

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION OF)	
KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY FOR)	CASE NO. 2025-00113
AN ADJUSTMENT OF ITS ELECTRIC)	
RATES AND APPROVAL OF CERTAIN)	
REGULATORY AND ACCOUNTING)	
TREATMENTS)	

In the Matter of:

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION OF)	
LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC)	CASE NO. 2025-00114
COMPANY FOR AN ADJUSTMENT OF ITS)	
ELECTRIC AND GAS RATES, AND)	
APPROVAL OF CERTAIN REGULATORY)	
AND ACCOUNTING TREATMENTS)	

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
LONNIE E. BELLAR
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, ENGINEERING, CONSTRUCTION AND
GENERATION FOR PPL SERVICES COROPRATION
ON BEHALF OF
KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY AND
LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Filed: May 30, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
PPL REALIGNMENT	2
SAFETY AND ELECTRIC GENERATION	3
CONCLUSION.....	15

1 **INTRODUCTION**

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

3 A. My name is Lonnie E. Bellar. I am the Executive Vice President of Engineering,
4 Construction and Generation for PPL Services Corporation (“PPL Services”), which
5 provides services to Kentucky Utilities Company (“KU”) and Louisville Gas and
6 Electric Company (“LG&E”) (collectively, the “Companies”). My business address is
7 2701 Eastpoint Parkway, Louisville, Kentucky 40223. A complete statement of my
8 education and work experience is attached to this testimony as Appendix A.

9 **Q. Have you previously testified before this Commission?**

10 A. Yes, since at least 2007, I have testified before this Commission numerous times,
11 including in the Companies’ last certificate of public convenience and necessity
12 (“CPCN”) application proceeding¹ and in the Companies’ pending CPCN proceeding.²

13 **Q. What is the purpose of your direct testimony?**

14 A. I will describe the corporate realignment that has happened at PPL Corporation (“PPL”)
15 and the Companies since the last rate cases and update the Commission on the status
16 of the Companies’ generation fleet and related generation capital projects.

17 **Q. Please briefly describe your professional history with the Companies.**

18 A. My career with the Companies dates back to 1987, when I started as an electrical
19 engineer with KU’s generation system planning group. From there, I served in various

¹ *Electronic Joint Application of Kentucky Utilities Company and Louisville Gas and Electric Company for Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity and Site Compatibility Certificates and Approval of a Demand Side Management Plan and Approval of Fossil Fuel-Fired Generation Unit Retirements*, Case No. 2022-00402, Direct Testimony of Lonnie E. Bellar (Dec. 15, 2022); Case No. 2022-00402, Rebuttal Testimony of Lonnie E. Bellar (Aug. 9, 2023).

² *Electronic Joint Application of Kentucky Utilities Company and Louisville Gas and Electric Company for Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity and Site Compatibility Certificates*, Case No. 2025-00045, Direct Testimony of Lonnie E. Bellar (Feb. 28, 2025).

1 management positions within generation planning and generation services, financial
2 planning and controlling, and electric transmission. In 2007 I was promoted to Vice
3 President, State Regulation and Rates, and from 2013 to early 2017 I served as Vice
4 Present, Gas Distribution. In January 2017, I was promoted to Senior Vice President
5 of Operations. I served in that position until I was promoted to Chief Operating Officer
6 (“COO”) for the Companies in March 2018 and I served in that role until March 2024.
7 Then, from March 2024 to April 2025 I served as Senior Vice President of Engineering
8 and Construction for PPL Services Corporation, and in April 2025 I was promoted to
9 Executive Vice President of Engineering, Construction and Generation for PPL
10 Services Corporation.

11 **Q. Please describe your area of responsibility for the Companies.**

12 A. In my current role, I oversee PPL enterprise-wide engineering and construction
13 services, energy supply and analysis, environmental compliance, and generation. Of
14 course, this means I have those same responsibilities for the Companies.

