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Q. Please state your name, position and business address.

A. My name is Lonnie E. Bellar. I am the Senior Vice President of Operations for Louisville Gas and Electric Company (“LG&E” or “Company”) and an employee of LG&E and KU Services Company, which provides services to LG&E. My business address is 220 West Main Street, Louisville, Kentucky 40202.

Q. Did you previously submit direct testimony in this proceeding?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. What are the purposes of your rebuttal testimony?

A. The purposes of my testimony are to rebut the testimonies of Allen R. Neale and Councilman Rick Blackwell submitted on behalf of Louisville/Jefferson County Metro Government (“Louisville Metro”). Particularly, I will respond to Mr. Neale’s conclusions about LG&E’s gas distribution system and Councilman Blackwell’s statements concerning the franchise fee.

Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits to your testimony?

A. Yes. I am sponsoring the following exhibit to my rebuttal testimony:

Rebuttal Exhibit LEB-1 Percentage of Gas Receipts at City Gate Stations.

LG&E’s GAS DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

Q. Do you agree with Mr. Neale’s preliminary conclusions that certain counties rely on Louisville Metro to receive gas?

A. No. First, Louisville Metro’s argument that the Commission should consider how natural gas moves through the LG&E system in determining if those residing outside of Louisville Metro are subject to a franchise fee is irrelevant because Louisville Metro simply does not have franchising authority over any area outside of the
Louisville Metro Franchise Area (“Franchise Area”). Moreover, the Commission has never decided how franchise fees are to be collected based on how a commodity moves through a utility’s system. This is simply not relevant.

In his testimony, Mr. Neale – among his many preliminarily conclusions – states that “without the ability to take receipts from . . . three citygate stations off of Texas Gas in Jefferson County, . . . Bullitt, Nelson, and Shelby, as well as Jefferson County, would not receive gas service. Furthermore, I conclude that without access to the LG&E facilities located in the Louisville Metro ROW, gas may not be able to arrive in the adjacent counties of Oldham, Spencer, Marion and Anderson.”¹ I disagree with these conclusions primarily because Louisville Metro is dependent upon the rights-of-way of municipal and county governments located outside of Louisville Metro to receive the gas volumes it needs.

Q. Please explain how Louisville Metro is dependent upon portions of LG&E’s gas system located outside of Jefferson County to receive gas?

A. Certainly. Mr. Neale asserts that other counties rely upon Louisville Metro rights-of-way to receive gas service, but the converse is actually true; Louisville Metro is dependent upon areas outside of Louisville Metro to receive the gas volumes it needs. As I explained in my direct testimony, in 2016, approximately forty-five percent of LG&E’s gas supply was received by LG&E within the Franchise Area, and approximately fifty-five percent of LG&E’s gas supply was received by LG&E outside the Louisville Metro Franchise Area.² Approximately seventy-two percent of LG&E’s total gas deliveries (both sales and transport volumes) were made to

---
¹ Neale Direct Testimony at 9, lines 250-54; see also Neale Direct Testimony at 8, lines 237-39.
² Rebuttal Exhibit LEB-1 contains an explanation of the percentage of gas received at each city gate station.
customers located within the Louisville Metro Franchise Area in 2016. Therefore, deliveries to customers located within the Franchise Area are very dependent on gas supplies received by LG&E from outside the Franchise Area. LG&E’s supplemental responses to Louisville Metro’s First Request for Information also rebut Mr. Allen’s contentions by showing that under design day conditions, significantly more gas flows into Jefferson County than out of Jefferson County. Additionally, LG&E gas customers within the Franchise Area benefit from LG&E’s underground gas storage system, which is all located outside of Jefferson County. Thus, contrary to Mr. Neale’s contentions, customers located within the Franchise Area utilize LG&E’s gas distribution system, gas transmission system, underground gas storage reservoirs, gas compressor stations, and other utility infrastructure located outside the Franchise Area to obtain the volumes of gas needed for their gas service.

