

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY  
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION OF EAST	)	
KENTUCKY POWER COOPERATIVE, INC. FOR A	)	
CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND	)	CASE NO.
NECESSITY TO CONSTRUCT A 161 KV	)	2025-00311
TRANSMISSION LINE IN PULASKI COUNTY,	)	
KENTUCKY AND OTHER GENERAL RELIEF	)	

ORDER

On November 10, 2025, East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. (EKPC) filed an application pursuant to KRS 278.020, 807 KAR 5:001, Sections 15 and 19, and 807 KAR 5:120 seeking a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) authorizing it to construct a 5.25<sup>1</sup> mile, 161 kV double-circuit transmission line between EKPC's John S. Cooper Station (Cooper Station) and Louisville Gas & Electric Company's (LG&E) and Kentucky Utilities Company's (KU) (collectively, LG&E/KU) Alcalde Substation located in Pulaski County, Kentucky. EKPC was also seeking the flexibility to move the proposed transmission line up to 50 feet in either direction of the centerline as shown on the route maps filed with the application.

EKPC stated that it is seeking authority for this improvement to provide electric transmission capacity to reliably deliver electricity in southern Kentucky from EKPC's planned addition of a new 745-MW generating unit at Cooper Station in Pulaski County, Kentucky. The total estimated cost of the project is \$24.13 million, which includes costs

---

<sup>1</sup> The mileage listed in the application on page 7 was subsequently changed; however, for purposes of this summary, the original mileage is being used.

of the expansions at the KU Alcalde Substation.<sup>2</sup> EKPC intends to initially use its syndicated credit facility or other interim financing for the construction, and to the degree that it is able, low-cost Rural Utility Service (RUS) debt would replace this short-term financing.<sup>3</sup> EKPC's estimated annual cost of operation after the proposed facilities are placed into service is \$1,108,966.<sup>4</sup>

The Commission continued this case to 120 days and established a procedural schedule for the orderly processing of this matter by Order on November 20, 2025.<sup>5</sup> No requests for intervention were made. Initially, EKPC responded to two requests for information from Commission Staff.<sup>6</sup> Following the issuance of a third request for information, EKPC discovered errors in its testimony and application.

An Informal Conference in this matter was held on February 5, 2026, for additional information and clarification regarding Commission Staff's Third Request for Information (Staff's Third Request),<sup>7</sup> wherein EKPC admitted clerical errors had been carried through between the original single line proposal and the application's double line proposal.<sup>8</sup> The errors included a misstatement of the transmission line length of 5.25 miles in lieu of

---

<sup>2</sup> Errata, Direct Testimony of Darrin Adams (Adams Direct Testimony) (filed Feb. 6, 2026) at 13.

<sup>3</sup> Application, Exhibit 4, Direct Testimony of Thomas J. Stachnik (Stachnik Direct Testimony) at 3.

<sup>4</sup> Application at 5.

<sup>5</sup> Order (Ky. Nov. 20, 2025).

<sup>6</sup> EKPC's Response to Commission Staff's First Request for Information (Staff's First Request) (filed Dec. 17, 2025), EKPC's Response to Commission Staff's Second Request for Information (filed Jan. 15, 2026).

<sup>7</sup> EKPC's Response to Commission Staff's Third Request for Information (Staff's Third Request) (filed Feb. 6, 2026); EKPC's Errata filing (filed Feb. 6, 2026).

<sup>8</sup> Informal Conference Memorandum and Attendance List (filed Feb. 10, 2026).

4.54 miles, and typographical errors in the siting study which originally had the transmission line terminating as a single circuit.<sup>9</sup>

On January 20, 2026, EKPC filed a motion to submit this case for an adjudication based upon the existing administrative record and without a formal evidentiary hearing.<sup>10</sup> EKPC confirmed that the case be determined on the record in a response filed on February 6, 2026.<sup>11</sup> Therefore, the record is complete, and the matter stands ready for a decision.

