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## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

With regard to the proposed Kentucky Economic Development Surcharge, please confirm
that all funds collected will go solely toward economic development, and exclusively within the KPCo service territory. If not, why not?

## RESPONSE

Kentucky Power confirms the statement. All funds collected through the K.E.D.S. tariff will be directed to economic development in the Company's service territory.

# American Electric Power Company, Inc. 2013 Gain Sharing Plan 

## Introduction

AEP is searching for sustainable cost savings in connection with its current business plan. The objectives of the 2013 Gain Sharing Plan (the Plan) are to:
$>$ Align and create an avenue for all employees to contribute to the sustainable savings target;
$>$ Create an environment that is not just about cutting Operations and Maintenance (O\&M) costs, but focused on new ideas and on working differently in the future that will lead to savings; and
$>$ Create a line of sight for each employee to contribute to the generation of innovative or money saving ideas that result in a direct benefit for AEP in 2013.

## Overview

The current AEP budget assumes that the Company will achieve $\$ 200$ million of sustainable savings for 2013 (the "2013 Target"). Under this Plan, AEP would share with the eligible Participants $50 \%$ of meaningful sustainable savings and additional revenues that result in AEP exceeding the 2013 Target. The payout cap generally will be $\$ 1,000$ per eligible Participant.

## Terms \& Conditions

## Gain Sharing

Employees are encouraged to submit cost-saving and revenue-enhancing ideas. AEP Management reserves full discretion to decide whether, when and how any of the submitted ideas will be implemented. To the extent AEP generates meaningful sustainable savings and additional revenues that result in AEP exceeding the 2013 Target, there will be a payout to the eligible Participants.

A Committee has been formed to administer this Plan. The Committee will have full discretionary authority to make all determinations under this Plan, including but not limited to,

- Whether and to what extent AEP achieves savings and additional revenues for 2013 that both (a) exceed the 2013 Target and (b) are sustainable into future years. That sustainable excess is referred to in this Plan as the "Gain;"
- The number and identity of the Participants who will be considered eligible for the payment of an award under this Plan;
- The amount payable under this Plan to eligible Participants, which shall not exceed Fifty Percent (50\%) of the Gain (the "Gain Sharing Pool");
- The Gain Sharing Pool generally shall be allocated among the eligible Participants, using the following guidelines:
o The share for each eligible Participant shall be prorated based upon the number of whole or partial months during calendar year 2013 that such Participant was on the payroll of a Participating AEP System Company;

0 The share for each eligible Participant classified by AEP as a part time employee shall be further reduced by applying a percentage equal to the percentage of full-time status that such Participant's estimated regular work schedule approximately represents.
o The non-prorated full share for any eligible Participant shall not exceed \$1,000 of regular bonus pay (the "Payout Cap");
o The Committee shall take into account the impact of applicable law, including wage and hour laws, on the amount payable to eligible Participants who are entitled to overtime pay during 2013;
o The Committee may further enhance the share of eligible Participants who receive overtime pay during 2013 in a manner similar to that implemented for compliance with applicable law; and

- Whether the Gain is meaningful, provided that the Gain shall not be considered meaningful if it would result in a Gain Sharing Pool that would provide a payout of less than $\$ 50$ to any eligible Participant who is classified by the Committee as a full time employee for the entire 2013 calendar year.

All determinations by the Committee shall be final and binding on all interested persons.
All payments shall be subject to such taxes, deductions and withholdings determined by the Committee to be required by law or otherwise appropriate.

## Committee

The Committee consists of American Electric Power Service Corporation’s Chief Executive Officer \& President, Chief Operating Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Chief Administrative Officer, General Counsel and top Human Resources officer. The CEO of American Electric Power Company, Inc. may change the composition and number of members of the Committee at any time for any reason. The Committee may delegate day-to-day authority to administer the Plan, as they deem appropriate. In lieu of an official meeting, the Committee may act by written or electronic consent of a majority of its members.

The Committee's interpretations of the Plan provisions are conclusive and binding on all Participants.

The Committee has sole authority to amend or terminate the Plan and may do so at any time, for any reason, either with or without notice. The Committee may adopt, delete, modify or adjust the manner in which Gain is to be measured at any time, including after the conclusion of 2013, should the Committee determine that changes in AEP structure or other significant business situations would result in a Gain for the year that is not reflective of the actual performance of the business. The Committee may also modify the eligibility criteria for the Plan and add or delete individual participants or groups of participants.

## Participation

All AEP employees classified as full-time or regular part-time on the payroll of a Participating AEP System Company at the time a gain sharing award payment is made under this Plan will be "Participants" in the Plan for 2013 except:

1. Any employee who is an Executive Officer (that is, those employees identified by AEP as subject to the disclosure requirements set forth in Section 16 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended) at any time between January 1, 2013 and the date the payment of any award under this Plan,
2. Any employee represented by unions that have not accepted the opportunity to participate in the Plan prior to December 31, 2013,
3. Individuals classified by AEP as temporary employees, co-ops, interns, contract workers and any other non-employee status as of December 31, 2013
4. Employees who have received no Qualifying Pay during calendar year 2013; and
5. Employees hired (or last rehired) by AEP on or after December 1, 2013.

Each direct or indirect wholly owned subsidiary of American Electric Power Company, Inc., which has employees on its payroll shall be considered a Participating AEP System Company, except that Bluestar Energy S.A.C. shall not be considered a Participating AEP System Company for purposes of this Plan.

For purposes of this Plan, "Qualifying Pay" shall include only: (1) Regular Earnings - Straight Rate; (2) Paid Vacation; (3) Paid Holidays; (4) Paid Personal Days Off; (5) Sick Pay (Nonoccupational \& Occupational); (6) Paid Jury Duty; (7) Paid Death in Family; (8) Paid Rest Period; (9) Inclement Weather Pay; (10) Lump Sum Merit Increase; (11) Lump Sum General Increase; (12) Grievance Settlement for Wages; (13) Overtime - Nonexempt and Exempt; (14) Shift Premium; (15) Sunday Premium; (16) Military Pay; and (17) Trip Pay (River). Earnings not classified as one of the above types in the AEP payroll system are not considered "Qualifying Pay" for purposes of determining eligibility for an award.

Participation in this Plan shall not confer any right to continued employment or to continued participation in any replacement or successor program.

Plan Participants are expected to comply with all applicable Company policies and directives as well as all applicable laws and regulations. Failure to do so may have many serious consequences, including but not limited to forfeiture of Plan eligibility in the current and future years.

Participants must be employed on the payroll of a Participating AEP System Company at the time of payment of a gain sharing award to be eligible to receive a gain sharing award for 2013, except as otherwise noted below. Individuals will not be eligible for an award if not on the payroll of a Participating AEP System Company at the time of payment, regardless of the reason they are not on such a payroll (e.g., if the Participant would die, retire, sever, resign or otherwise terminate their employment).

If a Participant transfers on or before December 31, 2013 to a position that is ineligible to participate in the Plan, then such Participant will be ineligible to receive an award from the Plan for 2013.

Satisfaction of eligibility criteria does not guarantee the payment of any award.

## Award Payment

Award payment will be made within 2-1/2 months after the end 2013 or as soon as practical thereafter if it is impractical, either administratively or economically, to make payments within this time period.


## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Provide all schedules, workpapers, and computations in electronic spreadsheet format with all formulas intact. For all input values, provide the source documents and/or calculations, including all electronic spreadsheets with all formulas intact.

## RESPONSE

In addition to Sections IV and V, which were filed on December 23, 2015 as excel spreadsheets, the requested documents are attached as follows:

| Attachment numbers | Witness |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 through 31 | Davis |
| 32 | McCoy |
| 33 through 36 | Stegall |
| 37 through 55 | Vaughan |
| 56 through 57 | Reitter |
| 58 through 72 | Yoder |
| 73 through 78 | Wohnhas |
| 79 through 83 | LaFleur |
| 84 through 151 | Avera/McKenzie |
|  | *Please note, the yellow highlighting in KIUC_1_17_Attachment 91 was for internal purposes |
| only and does not indicate confidentiality. |  |
| 152 through 167 | Rogness |
| 168 through 198 | Elliott |

WITNESS: Ranie K Wohnhas

AEV WP 2
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { SUBACCOUNT } & \text { AEPKPD } \\ \text { OP_MONTH } & \text { (Multiple Items) }\end{array}$

| AEV WP 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SUBACCOUNT | AEPKPD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OP_MONTH | (Multiple Items) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sum of |  |  |  |  | Sum of | Sum of |  | Sum of |  |
|  | DA_OP_R | Sum of | Sum of | Sum of | REG | LOST_OPPO | SYNCH_RESERVE | Sum of | SYNCH_RES_LOST_ |  |
| Row Labels | ES | BAL_LOST_OP_CR | REG_RMCCP | REG_RMPCP |  | UNITY_COST | _TIER1 | SYNCH_SRMCP | OPPORTUNITY |  |
| AEP BIG SANDY 1 |  | 152,658 | 65,341 | 4,886 |  | 51,401 | 24,094 | 16,523 | 3,748 |  |
| AEP BIG SANDY 2 |  | 182,070 | 145,524 | 11,019 |  | 324,686 | 54,932 | 18,904 | 11,171 |  |
| Grand Total |  | 334,728 | 210,865 | 15,905 |  | 376,087 | 79,026 | 35,427 | 14,919 |  |
|  | LRS |  | Net | Net | Net |  | Net | Net | Net |  |
| SUBACCOUNT AEPKPD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Regulation LOC credits from test year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sum of BAL_LOST_1 Column Labels |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Row Labels | AEP BIG SA AEP BIG SANDY 2 |  | Grand Total |  | KPD |  | OSS Ratio | LSE Ratio | BS 1 LSE LOC Credit BS 2 LSE LOC Credit |  |
| Jan-14 | 152,658 | 182,070 | 334,728 |  |  | 1/1/2014 | 0.24501 | 0.75499 | 115,255.26 | 137,461.03 |
| Feb-14 |  | - | - |  |  | 2/1/2014 | 0.23695 | 0.76305 |  |  |
| Mar-14 |  | - | - |  |  | 3/1/2014 | 0.24064 | 0.75936 |  |  |
| Apr-14 |  | - | - |  |  | 4/1/2014 | 0.32194 | 0.67806 |  |  |
| May-14 |  | - | - |  |  | 5/1/2014 | 0.1836 | 0.8164 |  |  |
| Jun-14 |  | - | - |  |  | 6/1/2014 | 0.36622 | 0.63378 |  |  |
| Jul-14 |  | - | - |  |  | 7/1/2014 | 0.32581 | 0.67419 |  |  |
| Aug-14 |  | - | - |  |  | 8/1/2014 | 0.37329 | 0.62671 |  |  |
| Sep-14 |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grand Total | 152,658 | 182,070 | 334,728 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Please provide detailed workpapers, electronically with all formulas intact, showing how PJM charges were derived that were added back in that the Company assumed it would incur to serve internal load without having BS2. Also, explain why administrative fees for both BS1 and BS2 were added back in, when Mr. Vaughan at line 7 of page 25 states that administrative fees for just BS2 had to be added back in.

## RESPONSE

See the Company's response to KIUC 1-17, specifically see KIUC_1_17_Attachments 40 and 41 for the requested workpapers regarding the amounts in columns E and F of Exhibit AEV 5 page 2 of 5 .

Only the $\$ 58,624$ of PJM administrative fees related to the internal load served by Big Sandy 2 should have been added back. The $\$ 19,025$ of PJM administrative fees related to Big Sandy 1 should not have been added back in because the $\$ 19,025$ is included in the Company's proposed BS1OR revenue requirement.

WITNESS: Alex E Vaughan

# KPSC 2014-00396 General Rate Adjustment Attorney General's Initial Set of Data Requests Dated January 29, 2015 Item No. 338 <br> Page 1 of 1 

## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Refer to the testimony of Mr. Vaughan concerning the BS1OR.
a. When will Big Sandy be converted to a natural gas fired generating plant?
b. For each year, 2009 through 2014, identify the total amounts, by account, of each type of cost that KPCo is proposing be recovered in the BS1OR Rider.

## RESPONSE

a. The Big Sandy Gas Conversion project is scheduled to be in-service in June 2016.
b. Please see AG_1_338_Attachment1.xls for this response.

WITNESS: Alex E Vaughan

Exhibit RCS-17
Case No. 2014-00396
Page 7 of 10

| Big Sandy Unit 1 Actual Expenses |  |  | Calendar Years |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Account by Cal Yr |  | O\&M Account | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
| Allowances | 5090000 | Allow Consum Title IV SO2 | \$442,883 | \$1,945,381 | \$3,195,691 | \$2,269,435 | \$1,346,394 | \$1,628,061 |
|  | 5090001 | Allowance Consumption - NOx |  |  |  |  |  | \$5,951 |
|  | 5090005 | An. NOx Cons. Exp | \$127,129 | \$80,437 | \$266,931 | \$19,953 | \$2,982 | \$25,702 |
| Allowances Total |  |  | \$570,013 | \$2,025,818 | \$3,462,623 | \$2,289,387 | \$1,349,375 | \$1,659,714 |
| Ash Sales | 5010012 | Ash Sales Proceeds |  |  |  | $(\$ 57,201)$ | $(\$ 3,320)$ | $(\$ 14,295)$ |
| Ash Sales Total |  |  |  |  |  | $(\$ 57,201)$ | (\$3,320) | (\$14,295) |
| Consumables | 5020001 | Lime Expense | (\$0) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5020002 | Urea Expense |  |  |  |  |  | \$590 |
|  | 5020003 | Trona Expense | \$0 |  |  | \$5 |  |  |
|  | 5020004 | Limestone Expense | (\$0) |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
|  | 5020007 | Lime Hydrate Expense |  |  |  |  |  | \$5 |
|  | 5020008 | Activated Carbon |  | \$0 | \$5 | (\$2) | \$0 |  |
| Consumables Total |  |  | (\$0) | \$0 | \$5 | \$2 | \$0 | \$596 |
| Fuel Handling | 5010000 | Fuel | \$136,026 | \$80,820 | \$197,353 | \$69,558 | \$110,895 | \$108,076 |
|  | 5010003 | Fuel - Procure Unload \& Handle | \$518,113 | \$461,863 | \$909,585 | \$540,641 | \$1,050,795 | \$1,396,450 |
| Fuel Handling Total |  |  | \$654,139 | \$542,683 | \$1,106,938 | \$610,198 | \$1,161,691 | \$1,504,526 |
| Gypsum Opns | 5010027 | Gypsum handling/disposal costs | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5010028 | Gypsum Sales Proceeds |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
|  | 5010029 | Gypsum handling/displ-Affiliat |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
| Gypsum Opns Total |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
| Steam Maint | 5100000 | Maint Supv \& Engineering | \$100,843 | \$100,171 | \$582,274 | \$572,540 | \$603,953 | \$599,323 |
|  | 5110000 | Maintenance of Structures | \$284,095 | \$218,348 | \$360,874 | \$224,501 | \$215,058 | \$395,971 |
|  | 5120000 | Maintenance of Boiler Plant | \$2,686,941 | \$2,991,305 | \$1,742,595 | \$1,402,747 | \$2,451,854 | \$2,093,541 |
|  | 5130000 | Maintenance of Electric Plant | \$1,003,484 | \$3,910,196 | \$319,365 | \$359,919 | \$252,295 | \$442,802 |
|  | 5140000 | Maintenance of Misc Steam Plt | \$157,007 | \$237,997 | \$298,031 | \$178,966 | \$136,374 | \$438,118 |
|  | 5140025 | Maint MiscStmPlt Environmental |  |  |  | \$1 | (\$1) |  |
| Steam Maint Total |  |  | \$4,232,370 | \$7,458,017 | \$3,303,139 | \$2,738,674 | \$3,659,534 | \$3,969,754 |
| Steam Opns | 5000000 | Oper Supervision \& Engineering | \$1,233,419 | \$1,357,503 | \$1,155,440 | \$519,521 | \$455,605 | \$502,489 |
|  | 5000001 | Oper Super \& Eng-RATA-Affil | \$4,954 | \$13,399 | \$7,803 | \$6,321 | \$7,224 | \$9,790 |
|  | 5020000 | Steam Expenses | \$321,863 | \$136,637 | \$367,847 | \$257,863 | \$318,629 | \$193,070 |
|  | 5020025 | Steam Exp Environmental | \$5 | \$9 | (\$24) | \$1 | (\$3) |  |
|  | 5050000 | Electric Expenses | \$23,761 | \$11,801 | \$121,497 | \$76,131 | \$102,968 | \$127,425 |
|  | 5060000 | Misc Steam Power Expenses | \$779,139 | \$2,437,681 | \$1,338,337 | \$1,437,754 | \$1,111,503 | \$1,273,072 |
|  | 5060001 | Dresden Misc Steam Pwer Exp |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
|  | 5060002 | Misc Steam Power Exp-Assoc | \$1,826 | \$8,965 | \$10,202 | \$8,677 | \$5,984 | \$6,032 |
|  | 5060003 | Removal Cost Expense - Steam |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
|  | 5060004 | NSR Settlement Expense |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
|  | 5060025 | Misc Stm Pwr Exp Environmental | \$1 | (\$1) |  |  | \$4 | (\$2) |
|  | 9230002 | Outside Svcs Empl - Assoc |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
| Steam Opns Total |  |  | \$2,364,967 | \$3,965,994 | \$3,001,102 | \$2,306,268 | \$2,001,915 | \$2,111,875 |
| A\&G Opns | 9200000 | Administrative \& Gen Salaries | \$811,753 | \$857,319 | \$676,056 | \$816,924 | \$1,164,770 | \$741,159 |
|  | 9210001 | Off Supl \& Exp - Nonassociated | \$67,966 | \$56,859 | \$48,841 | \$45,602 | \$141,748 | \$40,913 |
|  | 9210003 | Office Supplies \& Exp - Trnsf |  |  |  |  | \$6 | \$1 |
|  | 9210005 | Cellular Phones and Pagers | \$3 | \$1 |  |  |  | \$0 |
|  | 9230001 | Outside Svcs Empl - Nonassoc | \$161,322 | \$120,012 | \$142,633 | \$198,454 | \$340,364 | \$196,428 |
|  | 9230003 | AEPSC Billed to Client Co | \$428,116 | \$493,366 | \$419,296 | \$336,655 | (\$64,012) | \$42,745 |
|  | 9240000 | Property Insurance | \$87,286 | \$93,645 | \$110,672 | \$98,120 | \$68,691 | \$39,741 |
|  | 9250000 | Injuries and Damages | \$75,571 | \$74,893 | \$82,317 | \$76,217 | \$68,345 | \$68,861 |
|  | 9250001 | Safety Dinners and Awards | \$20 |  | \$106 | \$105 | \$163 | \$284 |
|  | 9250002 | Emp Accdent Prvntion-Adm Exp | \$445 | \$698 | \$374 | \$561 | \$366 | \$485 |
|  | 9250004 | Injuries to Employees | \$105 | \$2,380 | \$7,468 | \$1,879 | \$544 | \$1,865 |
|  | 9250006 | Wrkrs Cmpnstn Pre\&SIf Ins Prv | \$16,261 | \$19,623 | $(\$ 86,434)$ | \$38,882 | \$31,377 | \$21,419 |
|  | 9250007 | Prsnal Injries\&Prop Dmage-Pub | \$101,607 | \$71,243 | \$25,462 | \$575 | \$27,661 | \$18,700 |
|  | 9250010 | Frg Ben Loading - Workers Comp | $(\$ 4,693)$ | (\$7,358) | $(\$ 2,663)$ | $(\$ 4,470)$ | (\$10,756) | (\$815) |
|  | 9260000 | Employee Pensions \& Benefits |  |  |  | \$33 | \$38 |  |
|  | 9260001 | Edit \& Print Empl Pub-Salaries | \$1,536 | \$1,453 | \$2,448 | \$2,004 | \$810 | \$2,191 |
|  | 9260002 | Pension \& Group Ins Admin | \$922 | \$1,089 | \$3,162 | \$3,405 | \$2,279 | \$6,280 |
|  | 9260003 | Pension Plan | \$232,868 | \$305,825 | \$336,933 | \$372,809 | \$431,295 | \$494,844 |
|  | 9260004 | Group Life Insurance Premiums | \$20,370 | \$18,482 | \$16,711 | \$16,788 | \$12,850 | \$12,654 |
|  | 9260005 | Group Medical Ins Premiums | \$607,776 | \$511,505 | \$436,753 | \$431,332 | \$365,796 | \$394,913 |

