

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION OF CLARK)	
ENERGY COOPERATIVE, INC. FOR PASS-)	CASE NO.
THROUGH OF EAST KENTUCKY POWER)	2021-00106
COOPERATIVE, INC. WHOLESALE RATE)	
ADJUSTMENT)	

ORDER

On April 1, 2021, Clark Energy Cooperative, Inc. (Clark Energy) filed an application to pass through any wholesale rate adjustment granted to East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. (EKPC) in Case No. 2021-00103¹ pursuant to KRS 278.455(2) and 807 KAR 5:007. On July 30, 2021, Clark Energy filed a revised schedule of proposed rates for its pass-through of EKPC's wholesale rate adjustment based upon the Stipulation, Settlement Agreement and Recommendation filed in Case No. 2021-00103.

There are no intervenors in this proceeding. By Order entered April 15, 2021, Clark Energy's proposed rates were suspended up to and including October 5, 2021. Clark Energy responded to two requests for information from Commission Staff. This matter now stands submitted for a decision.

LEGAL STANDARD

The review of Clark Energy's application is governed by KRS 278.455, which provides that authorized increases and decreases in a generation and transmission

¹ Case No. 2021-00103, *Electronic Application of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. for a General Adjustment of Rates, Approval of Depreciation Study, Amortization of Certain Regulatory Assets, and Other General Relief* (filed Apr. 6, 2021).

(G&T) cooperative's rates may be flowed through to the customers of a distribution cooperative. Specifically, KRS 278.455(2) states, in relevant part, that an authorized increase or decrease in a G&T cooperative's rates:

[M]ay, at the distribution cooperative's discretion, be allocated to each class and within each tariff on a proportional basis that will result in no change in the rate design currently in effect. In the event of an increase in the wholesale rates and tariffs of the wholesale supplier by the Public Service Commission, the rates and tariffs of the distribution cooperative that have been revised on a proportional basis to result in no change in the rate design shall be authorized and shall become effective on the same date as those of the wholesale supplier.

The review of Clark Energy's application is also governed by Commission regulation 807 KAR 5:007, which establishes the filing and notice requirements for a distribution cooperative when rates change to reflect a change in the rates of its wholesale supplier. Specifically, pursuant to 807 KAR 5:007, Section 1(3) and Section 2(2), Clark Energy is one of the 16 owner-member cooperatives of EKPC, and in accordance with KRS 278.455, Clark Energy seeks to pass-through the increase in EKPC's wholesale rates. In accordance with 807 KAR 5:007, Sections 1(4), 2(1), and 2(2), Clark Energy included with its application proposed tariffs, a comparison of current and proposed rates, and a billing analysis to demonstrate that the rate change does not alter the rate design currently in effect and the revenue change has been allocated to each class and within each tariff on a proportional basis.

BACKGROUND

Clark Energy is a not-for-profit, member-owned, rural electric distribution cooperative organized under KRS Chapter 279. Clark Energy is engaged in the business of distribution retail electric power to 27,201 members in Bath, Bourbon, Clark, Estill,

Fayette, Madison, Menifee, Montgomery, Morgan, Powell, and Rowan counties, Kentucky.² Clark Energy does not own any electric generating facilities and is one of the 16-member cooperatives that own and receive wholesale power from EKPC. Clark Energy's last general rate adjustment was effective August 11, 2020, in Case No. 2020-00104.³

PROPOSED PASS-THROUGH RATE ADJUSTMENT

Clark Energy proposed to pass through EKPC's proposed wholesale rate increase based upon the 2019 billing information for each rate class in Clark Energy's Commission-approved tariffs. Clark Energy choose 2019 because it corresponds to the 2019 test period used by EKPC in Case No. 2021-00103.⁴ After adjustments for riders, billing adjustments, and other non-base-rate billing items,⁵ Clark Energy allocated EKPC's revenue increase first to each rate class and then to the individual base rate billing components of each class in order to maintain the current rate design in effect.⁶ Except for retail members served under a special electric contract, no distinctions were made between retail rate classes taking service under EKPC's different wholesale rate classes. For special electric contracts, the retail rate increases were determined using specific

² *Annual Report of Clark Energy to the Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Kentucky for the Calendar Year Ended December 31, 2020* at 45 and 53.

