



Mr. Jeff DeRouen  
Executive Director  
Kentucky Public Service Commission  
211 Sower Boulevard  
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

**RECEIVED**  
JUL 26 2010  
PUBLIC SERVICE  
COMMISSION

**Kentucky Utilities Company**  
State Regulation and Rates  
220 West Main Street  
PO Box 32010  
Louisville, Kentucky 40232  
www.eon-us.com

Rick E. Lovekamp  
Manager, Regulatory Affairs  
T 502-627-3780  
F 502-627-3780  
rick.lovekamp@eon-us.com

July 26, 2010

**Re: Application of Kentucky Utilities Company for an Order Authorizing the Restructure and Refinancing of Unsecured Debt and the Assumption of Obligations and for Amendment of Existing Authority – Case No. 2010-00206**

Dear Mr. DeRouen:

Enclosed for filing please find the original and twelve (12) copies of Kentucky Utilities Company's Response to the Commission Staff's Second Request for Information dated July 16, 2010, in the above referenced proceeding.

Should you have any questions regarding the enclosed, please contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Rick E. Lovekamp

cc: Parties of Record

**COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY**  
**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**In the Matter of:**

<b>APPLICATION OF KENTUCKY UTILITIES</b>	)	
<b>COMPANY FOR AN ORDER AUTHORIZING THE</b>	)	<b>CASE NO.</b>
<b>RESTRUCTURE AND REFINANCING OF UNSECURED</b>	)	<b>2010-00206</b>
<b>DEBT AND THE ASSUMPTION OF OBLIGATIONS AND</b>	)	
<b>FOR AMENDMENT OF EXISTING AUTHORITY</b>	)	

**RESPONSE OF**  
**KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY**  
**TO THE**  
**COMMISSION STAFF'S SECOND REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**  
**DATED JULY 16, 2010**

**FILED: July 26, 2010**





**KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY**

**CASE NO. 2010-00206**

**Response to Commission Staff's Second Request for Information  
Dated July 16, 2010**

**Question No. 1**

**Responding Witness: Daniel K. Arbough**

Q-1. Refer to the Attachment to the response to item 3 of the Commission Staff's First Request for Information ("Staff's First Request").

- a. Explain the assumptions underlying the Periodic Issuance Costs, at what intervals KU expects to incur these costs, and the meaning of the asterisks attached to the items "Moody's Rating" and "S&P Rating".
- b. Provide the anticipated terms of the L/C Facility and the Credit Facility shown at the bottom of the Attachment.
- c. Explain whether any of the costs shown on the Attachment are incremental costs over and above financing costs previously experienced by KU with financing secured through Fidelia Corporation.

A-1. a. The Periodic Issuance Costs were based off of estimates received from banks and costs incurred for recent tax exempt bond issuances at KU. The Present Value Analysis assumed that KU would incur these costs every two years. The asterisks attached to the "Moody's Rating" and "S&P Rating" fees was to reference that the Rating Fee was based on a periodic bond issuance of \$200MM.

- b. As noted in paragraph 28 of the financing application, the Company has proposed to enter into a new \$400 million revolving line of credit with one or more banks. The revolving line of credit could be used to fund working capital or to provide letters of credit to replace existing letters of credit supporting tax exempt bonds. The expected key terms of the multi-year credit facility based on expected credit ratings are:

Facility Size:	\$400 million
Commitment Fee:	.25%
Drawn Margin/LC Fee:	2%
Upfront Fee:	\$3,628,000

- c. Although some of the costs shown in the Attachment are incremental to the current costs incurred under the existing financing arrangements with Fidelia they are

reasonable and prudent expenses necessary to raise capital directly from the market. The legal fees, rating agency fees, printing and accounting fees are incremental compared to the inter-company loan financing, but are very similar to the costs incurred by the Company when it issued First Mortgage Bonds in the past and recovered as part of the cost of providing service. These costs are currently incurred by the Company when tax-exempt bonds are issued. The compliance costs are also incremental as the Company is currently not filing SEC documents or formally complying with the Sarbanes Oxley Act. Costs of compliance with legal reporting regulations change over time. As shown in the present value calculations included as Exhibit 4 to the application, even with these additional costs the current interest rate environment would allow the Company to realize present value savings as a result of the refinancing.



**KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY**

**CASE NO. 2010-00206**

**Response to Commission Staff's Second Request for Information  
Dated July 16, 2010**

**Question No. 2**

**Responding Witness: Daniel K. Arbough**

- Q-2. Refer to the Supplemental Response to Question No. 4 filed July 9, 2010. Supplemental Attachment 1 is an April 28, 2010 Standard & Poor's press release. The last full paragraph of page 1 of 2 discusses the funding of the acquisition, "including first-mortgage bonds at KU and LG&E, and unsecured debt at Kentucky Holdings, KU's intermediate holding company." Explain how the first-mortgage bonds, which are the subject of this financing case, will be used to fund the PPL acquisition as well as the reference to Kentucky Holdings and the use of its unsecured debt.
- A-2. The \$7.625 billion quoted in the S&P article includes the repayment at closing of all existing intercompany debt due from the Company and other E.ON U.S. subsidiaries to Fidelia and other E.ON affiliates. As requested in the financing application, KU is ultimately seeking to replace the Fidelia loans with the proposed first mortgage bonds. Similarly, the entity currently known as E.ON U.S. will issue unsecured debt of approximately \$800 million to replace a portion of the existing debt it owes to Fidelia. The repayment of the remainder of the E.ON U.S. debt due to Fidelia will be funded with an equity contribution from PPL.