

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION OF OWEN)	
ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC. FOR PASS-)	CASE NO.
THROUGH OF EAST KENTUCKY POWER)	2021-00115
COOPERATIVE, INC. WHOLESALE RATE)	
ADJUSTMENT)	

ORDER

On April 1, 2021, Owen Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Owen Electric) 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, Owen Electric 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.

Nucor Steel Gallatin is the only intervenor in this proceeding. By Order entered April 15, 2021, Owen Electric's proposed rates were suspended up to and including October 5, 2021. Owen Electric responded to three requests for information from Commission Staff. This matter now stands submitted for a decision.

LEGAL STANDARD

The review of Owen Electric'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 Owen Electric'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), Owen Electric is one of the 16 owner-member cooperatives of EKPC, and in accordance with KRS 278.455, Owen Electric 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), Owen Electric 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

Owen Electric is a not-for-profit, member-owned, rural electric distribution cooperative organized under KRS Chapter 279. Owen Electric is engaged in the business of distribution retail electric power to 62,563 members in Boone, Campbell,

Carroll, Gallatin, Grant, Kenton, Owen, Pendleton, and Scott counties, Kentucky.² Owen Electric does not own any electric generating facilities and is one of the 16-member cooperatives that own and receive wholesale power from EKPC. Owen Electric's last general rate adjustment was effective August 30, 2013, in Case No. 2012-00448.³

PROPOSED PASS-THROUGH RATE ADJUSTMENT

Owen Electric proposed to pass through EKPC's proposed wholesale rate increase based upon the 2019 billing information for each rate class in Owen Electric's Commission-approved tariffs. Owen Electric 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 Owen Electric 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 data provided by EKPC and is consistent with the treatment applied to these

² *Annual Report of Owen Electric Cooperative, Inc. to the Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Kentucky for the Calendar Year Ended December 31, 2019* at 45 and 53.

³ Case No. 2012-00448, *Application of Owen Electric Cooperative, Inc. for an Adjustment of Rates* (Ky. PSC Aug. 30, 2013).

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.

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 Owen Electric.⁹

Owen Electric 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

Owen Electric 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 Owen Electric 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 Owen Electric 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 Owen Electric'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 million 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, Owen Electric'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, Owen Electric 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 Owen Electric 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

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.

differ, thus altering the approved allocation and rate design. Based upon this review, the Commission finds that Owen Electric's approach complies with the provisions of KR 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. 2018-00407²⁰ will apply the methodology outlined in the Kenergy Order.

In reviewing Owen Electric's proposed revenue increase allocation under the settlement, the Commission notes that the proposed increase, \$5,302,439, differs from the \$5,367,547 increase allocated to Owen by EKPC.²¹ Owen Electric maintained that EKPC calculated member system rates on a wholesale rate class basis, and not by member system, while Owen Electric's pass-through exhibit was prepared individually.²² Owen Electric further maintained that the difference was due to rounding and calculation of the fuel adjustment charge and environmental surcharge, and was negligible.²³ In its response, Owen Electric did not provide adequate support to explain why the proposed increase for the member system differed from EKPC's calculation. While rounding errors may occur in rate design, the Commission expects Owen Electric to explain and support why inputs differ between the wholesale provider and the member system.²⁴

²⁰ Case No. 2018-00407, *A Review of the Rate Case Procedure for Electric Distribution Cooperatives* (Ky. PSC Dec. 20. 2019).

²¹ Owen Electric's Response to Commission Staff's Third Request for Information (filed Sept. 17, 2021), Item 1.

²² *Id.*

²³ *Id.*

²⁴ For example, there is a billing determinant difference between the special contract rate for Owen Electric and EKPC which results in differing revenues. See 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

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, Owen Electric's wholesale power cost will increase by \$5,143,921, or 3.9 percent, annually.²⁵ Furthermore, based upon Owen Electric'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 Owen Electric are denied.
2. The approach proposed by Owen Electric 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 Owen Electric to charge for service rendered on and after October 1, 2021.
4. Within 20 days of the date of this Order, Owen Electric 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 Oder.
5. This case is closed and removed from this Commission's docket.

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.

²⁵ See Appendix A.