15 **Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits?**

16 A. Yes, I am sponsoring Exhibits LEB-1 which is a listing of the Companies’ generation
17 portfolio.

18 **PPL REALIGNMENT**

19 **Q. What changes in the Companies’ operational management have been made in**
20 **recent years?**

21 A. On May 25, 2022, the Companies’ parent company, PPL, completed the acquisition of
22 The Narragansett Electric Company d/b/a Rhode Island Energy (“NECO”) from
23 National Grid USA. The consummation of this transaction created additional scale and
24 scope to PPL’s operations. During the integration of NECO into PPL’s operations,

1 PPL took the opportunity to look across the PPL family of companies, including the
2 Companies, to share best practices, consider a more consolidated shared services
3 approach, and improve operational efficiency to reduce costs for the retail customers
4 of its utility operations. This led to an announcement in February 2024 of a PPL
5 corporate realignment which includes a more centralized approach across the PPL
6 footprint to utility operations, engineering and construction, customer service, safety,
7 technical training, environmental compliance, and finance.

8 This realignment has provided the Companies with better access to and
9 knowledge of best practices in other areas of PPL's footprint while also allowing the
10 Companies' best practices to be shared likewise. The goal is increased efficiencies and
11 productivity across all of PPL. A critical step in furtherance of that goal is the planned
12 investments to upgrade and modernize Information Technology ("IT") across all of
13 PPL. IT witness Daniel Johnson and Customer Service Witness Shannon Montgomery
14 explain that effort in more detail and the tremendous benefits it will bring.

15 Increased efficiencies resulting from the realignment are already happening. As
16 examples, the realignment included harmonizing human resources operations
17 throughout PPL and developing a common storm response protocol throughout PPL
18 instead of the varying storm response protocols formerly in place. These two efforts
19 have resulted in efficiencies in their respective areas, and it is those exact type of
20 efficiencies that drove the decision to make the realignment in furtherance of our
21 intense focus on providing reliable service for the most reasonable cost possible for our
22 customers.

23 **SAFETY AND ELECTRIC GENERATION**

24 **Q. Are the Companies' operations performing safely?**

1 A. Yes, safety is our core value that drives all of our priorities. This is pervasive within
2 the Companies' culture. Recordable safety metrics demonstrate that the Companies'
3 safety culture actually translates into safer work and increased safety for employees,
4 contractors, and the public. Recordable Injury Incident Rate ("RIIR") measures the
5 rate of recordable injuries per 200,000 employee hours worked. For 2024, total
6 operations employee RIIR is just 1.57 or a total of 39 recordable injuries over the more
7 than 4.9 million employee hours worked. For contractors, the RIIR was just 1.03 in
8 2024. For reference, the national general industrial contractor average RIIR for 2023
9 was 2.8 (data for 2024 is not yet available).

10 Days Away/Restricted/Transferred ("DART") rate tracks the rate of injuries
11 resulting in a day away, restricted duty or transferred status over 200,000 hours worked.
12 The DART rate for operations employees was 0.72 for 2024. This is below the industry
13 average DART as tracked by Edison Electric Institute ("EEI") for 2023 (data for 2024
14 is not yet available). The consistently outstanding performance of the Companies'
15 employees and contractors in recordable incident and DART rates is a testament to the
16 Companies' steadfast commitment to safe work.

17 As we continue to evolve our safety culture, the Companies are increasing the
18 focus on Serious Incidents and Fatalities ("SIF") and Potentially Serious Incidents and
19 Fatalities ("PSIF"). These are the incidents that have the greatest impact on our
20 employees and contractors. While we continue to track our recordable safety events,
21 SIF and PSIF events receive an elevated level of attention and response.

22 **Q. Please describe the Companies' generation systems.**

1 A. Generation output is jointly dispatched between KU and LG&E to achieve operational
2 efficiencies. Pursuant to the Companies’ Power Supply System Agreement filed with
3 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”), the joint planning objectives of
4 the Companies are to maximize the economy, efficiency, and reliability of their
5 combined systems as a whole. Dispatch of generation, whether from the Companies’
6 own generating plant or from purchased power, is determined by lowest variable
7 operating cost regardless of ownership.