Notwithstanding any conclusions (preliminary or otherwise) that Mr. Neale has reached or may reach, LG&E has operated and continues to operate its gas system such that gas delivered inside Louisville Metro is heavily dependent upon gas originating outside Louisville Metro. This can lead to only one conclusion – that customers within the Franchise Area are heavily dependent upon the rights-of-way outside Louisville Metro. While Mr. Neale may develop any number of hypothetical scenarios and analyses that he may assert show otherwise, the fact of the matter is that this is how LG&E operates its system. Notwithstanding the relevance argument, this simple fact corresponds with the collection of the franchise fee from customers within the Franchise Area being supported by LG&E and which most importantly is

---

consistent with the franchise tariff approved by the Kentucky Public Service Commission and discussed in Mr. Conroy’s testimony.

Q. Please explain how LG&E’s supplemental responses to Louisville Metro’s First Request for Information further show Louisville Metro’s dependence on portions of LG&E’s system outside of Jefferson County.

A. Certainly. On May 26, 2017, LG&E filed supplemental responses to Question Nos. 1 and 12 of Louisville Metro’s First Request for Information. The maps LG&E developed and filed as a supplemental response show all of LG&E’s high pressure transmission pipelines in Jefferson County and all distribution pipelines (excluding service lines) of any pressure crossing the Jefferson County line. The maps also include the design day direction of flow and flow volumes and further show Louisville Metro’s dependence on areas of LG&E’s system outside of Jefferson County to receive the gas volumes it needs. The map titled “Jefferson County Detail” shows that under design day conditions, 14,416 mcf per hour of gas enters Jefferson County and only 1,691 mcf per hour of gas exits Jefferson County. Thus, the map shows that under design day conditions, the model predicts that almost ten times as much gas flows into Jefferson County as flows out of Jefferson County. This directly refutes Louisville Metro’s contention that all LG&E customers are dependent on the Louisville Metro rights-of-way to receive gas. Instead, the map shows that Jefferson County LG&E customers are largely dependent on areas of the LG&E system located outside of Jefferson County to receive gas.

Q. Do you wish to address any other aspect of Mr. Neale’s Direct Testimony?
A. Yes. In his direct testimony, Mr. Neale makes several incorrect statements about LG&E’s gas system. Mr. Neale states four times that Louisville Metro’s rights-of-way allow LG&E to serve customers in Anderson County.\(^4\) LG&E does not serve Anderson County. Mr. Neale also states: “Gas supply received via the LG&E citygate interconnections with Tennessee Gas Pipeline System (TGP) is likely to serve the counties of Marion, Washington, Mercer, Green and Larue.”\(^5\) LG&E does not serve Mercer County. Additionally, Mr. Neale incorrectly states the LG&E’s citygate interconnection with Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company is located in Metcalfe County.\(^6\) The Monroe city gate station is located in Hart County, not Metcalfe County.

Mr. Neale also states that documents received from LG&E “appeared to be missing direction of gas flow and operating pressure, and certainly provided no indication of the location of null points.”\(^7\) At the time of filing Mr. Neale’s direct testimony, Louisville Metro had not requested information about gas flow, operating pressure, or null points. Thus, documents provided by LG&E were not “missing” any information.\(^8\)

\(^4\) Neale Direct Testimony at 3, line 74 (“[Gas supply] possibly utilize[s] this same ROW in order to serve customers located in Oldham, Marion, and Anderson.”); Neale Direct Testimony at 5, line 141 (“[W]ithout the use of the ROW in Louisville Metro gas would . . . possibly not [be] available for use in customers living in Oldham, Marion and Anderson Counties.”); Neale Direct Testimony at 9, line 254 (“I conclude that without access to the LG&E facilities located in the Louisville Metro ROW, gas may not be able to arrive in the adjacent counties of Oldham, Spencer, Marion and Anderson.”); Neale Direct Testimony at 10, line 292 (“I conclude that . . . [g]as supply received via three LG&E citygate interconnections with Texas Gas utilize and relay [sic] upon the Metro Louisville ROW in order to serve customers located in . . . possibly the counties of Oldham, Spencer, Marion and Anderson.”).

