COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION OF DUKE ENERGY KENTUCKY, INC. FOR: 1) AN ADJUSTMENT OF THE ELECTRIC RATES; 2) APPROVAL OF NEW TARIFFS; 3) APPROVAL OF ACCOUNTING PRACTICES TO ESTABLISH REGULATORY ASSETS AND LIABILITIES; AND 4) ALL OTHER REQUIRED APPROVALS AND RELIEF	)))))))	CASE NO. 2024-00354

O R D E R

On October 22, 2025, Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. (Duke Kentucky) filed a petition, pursuant to KRS 278.400, requesting reconsideration of the final Order entered October 2, 2025, regarding PJM Interconnection, LLC (PJM) Billing Line Items (BLIs), actual rate case expense, and terminal net salvage. Additionally, on October 22, 2025, the Kroger Co. (Kroger) filed a motion requesting reconsideration regarding proposed changes to rate design to address issues with intraclass allocations for service at Secondary Distribution Voltage (Rate DS).

LEGAL STANDARD

KRS 278.400, which establishes the standard of review for motions for rehearing, limits rehearing to new evidence not readily discoverable at the time of the original hearings, to correct any material errors or omissions, or to correct findings that are unreasonable or unlawful. A Commission Order is deemed unreasonable only when "the evidence presented leaves no room for difference of opinion among reasonable minds."[1]

[1] *Energy Regulatory Comm'n v. Kentucky Power Co.*, 605 S.W.2d 46 (Ky. App. 1980).

An order can only be unlawful if it violates a state or federal statute or constitutional provision.[2]

By limiting rehearing to correct material errors or omissions, and findings that are unreasonable or unlawful, or to weigh new evidence not readily discoverable at the time of the original hearings, KRS 278.400 is intended to provide closure to Commission proceedings. Rehearing does not present parties with the opportunity to relitigate a matter fully addressed in the original Order.

BACKGROUND

Kroger – Rate DS Allocation

Kroger requested rehearing on the rate design for Rate DS. Kroger stated that the Commission's Order did not take into account that Kroger and Duke Kentucky, subsequent to the filing of testimony, mutually agreed on a rate design for Rate DS.[3] Instead, Kroger stated that the Commission ordered Duke Kentucky to calculate rates that further align the demand-related and energy-related rates to the respective costs in its next rate case filing.[4] Kroger requested that since the rate design was mutually agreed to by Kroger and Duke Kentucky, that the Commission should modify the Order to incorporate the alternative rate design.[5]

Duke Kentucky filed a response to Kroger's request for rehearing and stated that it did not oppose the request but did request that the change only be applied

[2] *Public Service Comm'n v. Conway*, 324 S.W.3d 373, 377 (Ky. 2010); *Public Service Comm'n v. Jackson County Rural Elec. Coop. Corp.*, 50 S.W.3d 764, 766 (Ky. App. 2000); *National Southwire Aluminum Co. v. Big Rivers Elec. Corp.*, 785 S.W.2d 503, 509 (Ky. App. 1990).

[3] Kroger's Petition for Rehearing (filed Oct. 22, 2025) (Kroger Rehearing Petition) at 1-2.

[4] Kroger's Rehearing Petition at 2.

[5] Kroger's Rehearing Petition at 1-5.

prospectively.[6] Duke Kentucky stated that a retroactive change would create customer confusion because the Rate DS approved in the final Order have been in effect since July 3, 2025, and a retroactive amendment would result in a refund process in addition to the refunds already being issued for the difference between the proposed rates and other rates set forth in the final Order.[7]

Duke Kentucky – PJM BLIs

Duke Kentucky requested rehearing or clarification regarding the exclusion of several PJM BLIs from recovery through either its Profit-Sharing Mechanism (PSM) or Fuel Adjustment Clause (FAC). Each of those BLIs are discussed separately below.

