COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION OF KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY FOR AN ADJUSTMENT OF ITS ELECTRIC RATES AND APPROVAL OF CERTAIN REGULATORY AND ACCOUNTING TREATMENTS	)))))	CASE NO. 2025-00113

COMMISSION STAFF'S THIRD REQUEST FOR INFORMATION TO KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY

Kentucky Utilities Company (KU), pursuant to 807 KAR 5:001, shall file with the Commission an electronic version of the following information. The information requested is due on August 12, 2025. The Commission directs KU to the Commission's July 22, 2021 Order in Case No. 2020-00085[1] regarding filings with the Commission. Electronic documents shall be in portable document format (PDF), shall be searchable, and shall be appropriately bookmarked.

Each response shall include the question to which the response is made and shall include the name of the witness responsible for responding to the questions related to the information provided. Each response shall be answered under oath or, for representatives of a public or private corporation or a partnership or association or a governmental agency, be accompanied by a signed certification of the preparer or the person supervising the preparation of the response on behalf of the entity that the

[1] Case No. 2020-00085, *Electronic Emergency Docket Related to the Novel Coronavirus COVID-19* (Ky. PSC July 22, 2021), Order (in which the Commission ordered that for case filings made on and after March 16, 2020, filers are NOT required to file the original physical copies of the filings required by 807 KAR 5:001, Section 8).

response is true and accurate to the best of that person's knowledge, information, and belief formed after a reasonable inquiry.

KU shall make timely amendment to any prior response if KU obtains information that indicates the response was incorrect or incomplete when made or, though correct or complete when made, is now incorrect or incomplete in any material respect.

For any request to which KU fails or refuses to furnish all or part of the requested information, KU shall provide a written explanation of the specific grounds for its failure to completely and precisely respond.

Careful attention shall be given to copied and scanned material to ensure that it is legible. When the requested information has been previously provided in this proceeding in the requested format, reference may be made to the specific location of that information in responding to this request. When applicable, the requested information shall be separately provided for total company operations and jurisdictional operations. When filing a paper containing personal information, KU shall, in accordance with 807 KAR 5:001, Section 4(10), encrypt or redact the paper so that personal information cannot be read.

1. Refer to the Commission's June 30, 2021 Order in Case No. 2020-00349,[2] in which the Commission ordered KU to file with its next base rate case a detailed plan for reducing the frequency and amounts of its tariffed non-recurring charges resulting from its advanced metering infrastructure (AMI) systems.

[2] Case No. 2020-00349, *Electronic Application of Kentucky Utilities Company for an Adjustment of its Electric Rates, A Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Deploy Advanced Metering Infrastructure, Approval of Certain Regulatory and Accounting Treatments, and Establishment of a One-Year Surcredit* (Ky. PSC June 30, 2021), Order at 64.

a. Explain whether KU has developed a detailed plan to reduce the frequency and amounts of its tariffed non-recurring charges resulting from its AMI systems.

b. If so, explain why the plan was not included in this application and provide a copy of the plan.

c. If not, explain why not.

2. Refer to the Application, Tab 4, page 183 of 205, Pre-pay Program Terms and Conditions.

a. Confirm that if an existing customer with a deposit signs up for the Pre-Pay Program, the deposit, plus any accrued interest, will either be used to fund the customer's Pre-Pay account or will be refunded to the customer.

b. Explain whether Pre-Pay customers will be subject to any special non-recurring charges included in the tariff.

c. Provide a copy of the Pre-Pay Program Service Agreement if one has been developed.

d. List the predetermined triggers that will be set to notify customers of a low balance.

3. Refer to the Direct Testimony of Shannon L. Montgomery, page 26, lines 19–22. Explain how the daily balance will be provided to a Prepay customer.

4. Refer to KU's response to Commission Staff's Second Request For Information (Staff's Second Request), Item 7.

a. When a EHLF developer signs a contract(s) with KU, explain what the developer is contracting for and what contractual obligations the developer is agreeing to.

b. Explain whether any of the terms of the EHLF contract(s) remains with the developer once an EHLF end use customer signs a contract with the developer. In the response, differentiate between the situations where the end use customer purchases the entire development and where the end use customer is a tenant of the EHLF developer.

c. Explain whether these EHLF developer contracts are standardized contract terms.

d. If available, provide a copy of the contract(s) that the EHLF developer will be required to sign.

