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# Glossary of Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCOSS</td>
<td>Class Cost-of-Service Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIUC</td>
<td>Kentucky Industrial Utility Consumers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLC</td>
<td>Kentucky League of Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KU</td>
<td>Kentucky Utilities Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY OF JEFFRY POLLOCK

1 Q PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

2 A Jeffry Pollock; 12647 Olive Blvd., Suite 585, St. Louis, MO 63141.

3 Q ARE YOU THE SAME JEFFRY POLLOCK WHO PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED DIRECT TESTIMONY ON BEHALF OF KENTUCKY LEAGUE OF CITIES (KLC)?

4 A Yes.

5 Q WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY?

6 A My Supplemental Direct testimony addresses how the Commission can use the results of Kentucky Utilities Company’s (KU) class cost-of-service study (CCOSS) notwithstanding the need to address possible errors in both the original and revised study as asserted by the Kentucky Industrial Utility Consumers (KIUC).

7 Q DID THE CLASS COST-OF-SERVICE STUDY RESULTS CHANGE DRAMATICALLY AS A RESULT OF THE CORRECTIONS MADE THUS FAR?

8 A No. The CCOSS results, both before and after the corrections, are summarized in the table below.
The corrections had differing impacts on different customer classes. This is shown in the third column of the table which measures the change in the rate of return at present rates. For example, the change in rate of return varied from less than 10 basis points (i.e., General Service, Power Service Secondary and Lighting) to over 200 basis points (Fluctuating Load Service). Thus, the Lighting class was one of the least affected by the corrections made to the originally-filed CCOSS.

Yes. Unlike other classes, 75% of the investment serving the Lighting class is directly assigned. In other words, the Lighting class is not as affected by changes in
demand allocation factors as other customer classes. Thus, to the extent that further corrections to the demand allocation factors are required, this should not change the fact that the Lighting class is providing a higher rate of return at present rates than KU’s proposed system-wide rate of return.

Q  WOULD YOU CHARACTERIZE THE CHANGE IN THE RESULTS OF THE CLASS COST-OF-SERVICE STUDY AS SUFFICIENT IN MAGNITUDE TO WARRANT REJECTING THE STUDY FOR USE IN DETERMINING AN APPROPRIATE CLASS REVENUE ALLOCATION IN THIS PROCEEDING?

A  No. With one exception, the corrected CCOSS results are directionally similar to the original study. Those customer classes that were above cost in the original CCOSS are still above cost. Similarly, those customer classes that were below cost in the original CCOSS are still below cost.

Further, as discussed in my Direct testimony, KU’s proposed class revenue allocation gave only token recognition to correcting the rate-of-return disparities that currently exist even in the corrected CCOSS.

Q  KIUC ALLEGES THAT THE CORRECTED CLASS COST-OF-SERVICE STUDY IS STILL FLAWED. DOES THIS SUPPORT KIUC’S POSITION THAT ANY REVENUE INCREASE AUTHORIZED FOR KU SHOULD BE SPREAD EQUALLY AMONG ALL CUSTOMER CLASSES?

A  No. First, it is important that the Commission be provided with a proper and accurate CCOSS to determine a class revenue allocation that moves all rates closer to cost. Second, if KIUC’s further allegations are corroborated, KU should further revise its CCOSS to correct any remaining errors. However, unless the results are
dramatically changed, the Commission should not ignore the CCOSS by adopting an 
equal percentage allocation. As stated in my Direct testimony, cost-based rates 
send proper price signals, encourage conservation and efficiency and provide more 
equitable treatment for all consumers.

Q WHAT DO YOU RECOMMEND?

A The corrected CCOSS demonstrates that rates do not reflect cost. Even if further 
corrections are necessary, it is highly unlikely that it would show a different result for 
the Lighting class. The Lighting class has a rate of return that far exceeds the 
system-wide rate of return that KU is proposing. Accordingly, no rate increase 
should be assigned to the Lighting class.

Q DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY?

A Yes.
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Jeffry Pollock, being first duly sworn, on his oath states:

1. My name is Jeffry Pollock. I am President of J. Pollock, Incorporated, 12647 Olive Blvd., Suite 585, St. Louis, Missouri 63141. We have been retained by Kentucky League of Cities to testify in this proceeding on its behalf;

2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my Supplemental Direct Testimony which has been prepared in written form for introduction into evidence in the Public Service Commission of Commonwealth of Kentucky, Case No. 2016-00370; and,

3. I hereby swear and affirm that my answers contained in the testimony are true and correct.

Jeffry Pollock

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of April 2017.

Kitty Turner, Notary Public
Commission #: 15390610

My Commission expires on April 25, 2019.

J. POLLOCK
INCORPORATED