SULLIVAN, MOUNTJOY, STAINBACK & MILLER PSC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

RECEIVED

MAY 24 2013

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Ronald M. Sullivan
Jesse T. Mountjoy
Frank Stainback

James M. Miller Michael A. Fiorella Allen W. Holbrook

R. Michael Sullivan
Bryan R. Reynolds*
Tyson A. Kamuf

Mark W. Starnes
C. Ellsworth Mountjoy

*Also Licensed in Indiana

May 23, 2013

Via Federal Express

Jeff Derouen
Executive Director
Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard, P.O. Box 615
Frankfort, Kentucky 40602-0615

Re: In the Matter of: An Examination by the Public Service Commission of the Environmental Surcharge Mechanism of Big Rivers Electric Corporation for the Six-Month Billing Period Ending January 31, 2013 and the Pass Through Mechanism of its Three Member Distribution Cooperatives, PSC Case No. 2013-00139

Dear Mr. Derouen:

Enclosed for filing in the above referenced matter are an original and seven copies of Big Rivers Electric Corporation's responses to the Commission Staff's first request for information and an original and seven copies of the direct testimony of Nicholas R. Castlen in support of the reasonableness of the environmental surcharge mechanisms of Big Rivers Electric Corporation, Jackson Purchase Energy Corporation, Kenergy Corp., and Meade County Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation. On this date, a copy of this letter, the testimony, and the responses were served on all parties of record by first class mail, postage prepaid or by Federal Express.

Sincerely,

Tyson Kamuf

Typon Korry

Enclosures

cc:

Billie Richert

Lawrence V. Baronowsky

Nicholas R. Castlen

Gregory J. Starheim

G. Kelly Nuckols

Burns E. Mercer

100 St. Ann Building

Telephone (270) 926-4000 Telecopier (270) 683-6694

> PO Box 727 Owensboro, Kentucky 42302-0727

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE MECHANISM
OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION
FOR THE SIX-MONTH BILLING PERIOD ENDING JANUARY 31, 2013
AND THE PASS THROUGH MECHANISM
OF ITS THREE MEMBER DISTRIBUTION COOPERATIVES
CASE NO. 2013-00139

VERIFICATION

I, Nicholas R. (Nick) Castlen, verify, state, and affirm that the Direct Testimony and data request responses filed with this verification for which I am listed as a witness are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief formed after a reasonable inquiry.

Nicholas R. (Nick) Castlen

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF HENDERSON)

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me by Nicholas R. (Nick) Castlen on this the 22 day of May, 2013.

Notary Public, Ky. State at Large My Commission Expires

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE MECHANISM
OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION
FOR THE SIX-MONTH BILLING PERIOD ENDING JANUARY 31, 2013
AND THE PASS THROUGH MECHANISM
OF ITS THREE MEMBER DISTRIBUTION COOPERATIVES
CASE NO. 2013-00139

VERIFICATION

I, Lawrence V. (Larry) Baronowsky, verify, state, and affirm that the data request responses filed with this verification for which I am listed as a witness are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief formed after a reasonable inquiry.

Lawrence V. (Larry) Baronowsky

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)
COUNTY OF HENDERSON)

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me by Lawrence V. (Larry) Baronowsky on this the 22 day of May, 2013.

Notary Public, Ky/ State at Large
My Commission Expires_____

Notary Public, Kentucky State-At-Large My Commission Expires: July 3, 2014 ID 421951

ORIGINAL



Your Touchstone Energy® Cooperative

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF KENTUCKY

In the Matter of:

AN EXAMINATION)	
BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION)	
OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE)	
MECHANISM OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC)	
CORPORATION FOR THE)	Case No. 2013-00139
SIX-MONTH BILLING PERIOD ENDING)	Case No. 2015-00159
JANUARY 31, 2013)	
AND THE PASS THROUGH MECHANISM)	
OF ITS THREE MEMBER DISTRIBUTION)	
COOPERATIVES)	

Responses to Commission Staff's Initial Request for Information dated May 7, 2013

FILED: May 24, 2013

ORIGINAL

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR THE SIX-MONTH BILLING PERIOD ENDING JANUARY 31, 2013 AND THE PASS THROUGH MECHANISM OF ITS THREE MEMBER DISTRIBUTION COOPERATIVES CASE NO. 2013-00139

Response to Commission Staff's Initial Request for Information dated May 7, 2013

May 24, 2013

1	Item 1) Prepare a summary schedule showing the calculation of E(m)
2	and the surcharge factor for the expense months covered by the billing
3	periods under review. Form 1.1 can be used as a model for this summary.
4	Include the expense months for the two expense months subsequent to the
5	billing period in order to show the over- and under-recovery adjustments
6	for the months included for the billing period. Include a calculation of
7	any additional over- or under-recovery amount Big Rivers believes needs
8	to be recognized for the billing periods under review. Include all
9	supporting calculations and documentation for the additional over- or
10	under-recovery.
11	
12	Response) Please see the attached schedule, in the format of Form 1.10,
13	covering each of the expense months from June 2012 through January 2013 (i.e.,
14	the expense months covered by the billing periods under review plus the
15	immediately following two months). No additional over/under recovery is sought
16	by Big Rivers Electric Corporation.
17	
18	
19	Witness) Nicholas R. Castlen
20	