\(^5\) Neale Direct Testimony at 3, lines 75-77.

\(^6\) Neale Direct Testimony at 9, line 267.

\(^7\) Neale Direct Testimony at 7, lines 210-11.

\(^8\) In an effort to provide the information Louisville Metro sought but did not specifically request in its First Request for Information and to resolve Louisville Metro’s motion to compel filed April 20, 2017, LG&E
Q. Do you agree with Councilman Blackwell’s assertion that municipality residents receive “all the same benefits from the franchise fee as those customers located outside the satellite cities”?9

A. No. First, it is irrelevant to the issue before the Commission to consider benefits received from franchise fee funds by customers residing outside of Louisville Metro because Louisville Metro simply does not have franchising authority over any area outside of the Franchise Area. Moreover, the Commission has never decided how franchise fees are to be collected based on how the municipality chooses to spend its discretionary funds. This is simply not relevant.

As I explained in my direct testimony, Louisville Metro has franchising authority over the old city of Louisville and unincorporated areas of Jefferson County, but does not have franchising authority of the rights-of-way located in the home rule municipalities located in or outside Jefferson County or unincorporated municipal areas outside Jefferson County. No level of benefits received by those outside of the Franchise Area gives Louisville Metro the basis to require LG&E to collect franchise fees from customers within those municipalities.

Second, Councilman Blackwell has not provided any specific support for this assertion in his testimony. It is not clear that residents of the 83 municipalities within Jefferson County (other than Louisville Metro) receive all of the same benefits as those customers located within the Franchise Area. It is my understanding, based on

---

9 Blackwell Direct Testimony at 3, lines 10-11.
my operating experience of LG&E’s gas distribution system with municipalities in Jefferson County, that these municipalities, all of which are cities of the home rule class, have independent authority to tax and provide services for their residents. These 83 municipalities in Jefferson County have the authority to provide police protection, fire protection, emergency medical services, garbage collection, streets, sewers, drainage, or other services to their residents. Each also has the authority to raise revenue through taxes to fund these services. As the Affidavit of Doug Hamilton explains, some of the municipalities in Jefferson County do provide their own police, fire, and EMS services.\textsuperscript{10} Thus, because some residents of these 83 municipalities in Jefferson County receive services from their municipality instead of Louisville Metro, it is not clear that municipality residents receive all of the same benefits from the franchise fee as customers located within the Franchise Area.

Q. Even if residents of the other 83 municipalities in Jefferson County receive some benefits from Louisville Metro, are these benefits necessarily funded by the franchise fee?

A. It is not clear that any benefits Louisville Metro provides to residents of the other 83 municipalities are funded by the franchise fee. Louisville Metro states that franchise fee funds are “added to the Louisville general fund, from which many of the benefits provided by the City are funded.”\textsuperscript{11} Franchise fee funds constitute a very small portion of the Louisville Metro general fund. For the 2017 fiscal year, Louisville

\textsuperscript{10} In the Matter of: Louisville/Jefferson County Metro Government v. Louisville Gas and Electric Company, Case No. 2016-00347, Amended Complaint (Ky. PSC Nov. 9, 2016).

\textsuperscript{11} Louisville Metro Responses to Data Requests of Louisville Gas and Electric Company, Question No. 1-3.
Metro’s approved budget includes $583 million in the general fund.\(^\text{12}\) Even if the maximum franchise fee is collected, it would still only represent approximately one percent of Louisville Metro’s general fund.\(^\text{13}\)

Municipality residents also contribute significantly to the Louisville Metro general fund through multiple county-wide exactions. For instance, residents of the other 83 municipalities pay property taxes, occupational license taxes if they work in Louisville Metro, and may pay additional taxes and fees to Louisville Metro. Louisville Metro admits that the source of funds is not traced for specific expenditures from the general fund.\(^\text{14}\) Thus, any benefits Louisville Metro provides to residents of the other 83 municipalities may be funded by those residents’ significant contributions to the general fund through county-wide exactions, not franchise fee revenue.

