VERIFICATION

| STATE OF OHIO |) | |
|--------------------|---|-----|
| |) | SS: |
| COUNTY OF HAMILTON |) | |

The undersigned, Libbie Miller, Rates & Regulatory Strategy Manager, being duly sworn, deposes and says that she has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the foregoing revised data request, and that the answers contained therein are true and correct to the best of her knowledge, information, and belief.

Libbie Miller Affiant

Subscribed and sworn to before me by Libbie Miller on this 4th day of April , 2024.

NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission Expires: July 8, 2027



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

KyPSC Case No. 2023-0374 TABLE OF CONTENTS

| DATA REQUEST | <u>WITNESS</u> <u>TA</u> | AB NO |
|-----------------|--------------------------|-------|
| STAFF-DR-02-001 | Libbie Miller | 1 |
| STAFF-DR-02-002 | Libbie Miller | 2 |
| STAFF-DR-02-003 | Libbie Miller | 3 |

Duke Energy Kentucky Case No. 2023-00374

STAFF Second Set of Data Requests

Date Received: March 21, 2024

STAFF-DR-02-001

REQUEST:

Refer to Duke Kentucky's Environmental Surcharge (ES) filing for expense months

October 2021 and December 2021, Form 1.10. The Total Adjusted Jurisdictional E(m) for

October 2021 as filed is \$896,302. The over- and under-recovery amount of (\$104,585)

appears to be overstated in the December 2021 filing when the Total Adjusted

Jurisdictional E(m) amount of \$896,302 is carried forward. Provide an explanation of the

apparent discrepancy and a reconciliation of the amounts.

RESPONSE:

The Company inadvertently used an incorrect amount of \$894,065 on Form 2.00, line 25,

Adjusted Jurisdictional E(m) Authorized for Expense Month Two Months Prior, in the

December 2021 ESM filing for the over/under recovery calculation. The amount should

have been \$896,302 on Form 2.00, line 25. The Company corrected the amount by

including an adjustment of \$2,237 on Form 1.10, line 10, Prior Period Adjustment, in the

June 2022 ESM filing. Please see STAFF-DR-02-001 Attachment for a reconciliation.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE:

Libbie Miller

ES FORM 2.00

DUKE ENERGY KENTUCKY, INC. ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE REPORT

Revenue Requirement of Environmental Compliance Costs

Jurisdictional E(m) to be Recovered in Rider PSM

| Line No. | Determination of Environmental Compliance Rate Base (RB) | Source | Original As Filed Expense Month December 2021 Amount (1) | | Corrected (Not Filed) Expense Month December 2021 Amount | | Difference Expense Month December 2021 Amount | | |
|----------------------|---|------------------------------|--|----------|--|----------|---|----------|--------------------------|
| 1 | Eligible Environmental Compliance Plant (Gross Plant) Excluding AFUDC | ES Form 2.10 | | \$ | 67,432,275 | \$ | 67,432,275 | \$ | |
| 2 | Eligible Environmental Compliance CWIP Excluding AFUDC Subtotal | ES Form 2.10 | - | \$ | 67,432,275 | \$ | 67,432,275 | \$ \$ | - |
| 4 | Additions: | | | | | | | | |
| 5 6 | Inventory - Emission Allowances Subtotal | ES Form 2.30 | • | \$ | 19,099 19,099 | \$ | 19,099 19,099 | \$ \$ | - - |
| 7 8 | <u>Deductions:</u> Accumulated Depreciation on Eligible Environmental Compliance Plant | ES Form 2.10 | | \$ | 4,064,000 | \$ | 4,064,000 | \$ | _ |
| 9 | Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes on Eligible Environmental Compliance Plant | ES Form 2.10 | | • | 4,352,002 | • | 4,352,002 | \$ | - |
| 10 11 | Accumulated Deferred Investment Tax Credits (ITC) on Eligible Environmental Compliance F Subtotal | ES Form 2.10 | | \$ | 8,416,002 | \$ | 8,416,002 | \$ \$ | - |
| 12 | Environmental Compliance Rate Base | | | \$ | 59,035,372 | \$ | 59,035,372 | \$ | - |
| 13 | Determination of Environmental Compliance Operating Expenses (OE) | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Monthly Depreciation Expense | ES Form 2.10 ES Form 2.10 | | \$ | 138,791 | \$ | 138,791 | \$ | - |
| 15 16 | Monthly Taxes Other Than Income Taxes Monthly Amortization Expense | ES Form 2.10 ES Form 2.20 | | \$ \$ | 70,886 202,486 | \$ \$ | 70,886 202,486 | \$ \$ | |
| 17 18 | Monthly Emission Allowance Expense Monthly Environmental Reagent Expense | ES Form 2.30 ES Form 2.50 | | \$ \$ | 12 234,642 | \$ \$ | 12 234,642 | \$ \$ | - |
| 19 | Total Environmental Compliance Operating Expense | 20 / 02.00 | • | \$ | 646,817 | \$ | 646,817 | \$ | - |
| 20 | Proceeds from Emission Allowance Sales (EAS) | | | | | | | | |
| 21 22 | SO2 Allowance Sales NOx Allowances Sales | | | \$ | - | \$ | 1 | \$ \$ | - |
| 23 | Total Emission Allowance Sales | | : | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 24 25 26 27 | (Over) / Under Recovery Adjusted Jurisdictional E(m) Authorized for Expense Month two Months Prior Jurisdictional E(m) Revenue Recovered in Current Expense Month (Over) / Under Recovery | | | \$ | 894,065 998,650 (104,585) | \$ | 896,302 998,650 (102,348) | \$ \$ | 2,237 - 2,237 / |
| | (1) Per Staff-DR-01-001 Attachment 46 Form 2.00 | | | | | | | | |
| | DUKE ENERGY KENTUCKY, INC. ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE REPORT | | | | | | ES FORM 1.10 | | |
| | Calculation of Current Month Environmental Surcharge F | actors | | | | | | / | / |
| | | | Original As Filed Expense Month June 2022 | | | | | | |
| Line No. | E(m) = RORB + OE - EAS + Prior Period Adjustment + (Over)/Under Recovery | Source | | | vironmental bliance Plans (2) | | / | | |
| 1 | Environmental Compliance Rate Base (RB) | ES Form 2.00 | | \$ | 57,860,995 | | | | |
| 2 | RB ÷ 12 months | (1) ÷ 12 | | \$ | 4,821,750 | | | | |
| 3 | Pretax Rate of Return (ROR) | ES Form 1.20 | | | 7.905% | | | | |
| 4 | Return on the Environmental Compliance Rate Base (RORB) | (2) x (3) | | \$ | 381,159 | | | | |
| 5 | Environmental Operating Expenses (OE) | ES Form 2.00 | + | \$ | 2,632,315 | | | | |
| 6 | Less: Proceeds from Emission Allowance Sales (EAS) | ES Form 2.00 | | \$ | 2,584,475 | , | | | |
| 7 | Sub-Total E(m) | (4) + (5) - (6) | | \$ | 428,999 | | | | |
| 8 | Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio for Expense Month | Line 18 | | | 96.96% | | | | |
| 9 | Jurisdictional E(m) | (7) x (8) | | \$ | 415,957 | / | | | |
| 10 | Prior Period Adjustment (if necessary) | (A) | + | \$ | 2,237 | | | | |
| 11 | Adjustment for (Over)/Under Recovery | ES Form 2.00 | + . | \$ | 582,615 | | | | |
| 12 | Total Adjusted Jurisdictional E(m) | (9) + (10) + (11) | 1 | \$ | 1,000,809 | | | | |
| | | | | _ | | | | | |

