

DUKE ENERGY CORPORATION

139 East Fourth Street 1212 Main Cincinnati, OH 45201-0960 Telephone: (513) 287-4315 Facsimile: (513) 287-4385

Kristen Cocanougher Sr. Paralegal E-mail: Kristen cocanougher@duke-energy com

VIA OVERNIGHT DELIVERY

February 16, 2012

RECEIVED

Mr. Jeff Derouen Executive Director Kentucky Public Service Commission 211 Sower Blvd Frankfort, KY 40601

FEB 1 7 2012

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Re: <u>Case No. 2011-448</u> In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. for the Annual Cost Recovery Filing for Demand-Side Management

Dear Mr. Derouen:

Enclosed please find an original and twelve copies each of *Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc.'s Responses to Commission Staff's Second Set of Data Requests* in the above captioned case. A CD is also enclosed which contains the electronic version of the attachments to Data Request Nos. 6, 7, 9 and 10.

Please date-stamp the extra two copies of the filing and return to me in the enclosed envelope.

Sincerely,

notin Cocaninghu

Kristen Cocanougher

cc: Larry Cook Richard Raff Florence W. Tandy Carl Melcher

State of Ohio))SS:County of Hamilton)

The undersigned, Thomas J. Wiles, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is the General Manager, Market Analytics, that he has supervised the preparation of the responses to the foregoing information requests; and that the matters set forth in the foregoing responses to information requests are true and accurate to the best of his knowledge, information and belief, after reasonable inquiry.

Thomas J. Wiles, Affiant

Subscribed and sworn to before me by $\frac{That as That as That as the sworn the sworn to before me by <math>\frac{That as That as That as the sworn the sworn to before me by That as the sworn the sworn to before me by That as the sworn the sworn to before me by That as the sworn the sworn to before me by That as the swor$

My Commission Expires:



MELISSA MANAUGH FELDMEIER, Attorney at Law NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF OHIO My commission has no expiration date, Section 147.03 O.R.C.

State of Ohio)) SS: County of Hamilton)

The undersigned, Kevin Bright, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is the Managing Director, Large & Small Business Market Strategy & Products, that he has supervised the preparation of the responses to the foregoing information requests; and that the matters set forth in the foregoing responses to information requests are true and accurate to the best of his knowledge, information and belief, after reasonable inquiry.

Kevin Bright, Affiant

Subscribed and sworn to before me by <u>KEVIN BRIGHT</u> on this 6^{TH} day of February 2012.

ADELE M. DOCKERY Notary Public, State of Ohio My Commission Expires 01-05-2014

NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission Expires: 1/5/2014

State of Ohio))SS:County of Hamilton)

The undersigned, Richard G. Stevie, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is the Chief Economist, that he has supervised the preparation of the responses to the foregoing information requests; and that the matters set forth in the foregoing responses to information requests are true and accurate to the best of his knowledge, information and belief, after reasonable inquiry.

Richard G. Stevie, Affiant

Subscribed and sworn to before me by $\underline{RUHAROG.STEVIC}$ on this \underline{CTH} day of February 2012.

Jalen Gorden

NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission Expires: 1/5/2D/4

ADELE M. DOCKERY Notary Public, State of Ohio My Commission Expires 01-05-2014

State of Ohio))SS:County of Hamilton)

The undersigned, Jim Ziolkowski, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is the Rates Manager, that he has supervised the preparation of the responses to the foregoing information requests; and that the matters set forth in the foregoing responses to information requests are true and accurate to the best of his knowledge, information and belief, after reasonable inquiry.

/Jim Ziołkowski, Affiant

Subscribed and sworn to before me by $\underline{\text{JIM EIDLKOWSK1}}$ on this $\underline{\text{GIM}}$ day of February 2012.

ADELE M. DOCKERY Notary Public, State of Ohio My Commission Expires 01-05-2014

NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission Expires: 1/5/2014

State of North Carolina)) SS: County of Mecklenburg)

The undersigned, Rick Mifflin, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is the Sr. Manager, Marketing, that he has supervised the preparation of the responses to the foregoing information requests; and that the matters set forth in the foregoing responses to information requests are true and accurate to the best of his knowledge, information and belief, after reasonable inquiry.

Rick Mifflin, Affiant

Subscribed and sworn to before me by $K_{1c}KM_{r}ff_{1in}$ on this \underline{qrh} day of February 2012.

alcer NOTARY PUBI

GLAINE FALCONE My Commission Expires: FED. 27, 2014

State of North Carolina)) SS: County of Mecklenburg)

The undersigned, Michael Corn, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is Lead Marketing Manager, that he has supervised the preparation of the responses to the foregoing information requests; and that the matters set forth in the foregoing responses to information requests are true and accurate to the best of his knowledge, information and belief, after reasonable inquiry.