Exhibit RCS-17
Case No. 2014-00396
Page 8 of 10

| Big Sandy Unit 1 Actual Expenses |  | Calendar Years |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Account by Cal Yr | O\&M Account | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|  | 9260006 Physical Examinations |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9260007 Group L-T Disability Ins Prem | (\$343) | \$20,895 | \$19,925 | \$1,332 | \$1,008 | \$855 |
|  | 9260009 Group Dental Insurance Prem | \$20,161 | \$27,724 | \$24,453 | \$24,362 | \$22,072 | \$12,355 |
|  | 9260010 Training Administration Exp | \$169 | \$284 | \$126 | \$94 | \$132 | \$74 |
|  | 9260012 Employee Activities | \$6 | \$207 | \$226 | \$207 | \$239 | \$165 |
|  | 9260014 Educational Assistance Pmts | \$982 | \$1,175 | \$43 | \$242 |  | \$162 |
|  | 9260019 Employee Benefit Exp - COLI |  |  |  |  |  | \$10,000 |
|  | 9260021 Postretirement Benefits - OPEB | \$436,664 | \$366,317 | \$277,597 | \$163,395 | (\$166,980) | $(\$ 372,243)$ |
|  | 9260026 Savings Plan Administration |  |  |  | \$6 |  |  |
|  | 9260027 Savings Plan Contributions | \$170,099 | \$171,198 | \$175,639 | \$160,445 | \$134,974 | \$177,883 |
|  | 9260036 Deferred Compensation | \$700 | (\$235) |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9260037 Supplemental Pension | \$7 | \$1 |  | \$0 |  |  |
|  | 9260040 SFAS 112 Postemployment Benef |  |  |  |  |  | \$160,313 |
|  | 9260050 Frg Ben Loading - Pension | $(\$ 27,762)$ | $(\$ 52,436)$ | $(\$ 57,924)$ | $(\$ 78,969)$ | $(\$ 92,724)$ | $(\$ 79,027)$ |
|  | 9260051 Frg Ben Loading - Grp Ins | $(\$ 94,734)$ | $(\$ 98,429)$ | $(\$ 93,040)$ | $(\$ 108,629)$ | $(\$ 97,797)$ | $(\$ 95,606)$ |
|  | 9260052 Frg Ben Loading - Savings | $(\$ 34,672)$ | $(\$ 30,630)$ | (\$31,249) | $(\$ 36,557)$ | $(\$ 31,322)$ | (\$44,811) |
|  | 9260053 Frg Ben Loading - OPEB | $(\$ 45,201)$ | $(\$ 43,668)$ | $(\$ 31,377)$ | $(\$ 52,305)$ | \$10,228 | \$11,212 |
|  | 9260055 IntercoFringeOffset- Don't Use | $(\$ 5,279)$ | $(\$ 8,109)$ | $(\$ 7,773)$ | $(\$ 43,756)$ | (\$29,271) | $(\$ 315,464)$ |
|  | 9260056 Fidelity Stock Option Admin |  |  | \$27 |  |  |  |
|  | 9260057 Postret Ben Medicare Subsidy | $(\$ 95,258)$ | (\$107,726) | $(\$ 100,813)$ | \$67,563 | \$45,395 | \$82,248 |
|  | 9260058 Frg Ben Loading - Accrual | \$13,017 | (\$180) | (\$934) | \$1,430 | \$557 | $(\$ 6,610)$ |
|  | 9260060 Amort-Post Retirerment Benefit |  |  |  |  | \$25,335 | \$22,975 |
|  | 9280000 Regulatory Commission Exp | \$1 | (\$1) | \$0 | (\$0) | \$5,466 | \$2,108 |
|  | 9280001 Regulatory Commission Exp-Adm | \$3 | (\$2) | (\$3) | (\$1) | (\$0) | (\$0) |
|  | 9280002 Regulatory Commission Exp-Case | (\$104) | \$9,303 | \$703 | \$10,063 | \$31,430 | \$61,321 |
|  | 9301000 General Advertising Expenses |  |  | \$588 | \$882 | \$484 | \$75 |
|  | 9301001 Newspaper Advertising Space | \$28,945 | $(\$ 22,853)$ | \$1,822 | \$1,334 | \$2,137 | \$827 |
|  | 9301002 Radio Station Advertising Time | \$185 | \$33 | \$158 | \$297 | \$5 | \$380 |
|  | 9301003 TV Station Advertising Time |  |  | \$54 |  | \$253 |  |
|  | 9301006 Spec Corporate Comm Info Proj |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9301008 Direct Mail and Handouts | \$69 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9301009 Fairs, Shows, and Exhibits | \$61 | \$48 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9301010 Publicity | \$127 | \$89 | \$90 | \$137 | \$290 | \$252 |
|  | 9301011 Dedications, Tours, \& Openings | \$4 | \$2 |  | \$0 |  |  |
|  | 9301012 Public Opinion Surveys |  | \$1 | (\$1) |  |  |  |
|  | 9301014 Video Communications | \$6 | \$3 | \$4 | \$1 | \$1 |  |
|  | 9301015 Other Corporate Comm Exp | \$1,374 | \$1,403 | \$1,671 | \$2,585 | \$1,552 | \$659 |
|  | 9302000 Misc General Expenses | \$21,222 | $(\$ 66,800)$ | \$33,255 | \$18,181 | \$18,056 | \$16,049 |
|  | 9302003 Corporate \& Fiscal Expenses | \$1,850 | \$944 | \$1,407 | \$1,027 | \$974 | \$1,392 |
|  | 9302006 Assoc Bus Dev - Materials Sold |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9302007 Assoc Business Development Exp |  | \$1 | (\$1) | (\$0) | \$6 | \$28 |
|  | 9302458 AEPSC Non Affliated expenses |  |  |  | \$12 | \$3 | (\$0) |
|  | 9310002 Rents - Personal Property | \$15,939 | \$7,154 | \$494 | \$386 | \$11,994 | \$16,548 |
| A\&G Opns Total |  | \$3,017,473 | \$2,796,748 | \$2,435,305 | \$2,569,639 | \$2,476,832 | \$1,746,789 |
| Taxes OTIT | 4081002 FICA | \$285,123 | \$373,062 | \$299,460 | \$284,242 | \$236,531 | \$394,070 |
|  | 4081003 Federal Unemployment Tax | \$1,749 | \$3,317 | \$3,741 | \$3,112 | \$4,256 | \$4,218 |
|  | 408100506 Real \& Personal Property Taxes | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 408100507 Real \& Personal Property Taxes | $(\$ 62,008)$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 408100508 Real \& Personal Property Taxes | \$148,693 | \$22,272 | \$912 | $(\$ 50,153)$ |  |  |
|  | 408100509 Real \& Personal Property Taxes | \$49 | \$768,249 | (\$44,421) | $(\$ 2,641)$ |  |  |
|  | 408100510 Real Personal Property Taxes |  | \$51 | \$222,078 | $(\$ 9,185)$ | \$828 |  |
|  | 408100511 Real Personal Property Taxes |  |  | \$51 | \$221,599 | (\$11,946) |  |
|  | 408100512 Real Personal Property Taxes |  |  |  |  | \$221,235 | \$4,548 |
|  | 408100513 Real Personal Property Taxes |  |  |  |  |  | \$215,276 |
|  | 4081007 State Unemployment Tax | \$3,324 | \$5,042 | \$3,878 | \$3,206 | \$4,193 | \$9,136 |
|  | 408100814 State Franchise Taxes |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,435 |
|  | 408101414 Federal Excise Taxes |  |  |  |  |  | \$116 |
|  | 408102014 State Business Occup Taxes |  |  |  |  |  | \$160,589 |
|  | 408102908 Real/Pers Prop Tax-Cap Leases | (\$859) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 408102909 Real/Pers Prop Tax-Cap Leases | \$694 | \$1 | \$0 |  |  |  |
|  | 408102910 Real-Pers Prop Tax-Cap Leases |  | \$1,522 |  | (\$978) |  |  |
|  | 408102911 Real-Pers Prop Tax-Cap Leases |  |  | \$1,357 | (\$376) | (\$970) |  |

Exhibit RCS-17
Case No. 2014-00396
Page 9 of 10

| Big Sandy Unit 1 Actual Expenses |  |  | Calendar Years |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Account by Cal Yr |  | O\&M Account | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|  | 408102912 | Real-Pers Prop Tax-Cap Leases |  |  |  | \$1,011 | (\$294) |  |
|  | 408102913 | Real-Pers Prop Tax-Cap Leases |  |  |  |  | \$293 | \$509 |
|  | 408102914 | Real-Pers Prop Tax-Cap Leases |  |  |  |  |  | \$503 |
|  | 4081033 F | Fringe Benefit Loading - FICA | $(\$ 40,901)$ | (\$39,491) | $(\$ 40,840)$ | $(\$ 46,209)$ | (\$41,178) | (\$57,605) |
|  | 4081034 F | Fringe Benefit Loading - FUT | (\$393) | (\$407) | (\$369) | (\$320) | (\$265) | (\$505) |
|  | 4081035 | Fringe Benefit Loading - SUT | (\$393) | (\$543) | (\$576) | (\$534) | (\$483) | $(\$ 1,797)$ |
| Taxes OTIT Total |  |  | \$335,078 | \$1,133,075 | \$445,270 | \$402,775 | \$412,199 | \$730,492 |
| Purchased Pwr | 5560000 | Sys Control \& Load Dispatching | \$103,805 | \$96,919 | \$82,599 | \$44,209 | \$34,606 | \$52,018 |
|  | 5570000 | Purchased Pwr Expenses | \$667,642 | \$630,208 | \$577,347 | \$369,256 | \$321,309 | \$172,566 |
| Purchased Pwr Total |  |  | \$771,447 | \$727,127 | \$659,946 | \$413,465 | \$355,915 | \$224,585 |
| A\&G Maint | 9350000 N | Maintenance of General Plant |  |  |  | \$2 |  |  |
|  | 9350001 | Maint of Structures - Owned | \$5 | (\$4) | (\$12) | \$0 | \$755 | \$896 |
|  | 9350002 N | Maint of Structures - Leased | \$2 | \$3 |  |  | (\$0) | \$161 |
|  | 9350003 N | Maint of Prprty Held Fture Use |  |  |  |  | \$0 | \$68 |
|  | 9350007 N | Maint of Radio Equip - Owned | \$13,613 |  | \$18 |  |  |  |
|  | 9350012 N | Maint of Data Equipment |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
|  | 9350013 N | Maint of Cmmncation Eq-Unall | \$68,212 | \$80,782 | \$62,638 | \$39,386 | \$12,985 | \$7,806 |
|  | 9350015 N | Maint of Office Furniture \& Eq | (\$13) | \$15,200 | \$188 | \$12 | \$42,739 | \$46,778 |
|  | 9350016 N | Maintenance of Video Equipment |  |  |  |  | \$41 |  |
|  | 9350019 N | Maint of Gen Plant-SCADA Equ |  |  |  |  | \$4 | \$0 |
|  | 9350023 S | Site Communications Services |  |  |  | \$15 |  |  |
| A\&G Maint Total |  |  | \$81,818 | \$95,981 | \$62,833 | \$39,415 | \$56,525 | \$55,710 |
| Grand Total |  |  | \$12,027,304 | \$18,745,443 | \$14,477,159 | \$11,312,623 | \$11,470,666 | \$11,989,745 |

# KPSC Case No. 2014-00396 General Rate Adjustment <br> Attorney General's Second Set of Data Requests Dated February 24, 2015 <br> Item No. 114 <br> Page 1 of 1 

## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Big Sandy Unit Operation Rider (BS1OR). Refer to the response to AG 1-338 and Company Exhibit AEV-4. Please reconcile the amounts shown on AG_1_338_Attachment1 to the proposed BS1OR revenue requirement of $\$ 18,245,412$. Identify, quantify and explain each reconciling item and show detailed calculations.

## RESPONSE

The amounts included in the Company's response to AG 1-338 are calendar year totals of non-fuel clause Big Sandy Unit 1 O\&M. These are comparable to items a and b on Company Exhibit AEV-4 page 1 of 3, however items a and b are test year amounts. The historic test year in this case is the 12 months ending September 30, 2014.

Item d from Company Exhibit AEV-4 page 1 of 3 was not included in the Company's response to AG 1-338 because the requested analysis has not been performed for 2009 2014, only for the historic test year in this proceeding.

Also, the Company's response to AG 1-338 was not grossed up by item f of Company Exhibit AEV-4 page 1 of 3.

WITNESS: Alex E Vaughan


# KPSC Case No. 2014-00396 General Rate Adjustment <br> Commission Staff's Second Set of Data Requests <br> Dated January 29, 2015 <br> Item No. 111 <br> Page 1 of 1 

## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Refer to the response to Staff's First Request, Item 33. For the test year, provide the following information at it relates to lobbying activities:
a. The names of each of the Company's Kentucky registered lobbyists.
b. For each of the registered lobbyists, the dollar amount and percentage of the lobbyist's salary, fringe benefits, any incentive pay, and expense reports recorded below the line and any lobbying activities costs reflected in the Company's proposed cost of service.
c. The dollar amount of any lobbying activity allocated to KentuckyPower from AEP or any of its subsidiaries, along with a statement in which these costs are recorded and account numbers where these costs are recorded (above or below the line).

## RESPONSE

a. Gregory Pauley, James Keeton, and Brad Hall.
b. During the test year period, $100 \%$ of Mr. Pauley's $\$ 220,420$ salary was directly charged to Account 920.0 (Administrative \& General Salaries), while $\$ 1,951$ in expenses were charged to Account 426.4 (Civic \& Political Activities) based upon the nature and purpose of the work performed. Please see the response to KPSC 1-33 for information on James Keeton and Brad Hall.

Kentucky Power found that $.95 \%(\$ 2,095)$ of Mr. Pauley's salary should have been charged to Account 426.4, instead of Account 920.0. In addition, Kentucky Power found that $12.6 \%(\$ 18,063)$ of Mr. Hall's salary should have been charged to Account 426.4 instead of Account 920.0.
c.. Please see response to KPSC 1-33.

WITNESS: Gregory G Pauley

KPSC 2014-00396 General Rate Adjustment Attorney General's Initial Set of Data Requests Dated January 29, 2015 Item No. 264
Page 1 of 1

## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

List each athletic and employee association to which the Company contributes and the associated amounts for the test year and preceding year. State how the Company has treated these expens-es for ratemaking purposes in the test year.

## RESPONSE

The Company contributed to the University of Kentucky Football association in the amount of $\$ 2,400$ for the test year and $\$ 1,200$ for the preceding year. The $\$ 2,400$ was included in test year O\&M expenses.

WITNESS: Gregory G Pauley

KPSC 2014-00396 General Rate Adjustment Attorney General's Initial Set of Data Requests Dated January 29, 2015

Item No. 267
Page 1 of 1

## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

For the base year list all payments made for employee gifts, employee awards, employee luncheons and dinners, employee picnics and all other similar type items. For each, list the dollar amount paid, the payee, the account charged and state the purpose. Provide copies of invoices which exceed $\$ 5,000$.

## RESPONSE

As recorded in account 9260012, the amount of Kentucky Power Company directly charged employee related expenses for the period October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 was a total of $\$ 5,815$. See AG_1_267_Attachment1.pdf.

WITNESS: Jason M. Yoder

KPSC Case No. 2014-00396
AG's Initial Set oEvaidoirdQuest\$8
Dated January 29, 2e11すo. 2014-00396
tem No. 267 Page 4 of 19 Attachment 1
Page 1 of 1
AG Data Request \#267 - Payments Made for Employee Gifts, Awards, Activities
October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014

| Acctg Date | Name | Account | Amount |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 2013-10-03 | JP MORGAN CHASE CORPORATE CARD ACTIVITY | 9260012 | 762.00 |
| $2013-10-03$ | JP MORGAN CHASE CORPORATE CARD ACTIVITY | 9260012 | $1,496.72$ |
| $2013-10-21$ | JP MORGAN CHASE CORPORATE CARD ACTIVITY | 9260012 | 125.00 |
| $2013-11-11$ | JP MORGAN CHASE CORPORATE CARD ACTIVITY | 9260012 | 225.00 |
| $2013-11-11$ | JP MORGAN CHASE CORPORATE CARD ACTIVITY | 9260012 | 550.00 |
| $2014-05-06$ | JP MORGAN CHASE CORPORATE CARD ACTIVITY | 9260012 | 200.00 |
| $2014-09-19$ | JP MORGAN CHASE CORPORATE CARD ACTIVITY | 9260012 | $1,338.94$ |
| $2014-09-19$ | JP MORGAN CHASE CORPORATE CARD ACTIVITY | 9260012 | $1,117.60$ |
| Total |  |  | $\underline{5,815.26}$ |

KPSC 2014-00396 General Rate Adjustment Attorney General's Initial Set of Data Requests Dated January 29, 2015 Item No. 268
Page 1 of 1

## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Identify all expenses incurred during the test year for athletic events, tickets, sky boxes and all sporting activities.
a. Specifically identify the activity and dollar amount.
b. Provide copies of paid vouchers and invoices supporting these expenditures.

## RESPONSE

a. UK Football Tickets $\$ 2,226.00$

PGA Championship \$29,256.00
Total \$31,482.00
b. Please see AG_1_268_Attachment1.pdf.