³ Case No. 2020-00104, *Electronic Application of Clark Energy Cooperative, Inc. for a General Adjustment of Rates Pursuant to Streamlined Procedure Pilot Program Established in Case No. 2018-00407* (Ky. PSC Aug. 11, 2020).

⁴ Application, Exhibit 6, Direct Testimony of John Wolfram (Wolfram Testimony) at 3.

⁵ These limited adjustments include a base energy charge adjustment due to a Commission-approved Fuel Adjustment Clause roll-in effective February 1, 2020, and a few large commercial or industrial retail members who either switched rates or received revised contract demand amounts since 2019. Wolfram Testimony at 4.

⁶ Wolfram Testimony at 3.

data provided by EKPC and is consistent with the treatment applied to these particular classes in EKPC's last rate case, Case No. 2010-00167.⁷ For vacant rate classes, if the per-unit charges were identical to another existing rate class, the per-unit charge applied was equivalent.⁸ Otherwise, a vacant rate classes' increase to each per-unit charge was the same percentage as the overall base rate increase for Clark Energy.⁹

Clark Energy stated that it considered the recent Commission Order in Case No. 2020-00095¹⁰ (Kenergy Order), where the Commission clarified "proportional" in light of the language contained in KRS 278.455(2).¹¹ The Commission explained that proportional increases should result in an increase that would avoid undoing any past rate design and avoid distorting the current rate design while maintaining the spirit of the regulation.¹² The Commission stated the revenue generated from each class and each of the class's rate components must continue to contribute in the same proportion to the total distribution cooperative revenue.¹³ To accomplish this, the Commission explained that each class's revenue contribution percentage should be determined based upon the most recent Commission-approved revenue allocation. The revenue contribution

⁷ *Id.* at 9. Case No. 2010-00167, *Application of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. for General Adjustment of Electric Rates* (Ky. PSC Jan. 14, 2011).

⁸ Wolfram Testimony at 9.

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ Case No. 2020-00095, *Electronic Application of Kenergy Corp. for a Declaratory Order* (Ky. PSC Mar. 11, 2021).

¹¹ *Id.* at 4.

¹² Kenergy Order at 7.

¹³ *Id.*

percentage is then applied to the total of the distribution cooperative's portion of the G&T increase.¹⁴

Clark Energy stated that the proposed rates were originally calculated based on the allocations from the last rate Order, but asserted that the Kenergy Order method produced self-evidently unreasonable results if the last approved revenue allocation was not consistent with the test year.¹⁵ Clark Energy argued that due to changes in the customers mix within the rate calculation, specifically for those rates with a three-part rate design, the demand charge could actually decrease leading to the conclusion that it would be unreasonable to pass-through a wholesale increase in such a manner.¹⁶ Thus, the pass-through was allocated consistent with the method approved in the pass-through filings for EKPC's last two rate cases so not to run afoul of the proportionality standard in KRS 278.455(2).¹⁷ Clark Energy further argued that although the Kenergy Order stated that any revenue distortions could be addressed through subsequent rate filings by a distribution cooperative, near-simultaneous rate cases would be filed due to the possible skewing effect between retail customer classes and such a result would be inconsistent with the enactment of KRS 278.455, where the intent is to avoid the need for each distribution cooperative to file a rate case.¹⁸

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ Wolfram Testimony at 4–5.

¹⁶ *Id.* at 5 and Clark Energy's Response to Commission Staff's First Request for Information (Staff's First Request) (filed May 26, 2021), Item 2.

¹⁷ Wolfram Testimony at 5–6.

¹⁸ *Id.* at 8.