### BACKGROUND

EKPC is a not-for-profit, rural electric cooperative corporation established under KRS Chapter 279 with its headquarters in Winchester, Kentucky.<sup>12</sup> EKPC is a utility as defined in KRS 278.010(3)(a), as well as a generation and transmission cooperative as defined in KRS 278.010(9).<sup>13</sup> EKPC provides electric generation capacity and electric energy to sixteen Owner-Member Cooperatives, which in turn serve over 570,000 Kentucky homes, farms, and commercial and industrial establishments in 89 Kentucky counties.<sup>14</sup> In total, EKPC owns and operates approximately 2,963 MW of net summer generating capacity and 3,265 MW of net winter generating capacity.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Informal Conference Memorandum and Attendance List.

<sup>10</sup> EKPC's Motion to Submit (filed Jan. 20, 2026).

<sup>11</sup> EKPC's Response to Staff's Third Request, Item 2.

<sup>12</sup> Application at 1.

<sup>13</sup> Application at 2.

<sup>14</sup> Application at 1.

<sup>15</sup> Application at 2.

EKPC has been a member of the PJM Interconnection, LLC (PJM) since June 1, 2013.<sup>16</sup> PJM is a regional electric grid and market operator with operational control of over 180,000 MW of regional electric generation through all or parts of Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia. PJM operates the largest capacity and energy market in North America.<sup>17</sup>

### PROPOSED TRANSMISSION PROJECT

EKPC's proposed construction project consists of a new 4.54 mile, 161kV double-circuit electric transmission line between EKPC's Cooper Station and the LG&E/KU Alcalde Substation, with both circuits of the line connected at a new Cooper Station to be constructed as part of the new 745-MW Combined Cycle Gas Turbine (CCGT) generation facility recently approved in Case No. 2024-00370.<sup>18</sup> Both circuits will terminate at the existing LG&E/KU Alcalde 345-161kV Substation.<sup>19</sup> The construction of the transmission line in this case, is the only greenfield project necessary as part of the upgrades for the Cooper CCGT project.<sup>20</sup>

EKPC stated the proposed transmission construction project is also needed due to approval of the Liberty RICE generation facilities in Casey County, Kentucky, approved

---

<sup>16</sup> Application at 2.

<sup>17</sup> Application, Exhibit 2 Direct Testimony of Darin Adams (Adams Direct Testimony) at 3.

<sup>18</sup> Errata Application (filed Feb. 6, 2026) at 4; Case No. 2024-00370, *Electronic Application of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. for 1) Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct a New Generation Resource; 2) for a Site Compatibility Certificate Relating to the Same; 3) Approval of Demand Side Management Tariffs; and 4) Other General Relief* (Ky. PSC July 30, 2025).

<sup>19</sup> Errata Application at 4.

<sup>20</sup> Application, Exhibit 3 Direct Testimony of Lucas Spencer (Spencer Direct Testimony) at 4.

in Case No. 2024-00310.<sup>21</sup> The addition of the Cooper CCGT and Liberty RICE generation facilities will provide approximately one GW of new generation capacity in the area, and EKPC noted it will increase power flows on the existing 161 kV and 69 kV transmission infrastructure.<sup>22</sup>

The line will consist of double construction galvanized steel poles with each circuit utilizing a 1272 aluminum conductor steel supported (ACSS) conductor with a typical shield wire size of 7#6 12 Alumoweld and an optical ground wire (OPGW) of 0.575" 72 count fiber.<sup>23</sup>

### Project Route

EKPC followed the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI)-KY Transmission Line Routing Methodology, and contracted with NV5 Geospatial to perform a Transmission Route Selection to determine the most suitable routing of the line.<sup>24</sup> The evaluation of the routes for the proposed transmission line considered several factors, including existing land uses and habitats, special geographic classifications, floodplains, wetlands, existing infrastructure paralleling opportunities, impact to local communities, and previously confirmed cultural resources.<sup>25</sup> The siting study evaluated many features of the engineering environment, natural environment and built environment along seven

---

<sup>21</sup> Application, Exhibit 2 Adams Direct Testimony at 5. See Case No. 2024-00310, *Electronic Application of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. for 1) a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct a New Generation Resource; 2) a Site Compatibility Certificate; and 3) Other General Relief* (Ky. PSC May 20, 2025) Order.

<sup>22</sup> Application, Exhibit 2 Adams Direct Testimony at 7.

<sup>23</sup> Application, Exhibit 3 Spencer Direct Testimony at 6.

<sup>24</sup> Application, Attachment LS-1 at 5.