WITNESS: Ranie K Wohnhas

| From: | Belinda A Stacy |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Tuesday, February 10, 2015 9:24 AM |
| To: | Belinda A Stacy |
| Subject: | Sent from Snipping Tool |

## 2014 Football Renewal

US \$4626.00

Invoice Number
698265

Renewal Item

| Item name | Seat | Qty | Price | Amount Paid |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2014 Football Processing Fee | GA | TS]1 | 1 Adult | US $\$ 10.00$ |

Donation

## Donation Name

Total
US $\$ 2400.00$

Invoice Total: US $\$ 4626.00$
https://oss.ticketmaster.com/html/invoicing history.html?!=EN\&CNTX=54da1423b6b9c6-39022076

Ship To:
VALHALLA GOLF CLUB
15503 Shelbyville Rd
LOUISVILLE. KENTUCKY 40245

Please include the invoice number on all remittances. For questions regarding this invoice, please contact our A/R department at (561) 624-7623

## Invoice Number

215521
Billing Date
Shipping Date
6/19/14

## Purchase Order Number

Shipping Reference

Customer Account
Number
17809

Ship Via
Customer Site
LOUISVILLE 2, KY

Remit To:
PGA Tournament Corp FEIN: 65-0394725
P.O. BOX 31089

PALM BEACH GARDENS. FLORIDA 33420

| Terms IMMED |  | Due Date $6 / 27 / 14$ | Customer RANIE WOH |  | Contact Phone 696-7004 |  | Contact Fax 696-7006 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item Num | Description |  |  | Quantity Shipped | Tax | Unit Price | Extended Amount |
| 1 | 201 FRID CHA AME | CHAMPIO <br> SATURDAY <br> NS CLUB <br> ES | JRSDAY, <br> N <br>  | 3 | Yes | 8,500.00 | 25,500.00 |
| 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 2014 \\ & \text { CLU } \end{aligned}$ | CHAMPIO URSDAY TI | AMPIONS | 2 | Yes | 350.00 | 700.00 |
| 3 | $\begin{aligned} & 2014 \\ & \text { CLU } \end{aligned}$ | CHAMPIO IDAY TICKE | AMPIONS | 2 | Yes | 350.00 | 700.00 |
| 4 | $\begin{aligned} & 2014 \\ & \text { CLU } \end{aligned}$ | CHAMPIO <br> TURDAY TI | AMPIONS | 2 | Yes | 350.00 | 700.00 |

Tax Summary

| Tax Name | Tax Rate(\%) | Tax Precedence | Tax Extended Amount |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| CITY | 0 |  | 0.00 |
| COUNTY | 0 | 0.00 |  |
| STATE | 6 | $1,656.00$ |  |

## WIRE TRANSFER INSTRUCTIONS:

Bank of America
Commercial Banking Division
Address: One, Financial Plaza, $9^{\text {th }}$ Floor
P.O. Box 407090, FT. Lauderdale, Florida 33394

ABA Number For ACH 063100277
ABA Number For Wire 026009593
Credit Account: PGA OF AMERICA
Account Number: 3602758540
Swift Address: BOFAUS3N

| Line | $27,600.00$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| Tax | $1,656.00$ |
| Shipping | 0.00 |
| Total | $29,256.00$ |
| Payments and Credits | 0.00 |
| Outstanding balance as of | $29,256.00$ |
| $6 / 20 / 14$ in USD |  |

## Voucher Accounting Entries

*Business Unit: 110 Qoucher ID: 00243217 Q Invoice Number: 215521 Q
*Accounting Line View Option:

$\square$ Reset


## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Refer to the response to AG 1-103.
a. Please provide a breakout of the membership dues by organization and include an explanation of how each such organizations benefits ratepayers.
b. Please explain fully and in detail whether the amount of lobbying expense is embedded in the amounts discussed in the response to Staff 1-33. If not, state the accounts in which these test year lobbying costs were recorded.
c. Please provide a breakout of the test year charitable contributions by organization and specify the account(s) in which these amounts were recorded.
d. Please provide a breakout by amount and account of the public relations expense and include an explanation of how each such public relations expense benefits ratepayers.

## RESPONSE

a. Please see AG_2_64_Attachment1.xls for the response. Membership into these organizations allows Company personnel to build relationships, gather and share information, and stay abreast of pertinent national, state and local issues that affect the Company. In addition, memberships allow Company personnel to work collaboratively to address issues or projects that may affect both the Company and the service territory. Having well informed Company personnel active in these organizations benefits all Kentucky Powerr customers.
b. Please see response to KPSC 2-111.
c. Please see AG_2_64_Attachment1.xls for the answer to this response.
d. Please see AG_2_64_Attachment1.xls for the answer to this response. The use of public relations benefits all of Kentucky Power's customers by keeping the public informed on matters that can affect the service the Company provides.

WITNESS: Gregory G Pauley

| Totals | Total | Non COS | Cost of Service |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Memberships | $59,157.16$ | $11,225.00$ | $47,932.00$ |
| Charitable Contributions | $323,109.67$ | $310,235.00$ | $12,875.00$ |
| Public Relations Expenses | $1,427,458.59$ | $1,179,301.00$ | $248,158.00$ |
| Total | $1,809,725.42$ | $1,500,761.00$ | $308,965.00$ |

Voucher Acctg Date

SOUTHEAST KENTUCKY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
SOUTHEAST KENTUCKY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
FRANKFORT COUNTRY CLUB
FRANKFORT COUNTRY CLUB
NATIONAL ASSN REG UTIL COM
NATINNAL ASSN REG UTIL COM
FRANKFORT COUNTRY CLUB
FRANKFORT COUNTRY CLUB
WINUP
WINUP
ASHLAND ALLIANCE
ASSOCIATION OF ENERGY SERVICES INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC DEV COUNCIL KENTUCKY ASSOCIATION FOR

KENTUCKY ASSOCIATION OF
 PIKEVILLE ROTARY CLUB

PIKEVILLE ROTARY CLUB
SOUTHEAST KENTUCKY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

| Voucher | Name | Account | Amount |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 00110579 | MARSHALL COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE | 5060000 | 750.00 |
| 00237956 | FOUNDATION FOR TRI-STATE COMMUNITY INC | 9301000 | $1,000.00$ |
| 00240578 | KENTUCKY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE | 9302000 | $7,500.00$ |
| 00240662 KENTUCKY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE | 9302000 | $3,625.00$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |















N


## 









##  <br> 















山



























す す



[^0]











 EMPLOYEE EXPENSE










































M


## 

## 









## 





# Kentucky Power Company 

## REQUEST

The AFUDC-related Deferred FIT calculation in footnote 1 of Section V, S-4, page 19 assumes that the cost related to A/R Financing in the capital structure is tax-deductible. In this regard, please provide the following information:
a. Confirm the above-stated fact. If you disagree, explain your disagreement.
b. If confirmed, explain why the Company has not made the same assumption (i.e., treat the $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{R}$ Financing cost component of the proposed overall rate of return as a tax-deductible item in the calculation of the interest synchronization adjustment on Section V, S-4, page 20.

## RESPONSE

a. We agree.
b. The A/R Financing had not been a part of the capital structure in preceding base rate cases, and thus was inadvertently overlooked in calculation of the interest synchronization adjustment. Please refer to page 2 of this response for a revised interest synchronization adjustment.

WITNESS: Errol K Wagner

|  | Kentucky Power Company Interest Synchronization Test Year Twelve Months Ended 6/30/2005 | Section V <br> Workpaper S-4 Page 20 Revised |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Ln} \\ & \frac{\text { No }}{(1)} \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{\text { Description }}{(2)}$ | PSC Jurisdictional Amount (3) |
| 1 | LTD, per Capitalization (Sch 3, C 12, Ln 1) | \$482,392,123 |
| 2 | LTD Rate (WP S-2, P 1, C 5, Ln 1) | 5.70\% |
| 3 | Annualized LTD Interest | \$27,496,351 |
| 4 | STD, per Capitalization (Sch 3, C 12, Ln 2) | \$3,340,763 |
| 5 | STD Rate (WP S-2, P 1, C 5, Ln 2) | 3.34\% |
| 6 | Annualized STD Interest | \$111,581 |
| 7 | A/R Financing, per Capitalization (Sch 3, C 12, Ln 3) | \$30,052,250 |
| 8 | A/R Financing Rate (WP S-2, P 1, C 5, Ln 3) | 2.99\% |
| 9 | Annualized A/R Financing Interest | \$898,562 |
| 10 | Total Annualized Interest (Ln $3+\operatorname{Ln} 6+\operatorname{Ln} 9)$ | \$28,506,495 |
| 11 | Interest per Books Net of ABFUDC | \$29,914,717 |
| 12 | Percent Retail (GP-TOT) | 0.990 |
| 13 | Retail Interest (Ln $11 \times \operatorname{Ln}$ 12) | \$29,615,570 |
| 14 | Decrease Interest Expense (Ln $10-\operatorname{Ln} 13$ ) | (\$1,109,075) |
| 15 | SIT Rate | 7.20\% |
| 16 | SIT Adjustment (Ln $14 \times \operatorname{Ln}$ 15) | \$79,853 |
| 17 | Net Change for FIT (Ln $14 \times \operatorname{Ln} 16$ ) | (\$1,029,222) |
| 18 | FIT Rate | 35.00\% |
| 19 | FIT Adjustment | \$360,228 |



## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Capitalization. Refer to (1) the Direct Testimony of Company witness Wohnhas, (2) Section V, Exhibit 1, Schedule 2 (page 1), and (3) Filing Requirement 807 KAR 5:001 Section 16 (4)(i) (pages 391-392).
a. Please explain fully and in detail why the Company's revenue requirement is calculated using the capitalization amount of $\$ 1,147,480,328$ versus the Kentucky jurisdictional rate base amount of $\$ 1,158,186,514$.
b. Please cite by date and docket number, the Commission Order which authorized KPCo to use a capitalization amount (of $\$ 1,147,480,328$ ) in its revenue requirement calculation that is different from the rate base amount (of $\$ 1,158,186,514$ ).
c. Referring to page 392 of Filing Requirement 807 KAR 5:001 Section 16 (4)(i), please explain fully and in detail the difference of $\$ 39,598,442$ that is reflected on Line 19 of page 392.
d. Please provide a breakout of the components which comprise the unreconciled difference of \$39,598,442.

## RESPONSE

a. The Company has filed using capitalization in each base rate case filed since at least the early 1980's.
b. Case Nos. 8734, 9061, 91-066, 2005-00341, 2009-00459.
c-d. The Company is working to provide this reconciliation, but is not able to complete prior to the due date of these responses. The Company will supplement this response no later than February 16, 2015.