Calculation of Total E(m) and Jurisdictional Surcharge Billing Factor

For the Expense Months: June 2012 to January 2013

1	E(m) =OE - BAS, where							
2	OE = Pollution Control				_			
3	BAS = Total Proceeds from	m By-Product and Allowance Sales			June 2012			July 2012
4								
5				Er	vironmental		Ex	vironmental
6					pliance Plans			npliance Plans
7					.piiaiico i iaiic		001.	.p.iaiioo i iaiio
8								
9	OE		=	\$	2,182,005	=	\$	2,440,704
10	BAS		=	\$	-	=	\$	-
11								
12	E(m)		=	\$	2,182,005	=	\$	2,440,704
13								
14		. 10 1 Poll E						
15	Calculation of Jurisdictional Enviro	onmental Surcharge Billing Factor	,					
16 17	<u> </u>							
18	Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio for Expe	ense Month	=		89.358343%	_		89.836556%
19	Jurisdictional $E(m) = E(m) \times Jurisdicti$		=	\$	1,949,804		\$	2,192,644
20	Adjustment for Over/(Under) Recovery		=	\$	114,486	=	\$	(9,462)
21	Prior Period Adjustment (if necessary)		=	\$	-	=	\$	
22	Net Jurisdictional E(m) = Jurisdictions	al E(m) plus Adjustment for Over/(Unde	er)					
23	plus Prior Period	Adjustment	=	\$	1,835,318	=	\$	2,202,106
24								
25	Jurisdictional S(m) = Monthly Jurisdic	ctional Kwh Sales for the Month	=		893,259,338	=		974,156,163
26								
27		7.11						
28	Jurisdictional Environmental Surchar				#0.0000FF			@0.0000C1
29	Net Jurisdictional E(m) / Jurisdictiona	IS(m); Per Kwh	=		\$0.002055	=		\$0.002261

Calculation of Total E(m) and Jurisdictional Surcharge Billing Factor

For the Expense Months: June 2012 to January 2013

Calculation of Total E(m)

1	E(m) = OE - BAS, where				
2	OE = Pollution Control Operating Expenses				
3	BAS = Total Proceeds from By-Product and Allowance Sales		A	ugust 2012	See Note 1
4					
5					
6				nvironmental	
U			Con	npliance Plans	
7					
8					
9	OE	=	\$	2,288,269	
10	BAS	=	\$	-	
11					
12	E(m)	===	\$	2,288,269	
13					
14					
15	Calculation of Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Billing Fa	ctor			
16					
17	The state of the s			01.0044000/	
18	Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio for Expense Month	=	Φ	91.324492%	
19	Jurisdictional E(m) = E(m) x Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio	=	\$	2,089,750	
20	Adjustment for Over/(Under) Recovery	=	\$	166,573	
21	Prior Period Adjustment (if necessary)	=	\$	-	
22	Net Jurisdictional E(m) = Jurisdictional E(m) plus Adjustment for Over/(ø.	1 000 155	
23	plus Prior Period Adjustment	=	\$	1,923,177	
24	T 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	_		000 007 040	
25	Jurisdictional S(m) = Monthly Jurisdictional Kwh Sales for the Month	=		926,097,349	
26					
27	r character and a later to the control of the contr				
28	Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Billing Factor:			***************************************	
29	Net Jurisdictional E(m) / Jurisdictional S(m); Per Kwh	=		\$0.002077	

Note 1: Pursuant to the Commission's Order dated October 1, 2012 in Case No. 2012-00063, Big Rivers implemented changes to its Environmental Surcharge ("ES") filing beginning with the September 2012 expense month (which calculated the ES factor applied to invoices for service delivered during October 2012 that were billed in early November 2012). These changes included allocating environmental surcharge costs based on a rolling 12-month average of Total Adjusted Revenues, instead of a kWh basis, and the inclusion of a rate of return on capital expenditures associated with the 2012 Environmental Compliance Plan for purposes of calculating the monthly ES factor. The following schedules, for the expense months of September 2012 through January 2013, reflect these changes.

Calculation of Total E(m) and Jurisdictional Surcharge Billing Factor

For the Expense Months: June 2012 to January 2013

1	E(m) =OE - BAS + RORB, where						
2	OE = Pollution Control Operating Expenses	0.1					
3	BAS = Total Proceeds from By-Product and Allowand	e Saies	g			0	ctober 2012
4	$RORB = [(RB/12) \times (RORORB)]$		Sel	otember 2012			ctober 2012
5							
6			Tr.	vironmental		Tr.	vironmental
7				opliance Plans			opliance Plans
_			COI	iphance r lans		COII	ipitatice I fails
8							
9 10	OE	==	œ	2,259,265	=	\$	1,933,202
11	BAS		\$	2,200,200	=	\$	1,550,202
12	RORB		\$		=	\$	_
13	KOKD	_	Ψ			Ψ	
14	E(m)		\$	2,259,265	=	\$	1,933,202
15	E(m)		Ψ	2,200,200		Ψ	1,000,202
16						·	
17	Calculation of Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Bill	ing Factor					
18	Calculation of Surficient Environmental Surficient Surf						
19							
20	Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio for the Month	=		90.526996%	=		90.764581%
21	Jurisdictional $E(m) = E(m) \times Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio$	=	\$	2,045,245	=	\$	1,754,663
22	Adjustment for (Over)/Under Recovery	-	\$	108,200	=	\$	154,377
23	Prior Period Adjustment (if necessary)	2000	\$	-	=	\$	-
24							
25	Net Jurisdictional E(m) = Jurisdictional E(m) plus (Over)/Under						
26	plus Prior Period Adjustment(s)	==	\$	2,153,445		\$	1,909,040
27							
28	R(m) = Average Monthly Member System Revenue for the 12 Mon	ths					İ
29	Ending with the Current Expense Month	-	\$	38,860,321	=	\$	39,070,620
30							
31	Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Billing Factor:						
32	CESF: E(m) / R(m); as a % of Revenue	=		5.541500%	=		4.886127%

Calculation of Total E(m) and Jurisdictional Surcharge Billing Factor

For the Expense Months: June 2012 to January 2013

$\frac{1}{2}$	E(m) =OE - BAS + RORB, where OE = Pollution Control Operating Expenses						
3	BAS = Total Proceeds from By-Product and Allowa	nce Sales					
4	$RORB = [(RB/12) \times (RORORB)]$		No	vember 2012		De	cember 2012
5 6							
7				vironmental			nvironmental
			Con	npliance Plans		Con	npliance Plans
8							
$\frac{9}{10}$	OE		\$	2,385,696	=	\$	2,466,165
11	BAS	=	\$	-,,	=	\$	-
12	RORB	-	\$	-	=	\$	-
13							
14	E(m)	=	\$	2,385,696	=	\$	2,466,165
15							
$\frac{16}{17}$	Calculation of Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Bi	lling Factor					
18	Outoutation of our isufcitional Environmental Europaige Es	anng ruovor					
19							
20	Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio for the Month	-		85.200207%	=		87.232120%
21	Jurisdictional E(m) = E(m) x Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio	Manual Ma	\$	2,032,618	=	\$	2,151,288
22	Adjustment for (Over)/Under Recovery	=	\$	50,264	=	\$	(20,870)
23	Prior Period Adjustment (if necessary)		\$	-	=	\$	-
24							1
25	Net Jurisdictional E(m) = Jurisdictional E(m) plus (Over)/Under						
26	plus Prior Period Adjustment(s)		\$	2,082,882	=	\$	2,130,418
27		. •					
28	R(m) = Average Monthly Member System Revenue for the 12 Me		•	00 181 000		4	00 540 014
29	Ending with the Current Expense Month	=	\$	39,474,882	=	\$	39,542,214
30							
31	Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Billing Factor:	=		5.276475%	=		5.387706%
32	CESF: E(m) / R(m); as a % of Revenue			0.410410%			9.907700%
	1						I

