



Allen Anderson, President & CEO

925-929 North Main Street  
Post Office Box 910  
Somerset, KY 42502-0910  
Telephone 606-678-4121  
Toll Free 800-264-5112  
Fax 606-679-8279  
[www.skrecc.com](http://www.skrecc.com)

May 4, 2009

Mr. Jeff Derouen  
Executive Director  
Kentucky Public Service Commission  
211 Sowder Blvd.  
P.O. Box 615  
Frankfort, KY 40602-0615

RECEIVED  
MAY - 5 2009  
PUBLIC SERVICE  
COMMISSION

RE: Case No. 2009-00039

Dear Mr. Derouen:

As per the order dated April 14, 2009, South Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation has enclosed an original and five (5) copies of the information requested concerning the examination of the environmental surcharge mechanism of East Kentucky Power, Inc.

Should you have any questions or need further information, please contact our office.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Darrell Saunders'.

Darrell Saunders  
Attorney for South KY RECC

jb  
Enclosures

**SOUTH KENTUCKY RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE  
CORPORATION**

**PSC CASE NO. 2009-00039**

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION DATA REQUEST DATED  
April 14, 2009**

**DATA REQUEST NO. 1**

**RESPONDING PERSON: Allen Anderson, President & CEO**

Request No. 1: Has your cooperative experienced any problems in administering its environmental surcharge pass-through mechanism over the 18-month period under review in this case? If yes, explain in detail the nature of the problems and any suggested changes to cure the problems.

Response: South Kentucky (SK) has experienced some problems in administering its environmental surcharge pass-through mechanism (ES) over the 18-month period under review in this case. SK does not believe the existing methodology for allocation of the ES is fair and reasonable to all of its members. Under the current method, the monthly ES factor charged by the wholesale supplier, East Kentucky Power (EKP), is recalculated each month based upon total retail revenues. This recalculation normally reduces the retail factor down. SK has several industrial loads which are on specials contracts or on EKP's rate B and C. The retail ES allows these customers to pay a lesser amount than EKP charges at the wholesale level; therefore the other retail classes are subsidizing a portion of these industrial customers' environmental surcharge.

Request No. 2: Has your cooperative received any customer complaints regarding the environmental surcharge pass-through mechanism during the 18-month period under review in this case? If yes, state the number of complaints received, the nature of each complaint, and the service classification of each customer making a complaint.

Response: SK has received complaints concerning the ES. At present SK does not track ES complaints.

Request No. 3: Does your cooperative believe that its environmental surcharge pass-through mechanism has operated reasonably over the 18-month period under review in this case? If no, explain in detail.

Response: SK does not believe that the ES has operated reasonably over the 18-month period under review in this case. See response number 4.

Request No. 4: Does your cooperative have any recommended changes for its existing environmental surcharge pass-through mechanism? If yes, explain the nature of each change and the reasons why the change is needed.

Response: SK believes that the ES would be more equitable among rate classes if allocated based on MWh at both the wholesale and retail level rather than on revenue. SK believes that the current allocation method places an undue burden on residential membership and an even greater burden on low income residential membership while subsidizing other larger rate classes. If a rate class uses no energy they will still receive an ES charge. If a rate class has other charges included in the rate (i.e. residential security light) then both the energy and the lease of the light fixture and pole will incur an ES. If a member has a barn metered and no energy is utilized during the current billing period then that member will receive an ES. Each monthly customer charge will attract an ES charge regardless of the amount energy utilized. The fuel charge also, attracts an ES. Off system purchases of power (included in the fuel charge) will also attract an ES charge. Why? SK would have thought that off system purchase would have been subject to the same type of ES when produced at the originating G&T. It would appear that there is an ES billing inequity.