WITNESS: Ranie K Wohnhas


Exhibit RCS-20

| KPCO Balance Sheet Detail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Section IV | Section V Exhibit 1 | All Balance Sheet | Section VExhibit 1 | Difference in | Included in | Not Included in |
|  | Page 3 \& 4 | Schedule 3 | Items Funded by | Schedule 4 | Capitalization \& | Section II, Pg 392 | Section 11, Pg 392 |
| ASSETS | Per Books 9/30/2014 | Capitalization | Capitalization | Rate Base | Rate Base | Reconciliation | Reconciliation |
| 1010001 Plant in Service | 2,731,720,184 |  | 2,731,720,184 | 2,731,720,184 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1010002 Plant In Service-Transmission | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1011001 Capital Leases | 6,651,762 |  | 6,651,762 | 6,651,762 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1050001 Held For Fut Use | 7,405,959 |  | 7,405,959 | 7,405,959 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1060001 Const Not Classifd | 148,935,471 |  | 148,935,471 | 148,935,471 | 0 |  | o |
| Plant In Service | 2,894,713,376 |  | 2,894,713,376 | 2,894,713,376 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1011004 Capital Leases - Gen \& Misc | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1011012 Accrued Capital Leases | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| General Plant | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1070001 CWIP - Project | 80,210,718 |  | 80,210,718 | 80,210,718 | 0 |  | $\underline{0}$ |
| Construction Work-ln-Progress | 80,210,718 |  | 80,210,718 | 80,210,718 | 0 |  | 0 |
| ELECTRIC UTILITY PLANT | 2,974,924,094 |  | 2,974,924,094 | 2,974,924,094 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1011006 Prov-Leased Assets | $(2,145,480)$ |  | $(2,145,480)$ | $(2,145,480)$ | 0 |  | 0 |
| $1080001 \mathrm{~A} / \mathrm{P}$ for Deprec of Plt | $(987,826,643)$ |  | $(987,826,643)$ | $(987,826,643)$ | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1080005 RWIP - Project Detail | 9,135,302 |  | 9,135,302 | 9,135,302 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1080011 Cost of Removal Reserve | $(21,769,449)$ |  | $(21,769,449)$ | $(21,769,449)$ | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1080013 ARO Removal Deprec - Accretion | 4,046,340 |  | 4,046,340 | 0 | 4,046,340 |  | 4,046,340 |
| 1110001 A/P for Amort of Plt | $(21,951,155)$ |  | (21,951,155) | (21,951,155) | 0 |  | 0 |
| less Accum Provision - Depre, Depl, Amort. | (1,020,511,085) |  | (1,020,511,085) | (1,024,557,424) | 4,046,340 |  | 4,046,340 |
| NET ELECTRIC UTILITY PLANT | 1,954,413,009 |  | 1,954,413,009 | 1,950,366,669 | 4,046,340 |  | 4,046,340 |
| 1210001 Nonutility Property - Owned | 995,120 |  | 995,120 |  | 995,120 | 995,120 | $\bigcirc$ |
| Gross NonUtility Property | 995,120 |  | 995,120 | 0 | 995,120 | 995,120 | 0 |
| 1220001 Depr\&Amrt of Nonut Prop-Ownd | (219,958) |  | (219,958) |  | (219,958) | (219,958) | o |
| Less Depr \& Amort NonUtility Property | $(219,958)$ |  | $(219,958)$ | 0 | $(219,958)$ | $(219,958)$ | 0 |
| 1240026 Other Property - CCNC | - |  | - |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1240027 Other Property - RWIP | 3,795 |  | 3,795 |  | 3,795 | 3,795 | 0 |
| 1240029 Other Property - CPR | 4,534,316 |  | 4,534,316 |  | 4,534,316 | 4,534,316 | $\underline{0}$ |
| Other Property Investments | 4,538,111 |  | 4,538,111 | 0 | 4,538,111 | 4,538,111 | 0 |
| Net NonUtility Property | 5,313,273 |  | 5,313,273 | 0 | 5,313,273 | 5,313,273 | 0 |
| Investment in Consol Subsidiaries | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Investment in NonConsol Subsidiaries | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Investment in NonConsol Subs Cost Basis | o |  | 0 |  | o |  | o |
| Investment in Subsidiary \& Associated | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1240002 Oth Investments-Nonassociated | 806 |  | 806 |  | 806 | 806 | 0 |
| 1240007 Deferred Compensation Benefits | 81,979 |  | 81,979 |  | 81,979 | 81,979 | 0 |
| 1240092 Fbr Opt Lns-In Kind Sv-Invest | 152,086 |  | 152,086 |  | 152,086 | 152,086 | o |
| Other Investments | 234,871 |  | 234,871 | 0 | 234,871 | 234,871 | 0 |
| 1290000 Pension Net Funded Position | 4,788,574 |  | 4,788,574 |  | 4,788,574 |  | 4,788,574 |
| 1290001 Non-UMWA PRW Funded Position | 10,385,901 |  | 10,385,901 |  | 10,385,901 |  | 10,385,901 |
| 1290002 SFAS 106 - Non-UMWA PRW | 2,869,871 |  | 2,869,871 |  | 2,869,871 |  | 2,869,871 |
| 1290003 SFAS 87 - Pension | $(1,969,737)$ |  | $(1,969,737)$ |  | $(1,969,737)$ |  | $(1,969,737)$ |
| Other Special Funds | 16,074,609 |  | 16,074,609 | 0 | 16,074,609 |  | 16,074,609 |
| 1581000 SO2 Allowance Inventory | 0 |  | 0 |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\underline{0}$ |
| Allowance - NonCurrent | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1750002 Long-Term Unreal Gns - Non Aff | 1,382,987 |  | 1,382,987 |  | 1,382,987 | 1,382,987 | 0 |
| 1750022 L/T Asset MTM Collateral | $(46,735)$ |  | $(46,735)$ |  | $(46,735)$ | $(46,735)$ | 0 |
| 1760011 L/T Asset for Commodity Hedges | 0 |  | $\underline{0}$ |  | $\underline{0}$ | - | o |
| Long Term Energy Trading Contracts | 1,336,252 |  | 1,336,252 |  | 1,336,252 | 1,336,252 | 0 |
| OTHER PROPERTY AND INVESTMENTS | 22,959,006 |  | 22,959,006 | 0 | 22,959,006 | 6,884,396 | 16,074,610 |
| 1310000 Cash | 653,790 |  | 653,790 |  | 653,790 | 1,307,580 | (653,790) * |
| Cash and Cash Equivalents | 653,790 |  | 653,790 | 0 | 653,790 | 1,307,580 | $(653,790)$ |
| 1340050 Spec Deposit Mizuho Securities | 154,543 |  | 154,543 |  | 154,543 | 309,085 | $(154,543)$ * |
| 1340051 Spec Depost RBC | 941,429 |  | 941,429 |  | 941,429 | 1,882,859 | (941,429) * |
| Special Deposits | 1,095,972 |  | 1,095,972 | 0 | 1,095,972 | 2,191,944 | $(1,095,972)$ |
| Other Intercompany Adj Working Funds | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Miscellaneous Working Funds | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Auction Rate Securities | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Special Deposits and Working Funds | 1,095,972 |  | 1,095,972 | 0 | 1,095,972 | 2,191,944 | (1,095,972) |
| Temporary Cash Investments | $\underline{0}$ |  | 0 |  | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | O |
| Cash and Cash Equivalents | 1,749,762 |  | 1,749,762 | 0 | 1,749,762 | 3,499,524 | $(1,749,762)$ |
| 1450000 Corp Borrow Prg (NR-Assoc) | 9,577,118 |  | 9,577,118 |  | 9,577,118 |  | 9,577,118 |
| Advances to Affiliates | 9,577,118 |  | 9,577,118 | 0 | 9,577,118 |  | 9,577,118 |
| 1420001 Customer A/R - Electric | 32,905,597 |  | 32,905,597 |  | 32,905,597 | 32,905,597 | 0 |
| 1420014 Customer A/R-System Sales | 524,277 |  | 524,277 |  | 524,277 | 524,277 | 0 |
| 1420019 Transmission Sales Receivable | 8,318 |  | 8,318 |  | 8,318 | 8,318 | 0 |
| 1420022 Cust A/R - Factored | $(37,559,285)$ |  | $(37,559,285)$ |  | $(37,559,285)$ | 0 | $(37,559,285)$ |
| 1420023 Cust A/R-System Sales - MLR | 953,600 |  | 953,600 |  | 953,600 | 953,600 | 0 |
| 1420024 Cust A/R-Options \& Swaps - MLR | 19,656 |  | 19,656 |  | 19,656 | 19,656 | 0 |
| 1420027 Low Inc Energy Asst Pr (LIEAP) | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1420044 Customer A/R - Estimated | 522,235 |  | 522,235 |  | 522,235 | 522,235 | 0 |
| 1420050 PJM AR Accrual | 2,991,974 |  | 2,991,974 |  | 2,991,974 | 2,991,974 | 0 |
| 1420052 Gas Accruals | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1420053 AR Coal Trading | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1420054 Accrued Power Brokers | 13,802 |  | 13,802 |  | 13,802 | 13,802 | 0 |
| 1420057 Customer A/R - REC activity |  |  | 31 |  | 31 | 31 | 0 |
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| KPCO Balance Sheet Detail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ASSETS | Section IV <br> Page 3 \& 4 <br> Per Books 9/30/2014 | $\frac{\text { Section V Exhibit } 1}{\frac{\text { Schedule } 3}{\text { Capitalization }}}$ | All Balance Sheet Items Funded by Capitalization | Section V Exhibit 1 $\frac{\text { Schedule } 4}{\text { Rate Base }}$ | Difference in <br>  <br> Rate Base |  | Not Included in <br> Section II, Pg 392 <br> Reconciliation |
| 1420101 Other Accounts Rec - Cust | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1420102 AR Peoplesoft Billing - Cust | 957,364 |  | 957,364 |  | 957,364 | 957,364 | $\underline{0}$ |
| Acct Rec - Customers | 1,337,570 |  | 1,337,570 | 0 | 1,337,570 | 38,896,854 | $(37,559,285)$ |
| 14300222001 Employee Biweekly Pay Cnv | 94,583 |  | 94,583 |  | 94,583 | 94,583 | 0 |
| 1430023 A/R Peoplesoft Billing System | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1430081 Damage Recovery - Third Party | 43,963 |  | 43,963 |  | 43,963 | 43,963 | 0 |
| 1430083 Damage Recovery Offset Demand | $(43,232)$ |  | $(43,232)$ |  | $(43,232)$ | $(43,23)$ | 0 |
| $1430089 \mathrm{~A} / \mathrm{R}$ - Benefits Billing | - |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1430101 Other Accounts Rec - Misc | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1430102 AR Peoplesoft Billing - Misc | 2,313 |  | 2,313 |  | 2,313 | 2,313 | 0 |
| 1710048 Interest Receivable -IIT-LT | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1710248 Interest Receivable-FIT-ST | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1710348 Interest Receivable -ST--LT | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1710448 Interest Receivable. -SIT-ST | 12 |  | 12 |  | 12 | 12 | 0 |
| 1720000 Rents Receivable | 2,182,210 |  | 2,182,210 |  | 2,182,210 | 2,182,210 | $\bigcirc$ |
| Act Rec - Miscellaneous | 2,279,848 |  | 2,279,848 | 0 | 2,279,848 | 2,279,848 | 0 |
| 1440002 Uncoll Actis-Other Receivables | (23,817) |  | (23,817) |  | (23,817) | $(23,817)$ | @ |
| Acct Rec - AP for Uncollectible Accounts | (23,817) |  | $(23,817)$ | 0 | (23,817) | $(23,817)$ | 0 |
| 1460001 A/R Assoc Co - Interunit G/L | 31,973,243 |  | 31,973,243 |  | 31,973,243 | 31,973,243 | 0 |
| 1460002 A/R Assoc Co - Allowances | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1460006 A/R Assoc Co - Intercompany | 853,542 |  | 853,542 |  | 853,542 | 853,542 | 0 |
| 1460009 A/R Assoc Co - InterUnit A/P | 12,626 |  | 12,626 |  | 12,626 | 12,626 | 0 |
| 1460011 A/R Assoc Co - Multi Pmts | 1,029,235 |  | 1,029,235 |  | 1,029,235 | 1,029,235 | 0 |
| 1460019 A/R-Assoc Co-AEPSC-Agent | 0 |  | 0 |  | ${ }^{0}$ | ${ }^{0}$ | 0 |
| 1460024 A/R Assoc Co. System Sales | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1460025 Fleet-M4-A/R | 27,886 |  | 86 |  | 86 | 886 | 0 |
| 1460045 A/R Assc Co-Realization Sharng | ㅇ |  | ㅇ |  | $\bigcirc$ | ㅇ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Act Rec - Associated Companies | 33,896,532 |  | 33,896,532 | 0 | 33,896, | 33,896,532 | 0 |
| 1510001 Fuel Stock - Coal | 28,96,476 |  | 28,964,476 | 28,964,476 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1510002 fuel Stock - Oil | 2,426,762 |  | 2,426,762 | 2,426,762 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1510020 Fuel Stock Coal - Intransit | 3,719,752 |  | 3,719,752 | 3,719,752 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1520000 Fuel Stock Exp Undistributed | 716,689 |  | 716,689 | 716,689 | @ |  | o |
| Fuel Stock | 35,827,679 |  | 35,827,679 | 35,827,679 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1540001 M\&S-Regular | 18,874,744 |  | 18,874,744 | 18,874,744 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1540004 M\&S-Exempt Material | 126,237 |  | 126,237 | 126,237 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1540006 MzS - Lime and Limestone | 1,571,884 |  | 1,571,884 | 1,571,884 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1540012 Materials \& Supplies - Urea | 503,764 |  | 503,764 | 503,764 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1540013 Transportation Inventory | 116,653 |  | 116,653 | 116,653 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1540022 MRS-Lime \& Limestone Intransit | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1540023 M\&SS Inv - Urea In-Transit | 1,036,552 |  | 1,036,552 | 1,036,552 | 0 |  | @ |
| Plant Materials and Supplies | 22,229,833 |  | 22,229,833 | 22,229,833 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Merchandise | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1581003502 Allowance Inventory - Curr | 13,191,961 |  | 13,191,961 | 13,191,961 | 0 | 13,191,961 | (13,191,961) |
| 1581004 NOX Allowance inventory - Curr | 16,048 |  | 16,048 | 16,048 | 0 | 16,048 | (16,048) |
| 1581006 An. NOX Comp Inv- Curr | 64,280 |  | 64,280 | 64,280 | 0 | 64,280 | $(64,280)$ |
| 1581009 CSAPR Current SO2 Inv | 350,000 |  | 350,000 | ㅇ | 350,000 | 350,000 | @ |
| Allowance Inventory | 13,622,289 |  | 13,622,289 | 13,272,289 | 350,000 | 13,622,289 | $(13,272,289)$ |
| 1630019 Stores Exp - Big Sandy Plant | $\bigcirc$ |  | - |  | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Stores Expenses | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Materials and Supplies | 35,852,122 |  | 35,852,122 | 35,502,122 | 350,000 | 13,622,289 | $(13,272,289)$ |
| 1730000 Accrued Utility Revenues | 8,056,499 |  | 8,056,499 |  | $8,056,499$ | 8,056,499 | 0 |
| 1730002 Acrd Utility Rev-Factored-Assc | (8,056,499) |  | (8,056,499) |  | (8,056,499) | (8,056,499) | ㅇ |
| Accrued Utility Revenues | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1750001 Curr. Unreal Gains - NonAffil | 4,345,901 |  | 4,345,901 |  | 4,345,901 | 4,345,901 | 0 |
| 1750021 S/T Asset MTM Collateral | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1760010 S/T Asset for Commodity Hedges | @ |  | @ |  | @ | - | @ |
| Energy Trading | 4,345,901 |  | 4,345,901 | 0 | 4,345,901 | 4,345,901 | 0 |
| 1650001 Prepaid Insurance | 649,020 |  | 649,020 | 649,020 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 165000213 Prepaid Taxes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 165000214 Prepaid Taxes | 802,165 |  | 802,165 | 802,165 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1650009 Prepaid Carry Cost-Factored AR | 26,888 |  | 26,888 | 26,888 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1650010 Prepaid Pension Benefits | 53,70,968 |  | 53,709,968 | 53,709,968 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 165001113 Prepaid Sales Taxes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 165001114 Prepaid Sales Taxes | 352,658 |  | 352,658 | 352,658 | 0 |  |  |
| 165001213 Prepaid Use Taxes | 31,883 |  | 31,883 | 31,883 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1650014 FAS 158 Qual Contra Asset | (53,709,968) |  | (53,70,968) | (53,70,968) | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1650021 Prepaid Insurance - Els | 641,774 |  | 641,774 | 641,774 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1650023 Prepaid Lease | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 1650035 PRW W Without MED-D Benefits | $(2,969,075)$ |  | $(2,969,075)$ | (2,969,075) | 0 |  | - |
| 1650036 PRW for Med-D Benefits | 5,838,946 |  | 5,838,946 | 5,838,946 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1650037 FAS158 Contra-PRW Exclud Med-D | $(2,869,871)$ |  | (2,869,871) | (2, 869,871) | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ |
| Prepayments | 2,504,389 |  | 2,504,389 | 2,504,389 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 1240005 Spec Allowance Inv NOX | 7 |  | 7 |  | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 1340018 Spec Deposits - Elect Trading | 900 |  | 900 |  | 900 | 900 | 0 |
| 1340043 Spec Deposit UBS Securities |  |  | , |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1340048 Spec Deposits-Trading Contra | $(45,747)$ |  | $(45,747)$ |  | $(45,747)$ | $(45,747)$ | 0 |
| 174001112 Non-Highway Fuel Tx Credt-2012 | - |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 174001113 Non-Highway Fuel Tx Credt-2012 | 514 |  | 514 |  | 514 | 514 | 0 |
| 1860007 Billings and Deferred Projects | 105,765 |  | 105,765 |  | 105,765 | 105,765 | $\underline{0}$ |
| Other Current Assets | 61,439 |  | 61,439 | ${ }^{0}$ | 61,439 | 61,439 | - |
| CURRENT ASSETS | 127,408,543 | 0 | 127,408,543 | 73,834,190 | 53,574,353 | 96,578,571 | $(43,004,218)$ |
| 1823007 SFAS 112 Postemployment Benef | 4,401,367 |  | 4,401,367 |  | 4,401,367 | 4,401,367 | 0 |
| 1823009 DSM Incentives | 2,741,216 |  | 2,741,216 |  | 2,741,216 | 2,741,216 | 0 |
| 1823010 Energy Efficiency Recovery | $(31,307,123)$ |  | $(31,37,123)$ |  | $(31,307,123)$ | $(31,307,123)$ | 0 |
| 1823011 DSM Lost Revenues | 6,673,849 |  | 6,673,849 |  | 6,673,849 | 6,673,849 | 0 |
| 1823012 DSM Program Costs | 21,892,058 |  | 21,892,058 |  | 21,892,058 | 21,892,058 | 0 |
| 1823022 HR 765kV Post Service AFUDC | 607,176 |  | 607,176 |  | 607,176 | 607,176 | 0 |
| 1823054 HRJ 765kV Depreciation Expense | 94,615 |  | 94,615 |  | 94,615 | 94,615 | 0 |
| 1823063 Unrecovered fuel Cost | 8,990,089 |  | 8,990,089 |  | 8,990,089 | 8,990,089 | 0 |
| 1823077 Unreal Loss on fwd Commitments | 1,235,880 |  | 1,235,880 |  | 1,235,880 | 1,235,880 | 0 |
| 1823078 Deferred Storm Expense | 15,69,833 |  | 15,669,833 |  | 15,669,833 | 15,669,833 | 0 |
| 1823099 Asset Retirement obligations | 1,172,796 |  | 1,172,796 |  | 1,172,796 | 1,172,796 | 0 |
| 1823115 Defd Equity Carry Chg-Non Fuel | $(6,547)$ |  | $(68,547)$ |  | $(68,547)$ | (68,547) | 0 |
| 1823118 BridgeCo TO Funding | 198,584 |  | 198,584 |  | 198,584 | 198,584 | 0 |
| 1823119 PJM Integration Payments | 36,426 |  | 36,426 |  | 36,426 | 36,426 | 0 |
| 1823120 Other PJM Integration | 209,804 |  | 209,804 |  | 209,804 | 209,804 | 0 |
| 1823121 Carry Chgs-RTo Startup Costs | 134,805 |  | 134,805 |  | 134,805 | ${ }^{134,805}$ | 0 |
| 1823122 Alliance RTO Deferred Expense | 103,937 |  | 103,937 |  | 103,937 | 103,937 | 0 |
| 1823165 REG ASSET FAS 158 Qual plan 1823166 REG ASET FAS 158 OPEB PLAN | $39,456,152$ $(8,45,244)$ |  | $3,3,456,152$ $(8,45,244)$ |  | $3,455,152$ $(8,45,244)$ | $\begin{gathered} 39,456,152 \\ (8,455,244) \end{gathered}$ | 0 |
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| 2340037 A/P Assoc-Global Borrowing lit | 350,000 |  | $(350,000)$ |  | $(350,000)$ | $(350,000)$ | 0 |  |
| 2340212 A/P Assoc-PCRB Reaca Int | 0 |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | - | - | $\underline{0}$ |  |
| A/P Associated Companies | 25,290,287 |  | $(25,290,287)$ | 0 | (25,290,287) | (25,290,287) |  |  |
| 2350001 Customer Deposits-Active | 25,260,450 |  | $(25,260,450)$ | $(25,260,450)$ | 0 | (25,260,450) | 25,260,450 |  |
| 2350003 Deposits - Trading Activity | 307,092 |  | (307,092) |  | $(307,092)$ | $(307,092)$ | 0 |  |
| 2350005 Deposits - Trading Contra | $\bigcirc \bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | - |  |
| Customer Deposits | 25,567,542 |  | $(25,567,542)$ | (25,260,450) | $(307,092)$ | (25,567,542) | 25,260,450 |  |
| 2360001 Federal Income Tax | 23,486,803 |  | $(23,486,803)$ |  | $(23,486,803)$ | $(23,486,803)$ | 0 |  |
| 236000209 State Income Taxes | (63,670) |  | 63,670 |  | 63,670 | 63,670 | 0 |  |
| 336000212 State Income Taxes | 0 |  | ${ }^{0}$ |  | ${ }^{0}$ | ${ }^{0}$ | 0 |  |
| 236000213 State Income Taxes | (940,194) |  | 940,194 |  | 940,194 | 940,194 | 0 |  |
| 33600214 State Income Taxes | 3,599,431 |  | $(3,599,431)$ |  | $(3,599,431)$ | (3,599,431) | 0 |  |
| 2360004 FICA | 170,340 |  | (170,340) |  | $(170,34)$ | $(170,34)$ | 0 |  |
| 2360005 Federal Unemployment Tax | 253 |  | (253) |  | (253) | (253) | 0 |  |
| 2360006 State Unemployment Tax | 3,088 |  | $(3,088)$ |  | $(3,088)$ | $(3,088)$ | 0 |  |
| 236000700 State Sales and Use Taxes | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 236000713 State Sales and Use Taxes | ${ }^{0}$ |  | $\stackrel{0}{0}$ |  | 0 | (67.893) | 0 |  |
| 236000714 State Sales and Use Taxes | 67,893 |  | (67,893) |  | (67,893) | $(67893)$ | 0 |  |
| 36000811 Real Personal Property Taxes | ${ }_{0}^{0}$ |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 236000813 Real Personal Property Taxes | 12,144,211 |  | $(12,144,211)$ |  | $(12,144,211)$ | $(12,144,211)$ | 0 |  |
| 336000914 Federal Exise Taxes | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | , | 0 |  |
| 236001212 State Franchise Taxes | 0 |  | ) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 236001213 State Franchise Taxes | 3,782 |  | $(3,782)$ |  | $(3,782)$ | 82) | 0 |  |
| 236001313 State Business Occupatn Taxes | 0 |  | ) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 236001314 State Business Occupatt Taxes | 331,048 |  | (331,048) |  | (331,048) | ${ }^{(331,048)}$ | 0 |  |
| 236001600 State Gross Receipts Tax | 71,358 |  | (71,358) |  | (71,358) | $(71,358)$ | 0 |  |
| 236001614 State Gross Receipts Tax | 15,000 |  | $(15,000)$ |  | $(15,000)$ | $(15,000)$ | 0 |  |
| 236001714 Municipal License Fees Acrrd | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 236003312 Pers Prop Tax-Cap Leases | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 236003313 Pers Prop Tax-Cap Leases | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 236003314 Pers Prop Tax-Cap Leases | 23,507 |  | $(23,507)$ |  | $(23,507)$ | $(23,507)$ | 0 |  |
| 236003513 Real Prop Tax-Cap Leases | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 236003514 Real Prop Tax-Cap Leases | 19,125 |  | (19,125) |  | $(19,125)$ $(365590)$ | ${ }^{(19,125)}$ | 0 |  |
| 2360037 FICA - Incentive accrual | 365,540 |  | $(365,540)$ |  | $(365,540)$ | $(365,540)$ | 0 |  |
| 2360502 State Inc Tax-Short Term Fin48 | ${ }^{(160)}$ |  | 160 |  | 160 | 160 | 0 |  |
| 2360001 Fed Inc Tax-Long Term fin48 | ${ }^{(0)}$ |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2360002 State Inc Tax-Long Term fin48 2360701 SEC Accum Defd IT-Util FiN 48 | 0 |  | 0 |  | ${ }_{0}^{0}$ | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2360702 SEC Accum Defd SIT - Fin 48 | 70 |  | (70) |  | (70) | (70) | 0 |  |
| 2368801 Federal Income Tax - IRS Audit | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | - | 0 |  |
| 2360901 Accum Defd FIT- RRS Audit | - |  | - |  | $\bigcirc$ | - | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| Taxes Accrued | 39,297,426 |  | $(39,297,426)$ | 0 | (39,297,426) | (39,297,426) | 0 |  |
| 2370002 Interest Accrued-Inst Pur Con | 2,618 |  | $(2,618)$ |  | $(2,618)$ | $(2,618)$ | 0 |  |
| 2370005 Interest Accrd-Other LT Debt | 3,194 |  | $(3,194)$ |  | $(3,194)$ | $(3,194)$ | 0 |  |
| 2370006 Interest Accrd-Sen Unsee Notes | 5,187,531 |  | $(5,187,531)$ |  | $(5,187,531)$ | $(5,187,531)$ | 0 |  |
| 2370007 Interest Accrd-Customer Depsts | 19,985 |  | $(19,985)$ |  | (19,985) | $(19,985)$ | 0 |  |
| 2370018 Accrued Margin Interest | 523 |  | (523) |  | (523) | (523) | 0 |  |
| 2370048 Acrd Int.- FIT Reserve - LT | 84,201 |  | $(84,201)$ |  | $(84,201)$ | $(84,201)$ | 0 |  |
| 2370202 Interest Accrd - IPC Buybacks | 0 |  | 0 |  | , | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2370248 Acrd Int. - FIT Reserve - ST | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2370448 Acrd Int. - SIT Reserve - ST | $\bigcirc$ |  | 0 |  | - | @ | @ |  |
| Interest Accrued | 5,298,052 |  | (5,298,052) | 0 | (5,298,052) | $(5,298,052)$ | 0 |  |
| Dividends Accrued | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 2430001 Oblig Under Cap Leases - Curr | 1,135,747 |  | $(1,135,747)$ |  | $(1,135,747)$ | $(1,135,747)$ | 0 |  |
| 2430003 Accrued Cur Lease Oblig | - |  |  |  | $\underline{0}$ |  | ㅇ |  |
| obligation Under Capital Leases | 1,135,747 |  | $(1,135,747)$ | 0 | $(1,135,747)$ | $(1,135,747)$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| 2440001 Curr. Unreal Losses - NonAffil | 2,163,931 |  | (2,163,931) |  | $(2,163,931)$ | 2,163,931 | (4,327,861) |  |
| $2440009 \mathrm{~S} / \mathrm{T}$ Option Premium Receipts |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 2440021 STT Liability MTM Collateral | (79,968) |  | 79,968 |  | 79,968 | (79,968) | 159,936 |  |
| 2450010 S/T Liability-Commodity Hedges | - |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| Energy Contracts Current | 2,083,963 |  | $(2,083,963)$ | 0 | $(2,083,963)$ | 2,083,963 | (4,167,925) |  |
| 2410001 Federal Income Tax Withheld | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2410002 State Income Tax Withheld | 139,546 |  | (139,546) |  | (139,546) | (139,546) | 0 |  |
| 2410003 Local Income Tax Withheld | 23,092 |  | $(23,092)$ |  | $(23,092)$ | $(23,092)$ | 0 |  |
| 2410004 State Sales Tax Collected | 729,372 |  | (729,372) |  | (729,372) | ${ }^{(729,372)}$ | 0 |  |
| 2410006 school District Tax Witheld | 50 |  | (50) |  | (50) | (50) | 0 |  |
| 2410008 Franchise Fee Collected | ${ }^{504,791}$ |  | (504,791) |  | ${ }^{(504,791)}$ | $(504,791)$ $(89965)$ | 0 |  |
| 2410009 KY Utility Gr Receipts Lic Tax Tax Collections Payable | ${ }_{2,2996,476}$ |  | ${ }_{(2,296,476)}^{(89,625)}$ | 0 | ${ }_{(2,2996,476)}^{(8,625)}$ | ( $2,29996,474$ ) | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| 2420514 Revenue Refunds Accrued | 1,149,493 |  | (1,149,493) |  | (1,149,493) | (1,149,493) | o |  |
| Revenue Refunds Accured | 1,149,493 |  | $(1,149,493)$ | 0 | $(1,149,493)$ | $(1,199,493)$ | 0 |  |
| Accrued Rents - Affiliated | - |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2420504 Accrued Lease Expense | ${ }_{6}^{6,423}$ |  | (6,423) |  | (6,423) | (6,423) | @ |  |
| Accrued Rents - NonAffiliated | 6,423 |  | (6,423) | 0 | $(6,423)$ | $(6,423)$ | 0 |  |
| Accrued Rents | 6,423 |  | $(6,423)$ | 0 | $(6,423)$ | (6,423) | 0 |  |
| 2420020 Vacation Pay - This Year | 2,048,877 |  | $(2,048,877)$ |  | (2,048,877) | $(2,048,877)$ | 0 |  |
| 2420021 Vacation Pay- Next Year | $\frac{2,950,022}{4.998899}$ |  | $\frac{(2,950,022)}{(4,998899)}$ |  | $\frac{(2,950,022)}{(4,998899)}$ | $\frac{(2,950,022)}{(4,998899)}$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| Accrued Vacations 2420051 Non-Productive Payroll | $\begin{array}{r}\text { 4,998,899 } \\ \hline 151,944\end{array}$ |  | $(4,998,899)$ $(151,944)$ | 0 | $(4,998,899)$ $(151,944)$ | $(4,998,899)$ $(151,944)$ | 0 |  |
| 2420053 Perf Share Incentive Plan | 196,370 |  | (196,370) |  | (196,370) | (196,370) | - |  |
| Miscellaneous Employee Benefits | 348,314 |  | (348,314) | 0 | $(348,314)$ | $(348,314)$ | - |  |
| Employee Benefits | 5,347,213 |  | $(5,347,213)$ | 0 | $(5,347,213)$ | (5,347,213) | 0 |  |
| $2420002 \mathrm{P} / \mathrm{R}$ Ded - Medical Insurance | 151,293 |  | $(151,293)$ |  | $(151,293)$ | $(151,293)$ | 0 |  |
| $2420003 \mathrm{P} / \mathrm{R}$ Ded - Dental Insurance | 12,580 |  | $(12,580)$ |  | $(12,580)$ | $(12,580)$ | 0 |  |
| 2420013 P/R Ded-LTD Ins Premiums | 1,053 |  | $(1,053)$ |  | $(1,053)$ | $(1,053)$ | 0 |  |
| 2420016 P/R Ded-Crt Ord/Grnshmt/Tx LV | 0 |  | 0 |  | - | 0 | 0 |  |
| ${ }^{2420044} \mathrm{P/R}$ Withholdings | ${ }^{165,729}$ |  | (165.729) |  | ${ }_{(165,729)}$ | ${ }_{\text {(165,729) }}^{(799)}$ | 0 |  |
| Payroll Deductions 2420503 Worker's Comp Admin Fee | 165,725 0 |  | $(165,725)$ 0 | 0 | $(165,725)$ | $(165,725)$ | 0 |  |
| 2420532 Adm Liab-Cur-S/lns-W/C | 711,604 |  | (711,604) |  | (711,604) | (711,604) | - |  |
| Acrued Workers' Compensation | 711,604 |  | (711,604) | 0 | $(711,604)$ | $(711,604)$ | - |  |
| 2420027 FAS 112 CURRENT LAB | 1,349,912 |  | (1,349,912) |  | (1,349,912) | (1,349,912) | 0 |  |
| 2420046 FAS 158 SERP Payable - Current | 15 |  | (15) |  | (15) | (15) | 0 |  |
| $2420071 \mathrm{P} / \mathrm{R}$ Ded - Vision Plan | 5,805 |  | $(5,805)$ |  | $(5,805)$ | $(5,805)$ | 0 |  |
| ${ }_{2}^{2420072 ~ P / R-P a y r o l \mid ~ A d j u s t m e n t ~}$ | 2,634 |  | (12,634) |  | $(12,634)$ <br> 20793$)$ | $(12,634)$ $(200793)$ | ${ }^{0}$ |  |
| 2420076 P/R Savings Plan - Incentive | 200,793 |  | (200,793) |  | (200,793) | (200,793) | 0 |  |
| 2420087 Engage to Gain Incentive |  |  |  |  | (174,750) | (174,750) | 0 |  |
| 2420088 Econ. Development Fund Curr 2420505 Workers Comp NC Admin Fee | 174,750 |  | (174,750) |  | $(174,750)$ | $(174,750)$ | 0 |  |
| ${ }_{2} 242025056$ Est Einancincing Cost - Bonds | (133,127) |  | 133,127 |  | 133,127 | ${ }_{133,127}$ | 0 |  |
| 2420511 Control Cash Disburse Account | 1,053,290 |  | $(1,053,290)$ |  | $(1,053,290)$ | $(1,053,290)$ | 0 |  |
| 2420512 Unclaimed Funds | 62,948 |  | $(6,948)$ |  | $(62,948)$ | (62,948) | 0 |  |
| 2420542 Acc Cash Franchise Req | 70,093 |  | $(70,093)$ |  | (70,093) | (70,093) | 0 |  |