1. PJM BLI 1216 – Pseudo-Tie Balancing Congestion Refund – Duke Kentucky requested that this line item be allocated between and recovered through the PSM and FAC mechanisms. The final Order referenced Duke Kentucky's request to add this BLI to both the PSM and the FAC, but the sentence approving its inclusion referenced only the PSM. Duke Kentucky stated that this BLI should be allocated between native and non-native costs and included in both the FAC and PSM, respectively.[8] Duke Kentucky requested rehearing to include this BLI in both the FAC and PSM as proposed.

2. PJM BLIs 1667/2667 – Non-performance / Bonus Performance – Duke Kentucky filed amended tariffs with its application seeking to add the BLIs 1667 and 2667 to its PSM as "one of several capacity related costs charged to the Company by PJM."[9]

[6] Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc.'s Reply in Support of the Kroger Co.'s Petition for Rehearing (filed Oct. 24, 2025) (Duke Kentucky's Response to Kroger Rehearing) at 1.

[7] Duke Kentucky's Response to Kroger Rehearing at 3.

[8] Duke Kentucky's Petition for Rehearing (Duke Kentucky's Rehearing Petition) (filed Oct. 22, 2025) at 3.

[9] Application, Schedule L-2.2 at 77.

The final Order found that 1667 and 2667 should be excluded from the PSM "because these BLIs are related to performance penalties and related revenue BLIs—the penalties should be the responsibility of the utility, which has an obligation to provide adequate service."[10] Duke Kentucky requested reconsideration of this denial because it asserted that these BLIs were already included in the PSM, as approved in Case No. 2017-00321.[11]

3. PJM BLIs 1980/2980 – Miscellaneous Bilateral Purchase or Sale – Duke Kentucky filed amended tariffs with its application seeking to add the BLIs 1980 and 2980 to portions of its FAC and PSM tariffs.[12] The Commission denied Duke Kentucky's request to add those BLIs to the tariff based on a finding that Duke Kentucky failed to present evidence justifying their inclusion, but indicated an openness to including the BLIs if Duke Kentucky presented evidence explaining the basis for their inclusion.[13]

On rehearing, Duke Kentucky argued that BLIs 1980 and 2980 are currently recovered through the FAC and PSM pursuant to the final Order in Case No. 2017-00321, and implied that was why there was limited evidence regarding these BLIs submitted with the application.[14] Duke Kentucky also stated that it provided information in response to

---

[10] Order (Ky. PSC Oct. 2, 2025) at 78.

[11] Duke Kentucky's Rehearing Petition at 4-7 *citing* Case No. 2017-00321, *Electronic Application of Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. for: 1) an Adjustment of the Electric Rates; 2) Approval of an Environmental Compliance Plan and Surcharge Mechanism; 3) Approval of New Tariffs; 4) Approval of Accounting Practices to Establish Regulatory Assets and Liabilities; and 5) All Other Required Approvals and Relief*, Order (Ky. PSC Apr. 13, 2018).

[12] Application, Schedule L-2.2 at 75-77.

[13] Order (Ky. PSC Oct. 2, 2025) at 78-79.

[14] Duke Kentucky's Rehearing Petition at 7.

post hearing requests for information explaining why it was reasonable to include BLIs 1980/2980.[15]

Specifically, Duke Kentucky stated that it explained in response to Commission Staff's Post-Hearing Request for Information that BLIs 1980 and 2980 ". . . are used when PJM administers agreed upon requests between specific PJM members to bilaterally adjust their billing statements."[16] Duke Kentucky further explained in its motion for rehearing that:

> When there is Miscellaneous Bilateral transaction, the Company researches the transaction and determines the underlying PJM BLIs that would have been charged/credited if PJM processed the transaction through its normal settlement process rather than through a Miscellaneous Bilateral transaction. After the underlying PJM BLIs have been determined, the amounts are recorded based on underlying PJM BLIs and recovery is based on the approval of the Commission of the underlying PJM BLIs and included in the appropriate section of the PSM or FAC, if applicable.[17]

Duke Kentucky – Actual Rate Case Expense

Duke Kentucky requested that the Commission grant rehearing on the issue of its actual rate case expense, allowing Duke Kentucky to recover an additional $172,153 in rate case expense for which documentation was submitted in July 2025 after the hearing in the case but prior to the final Order. In support of its position, Duke Kentucky argued that the Commission had previously allowed recovery of outside counsel fees incurred

[15] Duke Kentucky's Rehearing Petition at 8.