As demonstrated by EKP's response dated March 26, 2009 to the Commission's Appendix B Request No. 8 pages 1 of 33 (Attached for the Commission's and Member System's convenience) to Case No. 2009-00039 (PSC Request No. 8),— EKP's Current Method versus Alternative 1 versus Alternative 2 shows the effects of allocating the ES based on revenue versus MWh. As EKP's example shows the ES to allocate among member systems is all three scenarios is \$57,400,000 and EKP will collect the entire \$57,400,000 under all three scenarios. What is interesting is what rate classes ends up paying the ES. The Current Method as shown on Page 4 of 33 (PSC Request No. 8) indicates that a rate class is allocated an amount by EKP (revenue allocation method – Current Method) which when the member system then allocates out to its membership based on that member system's revenue the same rate class member will actually pay less than what is actually billed by EKP. SK has determined that the same inequity is resulting with the various rate classes within its member system. Additional EKP's analysis shows that the Current Method versus Alternative 2 would allocate additional ES to rate classes that consume larger amounts of MWh. This clearly shows that the ES charge should be allocated based on MWh instead of revenue. SK believes that allocating the ES based on MWh is a more equitable method of allocation. If the rate class utilizes MWh which requires environmental process to be employed then that rate class should pay for the ES associated with their utilization and not be subsidized by another rate class. SK does believe that using a rolling twelve month average to help smooth out the ES should be continued.

In closing each rate class does have common elements one of them being the need for clean efficient electricity. As each rate class requires the generation of electricity environment components must be employed to help protect the environment from the discharge of unwanted pollutants. SK realizes that EKP must recapture these costs and SK does not question whether or not EKP should or should not recapture the environmental costs associated with producing the required energy. SK does believe that the Commission should carefully review the mechanism that allocates the ES charge to all sixteen cooperatives and then how all sixteen cooperatives allocate the ES to their respective membership.

I certify that the above responses to the requests for information are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information and belief formed after a reasonable inquiry.



---

Allen Anderson, President & CEO  
South Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperative Corp.

Subscribed and sworn to before me by Allen Anderson as President & CEO of South Kentucky Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation this 4<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.



---

NOTARY PUBLIC, KY STATE AT LARGE  
My Commission Expires: January 17, 2010

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the above Response to Information Request was served by US mail to all parties on the 4<sup>th</sup> day of May 2009.

Honorable James M Crawford  
Attorney At Law  
Crawford & Baxter  
P.O. Box 353  
Carrollton, KY 41008

Honorable Michael L. Kertz  
Attorney At Law  
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowery  
36 East Seventh St, Suite 1510  
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Honorable Marvin W. Suit  
Attorney At Law  
Suit, McCartney & Price, PLLC  
207 Court Square  
Winchester, KY 41041

Robert Marshall  
President/CEO  
East KY Power Cooperative  
P.O. Box 707  
Winchester, KY 40392-0707

Bobby D. Sexton  
President/General Manager  
Big Sandy RECC  
504 11<sup>th</sup> Street  
Paintsville, KY 41240-1422

Daniel W. Brewer  
President/CEO  
Blue Grass Energy Cooperative  
P.O. Box 990  
Nicholasville, KY 40340-0990

Paul G. Embs  
President/CEO  
Clark Energy Cooperative  
P.O. Box 748  
Winchester, KY 40392-0748

Ted Hampton  
Manager  
Cumberland Valley Electric  
P.O. Box 440  
Gray, KY 40734

Christopher S. Perry  
President/CEO  
Fleming-Mason Energy  
P.O. Box 328  
Flemingsburg, KY 41240-1422

Carol H. Fraley  
President/CEO  
Grayson RECC  
109 Bagby Park  
Grayson, KY 41143

James I. Jacobus  
President/CEO  
Inter-County RECC  
P.O. Box 87  
Danville, KY 40423

Donald R. Schaefer  
President/CEO  
Jackson Energy Cooperative  
115 Jackson Energy Lane  
McKee, KY 40447

Kerry K. Howard  
General Manager/CEO  
Licking Valley RECC  
P.O. Box 605  
West Liberty, KY 41472

Michael L. Miller  
President/CEO  
Nolin RECC  
411 Ring Road  
Elizabethtown, KY 42701

Mark Stallons  
President/CEO  
Owen Electric Cooperative  
P.O. Box 400  
Owenton, KY 40359

J. Larry Hicks  
General Manager  
Salt River RECC  
P.O. Box 609  
Bardstown, KY 40004

Bill Prather  
President/CEO  
Farmers RECC  
P.O. Box 1298  
Glasgow, KY 42142

Debbie Martin  
President/CEO  
Shelby Energy Cooperative  
620 Old Finchville Rd.  
Shelbyville, KY 40065-1714

Barry Myers  
Manager  
Taylor County RECC  
P.O. Box 100  
Campbellsville, KY 42719



---

Allen Anderson  
South KY Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation  
President/CEO

**EAST KENTUCKY POWER COOPERATIVE, INC.**

**PSC CASE NO. 2009-00039  
ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE  
APPENDIX B  
FIRST DATA REQUEST RESPONSE**

**COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST DATA REQUEST DATED 2/23/09  
REQUEST 8**

**RESPONSIBLE PARTY: James C. Lamb, Jr.**

**Request 8.** In Case No. 2007-00378,<sup>7</sup> the Commission ordered that EKPC and its member Cooperatives would present any changes to the retail pass-through mechanism necessary to address the revenue allocation issue during the next 6-month surcharge review cases. Provide all documentation and workpapers available for any discussions and calculations that EKPC has had with its member cooperatives regarding changes to its retail pass-through methodology.