Exhibit RCS-20

| KPCO Balance Sheet Detail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Section IV | Section V Exhibit 1 | All Balance Sheet | Section VExhibit 1 | Difference in | Included in | Not Included in |
|  | Page 3 \& 4 | Schedule 3 | Items Funded by | Schedule 4 | Capitalization \& | Section II, Pg 392 | Section II, Pg 392 |
| ASSETS | Per Books 9/30/2014 | Capitalization | Capitalization | Rate Base | Rate Base | Reconciliation | Reconciliation |
| 2420558 Admitted Liab NC-Self/Ins-W/C | 2,077,548 |  | $(2,077,548)$ |  | $(2,077,548)$ | $(2,077,548)$ | 0 |
| 242059213 Sales Use Tax - Lease Equip | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 242059214 Sales Use Tax - Lease Equip | 291 |  | (291) |  | (291) | (291) | 0 |
| 2420618 Accrued Payroll | 2,093,459 |  | $(2,093,459)$ |  | $(2,093,459)$ | $(2,093,459)$ | 0 |
| 2420623 Distr, Cust Ops \& Reg Svcs ICP | 1,791,100 |  | $(1,791,100)$ |  | $(1,791,100)$ | $(1,791,100)$ | 0 |
| 2420624 Corp \& Shrd Srv Incentive Plan | 242,837 |  | $(242,837)$ |  | $(242,837)$ | $(242,837)$ | 0 |
| 2420635 Generation Incentive Plan | 2,828,571 |  | $(2,828,571)$ |  | $(2,828,571)$ | $(2,828,571)$ | 0 |
| 2420643 Accrued Audit Fees | 118,004 |  | $(118,004)$ |  | $(118,004)$ | $(118,004)$ | 0 |
| 2420653 Reorg Misc HR Exp Accrual | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2420656 Federal Mitigation Accru (NSR) | 554,326 |  | $(554,326)$ |  | $(554,326)$ | $(554,326)$ | 0 |
| 2420660 AEP Transmission ICP | 190,300 |  | $(190,300)$ |  | $(190,300)$ | $(190,300)$ | 0 |
| 2420664 ST State Mitigation Def (NSR) | 173,104 |  | $(173,104)$ |  | $(173,104)$ | $(173,104)$ | - |
| Miscellaneous Current and Accrued Liab | 12,856,652 |  | $(12,856,652)$ | 0 | $(12,856,652)$ | $(12,856,652)$ | 0 |
| Other Current and Accrued Liabilities | 22,533,587 |  | $(22,533,587)$ | 0 | $(22,533,587)$ | $(22,533,587)$ | 0 |
| Current Liabilities | 227,632,793 | 85,000,000 | $(187,632,793)$ | $(25,260,450)$ | $(162,372,343)$ | $(183,464,868)$ | 21,092,525 |
| 2811001 Acc Dfd FIT - Accel Amort Prop | 85,412,469 |  | $(85,412,469)$ | $(85,412,469)$ | 0 |  | 0 |
| 2821001 Accum Defd FIT - Utility Prop | 307,650,137 |  | $(307,650,137)$ | $(307,650,137)$ | 0 |  | 0 |
| 2823001 Acc Dfrd FIT FAS 109 Flow Thru | 57,737,500 |  | $(57,737,500)$ |  | $(57,737,500)$ | $(57,737,500)$ | 0 |
| 2824001 Acc Dfrd FIT - SFAS 109 Excess | $(589,613)$ |  | 589,613 |  | 589,613 | 589,613 | 0 |
| 2830006 ADIT Federal - SFAS 133 Nonaff | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2831001 Accum Deferred FIT - Other | 12,631,818 |  | $(12,631,818)$ | $(12,631,818)$ | 0 |  | 0 |
| 2831002 Accum Deferred SIT - Other | 4,723,865 |  | $(4,723,865)$ | $(4,723,865)$ | 0 | $(4,723,865)$ | 4,723,865 |
| 2831102 Acc Dfd SIT-WV Pollution Cntrl | 5,921,849 |  | $(5,921,849)$ | $(5,921,849)$ | 0 | $(5,921,849)$ | 5,921,849 |
| 2832001 Accum Dfrd FIT - Oth Inc \& Ded | 135,279 |  | $(135,279)$ |  | $(135,279)$ | $(135,279)$ | 0 |
| 2833001 Acc Dfd FIT FAS 109 Flow Thru | 55,447,034 |  | $(55,447,034)$ |  | $(55,447,034)$ | $(55,447,034)$ | 0 |
| 2833002 Acc Dfrd SIT FAS 109 Flow Thru | 69,583,721 |  | $(69,583,721)$ |  | $(69,583,721)$ | $(69,583,721)$ | $\underline{0}$ |
| Deferred Income Taxes | 598,654,060 |  | $(598,654,060)$ | $(416,340,139)$ | (182,313,921) | $(192,959,635)$ | 10,645,714 |
| 2550001 Accum Deferred ITC - Federal | 53,719 | 53,719 | ㅇ |  | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | ㅇ |
| Deferred Investment Tax Credits | 53,719 | 53,719 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2540011 Over Recovered Fuel Cost | $\bigcirc$ |  | 0 |  | ㅇ | ㅇ | @ |
| Over Recover of Fuel Cost | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SFAS 106 OPEB | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Demand Side Management Credit | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 2540000 Other Regulatory Liabilities | 542,318 |  | $(542,318)$ |  | $(542,318)$ | $(542,318)$ | 0 |
| 2540047 Unreal Gain on Fwd Commitments | 4,172,897 |  | $(4,172,897)$ |  | $(4,172,897)$ | $(4,172,897)$ | 0 |
| 2540105 Home Energy Assist Prgm - KPCO | 103,175 |  | $(103,175)$ |  | $(103,175)$ | $(103,175)$ | 0 |
| 2540173 Green Pricing Option | 684 |  | (684) |  | (684) | (684) | o |
| Other Regulatory Liability | 4,819,075 |  | $(4,819,075)$ |  | $(4,819,075)$ | $(4,819,075)$ | 0 |
| 2543001 SFAS109 Flow Thru Def FIT Liab | 28,926 |  | $(28,926)$ |  | $(28,926)$ | $(28,926)$ | 0 |
| 2544001 SFAS 109 Exces Deferred FIT | 907,097 |  | (907,097) |  | (907,097) | $(907,097)$ | 0 |
| FAS109 DFIT Reclass (Acct 254) | 936,023 |  | $(936,023)$ | 0 | $(936,023)$ | $(936,023)$ | 0 |
| Unamortized Gain on Reacquired Debt | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Regulatory Liabilities | 5,755,097 |  | $(5,755,097)$ | 0 | $(5,755,097)$ | $(5,755,097)$ | 0 |
| 2440002 LT Unreal Losses - Non Affil | 627,940 |  | $(627,940)$ |  | $(627,940)$ | 627,940 | $(1,255,880)$ |
| 2440022 L/T Liability MTM Collateral | $(12,514)$ |  | 12,514 |  | 12,514 | $(12,514)$ | 25,028 |
| 2450011 L/T Liability-Commodity Hedges | - |  | $\underline{0}$ |  | O | O | $\underline{0}$ |
| Long-Term Energy Trading Contracts | 615,426 |  | $(615,426)$ | 0 | $(615,426)$ | 615,426 | $(1,230,852)$ |
| 2520000 Customer Adv for Construction | 117,511 |  | (117,511) | (117,511) | ㅇ | ㅇ | o |
| Customer Advances for Construction | 117,511 |  | $(117,511)$ | $(117,511)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Deferred Gains on Sale/Leaseback | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| Deferred Gains on Dispostion of Utility Plant | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 2530000 Other Deferred Credits | 3,738 |  | $(3,738)$ |  | $(3,738)$ | $(3,738)$ | 0 |
| 2530004 Allowances | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | - | 0 |
| 2530022 Customer Advance Receipts | 1,505,492 |  | $(1,505,492)$ |  | $(1,505,492)$ | $(1,505,492)$ | 0 |
| 2530050 Deferred Rev-Pole Attachments | 247,227 |  | $(247,227)$ |  | $(247,227)$ | $(247,227)$ | 0 |
| 2530067 IPP - System Upgrade Credits | 275,431 |  | $(275,431)$ |  | $(275,431)$ | $(275,431)$ | 0 |
| 2530092 Fbr Opt Lns-In Kind Sv-Dfd Gns | 152,086 |  | $(152,086)$ |  | $(152,086)$ | $(152,086)$ | 0 |
| 2530101 MACSS Unidentified EDI Cash | 0 |  | (0) |  | (0) | (0) | 0 |
| 2530112 Other Deferred Credits-Curr | 230,828 |  | $(230,828)$ |  | $(230,828)$ | $(230,828)$ | 0 |
| 2530114 Federl Mitigation Deferal(NSR) | 1,110,644 |  | $(1,110,644)$ |  | $(1,110,644)$ | $(1,110,644)$ | 0 |
| 2530124 Contr In Aid of Constr Advance | 38,321 |  | $(38,321)$ |  | $(38,321)$ | $(38,321)$ | 0 |
| 2530137 Fbr Opt Lns-Sold-Defd Rev | 93,007 |  | $(93,007)$ |  | $(93,007)$ | $(93,007)$ | 0 |
| 2530177 Deferred Rev-Bonus Lease Curr | 431,564 |  | $(431,564)$ |  | $(431,564)$ | $(431,564)$ | 0 |
| 2530178 Deferred Rev-Bonus Lease NC | 1,546,438 |  | (1,546,438) |  | (1,546,438) | (1,546,438) | o |
| Other Deferred Credits | 5,634,775 |  | $(5,634,775)$ |  | $(5,634,775)$ | $(5,634,775)$ | 0 |
| Deferred Credits | 6,367,712 | 0 | $(6,367,712)$ | (117,511) | $(6,250,201)$ | $(5,019,349)$ | $(1,230,852)$ |
| DEFERRED CREDITS \& REGULATED LIABILITIES | 610,830,589 | 53,719 | $(610,776,869)$ | $(416,457,650)$ | (194,319,219) | (203,734,082) | 9,414,862 |
| CAPITAL \& LIABILITIES | 2,387,857,533 | 1,515,907,464 | (871,950,069) | $(441,718,100)$ | $(430,231,969)$ | $(461,225,637)$ | 30,993,668 |
| Accounts Receivable / Cash Working Capital |  | 52,409,892 | 52,409,892 | 72,856,334 | $(20,446,442)$ | 41,470,569 | (61,917,011) |
| Adjusted Total | 2,387,857,533 | 1,568,317,356 | $(819,540,177)$ | $(368,861,766)$ | $(450,678,411)$ | $(419,755,068)$ | $(30,923,343)$ |
| Assets | 2,387,857,533 | 0 | 2,387,857,533 | 2,041,290,361 | 346,567,172 | 369,450,441 | $(22,883,269)$ |
| Liabilities | 2,387,857,533 | 1,568,317,356 | $(819,540,177)$ | (368,861,766) | $(450,678,411)$ | $(419,755,068)$ | (30,923,343) |
| Total |  | 1,568,317,356 | 1,568,317,356 | 1,672,428,595 | $(104,111,239)$ | $(50,304,628)$ | $(53,806,611)$ |



## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Big Sandy Unit 1 Operation Rider (BS1OR). Refer to the Direct Testimony of Company witness Wohnhas and Company Exhibit AEV 4, which was filed in conjunction with the Direct Testimony of Company witness Vaughn. On page 7 of his Direct Testimony, Mr. Wohnhas stated that KPCo is proposing to recover (1) the non-fuel costs of operating Big Sandy Unit 1 as a coal facility until the conversion to natural gas; (2) the non-fuel costs of operating Big Sandy Unit 1 as a natural gas-fired generating station; and (3) the return on and of the capital investment required for the conversion of Big Sandy Unit 1 to a natural gas-fired unit once the gas-fired unit is in place. In addition, Mr. Wohnhas stated that the annual revenue requirement for the BS1OR (without recovery of any capital costs associated with the conversion to natural gas) totals $\$ 18,245,413$.
a. Please explain fully and in detail the Company's rationale for proposing the BS1OR and why each of the specific components related to Big Sandy Unit 1, as discussed on page 7 (lines 13-21) of Mr. Wohnhas' testimony, are being proposed to be recovered through the proposed BS1OR.
b. Please reconcile the $\$ 18,245,413$ annual revenue requirement related to the BS1OR to each component of the BS1OR noted above and on the referenced page of Mr. Wohnhas' testimony. Identify, quantify and explain each reconciling item.
c. Please explain fully and in detail why the Company proposes that the BS1OR remain in place until the rates established in the Company's next base rate case become effective.
d. Please clarify whether Mr. Wohnhas was referring to the base rates established in the instant proceeding or a base rate case filed subsequent to the instant proceeding. Explain fully.