Calculation of Total E(m) and Jurisdictional Surcharge Billing Factor

For the Expense Months: June 2012 to January 2013

1 2 3 4	E(m) =OE - BAS + RORB, where OE = Pollution Control Operating Expenses BAS = Total Proceeds from By-Product and Allowance Sales RORB = [(RB/12) x (RORORB)]		Ja	anuary 2013
5				
6			Er	vironmental
7				npliance Plans
8				•
9				
10	OE	=	\$	2,484,215
11	BAS	=	\$	-
12	RORB	=	\$	-
13				
14	E(m)	=	\$	2,484,215
15				
16				
17	Calculation of Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Billing Factor	r		
18				
19	Total Para Alleration Detice of Manda			00.0000000
20	Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio for the Month	==	ø.	89.090888%
21	Jurisdictional E(m) = E(m) x Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio	-	\$	2,213,209
22	Adjustment for (Over)/Under Recovery	=	\$	(6,199)
23	Prior Period Adjustment (if necessary)		\$	(57,831)
24	NEAT CONTROL TO THE C			
25	Net Jurisdictional E(m) = Jurisdictional E(m) plus (Over)/Under		Φ	0.140.170
26	plus Prior Period Adjustment(s)	=	\$	2,149,179
27				
28	R(m) = Average Monthly Member System Revenue for the 12 Months		Ф	00.054.050
29	Ending with the Current Expense Month	=	\$	39,654,353
30	T THE LET CLOT IN THE F			
31	Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Billing Factor:			F 4105010/
32	CESF: E(m) / R(m); as a % of Revenue	=		5.419781%

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR THE SIX-MONTH BILLING PERIOD ENDING JANUARY 31, 2013 AND THE PASS THROUGH MECHANISM OF ITS THREE MEMBER DISTRIBUTION COOPERATIVES CASE NO. 2013-00139

Response to Commission Staff's Initial Request for Information dated May 7, 2013

May 24, 2013

1	Item 2) For each of the three Member Cooperatives, prepare a
2	summary schedule showing the Member Cooperative's pass-through
3	revenue requirement for the months corresponding with the billing
4	periods under review. Include the two months subsequent to the billing
5	periods included in the review periods. Include a calculation of any
6	additional over- or under-recovery amount the Member Cooperative
7	believes needs to be recognized for the billing periods under review.
8	Include all supporting calculations and documentation for the additional
9	over- or under-recovery.
10	
11	Response) The attached two sets of schedules (Attachment 1 for non-dedicated
12	delivery points and Attachment 2 for dedicated delivery points) reflect Big Rivers
13	Members' environmental surcharge pass-through for the months corresponding to
14	Big Rivers' expense months of June 2012 through November 2012, applied to
15	Members' invoices for the service months of July 2012 through December 2012,
16	which Big Rivers billed to its Members August 2012 through January 2013. As
17	illustrated in the attached schedules, there is no billing lag for dedicated delivery
18	point customers.
19	As requested by the Commission, the attached schedules include the
20	Members' two billing months immediately following the review period. The
21	information on the attached schedules was obtained from the Members' monthly

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR THE SIX-MONTH BILLING PERIOD ENDING JANUARY 31, 2013 AND THE PASS THROUGH MECHANISM OF ITS THREE MEMBER DISTRIBUTION COOPERATIVES CASE NO. 2013-00139

Response to Commission Staff's Initial Request for Information dated May 7, 2013

May 24, 2013

1	Environmental Surcharge Schedules provided by Big Rivers' Members. Other
2	than the on-going cumulative over/under recovery mechanism, no additional
3	over/under recovery amount is requested.
4	
5	

6 **Witness)** Nicholas R. Castlen

7

Case No. 2013-00139 Response to PSC 1-2 Witness: Nicholas R. Castlen Page 2 of 2

KENERGY CORP.

ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE REVIEW

ــــ	ELIVINOS INIELITAS SOLVETIMICAS INICIA (I													
3	NON-DEDICATED DELIVERY POINT CUSTOMERS													
4	(a) (b) (c) (d) (e) (f)													
5	(a)	(b)	(f)											
6														
7		Big Rivers'				(Over)/Under								
8		Invoice			ES Amount Billed	Recovery								
9		ES Amount	(Over)/Under	Total	to Kenergy's	[(d) for 2nd preceding								
10	Service	for Service	Recovery	Recoverable	Customers	month less (e)								
11	Mo/Yr	\mathbf{Month}	[from (f)]	[(b) + (c)]	(Line 11 per Filing)	for current month]								
12	Jul-12	\$ 279,677	\$ (16,746)	\$ 262,931	\$ 210,615	\$ (16,746)								
13	Aug-12	\$ 261,409	\$ (38,289)	\$ 223,120	\$ 252,581	\$ (38,289)								
14	Sep-12	\$ 184,234	\$ 26,539	\$ 210,773	\$ 236,392	\$ 26,539								
15	Oct-12	\$ 229,117	\$ 26,214	\$ 255,331	\$ 196,906	\$ 26,214								
16	Nov-12	\$ 237,057	\$ 16,277	\$ 253,334	\$ 194,496	\$ 16,277								
17	Dec-12	\$ 276,306	\$ (31,680)	\$ 244,626	\$ 287,011	\$ (31,680)								
18	Jan-13	\$ 319,799	\$ (19,338)	\$ 300,461	\$ 272,672	\$ (19,338)								
19	Feb-13	\$ 305,424	\$ (24,174)	\$ 281,250	\$ 268,800	\$ (24,174)								
20	Mar-13	\$ 267,577	\$ 17,576	\$ 285,153	\$ 282,885	\$ 17,576								
21														
	······································													