Michael Corn, Affiant

Subscribed and sworn to before me by <u>Michael Corn</u> on this <u>9</u>th day of February 2012.



DIANE M. WILKINSON Notary Public North Carolina Lincoln County

NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission Expires:

12 July 2014

State of North Carolina SS:) **County of Mecklenburg**)

The undersigned, David L. Doss, Jr., being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is the Managing Director, Project Accounting, that he has supervised the preparation of the responses to the foregoing information requests; and that the matters set forth in the foregoing responses to information requests are true and accurate to the best of his knowledge, information and belief, after reasonable inquiry.

David L. Doss, Jr., Affiant

Subscribed and sworn to before me by David L. Doss Jr on this 944 day of February 2012.

Ludit A NOTARY PUBLIC My Commission Expires: $0 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{$

State of Ohio)) County of Hamilton)

The undersigned, William Don Wathen Jr., being duly sworn, deposes and says that I am employed by the Duke Energy Corporation affiliated companies as General Manager Duke Energy & Vice President Rates-Ohio & Kentucky; that on behalf of Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc., I have supervised the preparation of the responses to the foregoing information requests; and that the matters set forth in the foregoing response to information requests are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information and belief after reasonable inquiry.

Lac.

William Don Wathen Jr., Affiant

Subscribed and sworn to before me by William Don Wathen Jr. on this 10^{12} day

of February 2012.

ili M. Lak

NOTARY PUBLIC

My Commission Expires: 1/5/2014

ADELE M. DOCKERY Notary Public, State of Ohio My Commission Expires 01-05-2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DATA REQUEST	WITNESS	TAB NO.
STAFF-DR-02-001	Thomas J. Wiles	1
STAFF -DR-02-002	William Don Wathen Jr. / David Doss	2
STAFF -DR-02-003	Richard Mifflin	3
STAFF -DR-02-004	William Don Wathen Jr. / David Doss	4
STAFF -DR-02-005	William Don Wathen Jr. / David Doss	5
STAFF-DR-02-006	James E. Ziolkowski	6
STAFF -DR-02-007	William Don Wathen Jr. / Richard G. Stevie	7
STAFF -DR-02-008	Thomas J. Wiles	8
STAFF -DR-02-009	James E. Ziolkowski	9
STAFF -DR-02-010	Richard G. Stevie / Thomas J. Wiles	10
STAFF -DR-02-011	Kevin Bright / Richard Mifflin	11
STAFF -DR-02-012	Thomas J. Wiles	12
STAFF -DR-02-013	James E. Ziolkowski	13
STAFF -DR-02-014	Thomas J. Wiles	14

•

Richard Mifflin	15	5	
-----------------	----	---	--

STAFF-DR-02-001

REQUEST:

Refer to Duke Kentucky's response to Commission Staffs first information request ("Staffs First Request"), Item No. 1. The Gross Annual kWh Impact Prior to Evaluation (per bulb) was 67.7 and the Gross Annual kWh Impact After Evaluation (per bulb) is 52.76. Explain the decrease in kWh impact from 67.7 to 52.76.

RESPONSE:

Savings related to the installation of more energy efficient lighting are driven primarily by two factors. First, there is a reduction in wattage when the bulb is replaced, i.e. replacing a 100 watt incandescent bulb with lower wattage CFL. Second, savings are driven by the number of hours that the more efficient bulb typically operates.

Duke Energy performed Measurement and Verification analyses in 2008 and again in 2010 and the methodology used for both of these evaluations were essentially the same. A sample of customers was surveyed to collect information about which bulbs in their home were replaced with CFLs, both the wattage and the location. In addition, lighting loggers, a device which records the number of hours a bulb operates, were installed in a sample of homes to determine the average hours of operation in various locations within the home.

While many factors influenced the final results of these two evaluations, the data indicates that, compared to 2008, customers tended to be replacing bulbs in rooms where the typical hours of operation were lower. In addition, the average wattage of the bulb that was replaced tended to be lower.

The combination of these two factors leads to a lower overall savings, i.e. less wattage savings combined with fewer hours of operation creates less overall average savings.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Thomas J. Wiles

STAFF-DR-02-002

REQUEST:

Refer to Duke Kentucky's response to Item No. 3 of Staffs First Request.

- a. Explain whether the Company Labor Program Administration cost of \$13,280 is for additional employee costs, or if these costs are for existing employees and are included in base rates.
- b. Provide a breakdown, by type, of costs of the \$169,838 of Other costs.