5. When an EHLF developer contracts with KU for 600 MW or some other large amount of power, explain how KU accommodates the developer. For example, explain whether the Company reserves 600 MW dedicated to the developer that all else being equal, would not be used by other customers or whether the Company simply ensures that it has 600 MW available to serve the new load and that if the developer does not require 600 MW at any given time, the capacity would be available to serve other customers or for an off system sale.

6. Refer to KU's response to Commission Staff's First Request for Information (Staff's First Request), Item 54, Exhibit MEH-1 – PSA Rate Support, Worksheet Combined OH. Explain the reasoning for calculating the wireless facility attachment charge based on five times the weighted pole rate.

7. Refer to KU's response to Staff's First Request, Item 41. Confirm that employees hired on or after January 1, 2006, receive both 100 percent of the first 3 percent of the employee's eligible compensation plus 50 percent of the next 3 percent, subject to IRS limits, and between 3 percent and 7 percent of eligible pay based upon years of service.

8. Refer to KU's response to Staff's First Request, Item 54, 2025 PSC DR1 KU LGE Attach to Q54 – Exhibit MEH-4 – AMI Opt-Out Support, Worksheet KU-E AMI Opt Out. Also refer to KU's response to Commission Staff's First Request for Information in Case No. 2020-00349,[3] Item 56, 2020_Att_KU_LGE_PSC_1–56_Exhibit_WSS-19_AMI_Opt_Out_Calculation, Worksheet KU-E AMI Opt Out. Provide a detailed explanation and support for the increases to One-Time Fee, Field Services, and One-Time and Recurring Capital Costs, Enrollment, Billing and Reporting.

9. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 1, Attachment, Electric Tariff, page 139 of 238. Explain why KU's current tariff limited the availability of the One-Time Solar Capacity Charge to subscriptions on Solar Share Facilities that had not begun construction.

10. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 1, Attachment, Electric Tariff, page 140 of 238. Explain why KU's current tariff limited the subscription capacity of a subscribing customer to an aggregate of 500 kW DC and no more than 250 kW DC in any single Solar Share Facility.

[3] Case No. 2020-00349, (filed Dec. 15, 2020), KU's Responses to Commission Staff's First Request for Information.

11. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 1, Attachment, page 156 of 238. Explain why the actual incentive amounts were removed under from the Residential Online Audit program.

12. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 1, Attachment, page 225 of 238. Provide a copy of KU's Interconnection Requirements for Customer-Sited Distributed Generation.

13. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 8. Explain the reasonableness of KU being able to use a residential customer's deposit on their residential account to satisfy an obligation of a non-residential account owned by that same customer when the non-residential account is in the name of the business instead of the individual.

14. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 10.

a. Explain what would cause KU to require communication during the interconnection review process between the customer's distributed generation equipment and KU's control systems.

b. Explain why Application Fees were added for Level 1 Interconnections.

15. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 11(a). Explain what would cause monitoring or management to be required.

16. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 11(b). Explain under what circumstances KU would require communications equipment allowing the utility SCADA system to monitor generation and possibly remotely disconnect a DER site

in the event of an emergency for larger distributed generation sites, 1 MW or larger in capacity.

17. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 12(a). Confirm that replacement of currently installed modules with modules having slightly higher capacity due to the unavailability of identical modules would not result in the loss of NMS-1 legacy status. If not confirmed, explain why not.

18. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 13. Explain why the conversion fee was not proposed to be revised in this case seeing as it was last revised in 2021 and recognizing that the average remaining book value of all current working non-LED fixtures has likely decreased since 2021.

19. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 16. Explain why the Curtailable Billing Demand for customers served under the Curtailable Service Riders is calculated based off of just weekdays during the applicable time periods.

20. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 19. Provide a detailed explanation, including estimated costs, of what modifications would need to be made to the legacy Customer Information System in order for KU to be able to offer the Prepay Program once this proceeding concludes.

21. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 27. Explain why KU desired to remove the hourly charge from Rate EVC-L2 and replace it with the per kWh charge of the EVC-Fast tariff.

22. Refer to the Direct Testimony of Tim S. Lyons (Lyons Direct Testimony), Exhibit TSL-4, page 7. Explain the differences between the "Fully-Loaded Customer Costs" and "Basic Customer Costs."

23. Refer to the Lyons Direct Testimony, Exhibit TSL-4, page 7. Refer also to the Full Notice, generally. Provide an explanation of the following:

a. KU's request of a Rate RS basic service charge of approximately $19.47 per month[4] when the COSS supported a basic service charge of $31.39 per month.

b. KU's request of a Rate GS basic service charge of approximately $46.84 per month[5] when the COSS supported a basic service charge of $40.89 per month.

c. KU's request of a Rate AES single phase basic service charge of approximately $96.12 per month[6] when the COSS supported a basic service charge of $92.87 per month.

d. KU's request of a Rate PS-Sec basic service charge of approximately $103.42 per month[7] when the COSS supported a basic service charge of $79.64 per month.

e. KU's request of a Rate TOD-Pri basic service charge of approximately $406.06 per month[8] when the COSS supported a basic service charge of $386.81 per month.

---

[4] $19.47= ($0.64 x 365)/12.

[5] $46.84= ($1.54 x 365/12.

[6] $96.12= ($3.16 x 365)/12.

[7] $103.42= ($3.40 x 365)/12.

[8] $406.06= ($13.35 x 365)/12.

f. KU's request of a Rate RTS basic service charge of approximately $2,252.05 per month[9] when the COSS supported a basic service charge of $2,092.64 per month.

g. KU's request of a Rate FLS Transmission Service basic service charge of approximately $2,259.35 per month[10] when the COSS supports a basic service charge of $2,029.27 per month.

h. KU's request of a Rate OSL Secondary basic service charge of approximately $103.42 per month[11] when the COSS supported a basic service charge of $87.85 per month.

24. Refer to the Lyons Direct Testimony, Exhibit TSL-2, page 3. Refer also to the Full Notice, pages 15-16. Explain how the proposed Rate EVC rates will provide sufficient revenues to meet the proposed Rate of Return of 8.10 percent.

25. Refer to the Lyons Direct Testimony, TSL-2, generally. For customer classes that already have a Rate of Returns higher than the overall Rate of Return, explain why KU chose to increase the basic service charges for those rate classes.

26. Refer to the Direct Testimony of Charles R. Schram (Schram Direct Testimony), page 13, lines 16 through 18. Identify and explain what makes up the rest of the increase in sales between the base period and the forecasted test period.

---

[9] $2,252.05= ($74.04 x 365)/12.

[10] $2,259.35= ($74.28 x 365)/12.

[11] $103.42= ($3.40 x 365)/12.

27. Refer to the Schram Direct Testimony, page 13. Further explain the reasonableness to assume BlueOval SK (BOSK) Phase 1 is in full production in 2026 when it Phase 1 was originally expected to begin in the year 2025.

28. Refer to the Schram Testimony, generally. Identify all differences between the load forecasts submitted in this proceeding and the 2024 IRP load forecast. Additionally, explain the reasonings behind these differences.

29. Refer to the Schram Testimony, page 41. Provide further explanation behind the reasonableness to move the RTO study filing to align with the triennially IRP filing.

30. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 111. Provide cost justification for each non-recurring charge, including the calculation of the charge in Excel spreadsheet format with all formulas, rows, and columns unprotected and fully accessible.

31. Refer to the Direct Testimony of Lonnie Bellar(Bellar Direct Testimony), page 3, lines 15 through 18. Explain how KU quantified the efficiencies gained from harmonizing human resources operations throughout PPL and developing a common storm response protocol. Provide all calculations in Excel spreadsheet format with all formulas, rows, and columns unprotected and fully accessible.

32. Refer to Bellar Direct Testimony, page 9, lines 9 through 11. Explain why KU would request regulatory asset treatment for the Lewis Ridge Pumped Storage Project, should the project not go through.