DISCUSSION

Based upon the case record and being otherwise sufficiently advised, the Commission finds that, due to the \$36,355,254 annualized increase in EKPC's wholesale rates for service rendered on and after October 1, 2021, that was approved by the Commission in Case No. 2021-00103, Clark Energy's request for approval of a pass-through rate increase pursuant to KRS 278.455(2) should be approved.

The Commission further finds that, based on sufficient evidence in the case records, Clark Energy met its burden of proof, in accordance with KRS 278.455(2), that the rate change does not alter the rate design currently in effect and that the revenue change has been allocated to each class and with each tariff on a proportional basis. This finding is based upon the Commission's review of the approach proposed by Clark Energy to pass-through the increase of EKPC's wholesale rates and the allocation of such increase to its retail rates. The Commission recognizes the concern over using the last approved revenue allocation, especially given the anomalous results that are especially present in those distribution cooperatives that have not filed for a general rate increase for a substantial time.¹⁹ In the Kenergy Order, the Commission expressed its concern that rate increases, particularly revenue neutral increases, may result in a change of revenue allocation due to the change in rate design. For example, if a distribution cooperative proposes a revenue neutral rate design based upon a test year that differs from a Commission-approved test year, the class revenue allocation may differ, thus

¹⁹ For example, the last general rate increase for Salt River Electric Cooperative (Salt River Electric) was September 28, 1993, hence the necessary information needed to obtain the appropriate revenue allocation was not readily available. See Case No. 2021-00116, *Electronic Application of Salt River Electric Cooperative Corporation for Pass-Through of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. Wholesale Rate Adjustment*, Salt River Electric's Response to Commission Staff's First Request for Information (filed May 26, 2021), Items 3 and 4.

altering the approved allocation and rate design. For Clark Energy, the Kenergy Order method did produce reasonable results as the test year for Clark Energy's last rate filing is the same as the instant case; hence, the results of the Kenergy Order and the preset test-year allocation method are identical.²⁰ Based upon this review, the Commission finds that Clark Energy's approach complies with the provisions of KRS 278.455(2) and 807 KAR 5:007, Section 2(2), and therefore should be accepted. However, any revenue neutral case filed as a general rate case or under the Commission -approved streamlined process in Case No. 2018-00407²¹ will apply the methodology outlined in the Kenergy Order.

In reviewing Clark Energy's proposed revenue increase allocation under the settlement, the Commission notes that the proposed increase, \$1,604,082, differs from the \$1,603,808 increase allocated to Clark Energy by EKPC.²² Clark Energy maintained that EKPC calculated member system rates on a wholesale rate class basis, and not by member system, while Clark Energy's pass-through exhibit was prepared individually.²³ Clark Energy further maintained that the difference was due to rounding and calculation of the fuel adjustment charge and environmental surcharge, and was negligible.²⁴ In its response, Clark Energy did not provide adequate support to explain why the proposed increase for the member system differed from EKPC's calculation. While rounding errors

²⁰ Wolfram Testimony at 5.

²¹ Case No. 2018-00407, *A Review of the Rate Case Procedure for Electric Distribution Cooperatives* (Ky. PSC Dec. 20. 20219).

²² Clark Energy's Response to Commission Staff's Third Request for Information (filed Sept. 17, 2021), Item 1.

²³ *Id.*

²⁴ *Id.*

may occur in rate design, the Commission expects Clark Energy to explain and support why inputs differ between the wholesale provider and the member system.²⁵

Based upon the Commission's authorization of a \$36,355,254 million annualized increase in EKPC's wholesale rates effective for service rendered on and after October 1, 2021, Clark Energy's wholesale power cost will increase by \$1,510,903, or 4.9 percent, annually.²⁶ Furthermore, based upon Clark Energy's proposed pass-through analysis as filed on July 30, 2021, the Commission will maintain the dollar denominated differences between the estimated wholesale increase and member system increase in the determination of the rates.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. The rates and charges proposed by Clark Energy are denied.
2. The approach proposed by Clark Energy to allocate its portion of the increase in wholesale rates authorized in Case No. 2021-00103 is accepted.
3. The rates and charges in Appendix B, attached hereto, are fair, just and reasonable for Clark Energy to charge for service rendered on and after October 1, 2021.
4. Within 20 days of the date of this Order, Clark Energy shall file with the Commission, using the Commission's electronic Tariff Filing System, its revised tariffs as set forth in this Order reflecting that they were approved pursuant to this Order.