## RESPONSE

a. See the Company's response to Staff 2-86.
b. See the Company's response to KIUC 1-17, specifically KIUC_1_17_Attachments 46, 47 and 39 for the requested information. The detail behind Big Sandy 1 items a and bincluded in KIUC_1_17_Attachment 46 can be found in KIUC_1_17_Attachment 47. The detail behind Big Sandy 1 item c included in KIUC_1_17_Attachment 46 can be found in KIUC_1_17_Attachment 39.
c. The BS1OR is being proposed as an interim ratemaking mechanism to permit the Company to comply with certain requirements of the Mitchell Stipulation in light of the short extended period of operation of Big Sandy Unit 1 as a coal-fired unit. See also the Company's response to part a.
d. Company witness Wohnhas was referring to a base rate case filing subsequent to the instant proceeding.

WITNESS: Alex E Vaughan

KPSC 2014-00396 General Rate Adjustment Commission Staff's Second Set of Data Requests Dated January 29, 2015

Item No. 86
Page 1 of 1

## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Refer to Exhibit JAR-9, Kentucky Power's proposed P.S.C. KY. No. 10, Sheet Nos. 39-1, the Big Sandy Unit 1 Operation Rider; the Vaughan Testimony, page 18; and the Direct Testimony of Ranie K. Wohnhas ("Wohnhas Testimony"), page 7. State whether recovery of Big Sandy Unit 1 operating expenses pursuant to the Mitchell Stipulation and Settlement Agreement is limited to recovery through a rider as proposed, or whether Kentucky Power has other options for cost recovery.

## RESPONSE

Pursuant to the Stipulation and Settlement Agreement approved in Case No. 2012-00578, paragraph 3, "The Company agrees to remove all coal-related operating expenses related to Big Sandy 1....". With the one year extension to operate Big Sandy Unit 1 as coal leading up to the conversion to gas, the rider was the only option available that would keep the Company compliant with the Stipulation and Settlement Agreement. The rider gives transparency of the operating costs to all parties during the one year extension, during the conversion of the unit to gas, and through its operation as a gas-fired unit up until the next base rate filing after its conversion to gas.

WITNESS: Ranie K Wohnhas
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## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Please reference the Testimony of Gregory Pauley, p. 9, lines 21-24 and p. 10, lines 1-10. Explain why the Company will not continue to fund the KPCo Economic Advancement Program ("EAP") through shareholder funds, instead of proposing that the customers be forced to contribute to the surcharge.

## RESPONSE

The Company is continuing to fund the KEAP program with shareholder funds through 2018. The KEDS program is in addition to the KEAP. The Company will match KEDS funds collected from customers with shareholder funds.

WITNESS: Gregory G Pauley

# KPSC Case No. 2014-00396 General Rate Adjustment Attorney General's Second Set of Data Requests Dated February 24, 2015 Item No. 101 <br> Page 1 of 1 

## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Please reference the Company's response to AG 1-8.
a. Does the Company plan to continue to fund the Kentucky Power company Economic Advancement Program with shareholder funds beyond 2018, or will the contribution cease in 2018? Please explain the answer in full detail. If the contribution will cease in 2018 please explain why.

## RESPONSE

The Company has not made a decision concerning shareholder funding of the Economic Advancement Program beyond 2018.

WITNESS: Gregory G Pauley

# KPSC Case No. 2014-00396 General Rate Adjustment <br> Attorney General's Second Set of Data Requests Dated February 24, 2015 

Item No. 105
Page 1 of 1

## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Please reference Greg Pauley's Testimony p. 10, lines 3-10, as well as the Company's response to AG 1-32 and explain what "key economic development activities" within the region the Company plans to use the Kentucky Economic Development Surcharge ("K.E.D.S.") funds for if approved.

## RESPONSE

The Company plans to expend the funds in a cost-effective fashion. Although specific projects have not been identified, K.E.D.S. funds may be applied toward economic development activities such as:

- Industrial and commercial site development to provide adequate access and utilities to enhance the usefulness of the site and help ensure that industrial sites are "move in" ready for prospective businesses.
- Improvements to and development of buildings to provide move-in ready buildings that can be tailored to a prospective business' specific needs.
- Site marketing to inform and attract prospective businesses to consider a specific location.
- Personnel development / training to enhance the abilities of local and regional economic development personnel to enable them to be more effective in the vital areas of planning, preparation and recruiting prospective industries to their communities and region.

WITNESS: Gregory G Pauley

KPSC 2014-00396 General Rate Adjustment Commission Staff's Second Set of Data Requests Dated January 29, 2015 Item No. 51
Page 1 of 2

## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Refer to the Rogness Testimony, pages 16-20, describing the proposed Kentucky Economic Development Surcharge ("K.E.D.S.").
a. Does any other AEP subsidiary or related entity have a tariff provision to collect an economic development surcharge from its customers? if so, provide a copy of the tariff(s).
b. State whether Kentucky Power is aware of any other utility in any other jurisdiction having similar charges approved to support and promote economic development, if so, provide details concerning the utilities and related tariff provisions.
c. Explain whether and how the proposed K.E.D.S. differs from the economic development provision set forth in Paragraph 10 of the Stipulation and Settlement Agreement attached as Appendix A to the Final Order in Case No. 2012-00578.
d. Explain why Kentucky Power believes it is reasonable to collect an economic development surcharge from its customers to fund economic development initiatives that foster economic growth in Kentucky Power's service territory.

Explain why Kentucky Power believes it is reasonable to collect the proposed K.E.D.S. from its customers, with matching funds from shareholders, rather than fund economic development initiatives with shareholder contributions only.

## RESPONSE

a. There is a similar program in Ohio. See KPSC_2_51_Attachment1.pdf for a copy of the tariff.
b. The Company is not aware of any other utility in any other jurisdiction having similar charges approved to support and promote economic development.

# KPSC 2014-00396 General Rate Adjusitment ${ }^{\text {Pag }}$ <br> Commission Staff's Second Set of Data Requests <br> Dated January 29, 2015 <br> Item No. 51 <br> Page 2 of 2 

c. The proposed K.E.D.S. tariff is separate from the economic development provision in Paragraph 10 of the Stipulation and Settlement Agreement (Agreement) attached to the final Order in Case No. 2012-00578. Paragraph 10 of the Agreement specifically addresses support for Lawrence and the contiguous counties.

The economic development initiatives funded through the K.E.D.S. tariff are available to the entire service territory and not just the seven Counties discussed in the Agreement. These funds are separate from the other funds discussed in the Commission's Order. Shareholder matching funds in the K.E.D.S. initiatives are in addition to the funds addressed by in the Commission's final Order in Case No. 201200578.
d. Both the Company and its customers reside and do business in Eastern Kentucky and all have a stake in the health of regional economy. Enhanced economic development efforts will lead to economic growth and increased employment. The funds raised through the K.E.D.S. tariff will be targeted to specific efforts that will help the counties within the service territory to compete for competitive economic development projects. The surcharge to customers and the matching funds from Company shareholders represents the shared responsibility to support and enhance economic development efforts to the benefit of all.

## WITNESS: John A Rogness

P.U.C.O. NO. 20

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COST RECOVERY RIDER

Effective Cycle 1 October 2014, all customer bills subject to the provisions of this Rider, including any bills rendered under special contract, shall be adjusted by the Economic Development Cost Recovery charge of $11.44664 \%$ of the customer's distribution charges under the Company's Schedules, excluding charges under any applicable Riders. This Rider shall be adjusted periodically to recover amounts authorized by the Commission.

Filed pursuant to Order dated September 17, 2014 in Case No. 14-1329-EL-RDR
Issued: September 29, 2014

# KPSC Case No. 2014-00396 General Rate Adjustment Commission Staff's Third Set of Data Requests Dated February 24, 2015 Item No. 20 <br> Page 1 of 1 

## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Refer to the response to Item 51. Confirm that Ohio has enabling legislation providing for the cost of economic development programs to be recovered from utility customers.

## RESPONSE

Confirmed.

WITNESS: Gregory G Pauley


# KPSC Case No. 2014-00396 General Rate Adjustment <br> Attorney General's Initial Set of Data Requests 

 Dated January 29, 2014Item No. 335
Page 1 of 1

## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Refer to Exhibit JMS-3. If the transmission revenue requirement were to remain in KPCo's base rates, would that be accomplished by eliminating column 10 from Exhibit JMS-3?
a. If not, what other adjustments would be necessary to keep the transmission revenue requirement in KPCo's base rates?

## RESPONSE

Yes, eliminating the OATT adjustment in Column 10 of Exhibit JMS-3 would keep the transmission function revenue requirement in base rates which would result in the KY retail jurisdictional revenue requirement increasing by $\$ 126,908$ and customers' rates in aggregate and by class would not be aligned with the true cost of transmission service. Furthermore, the customer class revenue allocation would need to be re-examined since the effects of the OATT adjustment were taken into consideration when the Company decided not to remove any further inter-class subsidies.
a. None

WITNESS: Jason M Stegall

# KPSC Case No. 2014-00396 General Rate Adjustment <br> Commission Staff's Second Set of Data Requests <br> Dated January 29, 2015 <br> Item No. 101 <br> Page 1 of 1 

## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Refer to the Vaughan Testimony, page 21, lines 14-17. Mr. Vaughan states that the net effect of Kentucky Power's treatment of transmission revenues and expenses is $\$ 126,908$ and that '[i]t is important to note that this value will change to the extent any other aspect of the Company's requests in this proceeding are modified." Explain what is meant by "any other aspect."

## RESPONSE

Because the value of the transmission adjustment is related to the Company's authorized recovery of transmission revenues and expenses, changes in the manner in revenues and expenses are recovered will flow through to the transmission adjustment.

WITNESS: Alex E Vaughan

# KPSC Case No. 2014-00396 General Rate Adjustment KIUC First Set of Data Requests Dated January 29, 2015 <br> Item No. 81 <br> Page 1 of 2 

## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

In the current proceeding, Kentucky Power proposes to include the charges that it incurs as an LSE under PJM's OATT in the new PJM Rider, whereas in the past, Kentucky Power had previously included the embedded cost of transmission service and the PJM OATT transmission owner revenues in the Company's cost of service. (See Vaughan page 20)
a. Please provide a more detailed explanation of how this was previously done and how it compares to the new procedure.
b. Please provide workpapers, electronically with all formulas intact, showing how transmission costs and revenues were removed from the Company's cost of service and identify where these costs and revenues appear in the schedules the Company filed.
c. Please provide an analysis, electronically with all formulas intact, demonstrating whether or not the impact of the transmission costs and revenues removed from the cost of service matches closely with the impact of charging for transmission costs through the new PJM Rate Rider.

## RESPONSE

a. See KIUC_1_81_Attachment 1.
b. See the Company's response to KIUC 1-17, specifically KIUC_1_17_Attachment 35.
c. See the Company's response to KIUC 1-17, specifically KIUC_1_17_Attachment 35. Under the previous practice, the Company's requested revenue requirement would have been approximately \$127,000 higher.

The Company's proposed PJM rider has an initial revenue requirement of $\$ 0$. Adjusted test year amounts of the Company's PJM LSE OATT charges are included in its proposed base rate cost of service. The proposed PJM rider would recover amounts above and below the amount of PJM LSE OATT charges included in the Company's proposed base rate cost of service.

KPSC Case No. 2014-00396 General Rate Adjustment KIUC First Set of Data Requests Dated January 29, 2015<br>Item No. 81<br>Page 2 of 2

The removal of the transmission function costs and revenues and the recovery of the PJM LSE OATT charges through a combination of base rates and the proposed PJM rider are two separate items. The PJM LSE OATT charges represent the FERC approved cost of transmission service attributable to KPCo's internal load (LSE) incurred as part of the PJM RTO.

WITNESS: Alex E Vaughan


KPCo recieves load based LSE charges and wholesale revenues as a transmission owner under the PJM OATT.


For the purposes of the CCOS, the OATT LSE charges were classified as production function expenses. PJM OATT transmission owner revenues and KPCo's embedded cost of transmission serivice were classified as the transmission function.


Mechanically speaking, the OATT adjustment is the removal of the transmission function from the CCOS. This leaves only the OATT LSE charges in the CCOS that were classified as production expense. This is what Kentucky ratepayers will pay for their transmission service. The PJM transmission owner revenues compensate KPCo for its embedded transmission function cost of service. The net of the PJM transmission owner revenues and KPCo's embedded cost of transmission service was a $\$ 127 \mathrm{k}$ expense which the OATT adj removes from the overall cost of service. Previously, KPCo's embedded cost of transmission service, the PJM transmission owner revenues and the PJM LSE OATT charges were all included in the Company's Kentucky retail cost of service.
The $\$ 127 \mathrm{k}$ OATT Adjustment

It should be noted that the PJM LSE OATT charges are allocated to the customer classes the same way whether they are classified as transmission or production because both functions are allocated based on the classes' 12CP demands or total energy.

# KPSC Case No. 2014-00396 General Rate Adjustment KIUC First Set of Data Requests Dated January 29, 2015 Item No. 82 <br> Page 1 of 1 

## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Refer to Vaughan page 21 at line 15, please provide detailed workpapers, electronically with all formulas intact, demonstrating the development of the $\$ 126,908$ impact, which is the net effect of the Company's change to the treatment of transmission revenues and expenses. Also, please provide a narrative description explaining the calculations.

## RESPONSE

See the Company's response to KIUC 1-17, specifically KIUC_1_17_Attachment 35 for the workpapers supporting the calculation of the $\$ 126,908$.

For a narrative and illustrative explanation, see the Company's response to KIUC 1-81, specifically KIUC_1_81_Attachment 1.

WITNESS: Alex E Vaughan

# KPSC Case No. 2014-00396 General Rate Adjustment KIUC First Set of Data Requests Dated January 29, 2015 <br> Item No. 84 <br> Page 1 of 1 

## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Explain why a $\$ 126,908$ transmission adjustment is being made to remove costs in JMS-3, when at the same time $\$ 53,779,456$ is being added to the PJM Rider.

## RESPONSE

$\$ 53,779,456$ is not being added to the PJM Rider. KPCo proposes to continue to include the adjusted test year amount of PJM LSE OATT expense in base rates and track any over or under recovery of this expense through the PJM Rider.

The Company's proposal is to remove from base rates both the OATT revenues that KPCo receives from PJM as a transmission owner and KPCo's Kentucky retail jurisdictional transmission cost of service (return on and of transmission rate base and all transmission operating expenses).

The $\$ 126,908$ in Adjustment JMS-3 represents the removal of the KPCo’s transmission owner OATT revenues and KPCo's retail jurisdictional transmission cost of service from base rates.

The $\$ 53,779,456$ represents the adjusted test year level of OATT expense in base rates.
See also the Company's response to KIUC 1-81 part a.

WITNESS: Alex E Vaughan


# KPSC Case No. 2014-00396 General Rate Adjustment <br> Attorney General's Second Set of Data Requests <br> Dated February 24, 2015 

Item No. 36
Page 1 of 3

## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Mitchell Plant. Refer to the response to AG 1-18. Specifically, the Mitchell Plant Operating Agreement at page 2 states in part: "AEPGR transferred its fifty percent (50\%) undivided interest in the Mitchell Facility to Newco Wheeling Inc., exclusive of its interest in the Conner Run Fly Ash Impoundment and Dam ("Conner Run"), which interest in Conner Run was retained on the Transfer Date by AEPGR...". In addition, at page 3, the Mitchell Plant Operating Agreement states in part: "Whereas, the Owners desire that KPCo shall operate and maintain the Mitchell Facility, exclusive of Conner Run (the "Mitchell Plant"), in accordance with the provisions set forth herein;..."
a. As it is not clear from the Mitchell Plant Operating Agreement, please state whether AEPGR retained a $100 \%$ interest in the Conner Run Fly Ash Impoundment and Dam upon the 50/50 transfer of the Mitchell Facility between KPCo and Newco Wheeling Inc. If not, explain fully why not.
b. If the answer to part "a" is "no", please state whether KPCo's acquisition of its $50 \%$ undivided interest in the Mitchell Facility includes a $50 \%$ interest in the Conner Run Fly Ash Impoundment and Dam. If so, please explain fully and in detail why when AEPGR transferred its $50 \%$ undivided interest in the Mitchell Facility to Newco Wheeling Inc. exclusive of its interest in Conner Run.
c. If the answer to part "b" is "yes", please quantify and provide a breakout by amount and account of the costs associated with KPCo's $50 \%$ interest in Conner Run.

## RESPONSE

a. No. AEPGR transferred a $50 \%$ interest in the Mitchell facility including Conner Run to KPCo upon the completion of the transfer on December 31, 2013. AEPGR transferred a $50 \%$ interest in the Mitchell facility excluding Conner Run to Newco Wheeling Inc. upon the completion of the transfer on January 31, 2015 and thus AEPGR retained a $50 \%$ interest in Conner Run.

## Kentucky Power Company

b. See response to a. above. With respect to Wheeling Power Company's (WPCo) $50 \%$ interest in Mitchell Plant, the West Virginia Public Service Commission approved a settlement agreement between the parties in the Mitchell Plant transfer case that transferred the Mitchell Plant and generating facilities excluding the transfer of $50 \%$ of Conner Run (the Mitchell Settlement Interest), but it also approved the payment by WPCo of $\$ 20$ million to AEPGR and the establishment of a $\$ 20$ million regulatory asset to be included in WPCo's rate base that approximated AEPGR's book value of Conner Run. Reference page 8 of the WV Commission order in Case No. 14-0546-E-PC dated December 30, 2014 which states:
"The Stipulating Parties have agreed and proposed to the Commission that the Mitchell Settlement Interest be transferred at its net book value as of the date of transfer. The Stipulating Parties have also agreed and proposed to the Commission that on transfer WPCo will remit $\$ 20$ million to Generation Resources as a regulatory adjustment. The Commission views the $\$ 20$ million payment as a form of consideration for eliminating the Conner Run Impoundment and any future costs and liabilities related to the Conner Run Impoundment from the Mitchell Settlement Interest. WPCo will record a regulatory asset to be included in rate base and will be allowed to set rates based on a return on, and of, that $\$ 20$ million amount. Costs associated with this regulatory asset will be recovered over the remaining life of the generating facilities associated with the Mitchell Settlement Interest. At the hearing on the Joint Stipulation, Company witness Ferguson described the treatment of this $\$ 20$ million amount, and CAD witness Gregg testified that it was acceptable to CAD. Tr. At 21 (Ferguson); Tr. at 81 (Gregg). The Commission finds that these provisions of the Joint Stipulation are reasonable and will adopt them."
c. As indicated in a. above, Kentucky Power Company's 50\% interest in the Mitchell facility includes Conner Run. The costs on Kentucky books related to Conner Run at September 30, 2014 were as follows:

Account 101 Gross Cost including ARO \$24,693,773
Account 107 CWIP
Account 108 Accumulated Depreciation including ARO-
117,521
Net Book Value -
$(4,459,698)$
20,351,596
Account 403 Annualized Depreciation Expense -
553,731
Account 4031001 Adj. test year ARO Depreciation Expense- 394,685
Account 4111005 Adj. test year ARO Accretion Expense-
743,129
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Attorney General's Second Set of Data Requests
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## Kentucky Power Company

In addition, Kentucky Power Company has recorded an ARO liability of \$13,910,746 in account 2300001 and has $\$ 279,149$ for land recorded in account 1240029.