33. Refer to Bellar Direct Testimony, page 11, lines 16 through 17. Describe the costs associated with each of the following generation outage projects.

a. Mill Creek 3;

b. Mill Creek 4;

c. Ghent 1;

d. Ghent 2; and

e. Ghent 3.

34. Refer to the Direct Testimony of Elizabeth McFarland (McFarland Direct Testimony), page 9, lines 10 through 13. Explain why the longer-term goal of making the combined Companies national quartile performance in transmission reliability has not yet been achieved through the Transmission System Improvement Project (TSIP).

35. Refer to McFarland Direct Testimony, Exhibit BJM-2, page 35 of 87. Confirm if there are any quantifiable benefits associated with the implementation of TSHARP. If confirmed, explain when those benefits will be seen by Louisville Gas and Electric Company (LG&E) and KU's (jointly LG&E/KU)'s customers.

36. Refer to the Direct Testimony of Peter Waldrab (Waldrab Direct Testimony), page 20, lines 5 through 7. State the growth rate for labor rates for distribution line tech employees from 2020-2025.

37. Refer to Waldrab Direct Testimony, page 20, lines 11 through 15. Explain whether LG&E/KU have evaluated any alternative pad mount transformers with the recent cost increases.

38. Refer to the Direct Testimony of Vincent Poplaski (Poplaski Direct Testimony) at 12. Provide a breakdown of the listed criteria and percentages in terms of the descriptions below. For any criteria that are not relevant to the below descriptions, provide an explanation.

a. Financial Goals;

b. Safety Goals;

c. Customer Satisfaction Goals; and

d. Individual Goals.

39. Refer to the Poplaski Direct Testimony at 13-14. Compare the benefit structure of an employee hired before January 1, 2006, (but ineligible for the defined benefit plan) to the structure for similarly situated employees hired on or after January 1, 2006

40. Refer to the Direct Testimony of Christopher Garrett (Garrett Direct Testimony) at 9. Provide the estimated difference between the actual storm damage restoration and vegetation management costs and the respective amounts in base rates in the forecasted period. Provide also whether a regulatory asset or liability is expected to be recorded for these amounts.

41. Refer to the Garrett Direct Testimony at 11. Provide descriptions and depreciable lives of the underlying software/IT assets.

42. Refer to the Garrett Direct Testimony at 14. Provide support for amortizing the AMI regulatory assets over a longer period than the AMI regulatory liabilities.

43. Refer to the Direct Testimony of John Spanos (Spanos Direct Testimony), Exhibit JJS-KU-1, Intangible Plant. Explain specifically what items (particular software) are included in each of the following categories: cloud software; dms cloud software; cloud software-prepaids; and dms cloud software – prepaids.

44. Refer to Spanos Direct Testimony, Exhibit JJS-KU-1, Steam Production Plant, Structures and Improvements. Explain what investments were made to Trimble

Unit 2 that resulted in the increase in original cost as well as book depreciation reserve since the 2020 study.

45. Refer to Spanos Direct Testimony, Exhibit JJS-KU-1, Steam Production Plant, Structures and Improvements. Explain what specific factors, since 2020, resulted in the increase to calculated annual accrual rate for Trimble Unit 2.

46. Refer to Spanos Direct Testimony, Exhibit JJS-KU-1, Steam Production Plant, Structures and Improvements. Explain the approximate 300 percent increase in the original cost and book depreciation reserve for System Laboratory since 2020.

47. Refer to Spanos Direct Testimony, Exhibit JJS-KU-1, Steam Production Plant, Boiler Plant Equipment.

a. Explain what facts resulted in the change in annual accrual rate and composite remaining life for the Brown Units 1-3 Scrubbers and the Ghent Unit 1 scrubber when the original book remained approximately the same.

b. Explain why the book depreciation reserve increased significantly from 2020 for the Brown Units 1-3 Scrubbers. Include in that explanation a reconciliation of that information with the accrual rate and composite remaining life as discussed in Item 47(a).