Q. Do you agree with Councilman Blackwell’s characterization of the franchise fee as “rent”?\(^\text{15}\)

A. No. Councilman Blackwell asserts the franchise fee is “the rent a utility owes to a city for the opportunity to use the city’s infrastructure to provide services and earn a profit.”\(^\text{16}\) The 2016 Franchise Agreement is a written agreement documenting the terms of occupancy of the Louisville Metro rights-of-way, not a lease. Further, the


\(^{13}\) As I explained in my direct testimony, the terms of the 2016 Franchise Agreement cap the total annual franchise fee at three percent of gross receipts within the Franchise Area. Based on LG&E’s 2016 gross receipts, the maximum fee would result in an annual franchise fee of nearly $6 million.

\(^{14}\) Louisville Metro Responses to Commission Staff Data Request, Question No. 4(c) (“Franchise fee revenue is not segregated from other revenues. Franchise fee revenue is added to the general fund.”).

\(^{15}\) Blackwell Direct Testimony at 2, lines 28-29 (“This is related to the basic theory of a franchise fee, that the utility should pay rent for the use of the City’s rights of way.”); see also Blackwell Direct Testimony at 1, line 28.

\(^{16}\) Blackwell Direct Testimony at 2, lines 12-13.
2016 Franchise Agreement itself does not refer to the franchise fee as “rent.” Rather, the fee is described in the agreement as a “Franchise Fee.” In fact, the word “rent” does not appear even once in the agreement. Thus, by the agreement’s own terms, the franchise fee is not rent. The word “rent” is used to advance Louisville Metro’s larger rhetorical argument that the cost of the franchise fee should be recovered in base rates.

Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

A. Yes, it does.
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JUDY SCHOOLER
Notary Public, State at Large, KY
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PERCENTAGE OF GAS RECEIPTS AT CITY GATE STATION  
LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATION NAME</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONROE</td>
<td>HART</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALVARY</td>
<td>MARION</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE RUN</td>
<td>MEADE</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRESTWOOD</td>
<td>OLDHAM</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDER PARK</td>
<td>OLDHAM</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAGRANGE</td>
<td>OLDHAM</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEDFORD</td>
<td>TRIMBLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH STATION RD</td>
<td>JEFFERSON</td>
<td>MIDDLETOWN</td>
<td>12.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>55.30%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLINGSWORTH LN</td>
<td>JEFFERSON</td>
<td>METRO LOUISVILLE</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARDSTOWN RD</td>
<td>JEFFERSON</td>
<td>METRO LOUISVILLE</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENILE RD</td>
<td>JEFFERSON</td>
<td>METRO LOUISVILLE</td>
<td>22.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESTON STREET RD</td>
<td>JEFFERSON</td>
<td>METRO LOUISVILLE</td>
<td>16.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>44.70%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q. Please state your name, position, and business address.

A. My name is Robert M. Conroy. I am the Vice President of State Regulation and Rates for Louisville Gas and Electric Company ("LG&E" or "Company") and an employee of LG&E and KU Services Company, which provides services to LG&E. My business address is 220 West Main Street, Louisville, Kentucky 40202.

Q. Did you previously submit direct testimony in this proceeding?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?

A. The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to respond to a portion of the testimony of Councilman Rick Blackwell, submitted on behalf of Louisville/Jefferson County Metro Government ("Louisville Metro") regarding LG&E’s method of collecting the franchise fee. Councilman Blackwell asserts that the Louisville Metro Council believes that the collection of the franchise fee from all customers “regardless of the location in the LG&E service territory” is appropriate. Councilman Blackwell further argues that the Louisville Metro Council does not believe that the collection of the franchise fee from customers solely within the Franchise Area is “fair, just, reasonable, or lawful.” I disagree with these assertions.