8 The Companies own and operate approximately 7,265 MW of summer net
9 generating capacity in Kentucky with a net book value of approximately \$6.0 billion.
10 The combined Companies serve approximately 981,000 electric customers across a
11 footprint of 79 Kentucky counties.³ The generating system consists of four coal-fired
12 generating stations: the E.W. Brown Generating Station in Mercer County, the Ghent
13 Generating Station in Carroll County, the Mill Creek Generating Station in Jefferson
14 County, and the Trimble County Generating Station. The Companies own and operate
15 Cane Run Unit 7, a natural gas combined cycle (“NGCC”) generating unit located in
16 Jefferson County. The Companies also own and operate fourteen large frame and three
17 small frame natural-gas-fired combustion turbines (“CTs”), which supplement the
18 system during peak periods, hydroelectric generating stations at Dix Dam and Ohio
19 Falls, which provide base load supply subject to river and flow constraints, and two
20 solar facilities: the Brown Solar generating plant and the Solar Share array located in

³ KU also serves approximately 28,000 electricity customers in five Virginia counties, doing business as Old Dominion Power Company.

1 Simpsonville. The Companies also purchase power from the Ohio Valley Electric
2 Corporation (“OVEC”) through a long-existing Inter-Company Power Agreement.⁴

3 The Companies are also in the process of constructing the projects the
4 Commission approved in the Companies’ 2022 CPCN case which included the Mill
5 Creek 5 NGCC, the Brown battery energy storage system (“BESS”), and the Mercer
6 Solar Facility. The Commission also approved the Companies’ proposed Marion Solar
7 Facility which is a build-transfer arrangement. Finally, the Companies have proposed
8 in the pending CPCN case the Brown 12 NGCC, the Mill Creek 6 NGCC, and the Cane
9 Run BESS. Exhibit LEB-1 attached hereto shows Companies’ current generating units,
10 generating units under construction, and generating units proposed in the pending
11 CPCN case.

12 **Q. Please provide a status report of the projects approved in Case No. 2022-00402.**

13 A. The main projects the Commission approved in Case No. 2022-00402 were Mill Creek
14 5 NGCC, Brown BESS, Mercer County Solar, and Marion County Solar. The status
15 of those four projects is:

- 16 • Mill Creek 5. This project remains on track for commercial operation in the
17 summer of 2027. The current estimated completion cost is \$915 million.
18 With civil engineering work near completion and foundation work in
19 progress, most of the risk based on unknown site conditions is understood and
20 accounted for in this estimate. Contractual risk around standard conditions

⁴ The Commission approved the Inter-Company Power Agreement between KU and LG&E and OVEC in *Application of Kentucky Utilities Company for an Order Pursuant to KRS 278.300 and for Approval of Long-Term Purchase Contract*, Case No. 2004-00395, Order (Ky. PSC Dec. 30, 2004), and *Application of Louisville Gas & Electric Company for an Order Pursuant to KRS 278.300 and for Approval of Long-Term Purchase Contract*, Case No. 2004-00396, Order (Ky. PSC Dec. 30, 2004).

1 such as force majeure and shipment delays associated with long lead electrical
2 equipment continue to present cost risk not accounted for in the reported
3 estimate, but continue to decrease as major equipment manufacturing
4 continues to progress with most major equipment deliveries expected later
5 this year.

- 6 • Brown BESS. This project will be commercially operational in first quarter
7 of 2027 pending finalization of the engineering, procurement, and
8 construction (“EPC”) contract later this year. The current estimated
9 completion cost is \$270 million. This estimate is the last estimate evaluated
10 in Case No. 2022-00402 and will likely have an update when the Companies
11 enter into an EPC contract as noted. The Companies continue to track general
12 cost volatility associated with import tariff changes, raw materials,
13 installation labor, and long lead electrical equipment, as well as specific cost
14 volatility associated with lithium in the case of batteries.

- 15 • Mercer County Solar. The Companies forecast this project will enter
16 commercial operation in the first or second quarter of 2027. The current
17 estimated completion cost is \$243 million. The Companies received the EPC
18 bids on December 20, 2024. Following analysis and clarification of those
19 bids, the Companies have selected the best evaluated bid and are in the
20 process of finalizing negotiation targeting execution of the EPC contract in
21 late May or early June 2025. The Companies continue to track the same
22 general cost volatility noted above as well as the specific cost volatility
23 associated with solar panel supply and currently estimate that project costs

1 may decrease from the noted estimate pending final assessment of tariff
2 impact.