48. Refer to Spanos Direct Testimony, Exhibit JJS-KU-1, Steam Production Plant, Boiler Plant Equipment. Explain why Brown Unit 3's annual accrual rate increased from 5.81 percent in 2020[12] to 10.22 percent in this application.

[12] Case No. 2020-00349, (filed Nov. 25, 2020), Direct Testimony of John Spanos, Exhibit JJS-1, Depreciation Study (2020 Study).

49. Refer to Spanos Direct Testimony, Exhibit JJS-KU-1, Steam Plant Production, Turbogenerator Units. Explain why Brown Unit 3's original cost remained constant from 2020,[13] and the book depreciation doubled, from approximately $10.9 million to $21.5 million.

50. Refer to Spanos Direct Testimony, Exhibit JJS-KU-1, Turbogenerator Units, generally. Explain why the accrual rates for all of the units listed in the 2024 report increased, in different increments, except Brown 3 and include in the explanation why the accrual rates increased in different increments.

51. Refer to Spanos Direct Testimony, Exhibit JJS-KU-1, Other Production Plant, Land Rights. Explain with specificity why both the annual accrual rate increased as well as the composite remaining life. As part of this response, provide the current termination date for the land rights' contract listed in the account.

52. Refer to Spanos Direct Testimony, Exhibit JJS-KU-1, Other Production Plant, Structures and Improvements. Explain why both Brown Solar and Simpsonville Solar were removed from account 341.00.

53. Refer to Spanos Direct Testimony, Exhibit JJS-KU-1, Other Production Plant, Fuel Holders, Producers and Accessories.

a. Explain with specificity why Haefling Units 1-3 had an annual accrual rate increase from 4.75 in the 2020 Depreciation Study to 6.26 in the 2024 Depreciation Study.

---

[13] 2020 Study.

b. Explain with specificity why Brown CT Pipeline had an annual accrual rate increase from 4.75 in the 2020 Depreciation Study to 6.26 in the 2024 Depreciation Study.

54. Refer to Spanos Direct Testimony, Exhibit JJS-KU-1, Other Production Plant, Account 342.30.

a. Explain why this account is included in the 2024 Depreciation Study Summary but was not included in the 2020 Depreciation Study Summary.

b. Explain why the accrual rates for the inspections are generally so much higher than other accounts.

c. Identify and explain the aspects and assets of this account that depreciate.

55. Refer to Spanos Direct Testimony, Exhibit JJS-KU-1, Other Production Plant, Miscellaneous Power Plant Equipment. Explain why the composite remaining life increased for Cane Run CC7. Include in the explanation any projects or expenditures specific to that unit undertaken to prolong the life of the unit.

56. Refer to Spanos Direct Testimony, Exhibit JJS-KU-1, Transmission Plant, Account 352.20. Explain what assets are included in this account and why it was not included in the 2020 Depreciation Study.

57. Refer to Spanos Direct Testimony, Exhibit JJS-KU-1, Transmission Plant, Accounts 352 .10 and 352.20.

a. Explain what assets are included in each account.

b. Explain the distinction between non-system and system control.

c. Explain why the two accounts were not listed as such in the 2020 Depreciation Study.

d. Explain why the estimated service life is estimated to be 60 years for the non-system control.

e. Explain why the service life is estimated to be 30 years for the system control. Include in this explanation why there is a decrease in the estimated service life between the 2020 depreciation study and the 2024 depreciation study.

f. Provide a list of each customer service location that KU closed or no longer utilizes since the final Order in Case No. 2020-00349; whether that space is currently being utilized by any party for any purpose; the fair market value and a timeline for the dispensation of the property.

58. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 41. Provide a list of the transformers as prioritized by the companies as "at risk" by risk ranking. Include in this list the allocated company name, the location of the transformer, the criteria used to place the transformer on the list in its respective position as well as the criteria generally by importance.

59. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 56(a). The response was not responsive. Provide a list of cybersecurity programs or services provided utilized by the utility.

60. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 56(b). Provide the report referenced for the most recent year prior to 2022. If no report, has ever been completed, please include that in the response.

61. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Report, Item 56(c). Provide the NIST Cybersecurity Framework utilized by KU.