JACKSON PURCHASE ENERGY CORPORATION ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE REVIEW NON-DEDICATED DELIVERY POINT CUSTOMERS

3	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)
)											
)		В	ig Rivers'								(Over)/Under
l			Invoice					ES	S Amount Billed		Recovery
2		E	S Amount	(Ov	er)/Under		Total		to JPEC's	[(d) for 3rd preceding
3	Service	fc	or Service	R	Recovery	$R\epsilon$	coverable		Customers		month less (e)
1	Mo/Yr		Month	[:	from (f)]	[(b) + (c)	(Li	ne 11 per Filing)	1	for current month)]
5	Jul-12	\$	159,783	\$	(41,043)	\$	118,740	\$	162,458	\$	(41,043)
3	Aug-12	\$	149,078	\$	(39,874)	\$	109,204	\$	153,552	\$	(39,874)
7	Sep-12	\$	102,979	\$	(25, 321)	\$	77,658	\$	154,688	\$	(25,321)
3	Oct-12	\$	124,094	\$	30,011	\$	154,105	\$	88,729	\$	30,011
•	Nov-12	\$	130,063	\$	38,219	\$	168,282	\$	70,985	\$	38,219
)	Dec-12	\$	149,679	\$	5,908	\$	155,587	\$	71,750	\$	5,908
L	Jan-13	\$	171,746	\$	(29, 184)	\$	142,562	\$	183,289	\$	(29,184)
2	Feb-13	\$	160,815	\$	(51,248)	\$	109,567	\$	219,530	\$	(51,248)
3	Mar-13	\$	142,065	\$	(14,417)	\$	127,648	\$	170,004	\$	(14,417)
1											

1	MEADE COUNTY RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORPORATION													
2	ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE REVIEW													
3	NON-DEDICATED DELIVERY POINT CUSTOMERS													
4														
5	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		<u>(f)</u>			
6														
7		В	ig Rivers'								(Over)/Under			
8			Invoice					E	S Amount Billed		Recovery			
9		E	S Amount	rO)	er)/Under	Total			to MCRECC's	[(d) for 1st preceding				
10	Service	fc	r Service	F	Recovery	Recoverable			Customers		month less (e)			
11	Mo/Yr	Month		[from (f)]		[(b) + (c)]		(L	Line 11 per Filing)		for current month]			
12	Jul-12	\$	101,201	\$	(18,683)	\$	82,518	\$	97,178	\$	(18,683)			
13	Aug-12	\$	93,643	\$	11,111	\$	104,754	\$	71,407	\$	11,111			
14	Sep-12	\$	66,693	\$	18,493	\$	85,186	\$	86,261	\$	18,493			
15	Oct-12	\$	92,678	\$	3,928	\$	96,606	\$	81,258	\$	3,928			
16	Nov-12	\$	102,974	\$	(21,109)	\$	81,865	\$	117,715	\$	(21,109)			
17	Dec-12	\$	117,434	\$	(8,831)	\$	108,603	\$	90,696	\$	(8,831)			
18	Jan-13	\$	143,930	\$	(28,793)	\$	115,137	\$	137,396	\$	(28,793)			
19	Feb-13	\$	138,671	\$	18,668	\$	157,339	\$	96,469	\$	18,668			
20	Mar-13	\$	118,125	\$	4,176	\$	122,301	\$	153,163	\$	4,176			
21														

KENERGY CORP-EN	IVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE REVIEW
DEDICATED	DELIVERY POINT CUSTOMERS

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)		
Service Mo/Yr	Big Rivers Electric Invoice Amount for Service Month	Service Month to Retail Consumer	Monthly Over/Under (Column (b) less column (c)		
Jul-12	\$ 1,460,830	\$ 1,460,830	\$ -		
Aug-12	\$ 1,588,815	\$ 1,588,815	\$ -		
Sep-12	\$ 1,413,790	\$ 1,413,790	-		
Oct-12	\$ 1,655,330	\$ 1,655,330	\$ -		
Nov-12	\$ 1,458,159	\$ 1,458,159	-		
$\operatorname{Dec-12}$	\$ 1,543,807	\$ 1,543,807	-		
Jan-13	\$ 1,596,109	\$ 1,596,109	-		
Feb-13	\$ 1,484,856	\$ 1,484,856	\$		
Mar-13	\$ 1,468,926	\$ 1,468,926	-		

22
23 JACKSON PURCHASE ENERGY CORPORATION
24 ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE REVIEW
25 DEDICATED DELIVERY POINT CUSTOMERS

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
	Big Rivers Electric		·
	Invoice	Service Month	Monthly
	Amount	То	(Over)/Under Recovery
Service	for Service	Retail	(Column (b)
Mo/Yr	Month	Consumer	Less column (c)
Jul-12	\$ 400	\$ 400	-
Aug-12	\$ 962	\$ 962	
Sep-12	\$ 1,104	\$ 1,104	
Oct-12	\$ 1,962	\$ 1,962	
Nov-12	\$ 1,658	\$ 1,658	\$ -
Dec-12	\$ 1,855	\$ 1,855	\$
Jan-13	\$ 1,687	\$ 1,687	\$
Feb-13	\$ 1,511	\$ 1,511	
Mar-13	\$ 1,560	\$ 1,560	

Meade County Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation has no dedicated delivery point customers.