RESPONSE:

a. In its most recent electric base rate case, Case No. 2006-00172, Duke Energy Kentucky included an adjustment to eliminate all costs and all revenue related to DSM because such costs and revenue were addressed in a separate tracker (See Schedule D-2.21 in Company's Application in Case No. 2006-00172). Consequently, there are no costs related to demand-side management or energy efficiency in Duke Energy Kentucky's current base rates. This is how all of the energy efficiency program costs are treated for cost recovery in Duke Energy Kentucky. Therefore, the cost of \$13,280 is not included in base rates.

b.

Internal Labor, Benefits and Taxes	\$ 142,117
Internal Employee Expenses	\$ 6,231
Marketing Expense	\$ 3,882
External Labor	\$ 17,609
Total Other	\$ 169,838

Note: Amounts represent costs that were not directly charged to a specific program but were allocated to all programs based on each programs direct costs incurred.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: a. William Don Wathen, Jr. b. David Doss

STAFF-DR-02-003

REQUEST:

Refer to Duke Kentucky's response to Item No. 5a of Staffs First Request. The response states, "[d]ue to changes in program management by one of the vendors, refrigerator testing data was not consistently maintained. Therefore, all refrigerator testing data was unable to be reported to Duke Energy." Explain what Duke Kentucky has done to resolve this issue.

RESPONSE:

Duke Energy worked with the agency to understand the Program Manager vacancy and the impact on program reporting. The agency informed Duke Energy Kentucky that 11 refrigerator tests were not reported during the program manager vacancy in 2010-2011. Those 11 tests have been added to the program reporting for the 2011-2012 fiscal year. The agency filled the vacant position in the spring of 2011and began reporting normally at that time.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Rick Mifflin

τ

STAFF-DR-02-004

REQUEST:

Refer to Duke Kentucky's response to Item No. 7 of Staffs First Request.

- a. Provide a breakdown of the \$97,444 of actual program expenditures between program administration fees for the vendor and internal Duke Energy overhead costs.
- b. Provide a detailed description of the type and amounts of the Duke Energy overhead costs.
- c. Explain whether the overhead costs are included in base rates, or if they are incremental costs.

RESPONSE:

a. and b.

Vendor Program Administration Fees	\$ 71,481
External Direct Cost	\$ 112
Allocated Internal Costs	
Internal Labor, Benefits and Taxes	\$ 21,632
Internal Employee Expenses	\$ 948
Total Allocated Internal Costs	\$ 22,580
Allocated External Costs	
Marketing Expense	\$ 591
External Labor	\$ 2,680
Total Allocated External Costs	\$ 3,271
Actual Program Expenditures	\$ 97,444

Note: Amounts represent costs that were not directly charged to a specific program but were allocated to all programs based on each programs direct costs incurred.

c. In its most recent electric base rate case, Case No. 2006-00172, Duke Energy Kentucky included an adjustment to eliminate all costs and all revenue related to DSM because such costs and revenue were addressed in a separate tracker (See Schedule D-2.21 in Company's Application in Case No. 2006-00172). Consequently, there are no costs related to demand-side management or energy efficiency in Duke Energy Kentucky's current base rates. This is how all of the energy efficiency program costs are treated for cost recovery in Duke Energy Kentucky.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: a, b: David Doss c: William Don Wathen, Jr.

·

STAFF-DR-02-005

REQUEST:

Refer to Duke Kentucky's response to Item No. 8 of Staffs First Request.

- Explain whether the Company Labor Program Administration costs of \$28,696 are new employee costs or if the costs are for existing employees and are included in base rates.
- b. Provide a breakdown by type of costs of the \$269,960 of Other costs.

RESPONSE:

- a. In its most recent electric base rate case, Case No. 2006-00172, Duke Energy Kentucky included an adjustment to eliminate all costs and all revenue related to DSM because such costs and revenue were addressed in a separate tracker (See Schedule D-2.21 in Company's Application in Case No. 2006-00172). Consequently, there are no costs related to demand-side management or energy efficiency in Duke Energy Kentucky's current base rates. This is how all of the energy efficiency program costs are treated for cost recovery in Duke Energy Kentucky. Therefore, the cost of \$28,696 is not included in base rates.
- b.

Internal Labor, Benefits	Τ	
and Taxes	\$	225,852
Internal Employee	1	
Expenses	\$	9,915
Marketing Expense	\$	6,176
External Labor	\$	28,017
Total Other	\$	269,960

Note: Amounts represent costs that were not directly charged to a specific program but were allocated to all programs based on each programs direct costs incurred.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: a. William Don Wathen, Jr. b. David Doss

STAFF-DR-02-006

REQUEST:

Refer to Duke Kentucky's response to Item No. 13 of Staffs First Request. Provide, in an electronic format with formulas unprotected, a breakdown by type and amount of the other variable costs that make up the \$0.0019 per kWh.