[16] Duke Kentucky's Rehearing Petition at 8.

[17] Duke Kentucky's Rehearing Petition at 8.

after the hearing in Duke Kentucky's last electric rate case, Case No. 2022-00372.[18] Duke Kentucky noted in that case it was directed to file periodic updates of case expenses, including legal fees, until such time as an Order is issued.[19]

Duke Kentucky – Depreciation Expense – Terminal Net Salvage

Duke Kentucky requested that the Commission grant rehearing concerning its recovery of terminal net salvage for its East Bend 2 and Woodsdale fossil fuel generation plants as part of depreciation expense.[20] Duke Kentucky argued that denial of Duke Kentucky's recovery of terminal net salvage constitutes a taking of private property without just compensation in violation of Kentucky law as well as the United States and Kentucky Constitutions.[21] Further, Duke Kentucky argued that the Commission's interpretation of KRS 278.264 is unreasonable and inconsistent with past Commission practice, and that even if the interpretation was reasonable, Duke Kentucky argued that it has met the rebuttable presumption against retirement in KRS 278.264.[22]

The Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, by and through the Office of Rate Intervention (Attorney General) filed a response to Duke Kentucky's petition for rehearing regarding the terminal net salvage that argued that Duke Kentucky's petition does not present new evidence and should be denied. The Attorney General also stated that the Commission's ruling on this issue is consistent with precedent and not a taking

---

[18] Case No. 2022-00372, *Electronic Application of Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. for (1) An Adjustment of Electric Rates; (2) Approval of New Tariffs; (3) Approval of Accounting Practices to Establish Regulatory Assets and Liabilities; and (4) All Other Required Approvals and Relief* (Ky. PSC Oct. 12, 2023).

[19] Duke Kentucky's Rehearing Petition at 10-11.

[20] Duke Kentucky's Rehearing Petition at 11-15.

[21] Duke Kentucky's Rehearing Petition at 12-13.

[22] Duke Kentucky's Rehearing Petition at 13-15.

because these costs have not, and will not, be incurred until after the generating units are retired.[23]

Duke Kentucky filed a reply to the Attorney General's response which argued that the Attorney General did not sufficiently address the portion of Duke Kentucky's petition that argued that the removal of terminal net salvage from depreciation rates constitutes a taking, because it ignored that the Commission's disallowance "potentially creates millions of dollars in stranded costs."[24] Duke Kentucky also argued that the Attorney General's response did not address its arguments that "the Commission's interpretation and application of KRS 278.264 to deny recovery is not reasonable or consistent with the nature of terminal net salvage costs" and that the Commission's "denial of recovery of terminal net salvage is a departure from longstanding ratemaking principles and past Commission practice."[25]

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

Kroger – Rate DS

Kroger's witness, Justin Bieber, asserted in testimony filed in response to the application that Duke Kentucky's proposed rate design for Rate DS recovers 80.7 percent of demand-related costs through the demand charge, and 126.1 percent of energy-related costs through the energy charges, and recommended a rate design for Rate DS in which the demand charge would recover 92.9 percent of demand-related costs and the energy

[23] The Attorney General's Response to Duke Kentucky's Petition for Rehearing (filed Oct. 29, 2025) (Attorney General's Response to Rehearing Request) at 1-3.

[24] Duke Kentucky's Reply in Support of Petition for Rehearing (filed Nov. 4, 2025) (Duke Kentucky's Reply Supporting Rehearing) at 2.