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE MECHANISM
OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION
FOR THE SIX-MONTH BILLING PERIOD ENDING JANUARY 31, 2013
AND THE PASS THROUGH MECHANISM
OF ITS THREE MEMBER DISTRIBUTION COOPERATIVES
CASE NO. 2013-00139

Response to Commission Staff's Initial Request for Information dated May 7, 2013

May 24, 2013

1	Item 3) Refer to Form 2.5, Operating and Maintenance Expenses, for
2	each of the expense months covered by each billing period under review.
3	For each of the expense line items listed on this schedule, explain the
4	reason(s) for any change in the expense levels from month to month if that
5	change is greater than plus or minus 10 percent.
6	
7	Response) Please see the attached schedules of Operating and Maintenance
8	("O&M") expenses, including the requested variance explanations, for the expense
9	months of May 2012 through November 2012. Please note, May 2012 is only being
10	shown for purposes of calculating the variances in the first month of the review
11	period.
12	
13	
14	Witnesses) Nicholas R. Castlen (Schedules of O&M Expenses) and
15	Lawrence V. Baronowsky (Reason(s) for Changes in Expense Levels)
16	

Page 1 of 1

Form 2.5 - Operating and Maintenance Expenses Analysis

Expense Month Billing Month	May-12 Jul-12	Jun-12 Aug-12	Jun-12 vs. May- 12 % Change	Jul-12 Sep-12	Jul-12 vs. Jun-12 % Change	Aug-12 Oct-12	Aug-12 vs. Jul-12 % Change	Sep-12 Nov-12	Sep-12 vs. Aug-12 % Change	Oct-12 Dec-12	Oct-12 vs. Sep-12 % Change	Nov-12 Jan-13	Nov-12 vs. Oct-12 % Change
NOx Plan Anhydrous Ammonia	\$ 151,920	\$ 101,158	-33%	\$ 203,348	101%	\$ 151,461	-26% See Note 1	\$ 144,784	-4% See Note 1	\$ 215,798	49% See Note 1	\$ 203,377	-6% See Note 1
Emulsified Sulphur for NOx Individual Expense Account Items	-	-	See Note 1 See Note 1	-	See Note 1 See Note 1		See Note 1	-	See Note 1 See Note 1 See Note 1	-	See Note 1 See Note 1	-	See Note 1 See Note 1
Individual Expense Account Items Total NOx Plan O&M Expenses	\$ 151,920	\$ 101,158	See Note 1 -33%	\$ 203,348	See Note 1 101%	\$ 151,461	See Note 1 -26%	\$ 144,784		\$ 215,798		\$ 203,377	-6%

SO2 Plan:							T		la 10 1 10		O / 10 C . 10	T	Nov-12 vs. Oct-12
			Jun-12 vs. May-		Jul-12 vs. Jun-12		Aug-12 vs. Jul-12		Sep-12 vs. Aug-12		Oct-12 vs. Sep-12	ł	
Expense Month	May-12	Jun-12	12	Jul-12	% Change	Aug-12	% Change	Sep-12	% Change	Oct-12	% Change	Nov-12	% Change
SO2 Plan Expenses:													
Disposal-Flyash/Bottom Ash/Sludge											0.50/	0 410 040	10/
(See Note 2)	\$ 344,499	\$ 317,113	-8%	\$ 329,917	4%	\$ 362,589	10%	\$ 301,664	-17%	\$ 408,032	35%	\$ 410,943	1%
Off Spec Gypsum	_	-	See Note 1	-	See Note 1	•	See Note 1	-	See Note 1	-	See Note 1	-	See Note 1
Fixation Lime	152,180	144,123	-5%	190.886	32%	172,885	-9%	166,810	-4%	115,931	-31%	141,524	22%
Reagent-Calcium Oxide (landfill	200/200		See Note 1		See Note 1	-	See Note 1	-	See Note 1	-	See Note 1	-	See Note 1
Reagent-Limestone	361.321	380.116	5%	409,943	8%	385,889	-6%	402,057	4%	262,872	-35%	361,954	38%
Reagent-Lime	1,102,422		-5%	1,160,229	11%	1,056,356	-9%	1,002,379	-5%	766,442	-24%	1,077,084	41%
Emulsified Sulphur for SO2		7.078	See Note 1	7,081	0%	-	-100%	7,054	See Note 1	7,134	1%	6,888	-3%
Reagent-DiBasic Acid	97,199	114,593		77,760	-32%	120,452	55%	139,366	16%	78,274	-44%	123,306	58%
Reagent-Sodium BiSulfite for SO2	5,311	22,405	322%	11,041	-51%	-	-100%	-	See Note 1	13,112	See Note 1		-100%
Reagent-Hydroxy Basic Acid	- 0,011		See Note 1	-	See Note 1	-	See Note 1	65,687	See Note 1	11,592	-82%	-	-100%
Total S02 Plan O&M Expenses	*************	############	-2%	#########	8%	##########	-4%	#########	-1%	###########	-20%	<i>###########</i>	28%

SO3 Plan:											·		1
	1	<u> </u>	Jun-12 vs. May-		Jul-12 vs. Jun-12		Aug-12 vs. Jul-12		Sep-12 vs. Aug-12		Oct-12 vs. Sep-12		Nov-12 vs. Oct-12
Expense Month	May-12	Jun-12	12	Jul-12	% Change	Aug-12	% Change	Sep-12	% Change	Oct-12	% Change	Nov-12	% Change
SO3 Plan Expenses:									0.507	A 04.000	0.007	e 00.570	22%
Hydrated Lime - SO3	\$ 36,650	\$ 43,806	20%	\$ 34,450		\$ 29,869	-13%	\$ 19,267	-35%	\$ 24,268		\$ 29,578	
Individual Expense Account Items	-	-	See Note 1	-	See Note 1	-	See Note 1	-	See Note 1	-	See Note 1	-	See Note 1
Individual Expense Account Items	-	-	See Note 1	-	See Note 1	•	See Note 1		See Note 1	-	See Note 1		See Note 1
Total S03 Plan O&M Expenses	\$ 36,650	\$ 43,806	20%	\$ 34,450	-21%	\$ 29,869	-13%	\$ 19,267	-35%	\$ 24,268	26%	\$ 29,578	22%

Note 1: Percentage change not calculated because the cost incurred during the prior expense month was \$0.

Note 2: The monthly totals for Disposal Bottom Ash, Disposal Flyash and Disposal Flyash/Bottom Ash/Sludge have been consolidated due to similarity to better facilitate consistency.