**Response 8.** Please see pages 2 through 33 of this response. Pages 2 through 13 represent a PowerPoint presentation given to member system CEOs on September 9, 2008. Two alternatives were presented; EKPC has recommended Alternative 1 to any distribution member who is seeking an allocation change. Pages 14 through 33 are working papers used to support the PowerPoint presentation mentioned above.

Note that EKPC does not intend to modify its calculation of the environmental surcharge at wholesale.

---

<sup>7</sup> Case No. 2007-00378, An Examination By the Public Service Commission of the Environmental Surcharge Mechanism of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. for the Six-Month Billing Periods Ending June 30, 2006 and December 31, 2006, for the Two-Year Billing Period Ending June 30, 2007, and the Pass-Through Mechanism for Its Sixteen Member Distribution Cooperatives, final Order Dated August 1, 2008.



East Kentucky  
Power Cooperative

***Environmental Surcharge – Status  
And EK / Member System Options***

EKPC Member System CEO Meeting  
September 9, 2008

Privileged And Confidential

## ***History***

East  
Kentucky  
Power  
Cooperative

- **PSC Case 2004-00321 established the environmental surcharge**
- **EK's approach closely followed the utilities who had previously filed for the surcharge**
- **2 Important items**
  1. This case describes the method by which environmental surcharge revenue is to be collected – in other words, EK is on the record with regards to how the surcharge is to be applied
  2. A mechanism exists whereby member systems collect environmental surcharge revenue from the retail members with a shorter billing lag process than exists with the FAC

September 9, 2008

*Privileged And Confidential*

## ***Revenue Allocation Inequity***

- **First identified by Owen**
  - The PSC approved method, determined in case 2004-00321, has produced an unusual result relating to Gallatin Steel
    - Each year, Owen is collecting approximately \$800,000 less from GSC than they are being billed by EK
    - The difference is being made up from Owen's other classes
    - This problem is exacerbated because GSC is so large relative to Owen's other retail members
- **Two member systems, in their responses to the 4 questions also mentioned the current revenue allocation as being less than desirable, and proposed an alternative method**
  - The existing method allocates the surcharge using dollars of revenue
  - Two member systems have suggested that the surcharge be allocated using MWh energy

- **2007-00378**
  - 2 year review case
  - Order issued August 1
  - This case had each member system answer 4 questions relating to the environmental surcharge
  - “... the Commission finds the Member Cooperatives’ retail pass through mechanism is reasonable and should be continued in its current form. However, during EKPC’s next 6-month surcharge review case, the issue which has been identified by several of the Member Cooperatives as a revenue allocation inequity will be reviewed, and EKPC and its Member Cooperatives should be prepared to present any changes necessary to address that issue in a fair and reasonable manner”.

## ***What EK Is Doing About It***

East  
Kentucky  
Power  
Cooperative

- **The rest of this presentation describes 2 alternative methods for collecting environmental surcharge revenue**
  - PSC approval will be needed to do either one
- **Alternative 1**
  - EK continues to develop a single percentage factor for recovery, however member systems allocate \$ by Rates B, C, E, and Special Contracts.
  - In other words, Owen charges Gallatin Steel exactly what EK charges Owen (for Gallatin Steel), Salt River charges its B & C members exactly what EK charges Salt River, etc.
- **Alternative 2**
  - Both EK and members change the allocation procedure. Instead of allocating surcharge on \$ of revenue, the allocation is made using MWh.

