocated to Nolin RECC by EKPC.²¹ Nolin RECC maintained that EKPC calculated member system rates on a wholesale rate class basis, and not by member system, while Nolin RECC's pass-through exhibit was prepared individually.²² Nolin RECC further maintained that the difference was due to rounding and calculation of the fuel adjustment charge and environmental surcharge, and was negligible.²³ In its response, Nolin RECC 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 Nolin RECC to explain and support why inputs differ between the wholesale provider and the member system.²⁴

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

²¹ Nolin RECC's Response to Commission Staff's Third Request for Information (filed Sept. 17, 2021), Item 1.

²² *Id.*

²³ *Id.*

²⁴ 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),

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, Nolin RECC's wholesale power cost will increase by \$2,345,948, or 4.6 percent, annually.²⁵ Furthermore, based upon Nolin RECC'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 Nolin RECC are denied.
2. The approach proposed by Nolin RECC to allocate its portion of the increase in wholesale rates authorized in Case No. 2021-00103 is accepted.
3. The rates and charges in Appendix B, attached hereto, are fair, just and reasonable for Nolin RECC to charge for service rendered on and after October 1, 2021.
4. Within 20 days of the date of this Order, Nolin RECC 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.

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.

²⁵ See Appendix A.

By the Commission



ATTEST:

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Linda C. Bidwell". The signature is written in a cursive style.

Executive Director

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX TO AN ORDER OF THE KENTUCKY PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION IN CASE NO. 2021-00114 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. 2021-00114 DATED SEP 30 2021

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

SCHEDULE 1
RESIDENTIAL, FARM, NON-FARM, TRAILERS AND MOBILE HOMES

Member Cost of Service Charge	\$ 13.99
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.09184

SCHEDULE 2
COMMERCIAL, SMALL POWER, SINGLE PHASE AND THREE PHASE SERVICE

Member Cost of Service Charge	\$ 23.83
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.09124

SCHEDULE 3
LARGE POWER

Member Cost of Service Charge	\$ 36.26
Demand Charge per kW	\$ 6.24
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.07231

SCHEDULE 4
INDUSTRIAL

Member Cost of Service Charge	\$ 44.03
Demand Charge per kW	\$ 5.13
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.06328

SCHEDULE 5
SECURITY LIGHTS

HPS 100 Watt	\$ 10.10
LED 70 Watt	\$ 9.75
Directional Floodlight 100 Watt HPS	\$ 8.95

Directional Floodlight 70 Watt LED	\$ 17.44
Directional Floodlight 250 Watt HPS	\$ 14.96
Directional Floodlight 108 Watt LED	\$ 18.23
Directional Floodlight 400 Watt HPS	\$ 20.27
Directional Floodlight 208 Watt LED	\$ 20.36
Colonial Type 100 Watt HPS	\$ 13.35
Contemporary Type 400 Watt HPS	\$ 21.79
30ft Fiberglass Pole	\$ 10.63
25ft Wood Pole for overhead service	\$ 2.46
30ft Wood Pole for overhead service	\$ 2.84
25ft Wood Pole for underground service	\$ 3.44
30ft Wood Pole for underground service	\$ 3.83
Acorn Contemporary Type 400 Watt HPS	\$ 34.88
Santa Rose Contemporary Type 150 Watt HPS	\$ 34.53
Santa Rose Contemporary Type 150 Watt (excl. pole and fixture)	\$ 9.44

SCHEDULE 6
STREET LIGHTING

STANDARD OVERHEAD (WOOD POLE)	
HPS 100 Watt	\$ 10.34
HPS 250 Watt	\$ 15.54
HPS 400 Watt	\$ 20.24
LED 70 Watt	\$ 10.28
LED 108 Watt	\$ 11.96
LED 208 Watt	\$ 17.21
ORNAMENTAL SERVICE OVERHEAD (ALUMINUM POLES)	
HPS 100 Watt	\$ 23.71
HPS 250 Watt	\$ 27.95
HPS 400 Watt	\$ 31.80
ORNAMENTAL SERVICE UNDERGROUND (FIBERGLASS POLES)	
HPS 400 Watt	\$ 37.13
HPS 150 Watt	\$ 36.42
HPS 150 Watt (Excluding lighting fixture and pole)	\$ 9.97

SCHEDULE 7
INDUSTRIAL

Demand Charge per kW	\$ 9.36
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.05675

SCHEDULE 8
SEASONAL TIME OF DAY

Demand Charge per kW	\$ 9.25
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.05675

SCHEDULE 9
INDUSTRIAL (1,000-4,999 kW)

Customer Charge	
New Substation required	\$1,237.38
Existing Substation used	\$ 632.50
Demand Charge per kW of Contract Demand	\$ 6.36
Demand Charge per kW of Excess Demand	\$ 9.25
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.05462

SCHEDULE 10
INDUSTRIAL (5,000-9,999 kW)

Member Cost of Service Charge	\$1,263.40
Demand Charge per kW of Contract Demand	\$ 7.43
Demand Charge per kW of Excess Demand	\$ 10.34
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.04721

SCHEDULE 11
INDUSTRIAL (> 10,000 kW)

Member Cost of Service Charge	\$1,263.24
Demand Charge per kW of Contract Demand	\$ 6.36
Demand Charge per kW of Excess Demand	\$ 9.25
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.04751

SCHEDULE 12
INDUSTRIAL C (1,000-4,999 kW)

Customer Charge	
New Substation required	\$1,263.24
Existing Substation used	\$ 632.20
Demand Charge per kW	\$ 6.36
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.05460

SCHEDULE 13
INDUSTRIAL C (5,000-9,999 kW)

Customer Charge	\$1,263.24
Demand Charge per kW	\$ 6.36
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.04869

SCHEDULE 14
INDUSTRIAL C (> 10,000 kW)

Customer Charge	\$1,263.24
Demand Charge per kW	\$ 6.36
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.04751

SPECIAL CONTRACT
AGC Automotive

Customer Charge	\$5,726.70
Contract Demand per kW	\$ 7.30
Interruptible Credit per kW	\$ (5.60)
Energy Charge	\$ 0.04004

*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

*John J Scott
Attorney at Law
John J. Scott, P.S.C.
200 Logan Avenue
P.O. Box 389
 Elizabethtown, KENTUCKY 42702-038

*Nolin R.E.C.C.
411 Ring Road
Elizabethtown, KY 42701-6767