62. Refer to the KU's response to the Attorney General's First Request for Information, Item 101(a), Attachment. Provide all seven versions of the depreciation study referenced in the emails.

63. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 64 and Item 66.

a. Using the chart/table provided in the response to Item 64, provide approximate dates, month and year, for each milestone provided in the chart for all items.

b. Provide the in-service date for each software upgrade listed in the response to Item 64.

c. Provide the full cost of each item, using the milestones listed to delineate expenditures, including the amount contained in the forecasted test year if different than the total provided by item listed in the response to Item 64.

64. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 81(c). Confirm that the actual response isn't storm costs were lower but that storm costs were booked as a regulatory asset. If not confirmed, explain the response.

65. Refer to Trimble 2 generally. Several responses were provided discussing the expense related to the ongoing operation of the unit. Based on the current condition of the unit, provide the expected costs of the operating and maintenance, including any of the repairs discussed, for the years 2025 through 2030 in comparison to the benefit of Trimble 2's generation production for the years 2020 to 2025 to date. Also include the response whether KU expects the useful life of Trimble 2 to be extended by any of these repairs.

66. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 78. Explain how the lower capitalization threshold range of $200-$500 for office furniture was reflected in rate base for the forecasted test period.

67. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 46. Explain why in 2024, 2022, and 2020 KU did not reach its target miles.

68. Refer to Application, Schedule F-3.

a. Provide a breakdown of all expenditures related to employee recognition included in the base period.

b. Explain how KU forecasted employee recognition its test period. Include in this explanation why the forecasted test period is less than the base period.

69. Refer to KU's response to Staff's Second Request, Item 79 Attachment.

a. Provide the number of company credit cards along with the position of authorized users.

b. Provide any written policies related to the usage of company credit cards.

c. Explain what controls are in the place to ensure proper credit card use.

70. Refer to the Direct Testimony of Michael Hornung (Hornung Direct Testimony), page 4.

a. Explain whether any prospective Data Center (DC) customer(s) is aware of or has reviewed and/or commented on the proposed Extremely High Load Factor (EHLF) Tariff.

b. Explain the reasoning behind using an 85 percent load factor.

c. Explain why more than 100 MVA load size was chosen as the minimum load for EHLF tariff eligibility.

71. Refer to Schram Direct Testimony, pages 34-36 and the Commission's August 30, 2024 Order in Case No. 2023-00404.[14]

a. Explain why KU did not utilize a NGCC for capacity values and costs.

b. Provide specific evidence demonstrating that KU is not currently avoiding costs in light of Case No. 2022-00402.[15]

72. Refer to Staff's Second Request, Item 33. Explain how the companies determined the allocation of costs between LG&E and KU for the Lewis Ridge Pumped Storage Project.

Linda Bridwell RP

Linda C. Bridwell, PE
Executive Director
Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 615
Frankfort, KY 40602

DATED JUL 30 2025

cc: Parties of Record

[14] Case No. 2023-00404, *Electronic Tariff Filings of Louisville Gas and Electric Company and Kentucky Utilities Company to Revise Purchase Rates for Small Capacity and Large Capacity Cogeneration and Power Production Qualifying Facilities and Net Metering Service-2 Credit Rates* (Ky. PSC Aug. 30, 2024), Order at 21 and footnote 91.

[15] Case No. 2022-00402, *Electronic Joint Application of Kentucky Utilities Company and Louisville Gas & Electric Company for Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity and Site Compatibility Certificates and Approval of a Demand Side Management Plan and Approval of Fossil Fuel-Fired Generating Unit Retirements*.