September 9, 2008

***Privileged And Confidential***

# Summary Of Methods - 12 Months Ending September 2006

East  
Kentucky  
Power  
Cooperative

**Impact to EK is the same under any method , but different classes are charged different amounts**

	Emergency	Disaster	Other
Current Method	\$7,400,000		
Alternative 1	\$7,400,000		
Alternative 2	\$7,400,000		

September 9, 2008

Privileged And Confidential

# Summary Using A Member System W/O B, C, Or Special Contracts

East  
Kentucky  
Power  
Cooperative

	Big Sandy Rate E		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$1,300,000		
Alternative 1	\$1,300,000	0.00%	\$0
Alternative 2	\$1,236,293	-4.90%	(\$63,707)

# Summary Using A Member System With B / C Contracts

East  
Kentucky  
Power  
Cooperative

	Farmers Rate E			Farmers Rate B, C		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$2,254,282			\$245,718		
Alternative 1	\$2,226,690	-1.22%	(\$27,592)	\$273,310	11.23%	\$27,592
Alternative 2	\$2,080,513	-7.71%	(\$173,769)	\$311,746	26.87%	\$66,028
<b>Total Impacts</b>						
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference			
Current Method	\$2,500,000					
Alternative 1	\$2,500,000					
Alternative 2	\$2,392,259	-4.31%	(\$107,741)			



# Summary Using A Member System With B, C, and Special Contracts

East  
Kentucky  
Power  
Cooperative

	Fleming-Mason Rate E			Fleming-Mason Rate B, C		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$2,414,386			\$1,169,266		
Alternative 1	\$2,101,046	-12.98%	(\$313,340)	\$1,269,179	8.54%	\$99,913
Alternative 2	\$1,971,906	-18.33%	(\$442,480)	\$1,274,453	9.00%	\$105,187
<b>Total Inland</b>						
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Inland Container Including Steam		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$5,296,702			\$1,616,347		
Alternative 1	\$5,200,000			\$1,829,775	13.20%	\$213,428
Alternative 2	\$5,596,702	7.63%	\$396,702	\$2,350,343	45.41%	\$733,996

# Owen Electric

East  
Kentucky  
Power  
Cooperative

	Owen Rate E			Owen Rate B, C		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$5,418,887			\$746,924		
Alternative 1	\$4,641,513	-14.35%	(\$777,374)	\$767,245	2.72%	\$20,321
Alternative 2	\$4,523,438	-16.52%	(\$895,449)	\$963,156	28.95%	\$216,232
<b>Gallatin Steel</b>						
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$9,200,000			\$3,034,189		
Alternative 1	\$9,200,000			\$3,791,242	24.95%	\$757,053
Alternative 2	\$10,626,666	15.51%	\$1,426,666	\$5,140,072	69.41%	\$2,105,883

September 9, 2008

Privileged And Confidential

# Summary Of Methods – 12 Months Ending September 2006

East  
Kentucky  
Power  
Cooperative

	Rate E			B, C, Specials Exc Gallatin		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$46,736,298			\$7,629,514		
Alternative 1	\$44,975,148	-3.77%	(\$1,761,150)	\$8,633,610	13.16%	\$1,004,096
Alternative 2	\$42,113,621	-9.89%	(\$4,622,677)	\$10,146,307	32.99%	\$2,516,793

	Total Rate E			Gallatin Steel		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$7,400,000			\$3,034,189		
Alternative 1	\$5,400,000			\$3,791,242	24.95%	\$757,053
Alternative 2	\$5,400,000			\$5,140,072	69.41%	\$2,105,883

September 9, 2008

Privileged And Confidential

## ***Summary And Recommendation Going Forward***

East  
Kentucky  
Power  
Cooperative

- **Alternative 1**
  - Fixes the Owen / GSC issue
- **Alternative 2**
  - Big Rivers has received PSC approval for this method, however they claim a special reason
  - Since the PSC has previously approved EK / members' existing method, and since EK cannot claim the special reason that Big Rivers has, approval of this alternative will mean convincing the PSC to make the change
- **Recommendation**
  - EK intends to work with Owen on Alternative 1, and will work with any other interested member systems
  - EK does not believe that Alternative 2 would survive the regulatory process

