COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY BEFORE THE KENTUCKY PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

THE ELECTRONIC APPLICATION OF JACKSON) ENERGY COOPERATIVE CORPORATION FOR) CASE	
PASS-THROUGH OF EAST KENTUCKY POWER) 2025-0 COOPERATIVE, INC'S WHOLESALE RATE) ADJUSTMENT)	

JACKSON ENERGY COOPERATIVE CORPORATION'S
VERIFIED RESPONSE TO
COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
ENTERED SEPTEMBER 3, 2025

Comes now Jackson Energy Cooperative Corporation's ("Jackson Energy"), by counsel, and does hereby tender its Verified Response to the Commission Staff's First Request for Information entered September 3, 2025.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:	
THE ELECTRONIC APPLICATION OF JACKSON ENERGY COOPERATIVE CORPORATION FOR PASS-THROUGH OF EAST KENTUCKY POWER COOPERATIVE, INC'S WHOLESALE RATE ADJUSTMENT) CASE NO.) 2025-00215)
VERIFICATION OF AP	RIL RENNER
COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY) COUNTY OF JACKSON)	
April Renner, Vice President of Corporate Ser supervised the preparation of responses to Commission the above referenced case and that the matters and thin the best of her knowledge, information and belief, form	on Staff's First Request for Information in ngs set forth therein are true and accurate to
Ā	April Renner
The foregoing Verification was signed, acknow day of September 2025, by April Renner.	wledged and sworn to before me this 15 th
(Jusa Balen # 42192
Commiss	sion expiration: $1/19/2$ le

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

VERIFICATION OF JOHN WOLFRAM

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF JEFFERSON)

John Wolfram, being duly sworn, states that he has supervised the preparation of his responses to Requests for Information in this case and that the matters and things set forth therein are true and accurate to the best of his knowledge, information and belief, formed after reasonable inquiry.

John Wolfram

The foregoing Verification was signed, acknowledged and sworn to before me this 9th day of September, 2025, by John Wolfram.

Notary Commission No. KYNP98715

Heather S. Temple

Commission expiration: April 9, 2025

Request 1. Refer to Exhibit 4 of the Application

a. Provide the billing analysis in Excel spreadsheet format with all formulas, rows, and

columns unprotected and fully accessible.

b. Reconcile Jackson Energy's allocation of the East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc.

(EKPC) wholesale increase to the allocation assigned by EKPC to Jackson Energy and explain

any variance shown in Exhibit 4.

Response 1(a): Please see Attachment 1-1(a).

Response 1(b): See Application Exhibit 4, page 1. Also see Attachment 1-1(a), Summary tab,

last three lines and last column. The slight variance is the result of rounding the proposed per unit

charges to the appropriate number of decimal places.

ATTACHMENT IS AN EXCEL SPREADSHEET AND UPLOADED SEPARATELY

Jackson Energy Cooperative Corporation Case No. 2025-00215 Commission Staff's First Request for Information

Request 2. Refer to the Direct Testimony of John Wolfram, Exhibit 7.

- a. Confirm that Jackson Energy's proposed rates reflect a strict proportional pass-through of EKPC's wholesale increase in accordance with KRS 278.455. If not confirmed, explain the variance.
- b. If Jackson Energy considered any deviation from strict proportionality pass-through of the wholesale rate increase, identify and explain why no such deviation was proposed.
- c. Provide the class billing determinants used to support the proportional pass-through of the wholesale rate increase.

Response 2(a): Confirmed.

Response 2(b): Not applicable.

Response 2(c): Please see Application, Exhibit 4, column Billing Units, beginning on page 2.

Witness: John Wolfram

Jackson Energy Cooperative Corporation Case No. 2025-00215 Commission Staff's First Request for Information

Request 3. Refer to Case No. 2023-00014, which examined EKPC's fuel adjustment clause (FAC) adjustments and recovery.

- a. Provide a reconciliation between the \$0.01182 per kWh FAC roll-in incorporated in Exhibit 4 and Jackson Energy's FAC Form A filings filed after the August 30, 2024 Order in Case No. 2023-00014. Identify any differences between the billing analysis in Exhibit 4 and the FAC recovery amounts reported in Jackson Energy's semi-annual filings.
- b. Confirm that Jackson Energy will continue to apply monthly FAC adjustments filed under 807 KAR 5:056 on customer bills following implementation of the proposed pass-through rates. If not confirmed, explain the response.

Response 3(a): The FAC roll-in incorporated in Exhibit 4 reflects the adjustment specified in the Commission's Order in Case No. 2023-00014. The amount shown at the bottom of Exhibit 4 in the Present Rate column was moved from the FAC line to the base energy charge line for all rates on Exhibit 4 which include an energy charge. The amount is annualized such that the "Present Rate" reflects the movement of the ordered incremental energy charge from the FAC to base energy. This is evident in the Excel file provided in response to Item 1a, by comparing the energy charge and FAC in columns "2023 Revenue" and "Present Revenue" for each rate in Exhibit 4. (Note for Jackson Energy the amount is \$0.01182 per kWh not \$0.01194 per kWh.)