- 3 • Marion County Solar: The Companies executed a build-transfer agreement
4 (“BTA”) with FRON bn, LLC (“FRON bn”) on August 19, 2024. The
5 Companies and FRON bn have finalized the form of EPC agreement as
6 required by the BTA, and the Companies expect that FRON bn will enter into
7 the EPC agreement with the best evaluated bidder in May or June 2025.
8 FRON bn continues to communicate that this project remains on track for
9 commercial operation in the summer of 2027. Costs have increased
10 approximately \$35 million since the estimate evaluated in Case No. 2022-
11 00402 due to greater than expected civil scope, increased costs for both the
12 material and labor associated with balance of plant electrical scope, and
13 increased financing costs above original estimates provided by FRON bn.

14 We are pleased with the status and progress of these four critical projects and look
15 forward to bringing them on-line as scheduled to serve our customers.

16 **Q. Please describe the generation projects proposed in pending Case No. 2025-00045.**

17 A. Certainly. They are: (1) two 1-on-1 NGCC generation units (approximately 645 MW
18 summer-net each), the first of which is Brown 12 which will be built and in service by
19 2030, and the second of which is Mill Creek 6 which will be built and in service by
20 2031; and (2) a new 400 MW, four-hour (1600 MWh) lithium-ion battery storage
21 facility to be built at Cane Run, which will be built and in service in 2028.

22 **Q. Are the Companies actively evaluating considering a pumped hydro energy**
23 **storage facility in Bell County, Kentucky?**

1 A. Yes. It is called the Lewis Ridge Pumped Storage Project and it is being developed by
2 Rye Development. Pumped hydro is an older technology by which water is pumped to
3 an upper reservoir and then stored there until energy is needed at peak times. As it is
4 released to a lower reservoir, the water turns a hydroelectric turbine and produces
5 electricity that can be used at those peak periods. Then, at non-peak times, the water
6 is then pumped back to the upper reservoir where it is stored and ready to be used again
7 when needed. The Companies have been working with Rye Development in
8 considering this project as a possible generation resource but need time and will have
9 to spend resources as part of their evaluation of it. Should the project ultimately not
10 move forward, the Companies will request regulatory asset treatment in the future for
11 the associated project development costs.

12 **Q. Are the Companies' current generating units performing reliably?**

13 A. Yes, the reliability of the Companies' generation resources over the past few years in
14 particular has been exceptional. Average Equivalent Forced Outage Rate ("EFOR") is
15 a standard industry metric which measures the percentage of steam generation that is
16 unavailable due to forced outages or derates. Our generation fleet has the largest capital
17 investment among the lines of business. The reliability of the Companies' generation
18 resources, particularly over the past few years, has significantly exceeded that of our
19 peers. The data shown in the following chart demonstrates the Companies' excellent
20 EFOR results in generation reliability over the past seven years using the EFOR metric,
21 as well as our sustained excellence in this area compared to industry benchmarked
22 performance:

Reporting Year	Companies' Fleet	NERC Industry Top Quartile EFOR	NERC Industry Top Decile EFOR
2024	2.04	Not available	Not available
2023	1.64	8.03	5.03
2022	2.74	6.15	4.73
2021	1.76	6.00	2.75
2020	1.51	6.30	3.67
2019	2.34	4.23	2.80
2018	2.79	5.38	2.80

1 Our CTs are also performing reliably. Because combustion turbines are
2 typically deployed as “peaking” or on-demand units, the startup consistency of these
3 units is critical. Starting reliability measures the percentage of time a CT unit starts
4 when called upon. From 2022 through 2024, the average starting reliability of the
5 Companies’ CTs has been at or above 97 percent.