Case No. 2013-00139

Attachment for Response to PSC 1-3

Witnesses: Nicholas R. Castlen and Lawrence V. Baronowsky

Page 1 of 3

Form 2.5 - Operating and Maintenance Expenses Analysis

Variance Explanations:

Variance Explanations:
Anhydrous Amonia:
due to timing of product delivery and invoicing at filvir &L
Aug-12 vs Ji The decrease was due to timing of product delivery and invoicing at Wilson and HMP&L Oct-12 vs Sel The increase was due to timing of product delivery and invoicing at Wilson and HMP&L
Oct-12 vs Sel The increase was due to timing of product delivery and involving at white

Disposal-Flyash/Bottom Ash/Sludge:
Disposal-Fivash/Bottom Ash/Situage. Aug-12 vs Ju Increase due to ash pond dredging at Reid and HMPL along with incressed generation at
Sep-12 vs Ad Decrease due to reduced generation at Greek. Wilson Oct-12 vs Se Increase was due to 6,202 tons more of fly ash/bottom ash were hauled at Coleman in October
Oct-12 vs Se Increase was due to 6,202 tons more of his assistation and the dell company cost at Wilson
due to contractor preference & scheduling and landfill capping cost at Wilson.

Fixation Lin	The increase was due to the increase in generation/fuel burn at Green and High with
	line lead of the Wilson landfill
Oat 12 ve Se	The decrease was due to the decrease in generation/fuel burn at Green and HMP&L along
	till med a ct the Wilson landfill.
N 19 mg C	The increase was due to the increase in generation/fuel burn at Green and HMP&L along with
Nov-12 vs C	operational needs at the Wilson landfill.

3	Se The decrease was due to reduced generation at Wilson and timing of product derivery and invoicing at Wilson and Coleman. Of The increase was due to increased generation at Wilson and Coleman and timing of product
Nov-12 vs	O'The increase was due to increased generation at Wilson and Coleman and timing of product delivery and invoicing at Wilson and Coleman.

Reagent-Lime:	
Teagent-Line.	ase was due to increased generation at Green and HMP&L.
Jul-12 vs Ju The incre	ase was due to increased generation at Croop and HMP&I.
Oct-12 vs Se The decre	ase was due to reduced generation at Green and Time Box
N 10 O The incre	ase was due to increased generation at Green and HMP&L.
Oct-12 vs Se The decre	ase was due to reduced generation at Green and HMP&L. ase was due to increased generation at Green and HMP&L.

Emulsified Sulfur for SO2: Aug-12 vs Ju Emulsified sulfur is ordered on an as needed basis and added in batch based on scrubber chemistry. Chemical was added at HMP&L in August and none was added in July.	eded basis and added in batch based on scrubber &L in August and none was added in July.
---	---

Form 2.5 - Operating and Maintenance Expenses Analysis

Reagent-DiBasic Acid: Jun-12 vs M The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Jul-12 vs Ju The decrease was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Aug-12 vs Ju The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Sep-12 vs A The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Oct-12 vs Se The decrease was due to reduced generation and timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Nov-12 vs O The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Reagent-Sodium BiSulfite for SO2: Jun-12 vs M The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Jul-12 vs Ju The decrease was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Aug-12 vs Ju The decrease was due to stopped feeding SBS in July at Wilson
Jul-12 vs Ju The decrease was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Aug-12 vs Ju The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Sep-12 vs Au The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Oct-12 vs Se The decrease was due to reduced generation and timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Nov-12 vs O The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Reagent-Sodium BiSulfite for SO2: Jun-12 vs M The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Jul-12 vs Ju The decrease was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Jul-12 vs Ju The decrease was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson
Aug-12 vs Ju The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Sep-12 vs Au The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Oct-12 vs Se The decrease was due to reduced generation and timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Nov-12 vs Of The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Reagent-Sodium BiSulfite for SO2: Jun-12 vs M The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Jul-12 vs Ju The decrease was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson
Sep-12 vs Al The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Oct-12 vs Se The decrease was due to reduced generation and timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Nov-12 vs Ol The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Reagent-Sodium BiSulfite for SO2: Jun-12 vs M The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Jul-12 vs Ju The decrease was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Aug. 12 vs Ju The decrease was due to stopped feeding SBS in July at Wilson
Oct-12 vs Se The decrease was due to reduced generation and timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Nov-12 vs O The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Reagent-Sodium BiSulfite for SO2: Jun-12 vs M The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Jul-12 vs Ju The decrease was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Jul-12 vs Ju The decrease was due to stopped feeding SBS in July at Wilson
Nov-12 vs Ol The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Reagent-Sodium BiSulfite for SO2: Jun-12 vs M The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Jul-12 vs Ju The decrease was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Aug. 12 vs Ju The decrease was due to stopped feeding SBS in July at Wilson
Reagent-Sodium BiSulfite for SO2: Jun-12 vs M The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Jul-12 vs Ju The decrease was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Aug. 12 vs Ju The decrease was due to stopped feeding SBS in July at Wilson
Jun-12 vs M The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Jul-12 vs Ju The decrease was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Jul-12 vs Ju The decrease was due to stopped feeding SBS in July at Wilson
Jun-12 vs M The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Jul-12 vs Ju The decrease was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Jul-12 vs Ju The decrease was due to stopped feeding SBS in July at Wilson
Jul-12 vs Ju The decrease was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson Aug. 12 vs Ju The decrease was due to stopped feeding SBS in July at Wilson
Aug. 12 vs. Ju The decrease was due to stopped feeding SBS in July at Wilson
Nov-12 vs O Added chemical at HMP&L in October but none in November.
Reagent-Hydroxy Basic Acid:
Oct-12 vs Se Chemical trial at Wilson during September and October.
Nov-12 vs O Chemical trial at Wilson ended in October.
Hydrated Lime-SO3:
Let 10 we M The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson
Tul 19 ye Jul The decrease was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson
And 12 we full the decrease was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at wilson
Con 12 ye Ay The decrease was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson
Oct 12 us So The ingresse was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson
Nov-12 vs O The increase was due to timing of deliveries and invoicing at Wilson