September 9, 2008

***Privileged And Confidential***

12

PSC Request 8  
Page 12 of 13

12 Months Ending 9/30/06  
(EKPC's Test Year In Its Last Rate Case)

	All Members Rate E			All Members Rate B, C, Special Contracts		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$46,736,298			\$10,663,703		
Flow Through Method	\$44,975,148	-3.77%	(\$1,761,150)	\$12,424,852	16.52%	\$1,761,149
Allocation On MWh	\$42,113,621	-9.89%	(\$4,622,677)	\$15,286,379	43.35%	\$4,622,676
	Big Sandy Rate E			Big Sandy Rate B, C, Special Contracts		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$1,300,000			\$0		
Flow Through Method	\$1,300,000	0.00%	\$0	\$0		\$0
Allocation On MWh	\$1,236,293	-4.90%	(\$63,707)	\$0		\$0
	Blue Grass Rate E			Blue Grass Rate B, C, Special Contracts		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$5,136,531			\$863,469		
Flow Through Method	\$5,011,686	-2.43%	(\$124,845)	\$988,314	14.46%	\$124,845
Allocation On MWh	\$4,542,873	-11.56%	(\$593,658)	\$1,134,092	31.34%	\$270,623
	Clark Rate E			Clark Rate B, C, Special Contracts		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$2,200,000			\$0		
Flow Through Method	\$2,200,000	0.00%	\$0	\$0		\$0
Allocation On MWh	\$2,054,534	-6.61%	(\$145,466)	\$0		\$0
	Cumberland Valley Rate E			Cumberland Valley Rate B, C, Special		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$2,600,000			\$0		
Flow Through Method	\$2,600,000	0.00%	\$0	\$0		\$0
Allocation On MWh	\$2,413,546	-7.17%	(\$186,454)	\$0		\$0
	Farmers Rate E			Farmers Rate B, C, Special Contracts		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$2,254,282			\$245,718		
Flow Through Method	\$2,226,690	-1.22%	(\$27,592)	\$273,310	11.23%	\$27,592
Allocation On MWh	\$2,080,513	-7.71%	(\$173,769)	\$311,746	26.87%	\$66,028

	Fleming-Mason Rate E			Fleming-Mason Rate B, C, Special		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$2,414,386			\$2,785,613		
Flow Through Method	\$2,101,046	-12.98%	(\$313,340)	\$3,098,954	11.25%	\$313,341
Allocation On MWh	\$1,971,906	-18.33%	(\$442,480)	\$3,624,796	30.13%	\$839,183
	Grayson Rate E			Grayson Rate B, C, Special Contracts		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$1,245,946			\$54,054		
Flow Through Method	\$1,231,379	-1.17%	(\$14,567)	\$68,621	26.95%	\$14,567
Allocation On MWh	\$1,170,421	-6.06%	(\$75,525)	\$78,257	44.78%	\$24,203
	Inter-County Rate E			Inter-County Rate B, C, Special Contracts		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$2,018,594			\$181,406		
Flow Through Method	\$1,989,815	-1.43%	(\$28,779)	\$210,185	15.86%	\$28,779
Allocation On MWh	\$1,882,591	-6.74%	(\$136,003)	\$244,442	34.75%	\$63,036
	Jackson Rate E			Jackson Rate B, C, Special Contracts		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$4,541,353			\$258,647		
Flow Through Method	\$4,481,530	-1.32%	(\$59,823)	\$318,470	23.13%	\$59,823
Allocation On MWh	\$3,968,828	-12.61%	(\$572,525)	\$508,126	96.46%	\$249,479
	Licking Valley Rate E			Licking Valley Rate B, C, Special		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$1,300,000			\$0		
Flow Through Method	\$1,300,000	0.00%	\$0	\$0		\$0
Allocation On MWh	\$1,269,401	-2.35%	(\$30,599)	\$0		\$0
	Nolin Rate E			Nolin Rate B, C, Special Contracts		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$2,779,292			\$620,709		
Flow Through Method	\$2,650,295	-4.64%	(\$128,997)	\$749,704	20.78%	\$128,995
Allocation On MWh	\$2,625,845	-5.52%	(\$153,447)	\$943,273	51.97%	\$322,564
	Owen Rate E			Owen Rate B, C, Special Contracts		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$5,418,887			\$3,781,113		
Flow Through Method	\$4,641,513	-14.35%	(\$777,374)	\$4,558,487	20.56%	\$777,374
Allocation On MWh	\$4,523,438	-16.52%	(\$895,449)	\$6,103,228	61.41%	\$2,322,115

		Salt River Rate E			Salt River Rate B, C, Special Contracts		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	
Current Method	\$4,583,669			\$316,331			
Flow Through Method	\$4,525,524	-1.27%	(\$58,145)	\$374,476	18.38%	\$58,145	
Allocation On MWh	\$4,272,057	-6.80%	(\$311,612)	\$415,671	31.40%	\$99,340	