By the Commission



ATTEST:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Linda C. Lindwell". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line underneath it.

Executive Director

Case No. 2021-00115

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX TO AN ORDER OF THE KENTUCKY PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION IN CASE NO. 2021-00115 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. 2021-00115 DATED SEP 30 2021

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

SCHEDULE I
FARM AND HOME

Customer Charge	\$ 20.67
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.08362

SCHEDULE 1-D
FARM AND HOME INCLINING BLOCK

Customer Charge	\$ 16.31
Energy Charge per kWh (0-300 kWh)	\$ 0.06608
Energy Charge per kWh (301-500 kWh)	\$ 0.08934
Energy Charge per kWh (over 500 kWh)	\$ 0.12035

SCHEDULE I
SMALL COMMERCIAL

Customer Charge	\$ 25.84
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.08509

SCHEDULE II
LARGE POWER

Customer Charge	\$ 22.03
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.06301
Demand Charge per kW	\$ 6.34

SCHEDULE VIII
LARGE INDUSTRIAL RATE LPC1 (1,000-2,499 kW)

Customer Charge	\$1,573.12
Energy Charge per kWh first 425	\$ 0.04701

Energy Charge per kWh over 425	\$	0.04324
Demand Charge per kW	\$	7.49

SCHEDULE IX
LARGE INDUSTRIAL RATE LPC2 (5,000+ kW)

Customer Charge		\$3,136.91
Energy Charge per kWh first 425	\$	0.04174
Energy Charge per kWh over 425	\$	0.04084
Demand Charge per kW	\$	7.47

SCHEDULE X
LARGE INDUSTRIAL RATE LPC1A (2,500-4,999 kW)

Customer Charge		\$1,573.12
Energy Charge per kWh first 425	\$	0.04231
Energy Charge per kWh over 425	\$	0.04096
Demand Charge per kW	\$	7.49

SCHEDULE XI
LARGE INDUSTRIAL RATE LPB1 (1,000-2,499 kW)

Customer Charge		\$1,573.12
Energy Charge per kWh first 425	\$	0.04701
Energy Charge per kWh over 425	\$	0.04324
Demand Charge per kW	\$	7.49
Demand Charge Excess per kW	\$	10.32

SCHEDULE XII
LARGE INDUSTRIAL RATE LPB1A (2,500-4,999 kW)

Customer Charge		\$1,573.12
Energy Charge per kWh first 425	\$	0.04231
Energy Charge per kWh over 425	\$	0.04096
Demand Charge per kW	\$	7.49
Demand Charge Excess per kW	\$	10.32

SCHEDULE XIII
LARGE INDUSTRIAL RATE LPB2 (5,000+ kW)

Customer Charge		\$3,136.91
Energy Charge per kWh first 425	\$	0.04174
Energy Charge per kWh over 425	\$	0.04084
Demand Charge per kW	\$	7.47
Demand Charge Excess per kW	\$	10.29

SCHEDULE XIV
LARGE INDUSTRIAL RATE LPB (500-999 kW)

Customer Charge	\$ 1573.12
Energy Charge per kWh	\$ 0.04863
Demand Charge per kW	\$ 7.49
Demand Charge Excess per kW	\$ 10.32

SCHEDULE 1-B1
FARM AND HOME TIME-OF-DAY

Customer Charge	\$ 20.67
Energy Charge per kWh On Peak	\$ 0.12345
Energy Charge per kWh Off Peak	\$ 0.06071

SCHEDULE 1-B2
FARM AND HOME TIME-OF-DAY

Customer Charge	\$ 20.67
Energy Charge per kWh On Peak	\$ 0.10528
Energy Charge per kWh Off Peak	\$ 0.06071

SCHEDULE 1-B3
FARM AND HOME TIME-OF-DAY

Customer Charge	\$ 20.67
Energy Charge per kWh On Peak	\$ 0.10426
Energy Charge per kWh Off Peak	\$ 0.06071
Energy Shoulder per kWh	\$ 0.07880

SCHEDULE 1-C
SMALL COMMERCIAL TIME-OF-DAY

Customer Charge	\$ 25.34
Energy Charge per kWh On Peak	\$ 0.10348
Energy Charge per kWh Off Peak	\$ 0.05814

