PPL companies

After Action Review

Event:	Event Date:

Describe the event in this section including safety incidents, customer affected, damage (broken poles, downed conductor, damaged transformers, etc.), resources procured, and duration of restoration.

Summary Recommendations:
This section is considered an Executive level list of recommendations based on the information provided below. This information is consolidated into one master document and then the team agrees on the Summary Recommendations.

What went well (Provide a list of activities that went well during the restoration process):

1. Storm planning and resource staging prior to the event was effective. We had sufficient resources available, despite the day of the event being a company holiday, to perform swift restoration.
2. Very good turnout from LG&E and KU and contract workforce.
3. Incident command structure was structured well and with appropriate coordination of resources. Calls begin >24hr prior to the start of the event coordinating activities.
4. Good coordination with peer opcos. PPL EU and RI Energy needed resources during this event, and while we were unable to provide personnel, we were able to provide material. Daily calls with other opcos was effective to coordinate shared support needs.
5. Very good engagement with media and with PSC, particularly Brian Claypool, during the event. This was a highly watched event in the media. These comments exclude subsequent load-shed media coordination.

What did NOT go well (Identify problem areas that occurred without any specific recommendations on improvement):

1. Cold weather resulted in equipment tripping out on high-loading. Including Lemons Mills and the Alexander substations. A large number of the customers affected by the storm were interrupted as a result of equipment tripping out under load vs line faults.
2. Several safety events, including frostbite, Pineville MVA, parking lot MVA, etc.
3. Several personnel in key IC roles were out-of-office in the days prior to the storm because of the holiday and wanted to participate on as as-called-upon basis, vs actively staffing their IC role.
4. ERTs were suppressed until late afternoon on Fri (12/22). Need to come out of suppression sooner, particularly with extreme cold conditions.
5. It was found that some of the trips initiated for overload were the result of mismatches between the expected and actual ratings.

Comments/Suggestions to Improve (Identify what can be done to improve things that did or did not go well based on the comments above):

1. Assess whether high-load should be an alarming condtion or an automated tripping condition. With telemetered devices, control center can weigh risks of tripping vs running past ratings if high-load is an alarming condition. Similar to high-temp alarms for transformers.
2. Reinforce with IC members that: 1) emergency response is a command-and-control structure w/ IC at top, and 2) emergency response takes precedence over anything else, including personal plans. If you're the lead, then that is your primary function.
3. Establish better operational coordination between DCC and TCC for joint events.
4. Clarify the single-source-of-truth for equipment ratings and revise field device settings and OMA settings where discrepancies exist.

Name: Peter Waldrab **Role:** *VP* **Date:** Jan 9, 23

Please return Completed form(s) to Dan Hawk, via email at Daniel.hawk@lge-ku.com , or via house-mail (BOC I). Submitted forms will be reviewed by the Emergency Preparedness and Response Team for to identify and act on improvement opportunities.