WITNESS: Ranie K Wohnhas

## From the Charlotte Business J ournal
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## Duke Energy in \$100 million settlement talks over federal grand jury investigation

Feb 18, 2015, 7:51am EST | UPDATED: Feb 18, 2015, 8:41am EST


J ohn Downey
Senior Staff Writer- Charlotte
Business Journal
Email | Twitter | Google+
Duke Energy Corp. (NYSE:DUK) says it expects to file what will likely be a $\$ 100$ million settlement in the federal grand jury investigation into the massive coal spill on the Dan River last year.
"The company expects a proposed agreement could be reached and filed in the next several days for consideration by the court," Duke says in a prepared statement. "If approved, the proposed agreement would resolve the ongoing grand jury investigation of the company's coal ash basin management."

Duke says simply it is "in settlement discussions with the U.S. government related to the ongoing federal grand jury investigation of the February 2014 Dan River coal ash spill and ash basin operations at other North Carolina coal plants."

See Also

- Duke Energy calculates coal-ash costs at $\$ 3.4$ billion - for now
- Grand jury opens criminal probe into Duke Energy coal ash spill


## No further comment

The company has included a charge of $\$ 100$ million in its fourth-quarter earnings, released this morning, that represents "the company's assessment of probable financial exposure related to any agreement."

The charge amounts to 14 cents per share against its earnings for the quarter and the year.

Duke CEO Lynn Good and Chief Financial Officer Steve Young will hold a conference call on the earnings report Wednesday morning. But the company says they will not answer additional questions about the settlement because it involves a pending legal action.

Just over a year ago, a stormwater pipe running under the main coal ash pond at Duke's shuttered Dan River Steam Station spewed toxic coal ash into the river. It took days to seal the pipe, during which time an estimated 39,000 tons of ash escaped.

## New regulation

Federal and state authorities say Duke has completed the cleanup of the river. But a federal grand jury in Raleigh started investigating the spill within two weeks of the accident to determine if it amounted to a crime. Subpoenas also made clear that the grand jury was investigating Duke's practice of storing ash in wet ponds and whether there was any improper relationship with state employees and officials over the regulation of those ponds.

The spill also prompted the N.C. General Assembly to adopt new regulations on the disposal of coal ash. The legislation calls for all of Duke's more than 30 coal ash ponds to be closed over the next 15 years. Duke currently estimates the cost of that effort at around $\$ 3.4$ billion.

## Concerned About the

Affordable Care Act?
Oasis, as a Healthcare Reform expert, can
help you navigate through the complexities.

Click here

for more information!


Justin Miczek, Greenpeace
The spill at the shuttered Dan River Steam Station started on Feb. 2, 2014, and took several days to staunch.

## From the Charlotte Business J ournal

CHARLOTTE

## Duke Energy calculates coal-ash costs at $\$ 3.4$ billion —for now

Nov 6, 2014, 2:59pm EST | UPDATED: Nov 6, 2014, 4:57pm EST


J ohn Downey
Senior Staff Writer- Charlotte
Business Journal
Email | Twitter | Google+
depending on what is required in the cleanup.

Duke Energy (NYSE:DUK) has set aside a $\$ 3.4$ billion obligation in its accounting requirements for the costs of cleaning up its 32 ash ponds in North Carolina.

Duke had estimated the cleanup could cost $\$ 2$ billion to $\$ 10$ billion. Chief Financial Officer Steve Young emphasized to analysts this week that the obligation could rise or fall,

## Concerned About the

Affordable Care Act?
Oasis, as a Healthcare Reform expert, can help you navigate through the complexities.

## Click here

 for more information!

NANCY PIERCE
Duke Energy CFO Steve Young says the costs could rise or fall, depending on state rulings on treatment of ash in existing ponds.

## State reacts

Duke is scheduled to file plans to excavate and rebury ash at four sites - the closed Dan River, Riverbend and Cape Fear plants and the operating Asheville Plant - by the end of this month. Final decisions on what needs to be done at 10 other sites won't come until next year, at the earliest.

Already this week, state officials rejected Duke's first proposal for how it plans to assess groundwater conditions at the 14 plant sites.
"The plan as submitted fails to provide an adequate level of detail regarding the planned assessment activities, which if left unchanged may lead to an inadequate assessment of environmental conditions at the site," Jay Zimmerman, a section chief in the N.C. Division of Water Resources, wrote in a letter to Duke officials Wednesday.

## Public statement



Duke submitted those plans Sept. 26. It now has 30 days to submit new plans.
The company responded publicly with a prepared statement. It said the company shares DENR's "interest in conducting detailed groundwater assessments that will drive to appropriate closure decisions that are based on good science and engineering"
"We will incorporate the state's feedback to arrive at plans that meet their expectations," the statement says. "We remain focused on closing ash basins, which ultimately will address groundwater issues"

John Downey covers the energy industry and public companies for the Charlotte Business Journal.



# Duke Energy Agrees to Pay \$102.2 Milfifiof ${ }^{\text {fi }}$ for Coal-Ash Spill 

## U.S. government charges company violated Clean Water Act

By Rebecca Smith, Wall Street Journal
Updated Feb. 20, 2015 6:59 p.m. ET
Duke Energy Corp. has agreed to settle charges that it violated the federal Clean Water Act by spilling coal ash into the Dan River in North Carolina last year, and will pay $\$ 102.2$ million in penalties and restitution.

The deal with federal investigators includes a five-year probationary period with a courtappointed monitor to ensure compliance with provisions of the agreement. The terms are subject to review by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina.

The settlement amount would be paid by shareholders, not customers, the Charlotte, N.C., company said.

The investigation into Duke's coal-ash practices, conducted by U.S. attorneys in North Carolina, was prompted by a large release of coal-ash waste in February 2014 from a storage basin at the retired Dan River Steam Station owned by Duke.

A break in a pipe released large amounts of sludge and waste into the bucolic Dan River in Rockingham County, N.C. Subsequent inspections at other coal-waste dumps by federal and state officials identified numerous problems.

Federal officials on Friday charged Duke with nine misdemeanor violations of the federal Clean Water Act in connection with the spill and unauthorized discharges at Dan River, as well as problems at four other power plant locations.

The company said it is addressing problems at each site with upgrades or new permits.
"We are accountable for what happened at Dan River and have learned from this event," said Lynn Good, president and CEO, in a written statement. "We are setting a new standard for coal ash management and implementing smart, sustainable solutions for all of our ash basins."

Representatives of the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of North Carolina and Duke declined to comment on the settlement.

The Dan River spill focused national attention on the legacy problem of coal incineration near rivers. The river meanders through Virginia and North Carolina for 200 miles and its shallow waters are a favorite of inner-tubers and paddlers.

Duke is still working with state officials to fix problems at coal-waste sites and has said it potentially could spend more than $\$ 3$ billion in coming years to shore up waste storage.

The company estimates it has about 150 million tons of coal waste stored in 4,500 acres of ash dumps in the half dozen states where it has coal power plants, with about $70 \%$ of the waste in North Carolina.

# Duke Energy faces charges, $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 2}$ million in fines over coal ash spills 

By Ralph Ellis, CNN

Updated 6:55 AM ET, Sat February 21, 2015
(CNN)A year after a massive coal ash spill into a North Carolina river, Duke Energy said Friday it would pay $\$ 102$ million in a proposed settlement of nine criminal charges filed against the company by the U.S. government.

The charges, all misdemeanors alleging violations of the Clean Water Act, were filed Friday in U.S. district courts in North Carolina. A federal judge would have to approve the settlement.


Duke Energy faces federal charges for toxic spills 01:24
The case concerns problems at several Duke Energy locations, but the major problem occurred at the Dan River Steam Station in Rockingham County, near the Virginia border.

On February 2, 2014, a leak in a 48-inch stormwater pipe at that retired plant sent about 39,000 tons of coal ash and wastewater and up to 27 million gallons of basin water pouring into the Dan River.

The utility originally said 82,000 tons of coal ash spilled, but later revised the number.
Parts of the river turned into gray sludge. Coal ash, the byproduct of burning coal, is made up of aluminum oxide, iron oxide and silicon oxide. It also contains arsenic, mercury and other metals.

Researchers from Wake Forest University who used cameras on an unmanned aerial aircraft to create a 3-D image of the spill said as many as 35 million gallons of arsenic-contaminated water and ash may have made its way into the river.

A filing of criminal information said Duke "negligently" discharged pollutants and that employees failed to "exercise the degree of care that someone of ordinary prudence would have exercised in the same circumstances with respect to the discharge of ash and coal ash wastewater. ..."

The criminal charges were filed against the company, not individuals.
The $\$ 102$ million in payments would be paid by shareholders, not customers, a company press release said. The company said $\$ 68.2$ million would go toward fines and restitution and $\$ 34$ million for community service and mitigation projects.

The company said Clean Water Act violations concerning unauthorized discharges occurred at these company facilities in North Carolina: the Dan River plant in Eden; the Riverbend Steam Station in Mount Holly; the H.F. Lee Steam Electric Plant in Goldsboro; and the Asheville Steam Electric Generating Plant. A maintenance issue occurred at the Cape Fear Steam Electric Plant in Moncure, the company said.

The agreement would include five years of probation and a court-appointed monitor to make sure Duke Energy complies with all provisions of the settlement, the company said.

Duke has apologized for the spills -- both when they happened and Friday.
"We are accountable for what happened at Dan River and have learned from this event," said Lynn Good, president and CEO of Duke Energy.


## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Please explain why the Company seeks to retain $40 \%$ of all off-system sales margins above the amount included in base rates. In your response, please explain whether the sharing percentage will affect how the Company's generation is dispatched into PJM.

## RESPONSE

In short, continued sharing of the benefits of optimizing OSS margins between the Company and its customers aligns customer benefits with utility incentives. The Company believes that a mechanism that allows the Company to retain $40 \%$ of all margins above the amount included in base rates and to absorb $40 \%$ of the margins below the amount included in base rates provides a reasonable balance between the Company's incentive to maximize OSS margins, while sharing a large portion with customers, and the volatility that would exist for customers if $100 \%$ of the risk and reward of OSS margins was provided to customers.

The practice of providing utilities with an incentive to pursue off-system sales (OSS) through some kind of sharing mechanism has been in use by the Kentucky Commission since long before the emergence of RTOs. In today's complex and often volatile energy markets, the need for the OSS sharing incentive is stronger than ever. Participation in PJM requires a significant level of attention to detail and market intelligence to optimize the Company's resources and serve its load. The ability of the Commercial Operations personnel to get the most value for the Company's generating resources also enables them to maximize the off-system sales margins for the benefit of the customers and the Company. Active participation in all facets of the interrelated PJM markets provides the greatest benefits for the customer - and aligns the interest of the Company and customers. The absence of an OSS sharing mechanism would negatively impact the value received from the Company's generation in the PJM markets.

WITNESS: Ranie K Wohnhas

## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Reference the response to KIUC 1-54 Data Request regarding off-system sales margins.
a. Explain the percentage of off-system sales (OSS) margins that are derived as a result of offering units into the PJM market that are subsequently dispatched by PJM.
b. Explain what actions KPCo or AEC on KPCo's behalf actually takes beyond prudently offering units into the centrally dispatched PJM market to maximize OSS margins.
c. Explain what actions KPCo or AEC on KPCo's behalf could take that would lessen OSS margins if they are prudently offering ratebase units into the PJM market if no incentive is provided to keep part of the OSS margins.
d. Provide details on all OSS margins that are derived on behalf of KPCo that are not a result of participating in the PJM market with KPCo ratebased units.
e. Does KPCo propose to share OSS margins that are not directly related to KPCo ratebased units (i.e. other AEC asset or non asset based market sales) with customers?
f. Are the costs necessary for KPCo (or AEC on KPCo's behalf) to offer its units into the PJM market recovered from customers?
g. Are the personnel involved already offered incentive pay reflecting their performance in offering KPCo generation into the PJM market?
h. Is this incentive pay entirely taken from the OSS margins or is this part of the payroll package that KPCo proposes to recover separately in its revenue requirements?
i. Is there a distinction made between OSS margins obtained merely because KPCo's generation units are prudently offered into the PJM market and other OSS margins obtained?
j. Has KPCo ever justified buying, building, purchasing, improving, selling or decommissioning any generation facility in an application before the PSC by studies that involved future OSS margins?
i. Did such studies assume that $40 \%$ of the OSS margins would not be used to benefit KPCo’s customers?
ii. If not how does this claw back affect every study provided to the PSC in the last 10 years?
k. How did KPCo arrive at the $40 \%$ "incentive" for OSS margins?
i. Wouldn't $30 \%$ retention of OSS margins also be an incentive?
ii. What about $10 \%$, wouldn't this still be an incentive?
iii. What about $1 \%$, wouldn't this still be an incentive?

## RESPONSE

In answering this data request, the Company assumes "AEC" as used throughout the data request refers to American Electric Power Service Corporation.
a. As discussed on page 32 (lines 4-5) of Company Witness Vaughan's direct testimony, the Company's proposed adjusted test year margins from energy sales into PJM are $\$ 24.28$ million, while the other components of the total Company OSS margins are a negative $\$ 9.79$ million which result in the Kentucky Power adjusted test year total OSS margins $\$ 14.5$ million.
b. American Electric Power Service Corporation Commercial Operations Group, on behalf of Kentucky Power, engages in many activities beyond prudently offering units into the centrally dispatched PJM market. These actions further allow the Company to maximize OSS margins. For example, the Commercial Operations Group actively participates in the trading of futures/forward contracts within the PJM region. In addition to the potential for OSS margins directly related to this activity, this participation also has numerous other benefits that optimize the Company's generation. The Commercial Operations Group also improves OSS margins by enhancing the timing of unit outages and helps identify opportunities for hedging either a short or long generation position. Commercial Operations is also actively involved in managing the Company's FTR portfolio in order to minimize the cost of congestion for customers.

Even operating within the PJM markets, optimizing OSS margins is not a matter of prudently offering the Company's generation into the market. Utilizing the expertise of the Commercial Operations Group to respond to and anticipate the significant volatility between the day-ahead and real-time markets results in both increased OSS margins as well as lower fuel costs for customers. One final example of the methods the Commercial Operations Group employs to optimize OSS margins is the scheduling of the Company's generating units into the PJM day-ahead market. PJM bases its economic decision to select a unit to run in the day-ahead market based on a one day (or two days for the weekend period) analysis. However, such a short term look at the market can lead to less than optimal results for individual generators. For example, PJM may not clear some of the Company's units for the weekend and they would thus be shut down. However, within the parameters of the PJM rules, if the Company expects the units to be profitable and clear the market at the beginning of the following week, it could elect to self-schedule those units for the weekend. The units may incur a small loss on the sale of energy over the weekend, but they would avoid shut down and start-up costs, and would be ready to serve retail customers and make profitable sales in the market in the following days. By taking a longer term view of the unit's characteristics, and the expected PJM market conditions, the Commercial Operations Group's expertise and active management of the Company's resources leads to increased OSS margins and reduced costs for customers.
c. In the absence of a reasonable OSS margin sharing mechanism Kentucky Power would not take action to lessen OSS margins. Without financial compensation for incurring the costs and risks associated with taking the actions described in subpart (b) that are beyond the prudent offering of units into the market, however, the OSS margins realized could be reduced. The alignment of customer and Company incentives over the years has resulted in an OSS sharing mechanism that has provided significant customer benefits.
See the Company's response to part (b).
d. See the Company's response to part (b). Furthermore, the portion of OSS margins directly attributable to the expertise of and the broad scope of activities the Commercial Operations Group that are above and beyond the prudent offering of the Company's units in the PJM market cannot be directly quantified. Simply put, the many activities engaged in by Commercial Operations in order to optimize the Company's OSS margins produces a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts. The Company's sharing proposal ensures that the interest of the customer and the Company continued to be aligned, to the ultimate benefit of both parties.
e. Yes, as it historically has done through its System Sales Clause.
f. All costs attributable to internal load customers are recovered from those customers. All costs attributable to making off system sales margins as defined in the Company's System Sales Clause are shared between the Company and Customers through the sharing of OSS margins.
g. The personnel involved in the bidding and dispatch of Kentucky Power's generating assets in the PJM market participate in the Company's ICP program. They do not take part in a special compensation program that directly aligns their ICP with the Company's OSS margins.
h. ICP payments are not included the calculation of OSS margins. However, to the extent that performance results in an ICP level that is greater than what is in base rates, that would not be recovered from customers. As described by Company witness Carlin, the level of ICP requested as part of base rates in this case is consistent with a market competitive pay package.
i. Yes. See also part b.
j. See subpart ii below.
i. No.
ii. The Company objects to the mischaracterization of the OSS margin sharing mechanism as a "clawback," and the characterization that the OSS sharing mechanism does not benefit the Company's customers. Without waiving this objection, the Company responds that the disposition analyses submitted by the Company focus on the least-cost alternative to meet the capacity and energy requirements of Kentucky Power's native load customers. Projections concerning possible OSS margins do not materially affect the Company's determination of the least-cost alternative.
k. See subpart i below.
i. In light of the fact that under the proposed OSS sharing mechanism customers will receive (to the extent the margins are realized) $100 \%$ of the OSS margins built into base rates, permitting the Company to retain $40 \%$ of the OSS margins above the amount built into base rates is an appropriate sharing percentage. Moreover, the $60 \% / 40 \%$ sharing proposed by the Company represents a reduction in the Company's share of OSS margins above the amount built into base rates from the percentage received early in the operation of the sharing mechanism. Finally, assigning the Company less than $40 \%$ of the OSS margins above the amount built into base rates would unreasonably saddle Kentucky Power with a disproportionate risk of any shortfall without providing the Company with adequate compensation for that risk through a reasonable sharing of OSS margins above the amount built into base rates. For these reasons, the Company believes that the proposed $60 \% / 40 \%$ sharing of OSS margins above and below the monthly base credit between customers and the Company, respectively, is an appropriate incentive and sharing of the risks and returns of making OSS.
ii. See subpart i.
iii. See subpart i.

WITNESS: Alex E Vaughan
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## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Reference the response to AG 1-34.
a. Please provide information, including copies, of any public statements made, recognition granted or awards made by NERC, PJM, or any other related industry entity regarding AEPSC's cyber security plan and the systems developed in support thereof.
b. What steps is AEP taking to assure that the AEPSC cyber security plan is cost effective?
c. Identity all costs by account incurred by AEPSC (1) in total and (2) charged to KPCo, by month for cyber security from January 2011 through December 2014.