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR THE SIX-MONTH BILLING PERIOD ENDING JANUARY 31, 2013 AND THE PASS THROUGH MECHANISM OF ITS THREE MEMBER DISTRIBUTION COOPERATIVES CASE NO. 2013-00139

Response to Commission Staff's Initial Request for Information dated May 7, 2013

May 24, 2013

1	Item 4) In its testimony in Case No. 2012-00534, Big Rivers indicated
2	that construction on the projects approved in the 2012 compliance plan
3	was expected to begin in 2013.2 Provide an update on the activity
4	associated with Big Rivers' 2012 compliance plan.
5	
6	Response) Particulate testing that was ordered by the Commission in Case No.
7	2012-00063 has been completed at the Wilson and Green stations. Big Rivers
8	anticipates testing at the Coleman Stations to be complete by early June, 2013.
9	Big Rivers will submit its report to the Commission shortly after that date, as
10	soon as all test data is consolidated. Big Rivers is currently soliciting bids for A/E
11	services for the MATS projects and anticipates awarding a contract by early June,
12	2013. Big Rivers' current schedule projects the equipment specifications will be
13	completed by the end of August, 2013, with construction scheduled to begin on or
14	about September 30, 2013.
15	
16	

17 Witness) Lawrence V. Baronowsky

¹ Case No. 2012-00534, An Examination by the Public Service Commission of the Environmental Surcharge Mechanism of Big Rivers Electric Corporation for the Six-Month Billing Periods Ending January 31, 2012 And July 31, 2012, and the Pass Through Mechanism of its Three Member Distribution Cooperatives, Opening Order issued Dec. 13, 2012.

² Case No. 2012-00534, Direct Testimony of Nicholas R. Castlen on behalf of Big Rivers Electric Corporation, Jackson Purchase Energy Corporation, Kenergy Corp., and Meade County Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation at p. 8, filed Jan. 16, 2013.

ORIGINAL

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF KENTUCKY

In the Matter of:

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC)	
SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE)	
ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE)	
MECHANISM OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC)	Case No.
CORPORATION FOR THE SIX-MONTH)	2013-00139
BILLING PERIOD ENDING JANUARY 31,)	2010-00100
2013 AND THE PASS THROUGH)	
MECHANISM OF ITS THREE MEMBER)	
DISTRIBUTION COOPERATIVES)	

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

NICHOLAS R. CASTLEN

ON BEHALF OF

BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION,
JACKSON PURCHASE ENERGY CORPORATION,
KENERGY CORP., AND
MEADE COUNTY RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORPORATION

FILED: May 24, 2013

1 2 3 4		DIRECT TESTIMONY OF NICHOLAS R. CASTLEN
5	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
6	A.	My name is Nicholas R. Castlen, and my business address is Big Rivers
7		Electric Corporation ("Big Rivers"), 201 Third Street, Henderson, Kentucky,
8		42420. I am a Staff Accountant at Big Rivers.
9	Q.	Please summarize your education and professional experience.
10	A.	I received a Bachelor of Science in Accounting (Magna Cum Laude) from
1		the University of Kentucky in 2006 and a Master of Science in Accounting
12		from the University of Kentucky in 2007. I became a Certified Public
13		Accountant ("CPA") in 2007, receiving the Kentucky Society of CPAs Award
14		of Excellence for achieving the highest score on the Auditing & Attestation
15		section of the uniform CPA exam.
16		Before assuming my current position at Big Rivers, I was a Revenue
17		Accounting Analyst at LG&E and KU Energy LLC from December 2009
18		through April 2012, where I was responsible for various accounting,
19		reporting, and analysis roles for retail and wholesale, electric and gas
20		utility revenues. From January 2006 to December 2009, I was employed by
21		PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP as an Audit and Assurance Associate.
22	Q.	Please summarize your duties at Big Rivers.
23	A.	My primary responsibilities at Big Rivers include the Company's monthly
24		Fuel Adjustment Clause (Form A) and Environmental Surcharge filings.

1		accounting for the Company's Non-Fuel Adjustment Clause Purchased
2		Power Adjustment and Unwind Surcredit rate mechanisms, accounting for
3		the Company's various debt obligations, and ensuring compliance with its
4		debt covenants.
5	Q.	Have you previously testified before the Kentucky Public Service
6		Commission ("Commission")?
7	A.	Yes. I provided testimony and responses to data requests in Case No. 2012-
8		00534, and provided responses to data requests in Case No. 2012-00555.
9	Q.	On whose behalf are you filing this testimony?
10	A.	I am filing this testimony on behalf of Big Rivers and its three member
11		distribution cooperatives, Jackson Purchase Energy Corporation ("JPEC"),
12		Kenergy Corp. ("Kenergy"), and Meade County Rural Electric Cooperative
13		Corporation ("Meade County") (collectively, "the Members").
14	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?
15	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to describe the application of Big Rivers'
16		environmental surcharge mechanism as billed from August 1, 2012 through
17		January 31, 2013 (which corresponds to the expense months of June 2012
18		through November 2012). Additionally, I have coordinated with Big Rivers'
19		Members in the preparation of this testimony and prepared responses to the
20		Commission Staff's First Request for Information ("Commission's Initial
21		Requests") that accompany this testimony.

This testimony also includes information the Members have provided

22

me in support of their pass-through mechanisms that are also under review in this proceeding and that the Members use to pass through, to their retail members, the costs Big Rivers charges to them under Big Rivers' environmental surcharge mechanism. The review period for the Members' pass-through mechanisms that corresponds to the August 1, 2012 through January 31, 2013 billing period for Big Rivers' environmental surcharge mechanism are the billing months of September 2012 through February 2013 for non-dedicated delivery point customers (*i.e.*, there is a one-month lag for non-dedicated delivery point customers), and August 2012 through January 2013 for dedicated delivery point customers (*i.e.*, there is no billing lag for dedicated delivery point customers).

Α.