  

		Shelby Rate E			Shelby Rate B, C, Special Contracts		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	
Current Method	\$1,439,626			\$660,374			
Flow Through Method	\$1,395,816	-3.04%	(\$43,810)	\$704,184	6.63%	\$43,810	
Allocation On MWh	\$1,294,230	-10.10%	(\$145,396)	\$824,975	24.93%	\$164,601	

  

		South Kentucky Rate E			South Kentucky Rate B, C, Special		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	
Current Method	\$5,392,609			\$507,391			
Flow Through Method	\$5,297,074	-1.77%	(\$95,535)	\$602,962	18.84%	\$95,571	
Allocation On MWh	\$4,833,794	-10.36%	(\$558,815)	\$644,864	27.09%	\$137,473	

  

		Taylor County Rate E			Taylor County Rate B, C, Special		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	
Current Method	\$2,111,123			\$388,878			
Flow Through Method	\$2,022,780	-4.18%	(\$88,343)	\$477,220	22.72%	\$88,342	
Allocation On MWh	\$1,973,351	-6.53%	(\$137,772)	\$452,908	16.47%	\$64,030	

	Sum Of Member System Rate E			Sum Of B, C, Specials Exc Gallatin		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$46,736,298			\$7,629,514		
Alternative 1	\$44,975,148	-3.77%	(\$1,761,150)	\$8,633,610	13.16%	\$1,004,096
Alternative 2	\$42,113,621	-9.89%	(\$4,622,677)	\$10,146,307	32.99%	\$2,516,793

				Gallatin Steel		
				Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
				\$3,034,189		
				\$3,791,242	24.95%	\$757,053
				\$5,140,072	69.41%	\$2,105,883

*Alternative 1 - EK doesn't change its allocation method; however member systems allocate \$ by B, C, E, and Special Contracts. In other words, Owen charges Gallatin Steel exactly what EK charges Owen (for Gallatin Steel).*

*Alternative 2 - Both EK and members change the allocation procedure. Instead of allocating surcharge on \$ of revenue, the allocation is made using MWh.*



Big Sandy Rate E			
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$1,300,000		
Alternative 1	\$1,300,000	0.00%	\$0
Alternative 2	\$1,236,293	-4.90%	(\$63,707)


*Alternative 1 - EK doesn't change its allocation method, however member systems flow \$ through to B, C, E, and Special Contracts*

*Alternative 2 - Both EK and members change the allocation procedure. Instead of allocating surcharge on \$ of revenue, the allocation is made using MWh.*

	Blue Grass Rate E			Blue Grass Rate B, C		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$5,136,531			\$863,469		
Alternative 1	\$5,011,686	-2.43%	(\$124,845)	\$988,314	14.46%	\$124,845
Alternative 2	\$4,542,873	-11.56%	(\$593,658)	\$1,134,092	31.34%	\$270,623

	Revenue	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method			
Alternative 1			
Alternative 2			

*Alternative 1 - EK doesn't change its allocation method however member systems flow \$ through to B, C, E, and Special Contracts*

*Alternative 2 - Both EK and members change the allocation procedure. Instead of allocating surcharge on \$ of revenue, the allocation is made using MWh.*

	Environmental Surcharge	Clark Rate E	
		% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$2,200,000		
Alternative 1	\$2,200,000	0.00%	\$0
Alternative 2	\$2,054,534	-6.61%	(\$145,466)


*Alternative 1 - EK doesn't change its allocation method, however member systems flow \$ through to B, C, E, and Special Contracts.*

*Alternative 2 - Both EK and members change the allocation procedure. Instead of allocating surcharge on \$ of revenue, the allocation is made using MWh.*

Cumberland Valley Rate E			
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$2,600,000		
Alternative 1	\$2,600,000	0.00%	\$0
Alternative 2	\$2,413,546	-7.17%	(\$186,454)

	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$2,600,000		
Alternative 1	\$2,600,000	0.00%	\$0
Alternative 2	\$2,413,546	-7.17%	(\$186,454)

*Alternative 1 - EK doesn't change its allocation method; however, member systems flow \$ through to B, C, E, and Special Contracts.*

*Alternative 2 - Both EK and members change the allocation procedure. Instead of allocating surcharge on \$ of revenue, the allocation is made using MWh.*