6 **Q. What has contributed to the consistently reliable performance of the Companies’**
7 **generating units?**

8 A. A number of factors are responsible for the sustained reliability of the Companies’
9 generating units. First and foremost, the well-trained operations, maintenance, and
10 engineering staffs at each of our generating stations continue to perform exceptionally
11 as evidenced by recent results. Carefully planned and coordinated maintenance and
12 outage procedures designed to maximize the operating life of the units and minimize
13 unplanned downtime are critical. Generation has also benefitted from enhanced
14 monitoring technology that can signal a potential problem before it causes an
15 unplanned outage. Targeted reliability programs have also contributed significantly to
16 a reduction in unplanned outages. For example, I have previously testified about our
17 Boiler Reliability Program that was implemented several years ago to maximize the
18 reliability and life of boiler pressure parts through engineering best practices for

1 inspection, repairs, and capital replacements. The emphasis of the program is reducing
2 boiler tube failures through tracking and root cause analysis and detailed outage
3 inspection procedures. That program is one of the initiatives that has led to the very
4 favorable EFOR statistics described above.

5 **Q. Please summarize the capital investment the Companies plan to make in their**
6 **generation operations.**

7 A. The following chart summarizes non-mechanism capital expenses in generation, by
8 company, from January 1, 2022 through June 30, 2026 (in millions):

	KU	LG&E	Total
Outages for Coal Fired Units	\$161.6	\$102.2	\$263.9
Outages for Combustion Turbines	\$72.7	\$22.4	\$95.1
Generation Reliability	\$116.1	\$100.2	\$216.2
Plant Demolitions	\$32.1	\$3.2	\$35.3
Other	\$58.3	\$37.2	\$95.5
Total:	\$440.8	\$265.2	\$706.0

9 In addition to the projects in the chart above, we have also proposed the
10 construction of Selective Catalytic Reduction (“SCR”) facilities for Unit 2 at the Ghent
11 Generation Station in Case No. 2025-00045.

12 **Q. What generation outage projects involve significant capital investment during**
13 **2025 and 2026?**

14 A. As the table above shows, planned outage projects for generating units contribute
15 significantly to overall generation capital spending. For the cited period, there will be
16 significant outage work performed at Mill Creek 3, Mill Creek 4, Ghent 1 Ghent 2,
17 Ghent 3, and Trimble County 2.

1 Of particular note, our efforts addressing the deterioration of the stack liner on
2 Trimble County 1 demonstrate our continuing effort to find solutions in the most
3 efficient and economical way. Upon inspection of that stack liner in Fall 2021, we
4 learned of significant deterioration in its fiberglass reinforced plastic (“FRP”) liner.
5 While it was deemed operable after initial repairs, a monitoring plan was implemented
6 to track further degradation. In Fall 2022, we sought bids for inspection and repair
7 design, but none were acceptable. A detailed interior inspection was performed, and
8 FRP samples were tested. The results indicated that widespread repairs were
9 impractical. By early 2023, cracks had expanded, requiring additional repairs and
10 development of an ultimate replacement plan. Thus, we again sought bids for
11 engineering and repair and again received no acceptable bids due to the high risk
12 involved.

13 Since repairs were not feasible, we had to consider a full liner replacement or
14 construction of a completely new chimney with new liners. We were eventually able
15 to find a contractor who considered the design and construction of a new chimney, but
16 the cost eventually rose to approximately \$216 million. We therefore shifted our focus
17 to a liner replacement project for the Trimble County 1 liner as well as the Trimble
18 County 2 liner as its liner is of the same design and construction as Trimble County 1
19 and is deteriorating as well. As a result, we now believe we can install a new liner for
20 each unit for a combined total of approximately \$100 million without affecting the
21 safety or reliability of those facilities. Although these stack liner replacements will be
22 significant projects, our diligence drove to a decision that will be best for the

1 Companies and its customers that will be much less expensive than a completely new
2 chimney with new liners.

3 **Q. What kinds of capital investment are required for generation reliability projects?**

4 A. Compared to planned outages, most generation reliability projects are relatively small,
5 with fewer than 16 such projects exceeding a \$1 million capital threshold for the period
6 January 1, 2025 through December 31, 2026. These minor but numerous projects are
7 critical to the upkeep and continued reliability of the generating fleet. Examples of
8 these projects are: Ghent Limestone Unloader Replacement, Trimble County 1
9 Distributed Control System Upgrade, and the Mill Creek Coal Barge Unloading
10 System.

