VERIFICATION

STATE OF OHIO)	
)	SS:
COUNTY OF HAMILTON)	

The undersigned, Bradley A. Seiter, Sr. Project Manager, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the foregoing data requests, and that they are true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief.

Bradley A. Seiter Affiant

Subscribed and sworn to before me by Bradley A. Seiter on this 30th day of September, 2022.

NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission Expires: July 8, 2027



EMILIE SUNDERMAN Notary Public State of Ohio My Comm. Expires July 8, 2027

VERIFICATION

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA)	
)	SS
COUNTY OF MECKLENBURG	1	

The undersigned, Brian Weisker, Sr. Vice President, Chief Operating Officer Natural Gas, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the foregoing data requests, and that they are true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief.

Brian Weisker Affiant

Subscribed and sworn to before me by Brian Weisker on this 30th day of September, 2022.

SHANNON L. WALL Notary Public, North Carolina Mecklenburg County My Commission Expires June 28, 2027

NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission Expires: (4) 8 (20) 7

KyPSC Case No. 2022-00084 TABLE OF CONTENTS

DATA REQUEST	WITNESS	TAB NO.
STAFF-DR-03-001	Bradley A. Seiter	1
STAFF-DR-03-002	Brian R. Weisker	2
STAFF-DR-03-003	Brian R. Weisker	3
STAFF-DR-03-004	Brian R. Weisker	4
STAFF-DR-03-005	Brian R. Weisker	5
STAFF-DR-03-006	Bradley A. Seiter	6
STAFF-DR-03-007	Brian R. Weisker	7

Duke Energy Kentucky
Case No. 2022-00084
FE Third Set Data Requests

STAFF Third Set Data Requests Date Received: September 8, 2022

STAFF-DR-03-001

REQUEST:

Refer to Commission Staff's First Request for Information (Staff's First Request), Item 8.

a. Provide a cost-benefit analysis for bypassing the current pipe to pressure

test existing pipeline.

b. Explain why there is inadequate availability of temporary natural gas supply

volumes necessary to support the customer load supplied off sections of pipeline removed

from service in order to perform pressure testing.

c. State the estimated amount of time required to bypass the current pipe to

pressure test existing pipeline.

d. State the estimated cost of correcting deficiencies found during the in-line

inspection of the existing pipeline.

RESPONSE:

a. Retrofitting the existing pipeline to allow inline inspection, pressure testing,

and providing temporary liquified natural gas (LNG) during pressure testing for the

existing 4.5 miles of pipeline in the first phase would cost approximately

\$33,875,000. This is assuming that an adequate supply of LNG would be available, which

is unknown at this time, and that LNG supply would only be needed for approximately 2

months. In addition, it is estimated that an additional \$11,000,000 to \$14,500,000 would

be spent for excavations and replacements as part of ILI inspections on the vintage pipe

material that would not be required for a new pipeline.

b. While it is possible there is adequate LNG available to complete the work

on the pipeline, it's operationally and financially risky to perform this alternative due to

the unknown duration temporary gas could be needed. This work would only be feasible

in the summer months when there is no heat load as it involves reducing the pressure by

approximately half of AM07's typical operating pressure.

c. The AM07 Phase I pipeline would take approximately 2 months to take out

of service, hydrotest, dry, and replace back in service. In this event, supplemental gas

supply would be required to serve impacted customers during this outage. This duration

does not take into consideration any additional excavation and replacement work that might

be necessary.

d. As stated previously, it is estimated that an additional \$11,000,000 to

\$14,500,000 would be spent for excavations and replacements as part of ILI inspections on

the vintage pipe material that would not be required for a new pipeline.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE:

Bradley A. Seiter

Duke Energy Kentucky Case No. 2022-00084 STAFF Third Set Data Requests

Date Received: September 8, 2022

STAFF-DR-03-002

REQUEST:

Refer to Staff's First Request, Item 1.

a. State whether Duke Kentucky considered obtaining an alternate gas feed for

use during pressure testing of existing pipeline.

b. State the feasibility of obtaining an alternate gas feed for use during pressure

testing of existing pipeline.

c. State the estimated cost of obtaining an alternate gas feed for use during

pressure testing of existing pipeline.

RESPONSE:

a. Yes.

b. There are potential opportunities for providing temporary alternate feeds,

however, as stated in response to STAFF-DR-03-001(b), there are operational and financial

risks associated with this solution.

c. The cost of the obtaining an alternate gas feed would be dependent on the

amount of supplemental supply needed and the duration of time needed to provide gas

while pressure testing work is being performed. Based on the system needs, it is estimated

to cost between \$5 million and \$10 million for two months of support, depending on fuel

costs at the time of use.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE:

Brian R. Weisker

Duke Energy Kentucky Case No. 2022-00084 STAFF Third Set Data Requests

Date Received: September 8, 2022

STAFF-DR-03-003

REQUEST:

State whether Duke Kentucky has plans or needs to build a redundant pipeline or alternate

feed to serve the areas served by the AM07 pipeline.

RESPONSE:

There are currently no plans for an additional feed into these areas.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE:

Brian R. Weisker

Duke Energy Kentucky Case No. 2022-00084 STAFF Third Set Data Requests

Date Received: September 8, 2022

STAFF-DR-03-004

REQUEST:

State whether Duke Kentucky's proposed construction reduces the dependency on a single

line being in service at all times.

RESPONSE:

No, the project would provide no additional redundancy.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Brian R. Weisker

Duke Energy Kentucky Case No. 2022-00084

STAFF Third Set Data Requests

Date Received: September 8, 2022

STAFF-DR-03-005

REQUEST:

Explain whether Duke Kentucky evaluated replacing this pipeline without the additional

expense associated with making it ILI accessible. If so, explain why Duke Kentucky opted

to make the AM07 pipeline ILI accessible, especially since it is not a PHMSA requirement.

RESPONSE:

Duke Energy Kentucky did not evaluate replacing the pipeline without making it ILI

accessible. It is required by 49 CFR § 192.150 that new transmission lines be designed and

constructed to accommodate the passage of an ILI tool.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE:

Brian R. Weisker

Duke Energy Kentucky Case No. 2022-00084

STAFF Third Set Data Requests Date Received: September 8, 2022

STAFF-DR-03-006

REQUEST:

Provide the incremental expense associated with making the AM07 pipeline ILI accessible.

RESPONSE:

Retrofit only costs to make the pipeline ILI accessible would be approximately

\$19,125,000. This does not include pressure testing or the significant expected repair costs

identified from an ILI inspection due to the age of the existing pipe material.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE:

Bradley A. Seiter

Duke Energy Kentucky
Case No. 2022-00084
TE Third Set Data Baguests

STAFF Third Set Data Requests Date Received: September 8, 2022

STAFF-DR-03-007

REQUEST:

After the AM07 pipeline is in service, provide when it will need to be assessed for PHMSA

reassessment.

RESPONSE:

Baseline assessment is due 10-years from the date the pipeline was installed per

192.921(g).

PERSON RESPONSIBLE:

Brian R. Weisker