In the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF KENTUCKY UTILITIES)
COMPANY FOR AN ADJUSTMENT OF ITS) CASE NO. 2012-00221
ELECTRIC RATES)

KIUC'S RESPONSES TO COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

1. Refer to the Direct Testimony of Stephen J. Baron, Exhibits SJB-3, SJB-4, and SBJ-5. Provide
an electronic copy in spreadsheet format of each of the cost-of- service studies that support these
exhibits with the formulas intact and unprotected and with all columns and rows accessible.
RESPONSE:
See attached.
Answering Witness: Stephen J. Baron

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF KENTUCKY UTILITIES

COMPANY FOR AN ADJUSTMENT OF ITS

ELECTRIC RATES

)

(CASE NO. 2012-00221)

KIUC'S RESPONSES TO COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

2. Refer to the Direct Testimony and Exhibits of Lane Kollen ("Kollen Testimony, at pages 8-10, and the first attachment to Exhibit.(LK-4), both of which relate to the offsystem sales ("OSS") margin adjustment proposed by Kentucky Utilities Company ("KU"). On page 8, at lines 13-14, Mr. Kollen states that the proposed adjustment "fails to fully address any effects of seasonality on the margins that might occur over a full month test year." However, starting on page 9, at line 19, and concluding on page IO, at line 2, Mr. Kollen states that "there is no obvious pattern to the OSS margins," a statement which appears to be supported by the quarterly OSS sales data in the attachment. If there is "no obvious pattern," explain why Mr. Kollen cites "effects of seasonality" as a problem with the proposed adjustment.

RESPONSE:

Seasonality does not necessarily reflect itself in a pattern, but does affect a utility's offsystem sales and margins. For example, scheduled maintenance tends to be performed during the off-peak months during the year, thus leaving less capacity and energy to sell into the market. Purchased power tends to be cheaper during the off-peak months during the year. There are a

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY FOR AN ADJUSTMENT OF ITS

ELECTRIC RATES

) CASE NO. 2012-00221

KIUC'S RESPONSES TO COMMISSION STAFF'S

FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

multitude of other factors that also influence OSS sales and margins, all of which change

throughout the year. Thus, the best measures of all of these effects, if the Commission does not

adopt a selective post-test adjustment, as the Companies now propose, are the actual test year

off-system sales and margins. In Mr. Kollen's opinion, the Commission should use the test year

amounts unless there is something unusual or abnormal and nonrecurring that should be

normalized. The Companies have failed to demonstrate that any amounts of the off-system sales

and margins were unusual or abnormal and nonrecurring in the test year. The mere fact that the

off-system sales and margins were different in the immediate months after the test year

compared to the months during the test year in and of itself is not a valid test as to whether the

amounts in the test year should be normalized.

Answering Witness: Lane Kollen

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF KENTUCKY UTILITIES

COMPANY FOR AN ADJUSTMENT OF ITS

ELECTRIC RATES

)

(CASE NO. 2012-00221)

KIUC'S RESPONSES TO COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

- 3. Refer to pages 12-14 of the Kollen Testimony where Mr. Kollen discusses his proposed adjustment to normalize KU's generation outage maintenance expense. Mr. Kollen calculates his adjustment based on five years of historical data, adjusted for inflation and cites KU's data responses which indicate that its projected 2013 generation outage maintenance expense will be less than the test-year expense level.
- a. The test-year expense was \$20.6 million, the expense levels in the five years used in Mr. Kollen's proposed adjustment ranged from \$8.9 to \$20.2 million, and KU's projected expense levels are \$11.8 million in 2013 and \$29.6 million in 2014. With these ranges, historically, \$11.3 million, and projected, \$17.8 million, explain why an adjustment, be it a decrease or an increase, is appropriate.
- b. Explain why Mr. Kollen's proposed adjustment is dependent on KU's 2013 projected expense being less than the test-year expense.
- c. If an adjustment such as that proposed by Mr. Kollen is accepted by the Commission, explain whether KIUC believes that similar adjustments would need to be made in future KU cases, regardless of whether the adjustment was an increase or decrease.