[25] Duke Kentucky's Reply Supporting Rehearing at 2.

charges would recover 112.2 percent of energy-related costs.[26] In rebuttal testimony, Duke Kentucky's witness, Bruce Sailers, opposed Kroger's proposal and asserted that it ignored the potential intraclass subsidization it creates in regard to customers with demand less than or equal to 15 kW.[27] However, Duke Kentucky's witness indicated that if the Commission were inclined to increase the demand related charges that Duke Kentucky "would recommend the Commission slightly increase the demand charge for kw greater than 15 and offset that revenue increase by reducing only the final energy block."[28]

Mr. Bieber testified at the hearing that he found Mr. Sailers alternative proposal in rebuttal to be acceptable.[29] Mr. Sailer's similarly indicated at the hearing that he felt his alternative provided in rebuttal would be reasonable to better align the demand and energy related costs, stating:

> We see [Mr. Bieber's] point . . . we generally agree that cost-based rates that's the way that we prefer. So if we increase the demand charge, that greater than 15 kW demand charge, we would have proposed to just increase that last block, that additional Kw block, and don't reduce it to something that's unreasonable; reduce it maybe to the average Kw charge that comes from the cost of service study - like the total energy revenue requirement divided by the total Kw from RPS.[30]
>
> Duke Kentucky then referenced Mr. Sailer's testimony in its briefing stating:
>
> Company witness Mr. Sailers testified that the Company would be agreeable to reduce the Block 3 energy charge for

---

[26] Direct Testimony of Justin Bieber (Bieber Direct Testimony) at 14-16, Table JB-3.

[27] Rebuttal Testimony of Bruce L. Sailers (Sailers Rebuttal Testimony) at 5-7.

[28] Sailers Rebuttal Testimony at 7

[29] Hearing Video Transcript (HVT) of the May 22, 2025 Hearing at 04:43:50-04:45:50.

[30] HVT of the May 22, 2025 Hearing at 02:00.

> Rate DS to an energy charge calculated by taking the total energy revenue requirement for Rate DS from the cost of service divided by total Rate DS kWh as long as there is a corresponding revenue increase in the Block 2 demand charge for Rate DS customers. During his live testimony, Kroger witness Mr. Bieber agreed with the Company's proposed changes to Rate DS. The Commission should adopt changes to Rate DS consistent with the proposal made by the Company during the hearing.[31]

While the final Order notes the initial disagreement between Duke Kentucky and Kroger, it did not reference the testimony at the hearing or the briefing indicating that Duke Kentucky and Kroger were in agreement regarding changes to the rate design for Rate DS.[32] Further, the change to the rate design for Rate DS suggested by Duke Kentucky in rebuttal and later agreed to by Duke Kentucky and Kroger involves a reduction to the Block 3 energy charge and a corresponding increase in the Block 2 demand charge to partially realign costs within Rate DS such that it would not change the amount that Duke Kentucky will recover pursuant to Rate DS. The Commission finds, as discussed in more detail below, that partially shifting costs from the Block 3 energy charge for Rate DS to the Block 2 demand charge for Rate DS will result in a movement towards aligning rates with cost causation and reduces the existing intra-class subsidy between low-load-factor and higher-load-factor customers, which the final Order recognized and indicated Duke Kentucky should work towards in future proceedings.[33] Thus, given Kroger and Duke Kentucky's indication of agreement that was not addressed in the final Order and having no objection from any other party, the Commission finds that Kroger's request for

---

[31] Duke Kentucky's Initial Post-Hearing Brief (filed June 16, 2025) at 74-75.

[32] Order (Ky. PSC Oct. 2, 2025) at 65-66.

[33] Order (Ky. PSC Oct. 2, 2025) at 65-66.

rehearing regarding the Rate DS rate design should be granted, as discussed in more detail below, but that it should be granted on a prospective basis only for the reasons raised by Duke Kentucky in its response, among others.