Q. Please explain why LG&E’s collection of the franchise fee is fair, just, and reasonable.

A. Certainly. As I explained in my direct testimony, the collection of the franchise fee from customers solely within the Franchise Area is in compliance with LG&E’s tariff, which has been repeatedly approved by the Kentucky Public Service Commission.

1 Blackwell Direct Testimony at 2, line 17.
2 Blackwell Direct Testimony at 2, line 23.
Commission (“Commission”) as fair, just, and reasonable. The Commission’s general policy, which has been in place for years, is that franchise fees imposed by a municipality are to be recovered as a separate line item assessed only to the customers residing in the municipality imposing the fee. In reaching this policy, the Commission explained that it is unfair to require customers residing outside the fee-imposing municipality to pay the franchise fee. Further, the Commission reasoned that the franchise fee should be charged as a line item because the utility simply acts as a conduit and passes the funds collected through the fee on to the municipality and customers are entitled to know the amount of charges collected for government operating expenses. LG&E’s tariff and collection of Louisville Metro’s current franchise tariff comports with the Commission’s policy.

Collecting franchise fees as a line item on customer bills is also the collection method followed by a significant majority of states. Councilman Blackwell has offered no support for his conclusory argument that LG&E’s collection of the franchise fee from customers solely within the Franchise Area is not fair, just, and reasonable, or lawful.

Q. Please explain why the collection of the franchise fee from only the residents of Louisville Metro is permissible.

---

3 See, e.g., In the Matter of: Tariff of Louisville Gas and Electric Company to Implement a Franchise Fee Rider, Case No. 2003-00267, Order (Ky. PSC Oct. 16, 2003) (finding LG&E’s Franchise Fee Rider “provides for the proper recovery of said fees and expenses, is reasonable, and should be approved”); see also In the Matter of: Application of Louisville Gas and Electric Company for an Adjustment of Its Electric and Gas Rates, Case No. 2014-00372, Order at 12 (Ky. PSC June 30, 2016) (LG&E’s most recent rate case, wherein the Commission found LG&E’s rates, terms, and conditions are fair, just, and reasonable).
4 See, e.g., In the Matter of: The Local Taxes and/or Fees Tariff Filing of Columbia Gas of Kentucky, Inc., Case No. 7906, Order at 2 (Ky. PSC Oct. 10, 1980).
5 Id.
6 Id.
A. Certainly. The collection of the franchise fee is permissible because it is in accordance with LG&E’s tariff. LG&E’s tariff includes the Franchise Rider, which provides that franchise fees imposed by a municipality “shall be applied exclusively to the bills of customers receiving service within the territorial limits of the authority imposing the fee or tax.” As I explained above, LG&E’s tariff, including the Franchise Rider, has been repeatedly approved by the Commission. Thus, collecting the franchise fee from customers solely within the Franchise Area is in accordance with LG&E’s filed and approved gas tariff and is permissible.

Q. Do you have any comment on Mr. Blackwell’s assertion that “LG&E should pay for the right to earn a staggering amount of profit from its gas customers that LG&E could not earn without the benefit of Louisville’s rights of way”?8

A. Yes. The Franchise Agreement demonstrates LG&E’s agreement to pay a franchise fee to Louisville Metro in exchange for the franchise permitting LG&E’s gas distribution facilities to occupy Louisville Metro’s right of way. LG&E’s return on its investment to serve customers is regulated by this Commission and such regulation in no way creates a “staggering amount of profit.”

Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

A. Yes, it does.

---

7 LG&E Rates, Terms and Conditions for Furnishing Natural Gas Service, P.S.C. Gas No. 10, Original Sheet No. 90.
8 Blackwell Direct Testimony at 3, lines 18-20.
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