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF KENTUCKY UTILITIES)
COMPANY FOR AN ADJUSTMENT OF ITS) CASE NO. 2012-00221
ELECTRIC RATES)

KIUC'S RESPONSES TO COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

d. Explain why a five-year historical period was used in the proposed adjustment, as opposed to either a shorter or longer period.

RESPONSE:

a. The generation maintenance expense in the test year was greater than in any of the preceding 5 years and is greater than KU anticipates when new base rates are effective in 2013. The high end of the range for the historic years cited in the question reflects the unusually high expense in 2011 that also was reflected in the test year. The Commission and the Companies recognize that unusually high or low expense amounts in the test year sometimes need to be normalized in order to ensure that the Companies' reasonable expenses over time are recovered on the one hand and that customers are not required to provide excessive recovery over time on the other hand. Accordingly, the Commission traditionally has normalized revenues and expenses to remove the effects of unusual or abnormal and nonrecurring events and amounts, allowed certain storm damage expenses to be deferred and then recovered on an amortized basis, and used averages over historic time periods for certain expenses that vary significantly over time, such as storm damage expense and injuries and damages.

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF KENTUCKY UTILITIES

COMPANY FOR AN ADJUSTMENT OF ITS

ELECTRIC RATES

)

(CASE NO. 2012-00221)

KIUC'S RESPONSES TO COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

- b. This fact provides further evidence that the test year expense is unusually high and abnormal and nonrecurring. Mr. Kollen did not use the Company's projection in the quantification of his adjustment.
- c. Yes. This expense is greater than the storm damage expense and injuries and damages expense, which the Commission historically has normalized based on averages of actual expenses in prior years. Thus, the variability of this expense from year to year has a greater impact on the Company's revenue requirement and on its earnings than the other expenses.
- d. Mr. Kollen used a shorter period than the Commission's use of a 10 year average for storm damage expense and injuries and damages expense due to the changes in the Company's generation portfolio that have occurred over the last 10 years. The use of a 5 year average provides a closer proxy to its present generation portfolio than would a 10 year average.

Answering Witness: Lane Kollen

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY FOR AN ADJUSTMENT OF ITS

ELECTRIC RATES

) CASE NO. 2012-00221

KIUC'S RESPONSES TO

COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

4. Refer to page 21 of the Kollen Testimony at lines 3-9. Provide the amount of the change to KU's

rate-case amortization expense based on this alternative to Mr. Kollen's primary recommendation.

RESPONSE:

Effectively, it would be \$0. The remaining balance for KU will be \$0.008 at the

beginning of the rate effective period if the Commission rejects the Company's proposal to retain

the recovery of the 2008 rate case expenses after the amortization was completed rather than

applying the recovery to the 2009 rate case expenses. If the \$0.008 million is amortized over 36

months, then the annual recovery would be \$0.00027 million, or effectively \$0, the same amount

that Mr. Kollen recommended.

Answering Witness: Lane Kollen

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF KENTUCKY UTILITIES)
COMPANY FOR AN ADJUSTMENT OF ITS) CASE NO. 2012-00221
ELECTRIC RATES)

KIUC'S RESPONSES TO COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

5. Refer to page 5 of the Testimony of Richard A. Baudino ("Baudino Testimony"), pages 16 through 18. Explain why no gas utilities or combination utilities were included in the proxy group, and whether excluding such companies makes the proxy group size too small for a reliable comparison group.

RESPONSE:

Please note that according to the AUS Utility Report, September 2012, the following companies in Mr. Baudino's comparison group are considered combination electric and gas companies:

Alliant

Avista

Black Hills Corp.

Consolidated Edison

Dominion Resources

DTE Energy

Pepco Holdings

PG&E Corp.

TECO Energy

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF KENTUCKY UTILITIES

COMPANY FOR AN ADJUSTMENT OF ITS

ELECTRIC RATES

)

(CASE NO. 2012-00221)

KIUC'S RESPONSES TO COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Wisconsin Energy Xcel Energy

Mr. Baudino did not include gas distribution utilities because he estimated the cost of equity for KU's electric operations. Mr. Baudino believes that 16 companies comprise a sufficiently large enough group to reliably estimate the cost of equity for KU.