## RESPONSE

a. Please see AG_2_5_Attachmen1.pdf through AG_2_5_Attachment3.pdf for this response. This includes program materials for PJM's GRID 20/20 event. AEP presented its "CSOC Threat and Information Sharing" program on November 12, 2013 at this event.
b. For more than a decade, AEP has worked continuously to strengthen its cybersecurity programs and to ensure that those programs evolve to meet new and emerging risks. AEP constantly scans the system for risks or threats and continuously assess its capacity, including cybersecurity knowledge, staffing, capabilities and the need for future investment. Cyber hackers have been able to breach other entity's very secure facilities including federal agencies, banks, retailers, health insurers, and social media sites. As these events become known, AEP assesses its cybersecurity tools and processes to determine if and where further enhancement is appropriate. When new investments are required, those project requests are processed through AEP's normal investment governance procedures.
c. See the Company's response to KPSC-2-7.

WITNESS: H Kevin Stogran
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## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Rockport. Refer to the testimony of witness Elliott.
a. Identify and provide the FERC order that approved a $12.16 \%$ return on equity for the Rockport Plant.
b. Show in detail the capital structure and capital costs that KPCo is using for the Rockport Plant.
c. Is the Rockport Plant operated by KPCo's affiliate, Indiana and Michigan Electric Company?
d. Has the return on equity for the Rockport plant ever been addressed by the Indiana or Michigan regulatory commissions? (1) If so, identify the last three Indiana proceedings to address the return on equity. (2) Identify the last three Michigan PSC proceedings to address the return on equity.
e. Identify and provide the FERC Order and the filings in the FERC Docket where the Rockport UPA was approved, and identify the date when the $12.16 \%$ return on equity was allegedly approved.
f. Has KPCo ever used a $12.16 \%$ return on equity for the Rockport Plant in any other rate case or regulatory proceedings before the Kentucky PSC? (1) If not, explain fully why not. (2) If so, identify all previous proceedings before the Kentucky PSC wherein KPCo used a $12.16 \%$ return on equity for the Rockport Plant.
g. What risks are being borne by KPCo for the Rockport Plant that would justify using a return on equity of $12.16 \%$ ?
h. What revenue requirement for the Rockport UPA was approved by FERC?
i. How does the Company's request in the current rate case for Rockport UPA costs compare with the Rockport UPA revenue requirement last approved by FERC? Identify, quantify and explain any differences.
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## RESPONSE

a. Please see AG_1_394_Attachment1.
b.. The Company updates its capital structure used in the Rockport environmental surcharge revenue requirement calculation on a monthly basis based on the month's Rockport Unit Power bill.
c. The Rockport Plant is operated by Indiana Michigan Power Company.
d. The return on equity and capital structure used in billings for purposes of the Rockport Unit Power Agreement are established in accordance with the FERC-approved agreement and not the decisions of the Indiana or Michigan commissions. The information sought thus is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence. Further, the Company has not compiled a list of cases in which the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (IURC) or the Michigan Public Service Commission (MPSC) has addressed the return on equity associated with the AEG share of the Rockport Plant. The orders of the IURC and the MPSC are public documents that all parties to this proceeding have access.
e. See the Company's response to item a above. Filings before the FERC are public documents that all parties to this proceeding have access to.
f. KPCo has always used $12.16 \%$ return on equity for the AEG share of the Rockport plant consistent with the UPA. Examples of proceedings in which Kentucky Power used 12.16\% ROE for Rockport include but are not limited to:

KPSC Case No. 2005-00068;
KPSC Case No. 2006-00128;
KPSC Case No. 2006-00307;
KPSC Case No. 2007-00381;
KPSC Case No. 2009-00038;
KPSC Case No. 2009-00316;
KPSC Case No. 2010-00020;
KPSC Case No. 2010-00318;
KPSC Case No. 2011-00031;
KPSC Case No. 2012-00273;
KPSC Case No. 2013-00141;
KPSC Case No. 2013-00325;
KPSC Case No. 2014-00052; and
KPSC Case No. 2014-00322.
g. The $12.16 \%$ return on equity is established under the terms of the FERC-approved UPA.
h. See the Company's response to item a above.
i. All Rockport-associated costs flow through the FERC-approved UPA. The Company has not performed the requested analysis.

WITNESS: Amy J Elliott

Deposits and Working Funds (Accounts 132-134, 136, and 145) outstanding at the end of the previous month.
(b) Return on Other Capital, which shall be equal to the product of (i) the amount equal to the net interest expense associated with Long-Term and Short-Term Debt, net of any Temporary Cash Investments, Special Deposits and Working Funds, plus the preferred stock dividend requirement associated with the Preferred Stock outstanding at the end of the previous month; (ii) the Operating Ratio, as defined in Note 2 below; and (iii) the Unit No. 1 Net In-Service Investment Ratio, as defined in Note 3 below.

For the purposes of these calculations, net interest expense shall be equal to the sum of (i) the amount of Long-Term Debt outstanding at the end of the previous month multiplied by the weighted cost of such Long-Term Debt and (ii) the amount of Short-Term Debt outstanding at the end of the previous month multiplied by the weighted cost of such ShortTerm Debt, less (iii) the amount of Temporary Cash Investments, Special Deposits and Working Funds outstanding at the end of the previous month multiplied by the weighted cost of Long Term and Short-Term Debt combined determined pursuant to (i) and (ii) above.
(c) Recovery of Operating Expenses, excluding federal income taxes, which shall consist of provision for depreciation and amortization (Accounts 403-407, 411), including Asset Retirement Obligation (ARO) depreciation and accretion expenses (Accounts 403.1 and 411.10), taxes other than federal income taxes (Accounts 408-411) and operating and maintenance expenses associated with Unit No. 1 (including Common Facilities) offset by other operating revenues as recorded on the Company's books during the month in accordance with the FERC Uniform System of Accounts for Major Electric Utilities (See Note 6). Recovery of expenses for test energy shall be limited to recovery of actual fuel expense as recorded on the Company's books during the month in accordance with the FERC Uniform System of Accounts for Major Electric Utilities. Operating and maintenance expenses shall include, and reflect the recovery of, Steam Power Generation Expenses (Accounts 500-515 including lease rental payments recorded in Account 507), Other Power Supply Expenses (Accounts 555-557), Transmission Expenses (Accounts 560574), Distribution Expenses (Accounts 580-598), Customer Accounts Expenses (Accounts 901-905), Customer Service and Informational Expenses (Accounts 906-910), Sales Expenses (Accounts 911-917) and Administrative and General Expenses (Accounts 920-933 and 935). Recovery of 501 fuel expenses shall be adjusted to reflect the deferral and/or feedback of unrecovered levelized fuel expenses as may be recorded on the Company's books or as is currently recorded on the books of I\&M.
(d) Provision for Unit No. 1’s (including Common Facilities) allocated share of net current and deferred federal income tax expense and investment tax credit included in operating income as determined by the Company in accordance with federal income tax law, SEC approved consolidated current tax allocation procedures, and FERC rules and regulations.

For purposes of computing federal income taxes, the interest expense deduction shall be equal to the sum of the net interest expense computed in accordance with paragraph (b)
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## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Reference the Direct Testimony of Jeffery D. LaFleur on page 4 regarding Kentucky Power's 15\% ownership in the Rockport Plant. Please provide the following:
a. Current ownership agreement or any other related documents that detail how management decisions are made among the owners of the Rockport Plant.
b. A complete list of all owners, with percentage ownership.
c. Any affiliates of each owner and the related organization structure.
d. Membership of plant ownership management committee or equivalent owners’ representative organization.
e. Minutes, agendas, handouts and presentations from all meetings of the ownership management committee (or equivalent) for the last 3 years.
f. The amount of the demand charge KPCo pays for power produced at the Rockport plant. Confirm this sum is paid regardless of whether KPCo uses any power from Rockport.
g. Complete supporting information for the return on equity that KPCo is requesting in the current rate case on its $15 \%$ ownership in the Rockport Plant.

## RESPONSE

a-e. The Company does not have an ownership interest in the Rockport Plant. Kentucky Power has a unit power agreement for $15 \%$ of the generation from the Rockport Plant. The Rockport Plant is maintained and operated solely by Indiana Michigan Power Company.

Please see the Company's response to AG 1-375 for a copy of the unit power agreement.
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## Kentucky Power Company

f. Confirmed. Please see AG_1_19_Attachment1.xls for the demand charges for 2014.
g. Kentucky Power does not own a share of the Rockport Plant. Please see the Company's responses to AG 1-375 and AG 1-394 for additional detail regarding the Unit Power Agreement for Rockport.

WITNESS: Jeffery D LaFleur

Kentucky Power Company
Rockport's Demand Charges
Calendar Year 2014

| Aug 2014 | KY U1 | KY U2 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demand/Capacity Charge <br> Sept 2014 | $1,434,137$ <br> KY U1 | $2,351,063$ <br> KY U2 | $3,785,200$ <br> Total |
| Demand/Capacity Charge <br> Oct 2014 | $2,237,254$ <br> KY U1 | $2,723,590$ <br> KY U2 | $4,960,844$ <br> Total |
| Demand/Capacity Charge | $1,823,809$ | $2,206,222$ | $4,030,031$ |
| Nov 2014 | KY U1 | KY U2 | Total |
| Demand/Capacity Charge | $1,840,637$ | $3,802,096$ | $5,642,733$ |
| Dec 2014 | KY U1 | KY U2 | Total |
| Demand/Capacity Charge | $2,183,001$ | $1,972,446$ | $4,155,447$ |
| YTD TOTALS 2014 | KY U1 | KY U2 | Total |
| Demand/Capacity Charge | $21,672,200$ | $29,377,408$ | $51,049,608$ |
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## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Rockport. Refer to the response AG 1-389(b).
a. What fixed charges and demand charges would KPCo propose if the fixed Rockport costs were to be recovered through fixed charges and demand charges? Show how KPCo would develop fixed charge and demand charge rates.
b. Is it KPCo's position that the Rockport fixed costs must be recovered in per-kWh rates in perpetuity with no possibility of regulatory review to apply cost/causation principles? If not, explain fully why not.

## RESPONSE

a. Kentucky Power is not proposing to change its recovery methods for costs associated with Rockport.
b. Kentucky Power is recovering costs associated with Rockport in accordance with the Kentucky Public Service Commission's order dated December 13, 2004 in Case No. 2004-00420. This Order extends recovery for the life of the purchased power agreement which currently is scheduled to terminate on December 7, 2022.

WITNESS: John A Rogness

## Kentucky Power Company

## REQUEST

Rockport. Refer to the response to AG 1-394.
a. Provide a copy of the FERC Approved PPA or UPA which specifies that a $12.16 \%$ return in equity is to be used.
b. What is the term of the Rockport PPA/UPA?
c. Has the $12.16 \%$ been reviewed in any FERC proceeding since 2005? If so, identify the proceeding.
d. What portion of the Rockport plant is owned by AEG?
e. When did AEG acquire that ownership?
f. Why isn't the AEG owned part of the Rockport plant being transferred to KPCo at net book value, similar to the $50 \%$ interest in the Mitchell plant?

## RESPONSE

a. Please see AG_1_394_Attachment1.
b. The Rockport UPA will expire on December 7, 2022.
c. Please see the Company's response to AG 1-375.
d. AEP Generating Company (AEG) owns a 50\% interest in Rockport Unit 1.
e. The $50 \%$ interest in Rockport Unit 1 that AEG owns was acquired by AEG in two transactions in December of 1983 and October 1984.
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f. Please see the Company's response to subpart b above. AEP Generating Company and Indiana Michigan Power Company co-own Rockport Unit 1. Rockport Unit 2 is owned by an unrelated third-party and leased to AEP Generating Company and Indiana Michigan Power Company. Kentucky Power originally proposed to acquire a portion of the interest in the Rockport generating station held by AEP Generating Company. Its application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to acquire that interest was opposed and ultimately denied. The current contractual arrangement was created in response to provide the Company with the necessary generation. Further, there is no current need for Kentucky Power to acquire AEP Generating Company's interest in the units.

WITNESS: Ranie K Wohnhas Test Year Ended September 30, 2014

|  |  |  | Unit 1 |  |  | Unit 2 |  |  | Total |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Line <br> No. | Year | Month | Non-Fuel | Fuel | Total | Non-Fuel | Fuel | Total | Non-Fuel | Fuel | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2013 | 10 | \$1,426,670 | \$2,411,414 | \$3,838,084 | \$2,336,133 | \$3,432,031 | \$5,768,164 | \$3,762,803 | \$5,843,445 | \$9,606,248 |
| 2 | 2013 | 11 | \$1,915,781 | \$3,041,035 | \$4,956,816 | \$2,275,249 | \$3,332,736 | \$5,607,985 | \$4,191,030 | \$6,373,771 | \$10,564,801 |
| 3 | 2013 | 12 | \$1,287,319 | \$3,642,557 | \$4,929,876 | \$2,936,813 | \$3,538,537 | \$6,475,350 | \$4,224,132 | \$7,181,094 | \$11,405,226 |
| 4 | 2014 | 1 | \$1,423,709 | \$3,427,731 | \$4,851,440 | \$2,353,104 | \$3,221,395 | \$5,574,499 | \$3,776,813 | \$6,649,126 | \$10,425,939 |
| 5 | 2014 | 2 | \$1,807,838 | \$2,557,972 | \$4,365,810 | \$2,366,099 | \$2,645,208 | \$5,011,307 | \$4,173,937 | \$5,203,180 | \$9,377,117 |
| 6 | 2014 | 3 | \$1,487,345 | \$3,345,188 | \$4,832,533 | \$2,320,092 | \$3,224,976 | \$5,545,068 | \$3,807,437 | \$6,570,164 | \$10,377,601 |
| 7 | 2014 | 4 | \$1,544,779 | \$2,889,005 | \$4,433,784 | \$2,401,160 | \$2,449,507 | \$4,850,667 | \$3,945,939 | \$5,338,512 | \$9,284,451 |
| 8 | 2014 | 5 | \$2,349,064 | \$46,273 | \$2,395,337 | \$2,234,596 | \$3,749,337 | \$5,983,933 | \$4,583,660 | \$3,795,610 | \$8,379,270 |
| 9 | 2014 |  | \$1,767,204 | \$2,857,653 | \$4,624,857 | \$2,618,278 | \$3,031,712 | \$5,649,990 | \$4,385,482 | \$5,889,365 | \$10,274,847 |
| 10 | 2014 | 7 | \$1,773,423 | \$2,358,315 | \$4,131,738 | \$2,028,662 | \$3,023,080 | \$5,051,742 | \$3,802,085 | \$5,381,395 | \$9,183,480 |
| 11 | 2014 | 8 | \$1,434,137 | \$3,169,563 | \$4,603,700 | \$2,351,063 | \$2,558,853 | \$4,909,916 | \$3,785,200 | \$5,728,416 | \$9,513,616 |
| 12 | 2014 | 9 | \$2,237,254 | \$2,489,039 | \$4,726,293 | \$2,723,590 | \$2,378,724 | \$5,102,314 | \$4,960,844 | \$4,867,763 | \$9,828,607 |
| 13 | Total |  | \$20,454,523 | \$32,235,745 | \$52,690,268 | \$28,944,839 | \$36,586,096 | \$65,530,935 | \$49,399,362 | \$68,821,841 | \$118,221,203 |
| II. Charges for Return on Common Equity (Note A) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | 2013 | 10 | \$255,046 |  | \$255,046 | $(38,227)$ |  | $(38,227)$ | \$216,819 |  | \$216,819 |
| 15 | 2013 | 11 | \$259,107 |  | \$259,107 | $(53,883)$ |  | $(53,883)$ | \$205,224 |  | \$205,224 |
| 16 | 2013 | 12 | \$260,055 |  | \$260,055 | $(64,027)$ |  | $(64,027)$ | \$196,028 |  | \$196,028 |
| 17 | 2014 | 1 | \$251,680 |  | \$251,680 | $(28,386)$ |  | $(28,386)$ | \$223,294 |  | \$223,294 |
| 18 | 2014 | 2 | \$254,445 |  | \$254,445 | $(42,480)$ |  | $(42,480)$ | \$211,965 |  | \$211,965 |
| 19 | 2014 |  | \$252,800 |  | \$252,800 | $(53,053)$ |  | $(53,053)$ | \$199,747 |  | \$199,747 |
| 20 | 2014 |  | \$254,330 |  | \$254,330 | $(57,626)$ |  | $(57,626)$ | \$196,704 |  | \$196,704 |
| 21 | 2014 | 5 | \$258,229 |  | \$258,229 | $(73,355)$ |  | $(73,355)$ | \$184,874 |  | \$184,874 |
| 22 | 2014 | 6 | \$250,878 |  | \$250,878 | $(83,920)$ |  | $(83,920)$ | \$166,958 |  | \$166,958 |
| 23 | 2014 | 7 | \$243,646 |  | \$243,646 | $(39,753)$ |  | $(39,753)$ | \$203,893 |  | \$203,893 |
| 24 | 2014 | 8 | \$232,228 |  | \$232,228 | $(49,775)$ |  | $(49,775)$ | \$182,453 |  | \$182,453 |
| 25 | 2014 | 9 | \$230,021 |  | \$230,021 | $(59,043)$ |  | $(59,043)$ | \$170,978 |  | \$170,978 |
| 26 | Total |  | \$3,002,465 |  | \$3,002,465 | (643,528) |  | $(643,528)$ | \$2,358,937 |  | \$2,358,937 |
|  | III. Estimated Annual and Total Savings to KPCo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | If the $12.16 \%$ ROE Was Adjusted to: |  |  | Ratio to Estimated <br> Annual Savings <br> (Unit 1) |  | Estimated Annual Savings Carried Through Expiration Date (Note B) |  |  | Estimated <br> Annual <br> Savings (Both <br> Units <br> Combined) |  | Estimated Annual <br> Savings Carried <br> Through <br> Expiration Date <br> (Note B) |
| 27 | KPCo's requested ROE of $10.62 \%$ |  |  | 0.873355263 | \$380,000 | \$3,111,000 |  |  | \$299,000 |  | \$2,448,000 |
| 28 | KPCo's currently authorized ROE of 10.5\% |  |  | 0.863486842 | \$410,000 | \$3,356,000 |  |  | \$322,000 |  | \$2,636,000 |
| 29 | AG's recommended ROE of 8.65\% |  |  | 0.711348684 | \$867,000 | \$7,097,000 |  |  | \$681,000 |  | \$5,575,000 |

Notes and Source
Note A: Agreement provides for a $12.16 \%$ Return on Common Equity
Note B: Per KPCo's responses to AG 2-28(b) and AG 2-29(b), the Rockport UPA will expire on December 7,2022
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Note B: Per KPCo's response to AG 2-28(b) and AG 2-29(b), the Rockport UPA will expire on December 7, 2022 } \\ \text { Years from end of test year ( } 9 / 30 / 2014 \text { ) through Rockport UPA expiration (12/7/2022) } & 12 / 7 / 2022 & 9 / 30 / 2014 & 8.19 \text { years }\end{array}$
KPCo response to AG 2-5CS, Attachments 1 and 2
KPCo response to AG 2-5CS, Attachments 1 and 2
billed to Indiana \& Michigan Power Company, a utility affiliate. The amounts listed above are the AEPGenCo billings to KPCo
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