²⁵ For example, there is a billing determinant difference between the special contract rate for Owen Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Owen Electric) and EKPC which results in differing revenues. See Case No. 2021-00115, *Electronic Application of Owen Electric Cooperative, Inc. for Pass-Through of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc.'s Wholesale Rate Adjustment*, Owen Electric's Notice of Filing (filed July 30, 2021), Owen Electric filed Revised Exhibits of the proposed rates for the a pass-through of EKPC's wholesale rate adjustment, Staff 1-5-Owen-Settle-v2.xlsx and Case No. 2021-00103, *EKPC*, EKPC's Response to Commission Staff's Post-Hearing Requests for Information (filed Aug. 18, 2021), Item 10.

²⁶ See Appendix A.

5. This case is closed and removed from this Commission's docket.

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

By the Commission



ATTEST:


Executive Director

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX TO AN ORDER OF THE KENTUCKY PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION IN CASE NO. 2021-00106 DATED SEP 30 2021

Rate B				
EKPC Member	Present	Final	Change	As Percent
Big Sandy	\$ 341,987	\$ 350,744	\$ 8,757	2.6%
Blue Grass	\$ 10,757,845	\$ 11,035,263	\$ 277,418	2.6%
Clark	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Cumberland Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Farmers	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Fleming-Mason	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Grayson	\$ 1,733,635	\$ 1,778,438	\$ 44,803	2.6%
Inter-County	\$ 3,853,087	\$ 3,952,115	\$ 99,029	2.6%
Jackson	\$ 3,261,843	\$ 3,345,035	\$ 83,192	2.6%
Licking Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Nolin	\$ 1,546,266	\$ 1,587,786	\$ 41,520	2.7%
Owen	\$ 15,691,907	\$ 16,113,009	\$ 421,101	2.7%
Salt River	\$ 7,849,642	\$ 8,048,401	\$ 198,759	2.5%
Shelby	\$ 9,959,655	\$ 10,210,443	\$ 250,788	2.5%
South Ky	\$ 3,987,957	\$ 4,089,565	\$ 101,608	2.5%
Taylor	\$ 831,893	\$ 853,592	\$ 21,699	2.6%
Total	\$ 59,815,719	\$ 61,364,392	\$ 1,548,673	2.6%

Rate C				
EKPC Member	Present	Final	Change	As Percent
Big Sandy	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Blue Grass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Clark	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Cumberland Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Farmers	\$ 2,875,951	\$ 2,951,756	\$ 75,804	2.6%
Fleming-Mason	\$ 7,135,643	\$ 7,323,237	\$ 187,594	2.6%
Grayson	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Inter-County	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Jackson	\$ 1,001,698	\$ 1,027,537	\$ 25,839	2.6%
Licking Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Nolin	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Owen	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Salt River	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Shelby	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
South Ky	\$ 5,690,287	\$ 5,841,773	\$ 151,486	2.7%
Taylor	\$ 449,732	\$ 461,248	\$ 11,516	2.6%
	\$ 17,153,311	\$ 17,605,550	\$ 452,238	2.6%