	Farmers Rate E			Farmers Rate B, C		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$2,254,282			\$245,718		
Alternative 1	\$2,226,690	-1.22%	(\$27,592)	\$273,310	11.23%	\$27,592
Alternative 2	\$2,080,513	-7.71%	(\$173,769)	\$311,746	26.87%	\$66,028

	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method			
Alternative 1			
Alternative 2			

*Alternative 1 - EK doesn't change its allocation method, however member systems flow \$ through to B, C, E, and Special Contracts*

*Alternative 2 - Both EK and members change the allocation procedure. Instead of allocating surcharge on \$ of revenue, the allocation is made using MWh*

	Fleming-Mason Rate E			Fleming-Mason Rate B, C		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$2,414,386			\$1,169,266		
Alternative 1	\$2,101,046	-12.98%	(\$313,340)	\$1,269,179	8.54%	\$99,913
Alternative 2	\$1,971,906	-18.33%	(\$442,480)	\$1,274,453	9.00%	\$105,187

	Fleming-Mason Rate E			Inland Container Including Steam		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$2,414,386			\$1,616,347		
Alternative 1	\$2,101,046	-12.98%	(\$313,340)	\$1,829,775	13.20%	\$213,428
Alternative 2	\$1,971,906	-18.33%	(\$442,480)	\$2,350,343	45.41%	\$733,996

*Alternative 1 - EK doesn't change its allocation method; however member systems flow \$ through to B, C, E and Special Contracts. In other words, Fleming-Mason charges Inland exactly what EK charges Fleming-Mason.*

*Alternative 2 - Both EK and members change the allocation procedure. Instead of allocating surcharge on \$ of revenue, the allocation is made using MWh.*

	Grayson Rate E			Grayson Rate B / C		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$1,245,946			\$54,054		
Alternative 1	\$1,231,379	-1.17%	(\$14,567)	\$68,621	26.95%	\$14,567
Alternative 2	\$1,170,421	-6.06%	(\$75,525)	\$78,257	44.78%	\$24,203

Allocation			
Alternative	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Alternative 1			
Alternative 2			

*Alternative 1 - EK doesn't change its allocation method, however member systems flow \$ through to B, C, E, and Special Contracts.*

*Alternative 2 - Both EK and members change the allocation procedure. Instead of allocating surcharge on \$ of revenue, the allocation is made using MWh.*

	Inter-County Rate E			Inter-County Rate B / C		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$2,018,594			\$181,406		
Alternative 1	\$1,989,815	-1.43%	(\$28,779)	\$210,185	15.86%	\$28,779
Alternative 2	\$1,882,591	-6.74%	(\$136,003)	\$244,442	34.75%	\$63,036


*Alternative 1 - EK doesn't change its allocation method, however member systems flow \$ through to B, C, E, and Special Contracts.*

*Alternative 2 - Both EK and members change the allocation procedure. Instead of allocating surcharge on \$ of revenue, the allocation is made using MWh.*



	Jackson Rate E			Jackson Rate B / C		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$4,541,353			\$258,647		
Alternative 1	\$4,481,530	-1.32%	(\$59,823)	\$318,470	23.13%	\$59,823
Alternative 2	\$3,968,828	-12.61%	(\$572,525)	\$508,126	96.46%	\$249,479

	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method			
Alternative 1			
Alternative 2			

*Alternative 1 - EK doesn't change its allocation method, however member systems flow \$ through to B, C, E, and Special Contracts*

*Alternative 2 - Both EK and members change the allocation procedure. Instead of allocating surcharge on \$ of revenue, the allocation is made using MWh.*

Licking Valley Rate E			
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$1,300,000		
Alternative 1	\$1,300,000	0.00%	\$0
Alternative 2	\$1,269,401	-2.35%	(\$30,599)

Licking Valley Rate E			
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$1,300,000		
Alternative 1	\$1,300,000	0.00%	\$0
Alternative 2	\$1,269,401	-2.35%	(\$30,599)

*Alternative 1 - EK doesn't change its allocation method, however member systems flow \$ through to B, C, E, and Special Contracts*

*Alternative 2 - Both EK and members change the allocation procedure. Instead of allocating surcharge on \$ of revenue, the allocation is made using MWh*

