VERIFICATION

The undersigned, Amy J. Elliott, being duly sworn, deposes and says she is a Regulatory Consultant Sr. in Regulatory Services for Kentucky Power, that she has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the forgoing responses for which she is the identified witness and that the information contained therein is true and correct to the best of her information, knowledge, and belief

<u>/Imy J. Elliott</u> Amy J. Elliott

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

COUNTY OF FRANKLIN

) Case No. 2017-00327

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public in and before said County and State, by Amy J. Elliott, this 2nd day of November 2017.

Judy Kasquist

Notary ID 571144

My Commission Expires: January 23, 2021

Kentucky Power Company KPSC Case No. 2017-00327 Commission Staff's Second Set of Data Requests Dated October 18, 2017

DATA REQUEST

KPSC_2_1 Refer to Kentucky Power's response to Commission Staff's First Request for Information ("Staff's First Request"), Item 5.e. Explain whether this response indicates that polymer expenses were recovered through the environmental surcharge in accounts other than account 5020005 for the expense months of May 2016 through October 2016, or that the total polymer expense for this period was included in the November 2016 expense month.

RESPONSE

The polymer charges for the period were initially booked to an incorrect account and activity code and not recovered through the Environmental Surcharge. Only after these polymer expenses were reclassified to the correct account and activity code were they recovered through the Environmental Surcharge. The total polymer expense for the months of May 2016 through October 2016 was included in the November 2016 expense month.

Witness: Amy J. Elliott

Kentucky Power Company KPSC Case No. 2017-00327 Commission Staff's Second Set of Data Requests Dated October 18, 2017

DATA REQUEST

KPSC_2_2
Refer to Kentucky Power's response to Staff's First Request, Item 9, and Attachment 1. Explain Kentucky Power's decision to round column (8), Monthly Difference in WACC, to the hundredths place instead of the tenthousandths place given that columns (5) As-Revised Rockport WACC, (6) As-Filed Rockport WACC, and (7) Change in WACC to Reflect Updated Tax Rate are rounded to the ten-thousandths place.

RESPONSE

There was no conscious determination to treat rounding in the columns differently. Please refer to KPCO_R_KPSC_2_2_Attachment2.xls for a calculation that incorporates rounding to six decimal places in Column (8). For the two-year period, rounding to six decimal places in Column (8) rather than four decimal places results in a total of \$46,341 due to customers. The Company is proposing to refund this amount in the first month following the Commission Order in this case.

Witness: Amy J. Elliott