COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

NAV 18 2000 PUDLIC DESCRICE

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF DUKE ENERGY)	
KENTUCKY, INC. TO RE-INSTITUTE A)	CASE NO. 2008-00100
HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM)	

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION TO DUKE ENERGY KENTUCKY, INC.

Comes now the intervenor, the Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, by and through his Office of Rate Intervention, and submits his Supplemental Requests for Information to Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. to be answered in accordance with the following:

- (1) In each case where a request seeks data provided in response to a staff request, reference to the appropriate request item will be deemed a satisfactory response.
- (2) Please identify the witness who will be prepared to answer questions concerning each request.
- (3) These requests shall be deemed continuing so as to require further and supplemental responses if the company receives or generates additional information within the scope of these requests between the time of the response and the time of any hearing conducted hereon.
- (4) If any request appears confusing, please request clarification directly from the Office of Attorney General.
- (5) To the extent that the specific document, workpaper or information as requested does not exist, but a similar document, workpaper or information does exist, provide the similar document, workpaper, or information.
 - (6) To the extent that any request may be answered by way of a computer printout, please

identify each variable contained in the printout which would not be self evident to a person not familiar with the printout.

- (7) If the company has objections to any request on the grounds that the requested information is proprietary in nature, or for any other reason, please notify the Office of the Attorney General as soon as possible.
- (8) For any document withheld on the basis of privilege, state the following: date; author; addressee; indicated or blind copies; all persons to whom distributed, shown, or explained; and, the nature and legal basis for the privilege asserted.
- (9) In the event any document called for has been destroyed or transferred beyond the control of the company, please state: the identity of the person by whom it was destroyed or transferred, and the person authorizing the destruction or transfer; the time, place, and method of destruction or transfer; and, the reason(s) for its destruction or transfer. If destroyed or disposed of by operation of a retention policy, state the retention policy.

Respectfully submitted,

JACK CONWAY

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF KENTUCKY

DENNIS HOWARD II PAUL D. ADAMS

ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL 1024 CAPITAL CENTER DRIVE

FRANKFORT KY 40601-8204

(502) 696-5453

FAX: (502) 573-8315

dennis.howard@ag.ky.gov

paul.adams@ag.ky.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE AND NOTICE OF FILING

I hereby give notice that this the 13th day of May, 2008, I have filed the original and ten copies of the foregoing with the Kentucky Public Service Commission at 211 Sower Boulevard, Frankfort, Kentucky, 40601 and certify that this same day I have served the parties by mailing a true copy of same, postage prepaid, to those listed below.

Honorable Rocco O. D'Ascenzo Senior Counsel Honorable Amy B. Spiller Associate General Counsel Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. 139 East Fourth Street P.O. Box 960 Cincinnati, OH 45201-0960

Honorable Thomas Vergamini Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP 1717 Dixie Highway, Suite 340 Covington, KY 41011-4704

Assistant Attorney General

N:\ORI\PAdams\Public\Duke\2008-00100\2008-00100 AG Supplemental DR 05.07 08.doc

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION TO DUKE ENERGY KENTUCKY, INC. Case No. 2008-00100

- 1. Concerning the proposed administrative funds, please explain in detail how NKCAC is paid, e.g. fixed amount per participant, lump sum, etc.
- 2. Please reference the Company's Responses to the Supplemental Data Requests of the Attorney General dated April 11, 2008, Question 1. The Company states that total number of customers which could be eligible for benefits under the proposed program is approximately 32,000. As NKCAC administered the pilot program on behalf of the Company in Case No. 2005-00402, please provide the following:
 - a. Total number of participants in the pilot program;
 - b. The number of participants in the pilot program within the target range of 150%-200% of the federal poverty guideline level;
 - c. The average benefit level paid for all participants in the pilot program;
 - d. The average benefit level in the pilot program for the target range of 150%-200% of the federal poverty guideline level;
 - e. An estimate of the number of participants in the proposed program at the 150%-200% of the federal poverty guideline level included in the Company's 32,000 estimate;
 - f. The number of participants who received benefits under the pilot program and benefits under one or more of the Company's other programs; and,
 - g. The average benefit level paid for participants receiving benefits under the pilot program and under one or more of the Company's other programs.

- 3. Please reference the Company's Responses to the Supplemental Data Requests of the Attorney General dated April 11, 2008, Question 5. The Company states that the formula used by NKCAC to qualify participants under the proposed HEA program will not include cash value benefits received by the participant from any public or private agency and notes that no federally funded assistance programs consider these types of benefits as income. As the proposed program is funded by ratepayers and is NOT federally funded, please provide a detailed explanation as to why the Company believes that it is appropriate to exclude the cash value of other benefits received by participants in income calculations.
- 4. Please reference the Company's Responses to the Supplemental Data Requests of the Attorney General dated March 11, 2008, Question 1 and April 11, 2008, Question 5. In its responses, the Company notes that it is responding to a request from NKCAC in proposing the subject program.
 - a. To the extent that the Company is knowledgeable, please explain in detail what efforts, and their results, NKCAC took in addressing this shortfall prior to contacting the Company and the results of these efforts. If the Company has no information concerning these efforts, please explain in detail why the Company did not inquire as to same prior to its current proposal.
 - b. Please explain in detail why the Company believes ratepayers should be required to address this shortfall in light of the failure of NKCAC's other efforts.
- 5. Please reference the Company's Responses to the Supplemental Data Requests of the Attorney General dated April 11, 2008, Question 2. In regard to the statement by the Company that the

program would initially "target" customers at 150%-200% federal poverty guideline level, please explain in detail what the Company means in light of its letter of May 5, 2008 indicating that the "program is designed to offer benefits to low income customers up to 200% of the federal government poverty guidelines". How are participants in the 150%-200% level "targeted."

- 6. Please reference the Company's Responses to the Supplemental Data Requests of the Attorney General dated April 11, 2008, Question 3. Please provide the correct income levels of participants of the program in light of the statement by the Company in its May 5, 2008 letter indicating that the "program is designed to offer benefits to low income customers up to 200% of the federal government poverty guidelines."
- 7. Please reference the Company's Responses to the Supplemental Data Requests of the Attorney General dated April 11, 2008, Question 7. The Company's response indicates that the proposed program targets customers at the 150%-200% federal poverty guideline level. In light of the statement by the Company in its May 5, 2008 letter indicating that the "program is designed to offer benefits to low income customers up to 200% of the federal government poverty guidelines," please provide a corrected response indicating whether any overlap is possible between the proposed program and any other program offered by the Company and the degree of any such overlap.