- Q. Please provide a brief overview of Big Rivers' environmental
 surcharge mechanism.
 - Big Rivers' environmental surcharge mechanism was approved by the Commission by Order dated June 25, 2008, in Case No. 2007-00460, which was part of the transaction that unwound Big Rivers' 1998 lease with E.ON U.S. LLC and its affiliates (the "Unwind Transaction") and that the Commission approved by its Order dated March 6, 2009, in Case No. 2007-00455. Big Rivers' environmental surcharge went into effect immediately following the July 16, 2009, closing of the Unwind Transaction for service commencing July 17, 2009.

Big Rivers' environmental compliance plan approved by the

Commission in Case No. 2007-00460 (the "2007 Plan") consists of a program and the costs associated with controlling each of sulfur dioxide (" SO_2 "), nitrogen oxide (" NO_X "), and sulfur trioxide (" SO_3 "). The environmental surcharge costs Big Rivers may recover under KRS 278.183, and its environmental compliance plan, include reagent costs, sludge and ash disposal costs, and allowance costs.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

For the SO₂ program, Big Rivers recovers through its environmental surcharge mechanism the costs of reagents, the costs for the disposal of coal combustion byproducts (fly ash, bottom ash, and scrubber sludge), and the costs of purchasing SO₂ emission allowances. For the NO_X program, Big Rivers recovers the costs of reagents and the costs of purchasing additional NO_X emission allowances as needed. For the SO₃ program, Big Rivers recovers the costs of a reagent. Due to generating unit design and Big Rivers' compliance plan, no Big Rivers generating unit utilizes all the same reagents. Depending on the unit facilities, various reagents are used to treat the flue gas, thereby removing the three targeted emissions. The SO₂ reagents are comprised of emulsified sulfur, lime, fixation lime, limestone, dibasic acid, and sodium bisulfite. The NO_X reagents are comprised of anhydrous ammonia and emulsified sulfur. The SO₃ reagent is comprised of lime hydrate. Note that the 2007 Plan included only operating and maintenance ("O&M") costs.

In its Order dated October 1, 2012, in Case No. 2012-00063, the

Commission approved certain additions to the 2007 Plan relating to the
Mercury and Air Toxics Standards rule. The additions (the "2012 Plan")
involve installing activated carbon injection and dry sorbent injection
systems and emission control monitors at the Big Rivers Coleman, Wilson,
and Green generating stations; and installing emission control monitors at
Henderson Municipal Henderson & Light's Station Two generation station.
The 2012 Plan includes both the capital and O&M associated with the
projects, as well as recovery of Big Rivers' actual costs incurred in Case No.
2012-00063 (amortized over three years).

A.

Big Rivers' environmental surcharge mechanism allows Big Rivers to recover costs related to the 2007 Plan (which only includes O&M costs) and the 2012 Plan, less proceeds from by-product and emission allowance sales, plus or minus an ongoing cumulative over- or under-recovery adjustment.

- Q. Please provide a brief overview of the Members' pass-through mechanisms.
 - The Members' pass-through mechanisms allow each Member to bill its retail customers for the portion of Big Rivers' environmental surcharge that Big Rivers bills each Member. JPEC's pass-through mechanism was approved by the Commission in Case No. 2008-00010; Kenergy's mechanism was approved by the Commission in Case No. 2008-00009; and Meade County's was approved by the Commission in Case No. 2007-00470.
- Q. Have there been any changes to Big Rivers' environmental

1	surcharge	mechanism	since	the	prior	review	in	addition	to	those
---	-----------	-----------	-------	-----	-------	--------	----	----------	----	-------

- 2 described above?
- 3 A. The only changes to Big Rivers' environmental surcharge mechanism were
- 4 those approved by the Commission in Case No. 2012-00063. In addition to
- 5 the changes described, other notable changes approved in Case No. 2012-
- 6 00063 include a rate of return on capital expenditures associated with the
- 7 2012 Plan and allocating environmental surcharge costs based on a rolling
- 8 12-month average of Total Adjusted Revenues rather than on a kWh basis.
- As illustrated in the attachment to the response for Item 1 of the
- 10 Commission's Initial Requests, these changes were implemented beginning
- with the September 2012 expense month.
- 12 Q. Has Big Rivers sold any SO₂ or NO_x allowances during the expense
- months corresponding to the billing periods under review in this
- 14 case?
- 15 A. No. Big Rivers has not sold any SO₂ or NO_X allowances during the expense
- months corresponding to the billing periods under review in this case.
- 17 Q. Has Big Rivers' environmental surcharge mechanism been
- accurately compiled, and is it operating as intended?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Have the Members' pass-through mechanisms been accurately
- compiled, and are they operating as intended?
- 22 A. The Members believe their pass-through mechanisms have been accurately

4	• • • • • •	1					1 1
l .	compulad	and	OTO	operating	20	inton	ሰለለ
1	complied	anu	arc	operanne	as	TITIETI	ucu.

- 2 Q. Are the amounts charged under Big Rivers' environmental
- 3 surcharge mechanism during the review period just and
- 4 reasonable?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Are the amounts charged under the Members' pass-through
- 7 mechanisms during the review period just and reasonable?
- 8 A. The Members believe the amounts charged under their pass-through
- 9 mechanisms are just and reasonable.
- 10 Q. Do Big Rivers and its Members have additional over- or under-
- 11 recovery amounts they believe need to be recognized?
- 12 A. No. Big Rivers and its Members are not requesting any additional over- or
- under-recovery amount. The normal over/under recovery carry-forward
- element of Big Rivers' environmental surcharge mechanism is operating as
- intended.
- 16 Q. Does Big Rivers currently recover any capital costs through its
- 17 environmental surcharge mechanism?
- 18 A. No. Big Rivers does not currently recover any capital costs through the
- 19 environmental surcharge mechanism. However, Big Rivers will begin
- recovering capital costs associated with the 2012 Plan, consistent with the
- 21 approvals granted in Case No. 2012-00063, once construction on the
- 22 approved projects begin. Construction for approved projects is expected to

- 1 begin in 2013.
- 2 Q. What Base Environmental Surcharge Factor ("BESF") cost did Big
- 3 Rivers use during the review period?
- 4 A. Big Rivers had no environmental surcharge related costs in its base rates
- 5 during the review period.
- 6 Q. Is Big Rivers proposing to change the BESF cost as part of this
- 7 proceeding?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 10 A. Yes, it does.