Response 3(b): Confirmed.

Witness: April Renner

Jackson Energy Cooperative Corporation Case No. 2025-00215 Commission Staff's First Request for Information

Request 4. Describe how bills will be calculated for service periods that straddle the effective date of the new retail rates, consistent with its current billing cycle and tariff provisions.

- a. State whether any portion of the bill will be prorated, and identify which components (customer, energy, demand, lighting) are prorated and which are not.
- b. Describe the allocation method used to split usage/charges between the pre- and post-effective-date portions (e.g., by calendar days, meter-read splits, interval-data allocation), an provide the formulas used.
- c. Identify any tariff provisions, internal policies/procedures, or billing-system constraints relied upon in calculating the billing calculations described.

Response 4(a)-(c): Jackson Energy will not bill the new retail rates until there has been a full billing period following the effective date, with no proration. In other words, all billing cycles are for the previous calendar month, and when there is a rate change, the Cooperative does not prorate, but just starts with the new rates in the first cycle after the first of the month with the new rates.

Jackson Energy Cooperative Corporation Case No. 2025-00215 Commission Staff's First Request for Information

Request 5. Refer to Schedule OL (Outdoor Lighting Service) of Jackson Energy's current tariff.

- a. Confirm that service under Schedule OL is un-metered and billed on a per-light, per-month basis. If not confirmed, explain the response.
- b. Provide the assumed monthly kWh per fixture by type used in the billing analysis and show how those assumptions translate into the proposed monthly charges.
- c. Explain how the FAC roll-in is reflected for Schedule OL.

Response 5(a). Confirmed.

Response 5(b): The billing analysis for lighting is based on the number of lights, not the assumed usage. The proposed charges reflect the proportional application of the increase to the present perunit charges (which include the FAC roll-in approved by the Commission in Case No. 2023-00014).

Response 5(c): The FAC roll-in is entirely reflected in the present and proposed rates.

Jackson Energy Cooperative Corporation Case No. 2025-00215 Commission Staff's First Request for Information

Request 6. Refer to Exhibit 4, Billing Analysis, page 2, Commercial Off Peak ETS. Refer also to Exhibit 2, Proposed Tariffs, Schedule 22 – Commercial Service – Off Peak Retail Marketing Rate, and Exhibit 3, Present and Proposed Rates. The Billing Analysis shows an All kWh charge of \$0.061873 per kWh. However, the Proposed Tariff and Exhibit 3 show \$0.06187 per kWh. Explain and reconcile the discrepancy.

Response 6. This is a display issue only; the values are the same but presented to different decimal places.

Request 7. Refer to Exhibit 4, Billing Analysis, page 3, Large Power Loads 50 kW + energy charge. Refer also to Exhibit 2, Proposed Tariffs, Schedule 40 – Large Power Loads 50 kW and Over, and Exhibit 3, page 1. The billing analysis shows a proposed energy charge of \$0.079010 per kWh while Exhibits 2 and 3 state \$0.07901 per kWh. Explain why the last 0 was not included in Exhibits 2 and 3.

Response 7. This is a display issue only; the values are the same but presented to different decimal places.

Request 8. Refer to Exhibit 4, Billing Analysis, page 2, Large Power Rate 500 kW +. Refer also to Exhibit 2, Proposed Tariffs, Schedule 48 – Large Power Rate – 500 kW and Over, and Exhibit 3, Present and Proposed Rates. The Billing Analysis shows an energy charge of \$0.064734 per kWh. However, the Proposed Tariff and Exhibit 3 show \$0.06473 per kWh. Explain and reconcile the discrepancy.

Response 8. This is a display issue only; the values are the same but presented to different decimal places.

Request 9. Refer to Exhibit 4, Billing Analysis, page 2, School Churches Halls Parts rate. Refer also to Exhibit 2, Proposed Tariffs, Schedule 50 – Schools, Churches, Community Halls, and Community Parks, and Exhibit 3, Present and Proposed Rates. The Billing Analysis shows an energy charge of \$0,110413 per kWh. However, the Proposed Tariff and Exhibit 3 show \$0.11041 per kWh. Explain and reconcile the discrepancy.

Response 9. This is a display issue only; the values are the same but presented to different decimal places.

Request 10. Refer to Exhibit 4, Billing Analysis, page 2, All Electric Schools AES. Refer also to Exhibit 2, Proposed Tariffs, Schedule 52 – All Electric Schools (A.E.S.), and Exhibit 3, Present and Proposed Rates. The Billing Analysis shows an energy charge of \$0.093191 per kWh. However, the Proposed Tariff and Exhibit 3 show \$0.09319 per kWh. Explain and reconcile the discrepancy.

Response 10. This is a display issue only; the values are the same but presented to different decimal places.