<sup>25</sup> Application, Attachment LS-1 at 5.

alternate routes (Route A through Route G) connecting the Cooper and Alcalde substations.<sup>26</sup>

Route B was selected as the preferred route given that it was the overall best scoring route, and the best scoring route in the built, natural, and simple environments of the EPRI model.<sup>27</sup> Route B spans 4.54 miles, with 71.6 acres of forest needing to be cleared, four streams or rivers needing to be crossed, and no residences needing to be relocated within the 150 foot buffer.<sup>28</sup>

### Right-of-Way and Construction

NV5 Geospatial utilized the Standard EPRI-KY methodology to identify the preferred routes for construction of the new 161 kV transmission line, including a required 150 foot wide right-of-way (ROW).<sup>29</sup> EKPC requested the authority to move the location of the line up to 50 feet in either side of the proposed centerline to account for any unexpected conditions that may arise during construction.<sup>30</sup>

EKPC provided evidence it had given notice to each property owner over whose property the transmission line is proposed to cross via first-class mail to the addresses listed by the Pulaski County PVA.<sup>31</sup> Notice of the proposed route was mailed via United States Postal Service (USPS) first class mail to thirty-four property owners, over whose

---

<sup>26</sup> Application, Attachment LS-1 at 63.

<sup>27</sup> Application, Attachment LS-1 at 82.

<sup>28</sup> Application, Attachment LS-1 at 63.

<sup>29</sup> Application, Attachment LS-1 at 6.

<sup>30</sup> Application at 7.

<sup>31</sup> Application at 5.

property the transmission line ROW is proposed to cross on October 8, 2025.<sup>32</sup> The project is planned to begin ROW clearing in the Fall of 2026, with major construction activities beginning in January 2027.<sup>33</sup> Construction will last approximately six months, until July 2027.<sup>34</sup>

### Cost

The original estimated cost of the proposed single line 161 kV transmission line as reported in Case No. 2024-00370 was \$11.15 million. The updated cost in this proceeding, following material change to the project transitioning from single line to double line is \$24.13 million, which is an increase of \$12.98 million and includes the LG&E/KU's 161 kV expansion of the Alcalde Substation to accommodate the new line connection.<sup>35</sup> The estimated construction cost of approximately \$20.13 million in expense is attributable to EKPC, and approximately \$4.0 million in expense is attributable to LG&E/KU.<sup>36</sup> EKPC alleged that the increase of \$12.98 million is primarily for two reasons: (1) the project scope was increased as a result of further planning analysis and (2) cost escalations in materials and services rose from the estimates given in Case No. 2024-00370.<sup>37</sup> EKPC's estimated annual cost of operation after the proposed facilities are placed into service is approximately \$1,108,966.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Application, Exhibit 6.

<sup>33</sup> Application, Exhibit 3 Spencer Direct Testimony at 9.

<sup>34</sup> Application, Exhibit 3 Spencer Direct Testimony at 9.

<sup>35</sup> Errata Adams Direct Testimony at 13.

<sup>36</sup> Errata Adams Direct Testimony at 13.

<sup>37</sup> Application, Exhibit 3 Spencer Direct Testimony at 4-5. Also see the Adams Direct Testimony ERRATA Attachment DA-1, EKPC New Generation Transmission Analysis Report.

<sup>38</sup> Application, Exhibit 3 Spencer Direct Testimony at 4.

## LEGAL STANDARD

The Commission's standard of review regarding a CPCN is well settled. Under KRS 278.020(1), no utility may construct or acquire any facility to be used in providing utility service to the public until it has obtained a CPCN from this Commission. Certain exceptions to this requirement are set forth in KRS 278.020(1)(a), including an exception for projects that are ordinary extensions of existing systems in the usual course of business. However, KRS 278.020(2) states that any electric transmission line of more than 138 kV and more than 5,280 feet in length shall not be considered ordinary extensions of an existing system in the usual course of business, and such transmission lines shall require a CPCN.