To implement that change, consistent with Duke Kentucky's post-hearing brief quoted above, the Commission finds that the Rate DS Block 2 demand charge, i.e. the charge for demand above 15 kW, should be $12.97 per kW and that the Block 3 energy charge should be $0.060705 per kWh. The Commission notes that the changes in the charges should reflect about a 94.5 percent collection of demand-related costs being collected by the demand charge, instead of the 74.6 percent the final Order demand charge collected. Additionally, the Block 3 energy charge will aid in about 105.7 percent of energy-related costs being collected by the energy charges instead of the 123.2 percent collected based on the final Order.

<u>Duke Kentucky – PJM BLI</u>

1. <u>PJM BLI 1216</u>

While the final Order reflected that Duke Kentucky sought to include portions of BLI 1216 in both the FAC and the PSM, the portion of the final Order specifically approving the inclusion of BLI 1216 only referenced including it in the PSM. As indicated by the discussion of BLI 1216, the intent of the final Order is to authorize its inclusion in both the FAC and PSM. Thus, the Commission finds that rehearing should be granted with respect to this request to clarify that PJM BLI 1216 should be recoverable through the FAC, in addition to the PSM, as proposed by Duke Kentucky, as if it had been approved in the Final Order along with inclusion in the PSM.

2. PJM BLIs 1667/2667

On rehearing, Duke Kentucky argued that BLIs 1667 and 2667 are currently recovered through the PSM pursuant to the final Order in Case No. 2017-00321.[34] In that case, Duke Kentucky generally proposed to recover a number of BLIs related to PJM "capacity costs."[35] The final Order in Case No. 2017-00321 did not discuss each BLI separately but rather generally approved them with a requirement that Duke Kentucky list the relevant BLIs in the tariff.[36] Duke Kentucky did not explain the reason why, BLIs 1667 and 2667 were not included in the tariff. However, they are proposing to amend the tariff to include them here. Duke Kentucky has actually included amounts related to those accounts in the PSM, and they have resulted in credits of $887,130 since 2023.[37] Given the previous inclusion of BLIs 1667 and 2667 in the PSM and the credit customers have received, the Commission finds that rehearing should be granted to allow Duke Kentucky to include these PJM BLIs in the PSM, consistent with and subject to any limits placed on their inclusion in Case No. 2017-00321.

3. PJM BLIs 1980/2980

As noted with respect to BLIs 1667 and 2667, the final Order in Case No. 2017-00321 did not discuss each BLI separately but rather generally approved them with a

---

[34] Case No. 2017-00321, *Electronic Application of Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. for: 1) An Adjustment of the Electric Rates; 2) Approval of an Environmental Compliance Plan and Surcharge Mechanism; 3) Approval of New Tariffs; 4) Approval of Accounting Practices to Establish Regulatory Assets and Liabilities; and 5) All other Required Approvals and Relief* (Ky. PSC Apr. 13, 2018), Order at 52.

[35] Case No. 2017-00321, (Ky. PSC Apr. 13, 2018), Order at 50-52.

[36] Case No. 2017-00321, (Ky. PSC Apr. 13, 2018), Order at 52.

[37] *See* TFS2024-00044, TFS2025-00052, and TFS2025-00335.

requirement that Duke Kentucky list the relevant BLIs in the tariff.[38] Again, without an explanation for their exclusion, BLIs 1980 and 2980 were not included in the tariff, which is apparently why Duke Kentucky proposed to the amend the tariff to include them here.

However, BLIs 1980 and 2980 were referenced in the application in Case No. 2017-00321 as proposed to be included,[39] such that the final Order in that case could be read as applying to those BLIs. More importantly, the explanation of the BLIs in response to post case requests for information here indicate that the amounts could relate to adjustments for any number of other BLIs that Duke Kentucky is authorized to recover through the PSM or the FAC such that it is logical that these BLIs or portions thereof should be recoverable at least to the extent that the corresponding BLIs are recoverable.