Rate E				
EKPC Member	Present	Final	Change	As Percent
Big Sandy	\$ 15,194,682	\$ 15,929,940	\$ 735,258	4.8%
Blue Grass	\$ 75,472,253	\$ 79,160,079	\$ 3,687,826	4.9%
Clark	\$ 31,113,089	\$ 32,623,992	\$ 1,510,903	4.9%
Cumberland Valley	\$ 29,974,144	\$ 31,421,531	\$ 1,447,387	4.8%
Farmers	\$ 31,649,009	\$ 33,198,129	\$ 1,549,120	4.9%
Fleming-Mason	\$ 30,724,488	\$ 32,207,720	\$ 1,483,231	4.8%
Grayson	\$ 15,892,923	\$ 16,660,933	\$ 768,010	4.8%
Inter-County	\$ 29,674,742	\$ 31,124,764	\$ 1,450,022	4.9%
Jackson	\$ 58,279,094	\$ 61,105,989	\$ 2,826,895	4.9%
Licking Valley	\$ 17,298,143	\$ 18,132,437	\$ 834,294	4.8%
Nolin	\$ 43,686,325	\$ 45,822,867	\$ 2,136,542	4.9%
Owen	\$ 74,903,441	\$ 78,540,230	\$ 3,636,790	4.9%
Salt River	\$ 75,530,233	\$ 79,217,543	\$ 3,687,310	4.9%
Shelby	\$ 23,218,841	\$ 24,344,807	\$ 1,125,966	4.8%
South Ky	\$ 79,696,530	\$ 83,594,165	\$ 3,897,636	4.9%
Taylor	\$ 31,773,345	\$ 33,322,474	\$ 1,549,129	4.9%
	\$ 664,081,280	\$ 696,407,599	\$ 32,326,319	4.9%

Rate G				
EKPC Member	Present	Final	Change	As Percent
Big Sandy	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Blue Grass	\$ 5,730,294	\$ 5,874,687	\$ 144,393	2.5%
Clark	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Cumberland Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Farmers	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Fleming-Mason	\$ 13,625,132	\$ 13,976,173	\$ 351,041	2.6%
Grayson	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Inter-County	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Jackson	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Licking Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Nolin	\$ 6,160,848	\$ 6,328,734	\$ 167,886	2.7%
Owen	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Salt River	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Shelby	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
South Ky	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Taylor	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	\$ 25,516,274	\$ 26,179,595	\$ 663,320	2.6%

Contract				
EKPC Member	Present	Final	Change	As Percent
Big Sandy	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Blue Grass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Clark	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Cumberland Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Farmers	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Fleming-Mason	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Grayson	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Inter-County	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Jackson	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Licking Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Nolin	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Owen	\$ 41,786,791	\$ 42,872,821	\$ 1,086,030	2.6%
Salt River	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Shelby	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
South Ky	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Taylor	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	\$ 41,786,791	\$ 42,872,821	\$ 1,086,030	2.6%

Steam				
EKPC Member	Present	Final	Change	As Percent
Big Sandy	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Blue Grass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Clark	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Cumberland Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Farmers	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Fleming-Mason	\$ 10,716,264	\$ 10,994,937	\$ 278,674	2.6%
Grayson	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Inter-County	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Jackson	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Licking Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Nolin	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Owen	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Salt River	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Shelby	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
South Ky	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Taylor	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	\$ 10,716,264	\$ 10,994,937	\$ 278,674	2.6%

Rate TGP				
EKPC Member	Present	Final	Change	As Percent
Big Sandy	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Blue Grass	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Clark	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Cumberland Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Farmers	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Fleming-Mason	\$ 3,422,394	\$ 3,422,394	\$ -	0.0%
Grayson	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Inter-County	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Jackson	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Licking Valley	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Nolin	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Owen	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Salt River	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Shelby	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
South Ky	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Taylor	\$ 2,927,454	\$ 2,927,454	\$ -	0.0%
	\$ 6,349,849	\$ 6,349,849	\$ -	0.0%