11 **Q. What have the Companies done in generation operations to maximize efficiencies**
12 **and reduce costs where possible?**

13 A. Since 2023, we have aggressively pursued cost reductions when they can be made
14 without affecting our ability to provide reasonable and adequate service. As a result of
15 that effort, we will save an expected \$25 million in steam maintenance and \$3 million
16 in steam operations in 2026 when compared to the expected levels of spend as of 2021.
17 We are achieving these savings by managing and optimizing a combination of
18 employee headcount, external contractor resources, outage expense, non-outage
19 maintenance, and general operational resources. To manage employee headcount, we
20 have accepted attrition through retirement, eliminated some positions that were to be
21 backfilled, and have reduced some engineering support. For contractor expense, we
22 have implemented shift reductions. We have achieved outage expense savings by
23 pushing for less frequent and shorter outages and trimming outage scope.

1 We also performed work in 2024 on Unit 7 at our Cane Run Generating Station
2 by which we were able to improve efficiency and increase capacity. We upgraded the
3 two combustion turbines with the Siemens “FX” design by replacing various
4 components of those facilities. This resulted in a net heat rate improvement of
5 approximately 186 Btu/kWh for the station and an overall increased capacity of
6 approximately 55 MW net. This results in an annual fuel cost savings of approximately
7 \$4 million. We believe this is an excellent example of how the Companies are
8 constantly searching for opportunities to better serve our customers.

9 **Q. Are you concerned that your efforts to save expenses described above will sacrifice**
10 **reliability?**

11 A. Any effort to save or cut expenses by reducing labor or trimming the scope or level of
12 maintenance can only be pursued with great caution so as not to disrupt service
13 reliability. We take our obligation to provide adequate and reliable service very
14 seriously. At the same, time, we also take our obligation to provide that service at fair,
15 just and reasonable rates just as seriously. That is why we always strive to achieve that
16 optimal balance of provided reliable service at the least possible cost. Thus, we are
17 proud of the savings we have achieved, but we are even more proud that we achieved
18 those savings while maintaining the excellent EFOR metrics I described above. Thus,
19 while it is true that we must always be cautious, I am not concerned that our cost-saving
20 efforts will adversely affect service reliability.

1

CONCLUSION

2 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

3 **A. Yes, it does.**

VERIFICATION


COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)
)
COUNTY OF JEFFERSON)

The undersigned, **Lonnie E. Bellar**, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is Executive Vice President of Engineering, Construction and Generation for PPL Services Corporation and he provides services to Louisville Gas and Electric Company and Kentucky Utilities Company, that he has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the foregoing testimony, and that the answers contained therein are true and correct to the best of his information, knowledge, and belief.



Lonnie E. Bellar

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public in and before said County and State, this 27th day of May 2025.



Notary Public

Notary Public ID No. KYNPL63286

My Commission Expires:

January 22, 2027



APPENDIX A

Lonnie E. Bellar

Executive Vice President of Engineering, Construction and Generation
PPL Services Corporation
2701 Eastpoint Parkway
Louisville, Kentucky 40223

Education

Bachelors in Electrical Engineering; University of Kentucky, May 1987
Bachelors in Engineering Arts; Georgetown College, May 1987
E.ON Academy, Intercultural Effectiveness Program: 2002-2003
E.ON Finance, Harvard Business School: 2003
E.ON Executive Pool: 2003-2007
E.ON Executive Program, Harvard Business School: 2006
E.ON Academy, Personal Awareness and Impact: 2006
Tuck Executive Education Program, Dartmouth University: 2015

Professional Experience

PPL Services Corporation

Executive Vice President of Engineering, Construction and Generation	April 2025 - present
Senior Vice President, Engineering and Construction	Mar. 2024 – April 2025

Louisville Gas and Electric Company

Kentucky Utilities Company

Chief Operating Officer	Mar. 2018 – Mar. 2024
Sr. Vice President – Operations	Jan. 2017 – Mar. 2018
Vice President, Gas Distribution	Feb. 2013 – Jan. 2017
Vice President, State Regulation and Rates	Nov. 2010 – Jan. 2013

