

**COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE KENTUCKY PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**The 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

REPLY BRIEF OF THE KROGER CO.

The Kroger Co. (“Kroger”) submits this Reply Brief in support of its recommendations with respect to Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc.’s (“Duke” or “Company”) Application for an adjustment of its electric rates.

1. Kroger and Duke Are In Agreement That The Alternative Proposal Contained In Duke’s Rebuttal Testimony Represents A Reasonable Rate Design For Rate DS.

As explained in their respective initial briefs, both Kroger and Duke recommend that the Commission approve the rate design for Rate DS described on page 7 of Duke witness Bruce Sailors’ Rebuttal Testimony. Duke summarized this proposal in its Initial Brief stating:

“Company witness Mr. Sailors testified that the Company would be agreeable to reduce the Block 3 energy charge for 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 the hearing, Company witness Mr. Sailors testified that the Company would be agreeable to reduce the Block 3 energy charge for 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 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.”¹

Kroger agrees with Duke’s above summary of positions and recommends that the Commission approve the rate design for Rate DS contained in Mr. Sailers’ Rebuttal Testimony. Kroger and Duke are the only parties to this proceeding that have taken a position on the design of Rate DS, and therefore, no party has objected to this recommendation.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kurt J. Boehm

Kurt J. Boehm, Esq.

Jody Kyler Cohn, Esq.

BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY

425 Walnut Street, Suite 2400

Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Ph: 513.421.2255 Fax: 513.421.2764

kboehm@BKLawfirm.com

jkylercohn@BKLawfirm.com

COUNSEL FOR THE KROGER CO.

June 23, 2025

¹ Initial Post-Hearing Duke Brief, pp. 74-75.