To obtain a CPCN, the utility must demonstrate a need for such facilities and an absence of wasteful duplication.<sup>39</sup> "Need" requires:

[A] showing of a substantial inadequacy of existing service, involving a consumer market sufficiently large to make it economically feasible for the new system or facility to be constructed or operated, and "the inadequacy must be due either to a substantial deficiency of service facilities, beyond what could be supplied by normal improvements in the ordinary course of business; or to indifference, poor management or disregard of the rights of consumers, persisting over such a period of time as to establish an inability or unwillingness to render adequate service".<sup>40</sup>

"Wasteful duplication" is defined as "an excess of capacity over need" and "an excessive investment in relation to productivity or efficiency, and an unnecessary multiplicity of physical properties".<sup>41</sup> To demonstrate that a proposed facility does not

---

<sup>39</sup> *Kentucky Utilities Co. v. Pub. Serv. Comm'n*, 252 S.W.2d 885 (KY. 1952).

<sup>40</sup> *Kentucky Utilities Co. v. Pub. Serv. Comm'n*, 252 S.W.2d 885, at 890.

<sup>41</sup> *Kentucky Utilities Co. v. Pub. Serv. Comm'n*, 252 S.W.2d 885, at 890.

result in wasteful duplication, the Commission has held that the applicant must demonstrate that a thorough review of all reasonable alternatives has been performed.<sup>42</sup> The fundamental principle of reasonable, least-cost alternative is embedded in such an analysis. Selection of a proposal that ultimately costs more than an alternative does not necessarily result in wasteful duplication.<sup>43</sup> All relevant factors must be balanced.<sup>44</sup>

### DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

Having reviewed the record and being otherwise sufficiently advised, the Commission finds that EKPC has met its burden, establishing the need for a new transmission line. EKPC stated the 161 kV line and related investments are needed in order to provide greater capacity and reliability in the service area.<sup>45</sup> In addition, based on the evidence, the Commission finds that EKPC has provided sufficient evidence of a lack of wasteful duplication as discussed below.

Initially, using only the new generation provided from the Liberty RICE facility in a power flow analysis using a single circuit, EKPC noted it would need to undertake four transmission system upgrade projects.<sup>46</sup> However, once EKPC added in the new generation from the Cooper Station CCGT into the power flow analysis, there were

---

<sup>42</sup> Case No. 2005-00142, *Joint Application of Louisville Gas and Electric Company and Kentucky Utilities Company for the Construction of Transmission Facilities in Jefferson, Bullitt, Meade, and Hardin Counties, Kentucky* (Ky. PSC Sept. 8, 2005).

<sup>43</sup> See *Kentucky Utilities Co. v. Pub. Serv. Comm'n*, 390 S.W.2d 168, 175 (Ky. 1965). See also Case No. 2005-00089, *The Application of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct a 138 kV Electric Transmission Line in Rowan County, Kentucky* (Ky. PSC Aug. 19, 2005).

<sup>44</sup> Case No. 2005-00089, Aug. 19, 2005 final Order at 6.

<sup>45</sup> Errata Application at 7.

<sup>46</sup> Errata Adams Direct Testimony at 7.

numerous transmission system upgrades required.<sup>47</sup> EKPC requested that LG&E/KU model the new line to determine which facilities would be mitigated by the proposed project.<sup>48</sup> LG&E/KU performed this analysis and provided results to EKPC indicating that nine overloaded facilities were identified on its system, five of which were associated with the Cooper CCGT generation addition.<sup>49</sup> EKPC's review of these results indicated that modifying the scope of the Cooper-Alcalde 161 kV line from a single-circuit line to a double circuit line would eliminate overloads on some of the LG&E/KU facilities, and would reduce the flows significantly on other LG&E/KU facilities such that the scope of the required upgrades could be reduced.<sup>50</sup> In fact, changing the project to a double circuit line would result in minimal increased expenses, \$7.03 million while, according to EKPC, be offset by approximately \$38.61 million reduction in expense related to transmission facilities projects.<sup>51</sup>

EKPC reviewed the initial results from a power flow study analysis by PJM using the 161 kV single circuit transmission line which identified a total of 93 overloaded facilities on the system as a result of the added generation from the Liberty RICE and Cooper Station CCGT.<sup>52</sup> EKPC's analysis indicates that the Cooper-Alcalde 161 kV double-circuit line will eliminate 37 of the overloads completely and will reduce the flows on the

---

<sup>47</sup> Errata Adams Direct Testimony at 7.

<sup>48</sup> Errata Adams Direct Testimony at 8.

<sup>49</sup> Errata Adams Direct Testimony at 8.

<sup>50</sup> Errata Adams Direct Testimony at 8.