Answering Witness: Richard A. Baudino

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF KENTUCKY UTILITIES

COMPANY FOR AN ADJUSTMENT OF ITS **ELECTRIC RATES**

) CASE NO. 2012-00221

KIUC'S RESPONSES TO

COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

6. Refer to pages 21 and 22 of the Baudino Testimony. Explain why using internal growth and

return calculations, which are derived in part through rates determined by ROES awarded in other

jurisdictions, as a proxy for dividend growth does not introduce a certain amount of circularity into the

calculation.

RESPONSE:

Mr. Baudino agrees that a degree of circularity exists in the retention growth method when

Commission-allowed returns are used as the expected growth rate. In the retention growth rates

used by Mr. Baudino in his testimony, he used Value Line forecasts that are based on expected

returns from Value Line.

Answering Witness: Richard A. Baudino

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF KENTUCKY UTILITIES

COMPANY FOR AN ADJUSTMENT OF ITS **ELECTRIC RATES**

) CASE NO. 2012-00221

KIUC'S RESPONSES TO

COMMISSION STAFF'S

FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

7. Refer to the Direct Testimony of Dennis W. Goins, page 22, at which Mr. Gains discusses the

recommended three percent increase to curtailable service-rider credits. Provide the basis for the

proposed three-percent increase, and all calculations supporting its reasonableness.

RESPONSE:

Please see the workpapers filed with Dr. Goins' direct testimony—specifically, the Excel file

KIUC Goins WPs 2012-00221-00222-dg.xls at tab 2012-1K. Cells L30-L34 show the percentage

increase in demand charges for various industrial firm service rates proposed by KU and LG&E. These

increases range from 5.87 percent to 21.08 percent. In a perfect world, the CSR credits should increase

by these amounts to maintain the existing relative relationship of firm and nonfirm service prices.

However, Dr. Goins has proposed 3 percent increase in the CSR credits to offset partially the increase in

firm service rates proposed by KU and LG&E, and to mitigate the relative price distortion between firm

and interruptible service that would arise if KU's and LG&E's proposed firm service rate increases were

approved.

Answering Witness: Dennis W. Goins

The undersigned, Richard A. Baudino of Kennedy & Associates, being duly sworn, deposes and states that he has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the forgoing responses for which he is the identified witness and that the information contained therein is true and correct to the best of his information, knowledge, and belief.

Richard A. Baudino Oct. 25, 2012

Richard H. Reich Notary Public Forsyth County, NC

My Commission Expires Feb. 11, 2017

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA COUNTY OF FORSYTH

Sworn to and subscribed before me on this

25th day of October, 2012.

My commission expires: February 11,2017

The undersigned, Dennis W. Goins of Potomac Management Group, being duly sworn, deposes and states that he has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the foregoing responses for which he is the identified witness and that the information contained therein is true and correct to the best of his information, knowledge, and belief.

Dennis W Goins

Sworn to and subscribed before me on this 24th day of October, 2012.

Notary Public

JOSHUA J. TOTH Notary Public Commonwealth of Virginia 7208060

My Commission Expires Jun 30, 2016

The undersigned, Lane Kollen of Kennedy & Associates, being duly sworn, deposes and states that he has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the forgoing responses for which he is the identified witness and that the information contained therein is true and correct to the best of his information, knowledge, and belief.

Lane Kollen

Sworn to and subscribed before me on this 24th day of October, 2012.

Notary Public

O WOLLO WAS TO SHARE THE STATE OF THE STATE

The undersigned, Stephen J. Baron of Kennedy and Associates, being duly sworn, deposes and states that he has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the forgoing responses for which he is the identified witness and that the information contained therein is true and correct to the best of his information, knowledge, and belief.

Stephen J. Baron

Sworn to and subscribed before me on this 24th day of October, 2012.

Notary Public

OUNTY.