	Nolin Rate E			Nolin Rate B / C		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$2,414,386			\$175,153		
Alternative 1	\$2,101,046	-12.98%	(\$313,340)	\$197,424	12.72%	\$22,271
Alternative 2	\$1,971,906	-18.33%	(\$442,480)	\$240,024	37.04%	\$64,871

	AGC		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$444,556		
Alternative 1	\$552,280	24.23%	\$107,724
Alternative 2	\$703,249	58.19%	\$258,693

*Alternative 1 - EK doesn't change its allocation method, however member systems flow \$ through to B, C, E, and Special Contracts.*

*Alternative 2 - Both EK and members change the allocation procedure. Instead of allocating surcharge on \$ of revenue, the allocation is made using MWh.*

	Owen Rate E			Owen Rate B, C		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$5,418,887			\$746,924		
Alternative 1	\$4,641,513	-14.35%	(\$777,374)	\$767,245	2.72%	\$20,321
Alternative 2	\$4,523,438	-16.52%	(\$895,449)	\$963,156	28.95%	\$216,232

	Gallatin Steel		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$3,034,189		
Alternative 1	\$3,791,242	24.95%	\$757,053
Alternative 2	\$5,140,072	69.41%	\$2,105,883

*Alternative 1 - EK doesn't change its allocation method, however member systems flow \$ through to B, C, E, and Special Contracts. In other words, Owen charges Gallatin Steel exactly what EK charges Owen (for Gallatin Steel).*

*Alternative 2 - Both EK and members change the allocation procedure. Instead of allocating surcharge on \$ of revenue, the allocation is made using MWh.*

	Salt River Rate E			Salt River Rate B / C		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$4,583,669			\$316,331		
Alternative 1	\$4,525,524	-1.27%	(\$58,145)	\$374,476	18.38%	\$58,145
Alternative 2	\$4,272,057	-6.80%	(\$311,612)	\$415,671	31.40%	\$99,340


*Alternative 1 - EK doesn't change its allocation method, however member systems flow \$ through to B, C, E, and Special Contracts*

*Alternative 2 - Both EK and members change the allocation procedure. Instead of allocating surcharge on \$ of revenue, the allocation is made using MWh.*

	Shelby Rate E			Shelby Rate B / C		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$1,439,626			\$660,374		
Alternative 1	\$1,395,816	-3.04%	(\$43,810)	\$704,184	6.63%	\$43,810
Alternative 2	\$1,294,930	-10.05%	(\$144,696)	\$824,975	24.93%	\$164,601

	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$1,439,626		
Alternative 1	\$1,395,816	-3.04%	(\$43,810)
Alternative 2	\$1,294,930	-10.05%	(\$144,696)

*Alternative 1 - EK doesn't change its allocation method, however member systems flow \$ through to B, C, E, and Special Contracts.*

*Alternative 2 - Both EK and members change the allocation procedure. Instead of allocating surcharge on \$ of revenue, the allocation is made using MWh.*

	South Kentucky Rate E			South Kentucky Rate B, C		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$5,392,609			\$507,391		
Alternative 1	\$5,297,074	-1.77%	(\$95,535)	\$602,926	18.83%	\$95,535
Alternative 2	\$4,833,794	-10.36%	(\$558,815)	\$644,864	27.09%	\$137,473

	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method			
Alternative 1			
Alternative 2			

*Alternative 1 - EK doesn't change its allocation method, however member systems flow \$ through to B, C, E, and Special Contracts. In other words, Fleming-Mason charges Inland exactly what EK charges Fleming-Mason.*

*Alternative 2 - Both EK and members change the allocation procedure. Instead of allocating surcharge on \$ of revenue, the allocation is made using MWh.*

	Taylor County Rate E			Taylor County Rate B / C		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$2,111,123			\$100,324		
Alternative 1	\$2,022,780	-4.18%	(\$88,343)	\$107,638	7.29%	\$7,314
Alternative 2	\$1,973,351	-6.53%	(\$137,772)	\$129,402	28.98%	\$29,078

	TGP		
	Environmental Surcharge	% Difference	\$ Difference
Current Method	\$288,554		
Alternative 1	\$369,582	28.08%	\$81,028
Alternative 2	\$323,506	12.11%	\$34,952

*Alternative 1 - EK doesn't change its allocation method; however member systems flow \$ through to B, C, E, and Special Contracts.*

*Alternative 2 - Both EK and members change the allocation procedure. Instead of allocating surcharge on \$ of revenue, the allocation is made using MWh.*