<sup>51</sup> Errata EKPC's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 4.

<sup>52</sup> Errata Adams Testimony at 6 and 8.

remaining five facilities.<sup>53</sup> EKPC submitted the new 161 kV double-circuit line to PJM as a proposed network upgrade project to address various thermal violations that were identified in PJM's Phase 1 power-flow analysis for Transition Cycle #2.<sup>54</sup> According to the application, PJM is incorporating this transmission reinforcement project, along with all other proposed network upgrades identified by EKPC and the other PJM Transmission Owners into its power-flow models that will be used for Phase 2 of the Transition Cycle #2 analysis.<sup>55</sup> PJM's Phase 2 analysis will verify that all proposed network upgrades identified by the EKPC and LG&E/KU will adequately mitigate the thermal violations identified in the Phase 1 analysis.<sup>56</sup>

The Commission notes that, although there may be some additional projects, overall, the double circuit 161 kV transmission line will address the need created by the additional generation projects and result in an overall efficient solution, thus will not result in wasteful duplication. The proposed project will be a new 4.54 mile 161 kV transmission line connection between two substations in the region, EKPC's Cooper Station and the upgraded LG&E/KU Alcalde Substation.<sup>57</sup> As such, it will not be replacing nor duplicating any current facilities.

EKPC reviewed the proposed routes and asserts the process resulted in the selection of a route that will have the least impact on the surrounding area and property owners. The Siting Study evaluated many features of the engineering environment,

---

<sup>53</sup> Errata Adams Direct Testimony at 8.

<sup>54</sup> Application, Exhibit 2, Adams Direct Testimony at 6.

<sup>55</sup> Application, Exhibit 2, Adams Direct Testimony at 6.

<sup>56</sup> Application, Exhibit 2, Adams Direct Testimony at 6.

<sup>57</sup> Errata Adams Direct Testimony, at 11.

natural environment and built environment along seven alternate routes, Route A through Route G, connecting the Cooper and Alcalde substations.<sup>58</sup> Although Route G was the best scoring route in the engineering environment, Route G was the poorest scoring route in all other environments.<sup>59</sup> Route B scored 4th best in the Engineering environment with a score of 0.560, which is very similar to the 2nd and 3rd best scoring routes (Route C & Route D, respectively).<sup>60</sup> Route B was selected as the preferred route given that it was the overall best scoring, least cost route, and the best scoring route in the built, natural, and simple environments of the EPRI model.<sup>61</sup>

While the original routing study and testimony contained inconsistent mileage references due to the early oversight, the routing methodology, route selection, and final design remained consistent throughout the project.<sup>62</sup> The correct description, maps, and costs were reflected for Route B with the only incorrect information being the length of the line.<sup>63</sup> According to EKPC, the final design documents accurately reflect the proposed alignment and total length, and the siting report has been updated to reflect the correct route descriptions and the final centerline length based on the design initially attached.<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> Application, Attachment LS-1 at 69.

<sup>59</sup> Application, Attachment LS-1 at 82.

<sup>60</sup> Application, Attachment LS-1 at 82.

<sup>61</sup> Application, Attachment LS-1 at 81.

<sup>62</sup> EKPC's Responses to Staff's Third Request, Item 1(b) at 3. Although EKPC did correct items related to the length and construction of the line, it does not appear the approximate cost was updated in the Table included above.

<sup>63</sup> EKPC's Response to Staff's Third Request, Item 1(b) at 3.

<sup>64</sup> EKPC's Response to Staff's Third Request, Item 1(b) at 3.

Table 1. Updated analysis results for the 7 routes identified during the Route Selection Study

	Route A	Route B	Route C	Route D	Route E	Route F	Route G
<b>Built</b>							
Relocated Residences (within 150' Corridor)	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Proximity to Residences (300' buffer)	12	5	5	3	8	9	19
Proximity to Commercial Buildings (300')	0	0	1	1	1	1	7
Rank	4	1	3	2	5	6	7
<b>Natural</b>							
Natural Forests (Acres)	74.84	71.64	66.58	71.82	73.09	67.88	78.38
Stream River Crossings	7	4	7	6	7	8	8
Floodplain (Acres)	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.45
Rank	4	1	3	2	5	6	7
<b>Engineering</b>							
Length (miles)	5.48	4.54	5.25	5.15	5.40	5.50	6.10
Co-location with transmission line (miles)	0.53	0.94	2.04	1.55	2.23	2.71	4.70
Co-location with roads (miles)	0.46	0.31	0.25	0.24	0.25	0.26	0.88
Rank	7	4	3	2	5	6	1
Total Project Cost (Million)	\$ 10.7	\$ 9.7	\$ 10.5	\$ 11.1	\$ 11.4	\$ 11.2	\$ 12.9