For the reasons discussed above and having reviewed the record and being otherwise sufficiently advised, the Commission finds that rehearing should be granted with respect to BLIs 1980/2980 to allow them to be recovered as proposed by Duke Kentucky, consistent with and subject to any limits placed on their inclusion in Case No. 2017-00321. However, given the broad and potentially unclear nature of the costs that may be flowed through those BLIs (e.g. adjustments related to numerous other BLIs), the Commission also finds that such amounts should be subject to review based on the reasonableness of how they are included and separately identified in the PSM and FAC filings with an explanation of what the amounts represent to facilitate the Commission's review of the amounts included.

[38] Case No. 2017-00321, (Ky. PSC Apr. 13, 2018), Order at 52.

[39] Case No. 2017-00321, Sept. 15, 2017 Application, Direct Testimony of John Swez, Attachment JDS-4 at 2.

Duke Kentucky – Actual Rate Case Expense

The Commission finds that rehearing should be granted on the amount of rate case expenses recovered in base rates to allow Duke Kentucky to recover the full amount documented in the record. Duke Kentucky's most recent rate case indicated that they could file amounts through the final order.[40] However, in future cases, the Commission will establish a specific deadline for updating rate case expense or estimates thereof through the procedural or post hearing order in a case, as parties need the opportunity to review proposed rate case expense and to limit changes to the revenue requirement near the date an order will be issued.

The inclusion of the additional $172,153 in rate case expense results in an additional increase of $34,431 to the Commission-approved revenue increase based on a five-year amortization period for the rate case expense.[41] Consistent with the change to Rate DS above, the Commission finds that this change should be prospective.[42] However, to ensure that these amounts are fairly and accurately reflected in rates, the Commission finds that within ten days from the date of this Order that Duke Kentucky should file in this matter proposed rates reflecting the additional rate case expense in rates based on a five-year amortization period, along with workpapers and any explanation it determines to be necessary to understand the proposal. The Commission

[40] Case No. 2022-00372, (Ky. PSC July 1, 2024), Order at 11.

[41] Duke Kentucky amortizes rate case expense over five years. $172,153 / 5 = $34,431.

[42] Notably, this should not affect Duke Kentucky's recovery of the rate case expense as Duke Kentucky can simply track the amortization of this portion of the expense from the effective date of these rates.

finds that within seven days thereafter that other parties may respond to Duke Kentucky's proposal to reflect those amounts to the extent that they have any objection.

Duke Kentucky – Depreciation Expense – Terminal Net Salvage

The Commission finds that rehearing should be denied for Duke Kentucky's recovery of depreciation expense associated with terminal net salvage. Duke Kentucky argued that denial of the terminal net salvage value as part of depreciation expense is a taking of private property without just compensation. However, as the Attorney General argued in its response, the Commission has only determined that Duke Kentucky cannot recover those costs, which have generally not been incurred,[43] until it satisfies the requirements of KRS 278.264. While there may be additional reasons not discussed here, the Commission has not denied Duke Kentucky's ability to recover these expenses in the future, and therefore, the adjustment is not a taking.

The Commission's interpretation of KRS 278.264 has also now been addressed in both Case No. 2022-00372, where the Commission first denied Duke Kentucky's recovery of terminal net salvage, and the present case. The Commission maintains that KRS 278.264 requires Duke Kentucky to overcome a rebuttable presumption against the retirement of fossil fuel generation plants before it can recover costs associated with terminal net salvage. Duke Kentucky has so far failed to overcome the presumption as discussed in the final Order. Further, Duke Kentucky has not presented any additional evidence to support its position on this issue, it only restates arguments made prior to the

[43] While other amounts such as the salvage value of equipment are included, the amounts associated with terminal net salvage primarily consist of estimated costs that Duke Kentucky contends that it will incur in decommissioning or closing the generation facilities such that the costs have not actually been incurred.

issuance of the final Order. Thus, the Commission denies Duke Kentucky rehearing on the issue of recovering depreciation expenses for the terminal net salvage of its East Bend 2 and Woodsdale fossil fuel generation plants.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Duke Kentucky's motion for reconsideration is granted, in part, and denied, in part.