*Angela M Goad
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General Office of Rate
700 Capitol Avenue
Suite 20
Frankfort, KY 40601-8204

*Honorable David Edward Spenard
Strobo Barkley PLLC
239 South 5th Street
Ste 917
Louisville, KY 40202

*Jody Kyler Cohn
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry
425 Walnut Street
Suite 2400
Cincinnati, OH 45202

*Ashley Wilmes
Kentucky Resources Council, Inc.
Post Office Box 1070
Frankfort, KY 40602

*Honorable W. Duncan Crosby III
Attorney at Law
Stoll Keenon Ogden, PLLC
2000 PNC Plaza
500 W Jefferson Street
Louisville, KY 40202-2828

*Joe F. Childers
Childers & Baxter PLLC
300 Lexington Building, 201 West Sho
Lexington, KY 40507

*Honorable Allyson K Sturgeon
Vice President and Deputy General Counsel-
LG&E and KU Energy LLC
220 West Main Street
Louisville, KY 40202

*Thomas J FitzGerald
Counsel & Director
Kentucky Resources Council, Inc.
Post Office Box 1070
Frankfort, KY 40602

*John Horne
Office of the Attorney General Office of Rate
700 Capitol Avenue
Suite 20
Frankfort, KY 40601-8204

*Bethany Baxter
Childers & Baxter PLLC
300 Lexington Building, 201 West Sho
Lexington, KY 40507

*Gabriel Thatcher
Attorney Senior
Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government
Department Of Law
200 East Main Street
Lexington, KY 40507

*Honorable Kurt J Boehm
Attorney at Law
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry
425 Walnut Street
Suite 2400
Cincinnati, OH 45202

*Byron Gary
Kentucky Resources Council, Inc.
Post Office Box 1070
Frankfort, KY 40602

*Hannah Wigger
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP
2099 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 1
Washington, DC 20006

*Kyle J Smith
General Attorney
U.S. Army Legal Services Agency
9275 Gunston Road
ATTN: JALS-RL/IP
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-554

*Carrie H Grundmann
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC
110 Oakwood Drive, Suite 500
Winston-Salem, NC 27103

*James B Dupree
50 Third Ave
Building 1310- Pike Hall
Fort Knox, KY 40121

*Honorable Lindsey W Ingram, III
Attorney at Law
STOLL KEENON OGDEN PLLC
300 West Vine Street
Suite 2100
Lexington, KY 40507-1801

*Honorable David J. Barberie
Managing Attorney
Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government
Department Of Law
200 East Main Street
Lexington, KY 40507

*James W Gardner
Sturgill, Turner, Barker & Moloney, PLLC
333 West Vine Street
Suite 1400
Lexington, KY 40507

*Lawrence W Cook
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General Office of Rate
700 Capitol Avenue
Suite 20
Frankfort, KY 40601-8204

*Matt Partymiller
President
Kentucky Solar Industries Association
1038 Brentwood Court
Suite B
Lexington, KY 40511

*Rebecca C. Price
Sturgill, Turner, Barker & Moloney
155 East Main Street
Lexington, KY 40507

*J. Michael West
Office of the Attorney General Office of Rate
700 Capitol Avenue
Suite 20
Frankfort, KY 40601-8204

*Randal A. Strobo
Strobo Barkley PLLC
239 South 5th Street
Ste 917
Louisville, KY 40202

*Honorable Michael L Kurtz
Attorney at Law
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry
425 Walnut Street
Suite 2400
Cincinnati, OH 45202

*Steven W Lee
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC
1100 Brent Creek Blvd., Suite 101
Mechanicsburg, PA 17050

*Nathaniel Shoaff
Sierra Club
2101
Webster St. , Suite 1300
Oakland, CA 94612

*Kentucky Utilities Company
220 W. Main Street
P. O. Box 32010
Louisville, KY 40232-2010

*Paul Werner
Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP
2099 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 1
Washington, DC 20006

*Sara Judd
Senior Corporate Attorney
LG&E and KU Energy LLC
220 West Main Street
Louisville, KY 40202

*Rick E Lovekamp
Manager - Regulatory Affairs
LG&E and KU Energy LLC
220 West Main Street
Louisville, KY 40202

*Toland Lacy
Office of the Attorney General
700 Capital Avenue
Frankfort, KY 40601

*Robert Conroy
Vice President, State Regulation and Rates
LG&E and KU Energy LLC
220 West Main Street
Louisville, KY 40202

*M. Todd Osterloh
Sturgill, Turner, Barker & Moloney, PLLC
333 West Vine Street
Suite 1400
Lexington, KY 40507