\$ 13,042

(7) - (9)

Duke Energy Kentucky Case No. 2023-00374

STAFF Second Set of Data Requests

Date Received: March 21, 2024

STAFF-DR-02-002

REQUEST:

Refer to Duke Kentucky's ES filing for expense months February 2022 through April 2022,

Form 2.20, page 2 of 3. Explain the rationale behind the February Notice of the approved

landfill closure costs being recovered with a two-month lag beginning with the April 2022

expense month filing.

RESPONSE:

KRS Chapter 278.183, Section 2, states the following:

"Recovery of costs pursuant to subsection (1) of this section that are not already

included in existing rates shall be by environmental surcharge to existing rates

imposed as a positive or negative adjustment to customer bills in the second month

following the month in which costs are incurred."

The Company is following the statute by including the costs in the expense month

the costs were incurred and recovering those costs two months later. For example, the

February 2022 spend on Form 2.20 page 2 of 3, of \$103,920 (Column 7, line 64) is

recovered in April 2022 rates (Column 8, line 66). All of the costs incurred in an expense

month are included in customer bills in the second month following the month in which

the costs are incurred. The two-month lag is related to when costs are recovered, not the

expense month to include costs.

Also, in Case No. 2021-00290 per the Direct Testimony of Theodore H. Czupik,

page 3, lines 14-17, "The Company proposes to revise FORM 2.20 of its monthly ESM

filing to add columns for the monthly cash spend related to the closure of the East Landfill,

for **recovery** on a two-month lag, similar to recovery of other ARO costs recovered in Rider

ESM."

The Commission granted Duke Energy Kentucky's request in this same Order

2021-00290 as referenced in Mr. Czupik's Direct Testimony above, "to amend its

Environmental Compliance Plan (ECP) for purposes of recovering the costs of the closure

and maintenance of the East Landfill and the maintenance of the West Landfill through its

ESM is granted, and to recover unrecovered construction, maintenance, closure, and post-

closure maintenance costs of the East Landfill and unrecovered maintenance costs of the

West Landfill through its ESM is granted", per Order 2021-00290, page 10, Sections 2 and

3.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE:

Libbie Miller

Duke Energy Kentucky Case No. 2023-00374

STAFF Second Set of Data Requests

Date Received: March 21, 2024

STAFF-DR-02-003

REQUEST:

Refer to Duke Kentucky's ES filing beginning with the expense month February 2022

going forward, Form 2.00, line 16 "Monthly Amortization Expense" and Form 2.20,

column 7 and column 11. Compare the figures from Form 2.00, line 16, with the "Total

Recovery" (column 11) figures found on Form 2.20 beginning with the expense month

February 2022 going forward. It appears that the "Total Recovery" (column 11) figure from

Form 2.20 accounts for Cash Spend (column 7) with a two-month lag, while the "Monthly

Amortization Expense" figure from Form 2.00 accounts for Cash Spend (column 7) in the

month that the expense is incurred. Explain the rationale between the two accounting

treatments for "Cash Spend" (column 7) between Form 2.20 and Form 2.00.

RESPONSE:

The Company is using the same accounting treatment for the Cash Spend amount

(column 7) between Form 2.20 and Form 2.00. The entire ESM filing, including Forms

2.00 and 2.20, reports all operating expenses in the expense month they are incurred and

recovered two months later. Form 2.20 not only shows the month the costs are incurred

but also shows the month the costs will be recovered. As an example, the February 2022

Cash Spend of \$103,920 incurred for the month is located on Form 2.20, column 7, line

64. This amount also is located on Form 2.20, column 8, line 66, showing that it will be

recovered two months later in April 2022. The total amortization expense for an expense

month includes the ARO cash spend for that month and the ARO amortization approved

in Case Nos. 2017-00321 and 2021-00290. See the response to STAFF-DR-02-002 for the rational supporting this treatment.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE:

Libbie Miller