E.ON U.S. LLC

Vice President, State Regulation and Rates	Aug. 2007 – Nov. 2010
Director, Transmission	Sept. 2006 – Aug. 2007
Director, Financial Planning and Controlling	April 2005 – Sept. 2006
General Manager, Cane Run, Ohio Falls and Combustion Turbines	Feb. 2003 – April 2005
Director, Generation Services	Feb. 2000 – Feb. 2003
Manager, Generation Systems Planning	Sept. 1998 – Feb. 2000
Group Leader, Generation Planning and Sales Support	May 1998 – Sept. 1998

Kentucky Utilities Company

Manager, Generation Planning	Sept. 1995 – May 1998
Supervisor, Generation Planning	Jan. 1993 – Sept. 1995
Technical Engineer I, II and Senior, Generation System Planning	May 1987 – Jan. 1993

Professional Memberships

Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers

Civic Activities

Metro United Way Board of Directors – 2023 – Present
UK College of Engineering Advisory Board – 2009 – Present
Trees Louisville Board of Directors – 2023 – 2025
Greater Louisville, Inc.
Board of Directors, Chair – 2020-2021
Board of Directors, Executive Committee – 2016–2024
LG&E and KU Power of One Chair - 2018
American Gas Association – Board of Directors – 2013 – 2024
Southern Gas Association – Board of Directors – 2013 – 2024
Kentucky Science Center – Board of Directors – 2008–2016
E.ON U.S. Power of One Co-Chair – 2007

Summary of Generation Plant of KU & LG&E

Generating Facility/Unit	Unit Type	Summer Net Capacity (MW)¹	KU Ownership (%)	LG&E Ownership (%)
Existing Resources				
Brown 3	Coal-Fired	412	100%	n/a
Brown 5	CT	130	47%	53%
Brown 6, 7	CT	292	62%	38%
Brown 8, 9, 10, 11	CT	484	100%	n/a
Brown Wind	Wind	0.022	64%	36%
Brown Solar	Solar	8	61%	39%
Business Solar - Archdiocese	Solar	0.02	n/a	100%
Business Solar - Maker's Mark	Solar	0.25	100%	n/a
Cane Run 7	CCGT	691	78%	22%
Dix Dam 1, 2, 3	Hydroelectric	31.5	100%	n/a
Ghent 1, 2, 3, 4	Coal-Fired	1,919	100%	n/a
Haefling 1, 2	CT	24	100%	n/a
Mill Creek 2, 3, 4	Coal-Fired	1,165	n/a	100%
Ohio Falls 1-8	Hydroelectric	64	n/a	100%
Paddy's Run 12	CT	23	n/a	100%
Paddy's Run 13	CT	147	47%	53%
Simpsonville Solar (Solar Share)	Solar	1.7	56%	44%
Trimble County 1 ²	Coal-Fired	370	n/a	100%
Trimble County 2 ³	Coal-Fired	549	81%	19%
Trimble County 5, 6	CT	318	71%	29%
Trimble County 7, 8, 9, 10	CT	636	63%	37%
Resources Under Development				
Mill Creek 5	CCGT	645	69%	31%
Brown BESS	Battery	125	n/a	100%
Marion County Solar	Solar	120	63%	37%
Mercer County Solar	Solar	120	63%	37%
Proposed Resources				
Mill Creek 6	CCGT	645	n/a	100%
Brown 12	CCGT	645	n/a	100%
Cane Run BESS	Battery	400	32%	68%

¹ Ratings represent the 2024 net summer capacity of all listed units for the portions owned by KU and LG&E. The ratings for the solar and hydroelectric resources reflect the expected output at the time of peak summer demand.

² LG&E owns 100% of Trimble County 1 relative to KU and LG&E. However, LG&E owns only 75% of the unit's total generating capacity. The remaining 25 percent of Trimble County 1 is owned by Illinois Municipal Electric Agency ("IMEA") and Indiana Municipal Power Association ("IMPA").

³ KU and LG&E combined own 75 percent of the generating capacity of Trimble County 2. The remaining 25 percent of Trimble County 2 is owned by IMEA and IMPA.