SCHEDULE 2-A
LARGE POWER TIME-OF-DAY

Customer Charge	\$ 63.40
Energy Charge per kWh On Peak	\$ 0.10278
Energy Charge per kWh Off Peak	\$ 0.05789

SCHEDULE ETS
ETS OFF-PEAK

Energy Charge per kWh \$ 0.05017

SPECIAL CONTRACT

Demand Charge per kW \$ 7.15
Energy Charge per kWh On Peak \$ 0.039567
Energy Charge per kWh Off Peak \$ 0.036139
Min kWh Adjustment \$ (0.026240)
Demand Credit Interruptible 10 Min \$ (6.22)
Demand Credit Interruptible 90 Min \$ (4.20)
Distribution Demand per kW \$ 0.037500
Distribution Energy per kWh \$ 0.000285

SCHEDULE I - OLS
OUTDOOR LIGHTING SERVICE

Rate 2

LED Outdoor Light on existing pole \$ 11.30
LED Outdoor Light one pole added \$ 16.47
100 Watt, S/L on existing pole \$ 11.30
100 Watt, S/L one pole added \$ 16.47

Rate 3

Cobrahead 100 Watt on existing pole \$ 16.85
Cobrahead 100 Watt, one pole added \$ 23.09
Cobrahead 250 Watt on existing pole \$ 22.76
Cobrahead 250 Watt, one pole added \$ 29.01
Cobrahead 400 Watt on existing pole \$ 28.13
Cobrahead 400 Watt, one pole added \$ 34.37
Cobrahead - LED on existing pole (59 watt or equiv) \$ 16.71
Cobrahead - LED one pole added (59 watt or equiv) \$ 21.88
Cobrahead - LED on existing pole (113 watt or equiv) \$ 19.87
Cobrahead - LED one pole added (113 watt or equiv) \$ 25.04
Cobrahead - LED on existing pole (225 watt or equiv) \$ 26.54
Cobrahead - LED one pole added (225 watt or equiv) \$ 31.70

Rate 4

Directional 100 Watt on existing pole \$ 15.76
Directional 100 Watt, one pole added \$ 22.01
Directional 250 Watt on existing pole \$ 19.23
Directional 250 Watt, one pole added \$ 25.47
Directional 400 Watt on existing pole \$ 24.28
Directional 400 Watt, one pole added \$ 30.53
Directional - LED on existing pole (51 watt or equivalent) \$ 14.73
Directional - LED one pole added (51 watt or equivalent) \$ 19.90

Directional- LED on existing pole (85 watt or equivalent)	\$ 17.31
Directional - LED one pole added (85 watt or equivalent)	\$ 22.48
Directional - LED on existing pole (129 watt or equivalent)	\$ 19.45
Directional - LED one pole added (129 watt or equivalent)	\$ 24.62

SCHEDULE II - SOLS
SPECIAL OUTDOOR LIGHTING SERVICE

Traditional light, w/ fiberglass pole	\$ 16.64
Holophane light, w/ fiberglass pole	\$ 19.80
Acorn - LED w/ fiberglass pole	\$ 25.82
Holophane LED, w/ fiberglass pole	\$ 32.24
Traditionaire LED, w/ fiberglass pole	\$ 27.11
Holophane LED, w/ aluminum pole	\$ 45.26

SCHEDULE III - SOLS
SPECIAL OUTDOOR LIGHTING SERVICE

Energy Rate for each type of light per kWh	\$ 0.05760
--	------------

*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

*Jody M Kyler Cohn
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry
36 East Seventh Street
Suite 1510
Cincinnati, OHIO 45202

*Honorable Kurt J Boehm
Attorney at Law
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry
36 East Seventh Street
Suite 1510
Cincinnati, OHIO 45202

*Honorable Michael L Kurtz
Attorney at Law
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry
36 East Seventh Street
Suite 1510
Cincinnati, OHIO 45202

*Michael L Cobb
Manager - Corporate Accounting
Owen Electric Cooperative, Inc.
P. O. Box 400
Owenton, KY 40359

*Owen Electric Cooperative, Inc.
8205 Highway 127 North
P. O. Box 400
Owenton, KY 40359