VERIFICATION

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA)))SS:)COUNTY OF TRANSYLVANIA)

The undersigned, **William Steven Seelye**, being duly sworn, deposes and states that he is a Principal of The Prime Group, LLC, that he has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the responses for which he is identified as the witness, and the answers contained therein are true and correct to the best of his information, knowledge and belief.

William Steven)Seelye

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public in and before said County

and State, this 25 day of March 2017.

(SEAL)

My Commission Expires:

11-17 2018

BENJAMIN NOTARY PL ^{`ransylvania} County,

KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY

CASE NO. 2016-00370

March 29, 2017 Supplemental Response to Attorney General's Initial Data Requests for Information Dated January 11, 2017

Question No. 274

Responding Witness: William S. Seelye / David S. Sinclair

- Q-274. With regard to Mr. Seelye's Loss of Load Probability ("LOLP") study, he indicates that hourly loads were utilized for individual classes. In this respect, provide:
 - a. a detailed narrative description of how class hourly loads were developed;
 - b. each class hourly load for the forecasted test year (or the period utilized by Mr. Seelye within his CCOSS). Because of the joint dispatch of the Companies' generation facilities, include both KU and LG&E classes (showing KU and LG&E classes separately). In addition, also include each non-jurisdictional class;
 - c. a detailed explanation of how curtailable load or curtailable load credits are reflected within the class hourly loads;
 - d. all workpapers, analyses, spreadsheets, etc. showing the development of each hourly load for each class; and,
 - e. an explanation of whether the hourly loads provided in (b) are measured at the meter or generation level.

Provide all data in hardcopy as well as in executable electronic format. Excel preferred. If data is not available in Excel format, provide ASCII comma-delimited format with all fields defined.

A-274. Original Response:

- a. The following process was used to develop hourly class load profiles for the forecasted test year.
 - 1. Hourly class load profiles for the 12 months ending June 2016 ("Historical Period") are developed using 5- and 15-minute interval data from the MV-90 system.
 - a. For each month in the Historical Period, the sum of each class's hourly loads equals the class's actual monthly energy consumption derived from monthly billing data in the Customer Care System ("CCS").

- b. For each hour in the Historical Period, each class's share of the Company's actual hourly load is computed with an appropriate adjustment for losses ("Hourly Class Ratio").
- c. For each hour in the Historical Period, the sum of all class loads plus distribution and transmission losses and company uses equals the Company's actual hourly load in the Energy Management System ("EMS").
- 2. For each month in the Historical Period, the Company's hourly class loads are totaled for each day and the daily totals are sorted from highest to lowest.
- 3. For each month in the forecasted test period, the Company's hourly load forecast is totaled for each day and the daily totals are sorted from highest to lowest.
- 4. To develop hourly class load profiles for the forecasted test period (July 2017 to June 2018), the hourly load for each day in the hourly load forecast (as ordered in Step 3) is multiplied by the corresponding day's Hourly Class Ratios (as ordered in Step 2).
 - a. For each month in the forecasted test period, the sum of each class's hourly loads equals the class's forecasted monthly energy consumption.
 - b. For each hour in the forecasted test period, the sum of class loads plus forecasted distribution and transmission losses and forecasted company uses equals the Companies' forecasted hourly load.
- b. See the attachment to PSC 2-97.
- c. The impact of curtailable loads is not reflected in the hourly class load profiles. See the response to KIUC 1-56.
- d. See the attachments being provided in Excel format.
- e. The hourly loads used in developing the LOLP allocator were based on hourly loads including losses. Therefore, the loads measured were at the generation level.

March 29, 2017 Supplemental Response:

d. See the revised Attachment 4 being provided in Excel format with formulas intact. Attachments 1-3 that were originally filed have not changed. The load profiles provided in the revised Attachment 4 are identical to the load profiles provided on March 28, 2017 in the supplemental response to PSC 2-97.

The attachment is being provided in a separate file in Excel format.