Total				
EKPC Member	Present	Final	Change	As Percent
Big Sandy	\$ 15,536,669	\$ 16,280,684	\$ 744,015	4.8%
Blue Grass	\$ 91,960,392	\$ 96,070,029	\$ 4,109,637	4.5%
Clark	\$ 31,113,089	\$ 32,623,992	\$ 1,510,903	4.9%
Cumberland Valley	\$ 29,974,144	\$ 31,421,531	\$ 1,447,387	4.8%
Farmers	\$ 34,524,960	\$ 36,149,884	\$ 1,624,924	4.7%
Fleming-Mason	\$ 65,623,921	\$ 67,924,461	\$ 2,300,540	3.5%
Grayson	\$ 17,626,559	\$ 18,439,371	\$ 812,813	4.6%
Inter-County	\$ 33,527,829	\$ 35,076,879	\$ 1,549,051	4.6%
Jackson	\$ 62,542,635	\$ 65,478,561	\$ 2,935,926	4.7%
Licking Valley	\$ 17,298,143	\$ 18,132,437	\$ 834,294	4.8%
Nolin	\$ 51,393,440	\$ 53,739,387	\$ 2,345,948	4.6%
Owen	\$ 132,382,139	\$ 137,526,060	\$ 5,143,921	3.9%
Salt River	\$ 83,379,874	\$ 87,265,943	\$ 3,886,069	4.7%
Shelby	\$ 33,178,496	\$ 34,555,250	\$ 1,376,754	4.1%
South Ky	\$ 89,374,774	\$ 93,525,503	\$ 4,150,730	4.6%
Taylor	\$ 35,982,424	\$ 37,564,768	\$ 1,582,344	4.4%
	\$ 825,419,487	\$ 861,774,741	\$ 36,355,254	4.4%

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX TO AN ORDER OF THE KENTUCKY PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION IN CASE NO. 2021-00106 DATED SEP 30 2021

The following rates and charges are prescribed for the customers served by Clark Energy. All other rates and charges not specifically mentioned herein shall remain the same as those in effect under the authority of this Commission prior to the effective date of this Order.

SCHEDULE R

Residential

Facility Charge per month	\$ 18.62
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.08945

PREPAY SERVICE RIDER

Residential

Facility Charge per month	\$ 18.62 (\$0.621/day)
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.08945
Prepay Service Fee	\$ 5.00 (\$0.167/day)

SCHEDULE D

Time of Use Marketing Service

Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.06478
-----------------------	------------

SCHEDULE C

General Power Service < 50kW

Facility Charge Single Phase per month	\$ 26.20
Facility Charge Three Phase per month	\$ 51.85
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.09798

SCHEDULE E

Public Facilities

Facility Charge per month	\$ 18.62
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.09852

SCHEDULE L
General Power Service 50-500 kW

Facility Charge per month	\$ 65.99
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.06951
Demand Charge per kW	\$ 6.69

SCHEDULE M
General Power Service 1000-5000 kW

Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.06252
Demand Charge per kW	\$ 10.41

SCHEDULE P
General Power Service 500+ kW

Facility Charge per month	\$ 89.85
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.05900
Demand Charge per kW	\$ 6.42

SCHEDULE B-1
Large industrial Rate 500+ kW

Facility Charge per month	\$ 868.72
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.050656
Demand Charge	
Contract Demand per kW	\$ 7.41
Excess of Contract Demand per kW	\$ 10.32

SCHEDULE T
Outdoor Lights

400 Watt	\$ 17.61
----------	----------

SCHEDULE S
Outdoor Lights

175 Watt	\$ 9.66
----------	---------

SCHEDULE O
LED Outdoor Lighting

Open Bottom Light	4,800 - 6,800 Lumens	\$ 9.81
Cobra Head Light	7,200 - 10,000 Lumens	\$ 15.10
Directional Flood Light	15,000 - 18,000 Lumens	\$ 22.56
Ornamental Light w/Pole	4,800 - 6,800 Lumens	\$ 20.87
Additional Pole (30' Wood / if no existing pole available)		\$ 5.73

*L Allyson Honaker
Goss Samford, PLLC
2365 Harrodsburg Road, Suite B325
Lexington, KENTUCKY 40504

*David S Samford
Goss Samford, PLLC
2365 Harrodsburg Road, Suite B325
Lexington, KENTUCKY 40504

*Clark Energy Cooperative, Inc.
2640 Ironworks Road
P. O. Box 748
Winchester, KY 40392-0748