2. Duke Kentucky's motion for reconsideration regarding actual rate case expenses and PJM BLIs are granted.

3. Duke Kentucky's motion for reconsideration regarding the removal of terminal net salvage is denied.

4. Kroger's motion for reconsideration is granted as discussed herein.

5. The rates and charges, as set forth in the Appendix to this Order, are approved as fair, just and reasonable rates for Duke Kentucky and these rates and charges are approved for service rendered on and after the date of entry of this Order.

6. Duke Kentucky's proposal to include BLI 1216 in its PSM and FAC is approved as proposed.

7. Duke Kentucky is approved to include BLIs 1667 and 2667 in its PSM consistent with the approval and subject to any limits placed on their inclusion in Case No. 2017-00321.

8. Duke Kentucky is approved to include BLIs 1980 and 2980 in its PSM and FAC, consistent with the approval and subject to any limits placed on their inclusion in Case No. 2017-00321, except that amounts included in BLIs 1980 and 2980 shall be subject to review based on the reasonableness of how they are included and shall be

separately identified in the PSM and FAC filings with a brief explanation or notation of what the amounts represent to facilitate the Commission's review of the amounts included.

9. Within 20 days of the date of this Order, Duke Kentucky shall file with the Commission, using the Commission's electronic Tariff Filing System, new tariff sheets setting forth the rates, charges, and modifications approved or as required herein and reflecting their effective date and that they were authorized by this Order.

10. Within ten days from the date of this Order, Duke Kentucky should file in this matter proposed rates reflecting the additional rate case expense in rates based on a five-year amortization period, along with workpapers and any explanation Duke Kentucky determines to be necessary to explain the proposal.

11. Within seven days after Duke Kentucky's filing pursuant to ordering paragraph 10 of this Order, other parties may respond to Duke Kentucky's proposal to reflect the approved increase.

12. The remainder of the October 2, 2025 Order not in conflict with this Order remains in effect.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Chairman

Commissioner

Commissioner

ATTEST:

Executive Director

ENTERED

NOV 10 2025

jdc

KENTUCKY PUBLIC
SERVICE COMMISSION

APPENDIX

APPENDIX TO AN ORDER OF THE KENTUCKY PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION IN CASE NO. 2024-00354 DATED NOV 10 2025

The following rates and charges are prescribed for the customers served by Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. 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.

Service at Secondary Distribution Voltage (Rate DS)

Demand Charge; Additional kilowatts	$12.97 per kW
Energy Charge; First 6,000 kWh	$0.123015 per kWh
Energy Charge; Next 300 kWh/kW	$0.082846 per kWh
Energy Charge; Additional kWh	$0.060705 per kWh
Cap Rate (non-church)	$0.331506 per kWh
Cap Rate (church)	$0.203519 per kWh

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

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

*Debbie Gates
Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc.
139 East Fourth Street
Cincinnati, OH 45201

*Elizabeth Brama
Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP
1717 Dixie Highway, Suite 340
Covington, KY 41011-4707

*Hikmat N. Al-Chami
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC
110 Oakwood Drive, Suite 500
Winston-Salem, NC 27103

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

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

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

*Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc.
139 East Fourth Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202

*Larisa Vaysman
Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc.
139 East Fourth Street
Cincinnati, OH 45201

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

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

*Minna Sunderman
Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc.
139 East Fourth Street
Cincinnati, OH 45201

*Rocco O D'Ascenzo
Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc.
139 East Fourth Street
Cincinnati, OH 45201

*Sarah Lawler
Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc.
139 East Fourth Street
Cincinnati, OH 45201