The Commission finds that EKPC’s request for a CPCN for the 4.54-mile 161 kV double-circuit transmission line between EKPC’s Cooper Station and the LG&E/KU Alcalde Substation should be granted. In addition, the Commission finds that the flexibility to move the proposed transmission line up to 50 feet in either direction of the centerline to account for any unexpected conditions that may arise during the construction of the 161 kV transmission line should also be granted so long as no new property owners are affected. If a new parcel owner is impacted, EKPC shall request approval from the Commission for a change in the transmission line route.

The Commission also finds that EKPC should file a motion requesting Commission approval upon knowledge of any material changes to the project, including but not limited to, increase in cost, any significant delays in construction, any deviations, or any changes in the route of the transmission line not expressly authorized in this Order.<sup>65</sup> Upon

<sup>65</sup> Case No. 2022-00314, *Electronic Application of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. for a (1) Certificate Of Public Convenience and Necessity for the Construction of Transmission Facilities in Madison County, Kentucky; and (2) Declaratory Order Confirming that a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity is not Required for Certain Facilities* (Ky. PSC Sep. 22, 2023), Order at 3, “Instead of seeking leave of the Commission’s initial requirements, EKPC instead chose to inform the Commission what it was going to do.”

receiving adequate information to thoroughly consider the request, the Commission will use its best efforts to rule upon such motions within 14 days.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. EKPC is granted a CPCN to construct and operate a 4.54 mile 161 kV double-circuit transmission line between EKPC's Cooper Station and the LG&E/KU Alcalde Substation located in Pulaski County, Kentucky.

2. EKPC is granted authority to move the location of proposed transmission line up to 50 feet on either side of the centerline to account for any unexpected conditions that may arise during construction unless a new parcel owner is impacted.

3. EKPC shall file a motion requesting approval of any material changes to the project, including but not limited to, increase in cost, any significant delays in construction, any deviations, or any changes in the route of the transmission line not expressly authorized in this Order.

4. EKPC shall file with the Commission documentation of the total costs of the projects, including the cost of construction and all other capitalized costs, including engineering, legal, administrative, etc., within 60 days of the date that construction authorized under this CPCN is substantially completed. Construction costs shall be classified into appropriate plant accounts in accordance with the Uniform System of Accounts for electric utilities as prescribed by the Commission.

5. EKPC shall file a survey of the final location of the transmission facilities after any modifications are finalized as authorized by this Order and before construction begins.

6. EKPC shall file as built drawings and maps, and a certified statement that the construction has been satisfactorily completed in accordance with the plans and specifications within 60 days of the completion of the construction authorized by this Order.

7. EKPC shall file with the Commission all permits acquired in connection with this project within 30 days of issuance of the permit.

8. Any documents filed in the future pursuant to ordering paragraph 3 through 7 shall reference this case number and shall be retained in the post-case correspondence file for this proceeding.

9. This case is closed and removed from the Commission's docket.

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioner

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioner

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Executive Director



\*L. Allyson Honaker  
Honaker Law Office, PLLC  
1795 Alysheba Way  
Suite 1203  
Lexington, KY 40509

\*Greg Cecil  
East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc.  
4775 Lexington Road  
P. O. Box 707  
Winchester, KY 40392-0707

\*Heather Temple  
Honaker Law Office, PLLC  
1795 Alysheba Way  
Suite 1203  
Lexington, KY 40509

\*Jacob Watson  
East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc.  
4775 Lexington Road  
P. O. Box 707  
Winchester, KY 40392-0707

\*Meredith L. Cave  
Honaker Law Office, PLLC  
1795 Alysheba Way  
Suite 1203  
Lexington, KY 40509

\*East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc.  
4775 Lexington Road  
P. O. Box 707  
Winchester, KY 40392-0707