RESPONSE:

The variable O&M figure of \$0.0019 was obtained from an internal Company document and has been used for a few years. The source document and exact calculations that derive this figure are not available because of organization and personnel changes.

The STAFF-DR-02-006 Attachment attempts to replicate this number using data from Duke Energy Kentucky's last base rate case, Case No. 2006-00172.

The kWh sales figures in the spreadsheet are from Schedule M-2.1 in the 2006-00172 case. The energy-related production maintenance expenses are from the settlement Cost Of Service Study in that case.

Dividing the approximately \$12.4 million of variable production maintenance costs by the annual kWh figures results in a variable maintenance rate of about \$0.0033 per kWh.

The combined tax rate from the COSS is 0.387605. Application of this tax adjustment to the preceding number yields a variable rate of about \$0.0020 per kWh.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: James E. Ziolkowski

Annual kWh Tax Adjustment Variable O&M Rate (Production Maintenance)	O&M EXPENSES PRODUCTION O&M ENERGY RELATED PRODUCTION O&M OTHER PRODUCTION EXPENSE - MAIN TOTAL ENERGY RELATED	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	LINE RATE NO. CODE (A)	DATA:BASE PERIOD _X_FORE TYPE OF FILING: _X_ ORIGINAL WORK PAPER REFERENCE NO(S): 25 Year Average Normalized Period
oduction Maintenance)	O&M EXPENSES PRODUCTION O&M ENERGY RELATED PRODUCTION O&M OTHER PRODUCTION EXPENSE - MAINTENANCE TOTAL ENERGY RELATED	RESIDENTIAL SERV DISTRIBUTION SERV TIME OF DAY ELEC SPACE HEATING SPORTS SERV SMALL FIXED LOADS PRIMARY VOLTAGE TIME OF DAY REAL TIME PRICING REAL TIME PRICING REAL TIME PRICING REAL TIME PRICING REAL TIME PRICING STREET LIGHTING TRAFFIC LIGHTING TRAFFIC LIGHTING S L - CUST OWNED S L - CUST OWN	CLASS / DESCRIPTION (B)	CASTED PERIO UPDATED of 1981 - 2005
1,524,062,000 0.003257034 0.612395 0.001994591	RS E 4,963,922 12,612,020	1,457,429 147,481 42,7 2,228 863 320 10,356 151 162 152 162 142,529 8,620 51,832 2,773 1,947,699 120 0 1,947,699	CUSTOMER BILLS (C)	Æ VISEC
1,035,731,000 0.003281077 0.612395 0.002009315	DS E 3,398,313 8,634,223	(KWH) 1,524,062,000 1,535,731,000 1429,689,000 7429,689,000 14,022,000 6,230,000 14,022,000 1,004,000 1,004,000 1,004,000 1,004,000 1,004,000 5,258,000 5,258,000 13,000 13,000 13,000 13,000 22,114,000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	SALES (D)	DUKE ENERGY KENTUCKY CASE NO. 2006-00172 FORECAST PERIOD REVENUES AT AVERAGE RATES FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007 (ELECTRIC SERVICE) FORECAST PERIOD ACTUAL
34,093,000 0.003276039 0.612395 0.00200623	DP 111,690 283,775	(\$) 102,175,525 69,321,579 69,321,579 20,819,182 40,455,731 729,666 36,046 36,046 1,853,715 8,998,610 1,174,430 1,174,430 4,143,353 2,173,355 534,689 554,689 554,689 554,689 554,689 554,689 554,689 554,689 147,429	BASE PERIOD REVENUE LESS FUEL COST REVENUE (E)	DUKE ENERGY KENTUCKY CASE NO. 2006-00172 PERIOD REVENUES AT AVER LVE MONTHS ENDED DECEN (ELECTRIC SERVICE) FORECAST PERIOD ACTUAL
429,689,000 0.003302691 0.612395 0.002022551	DT-PRI 1,419,130 3,605,638	(¢/KWH) 6.70 6.89 5.55 5.20 5.59 5.44 5.44 5.44 5.44 5.59 5.59 5.59	AVERAGE RATE (F=E/D)	Y ERAGE RATES EMBER 31, 200
729,460,000 0.003261329 0.612395 0.001997222	DT-SEC EI 2,379,009 6,044,438	(%) 40.62 27.56 8.28 16.08 0.29 0.01 0.19 0.74 0.19 0.14 0.19 0.14 0.14 0.21 0.21 0.21 0.21 0.21 0.21 0.21 0.21	% OF REV TO TOTAL EXCLUSIVE OF FUEL COST (G)	57
14,024,000 0.003282516 0.612395 0.002010196	H 46,034 116,960	(\$) (3,848,257) (2,615,221) (1,084,965) (1,084,965) (1,941,887) (35,414) (1,013) (15,731) (86,085) (455,4573) (145,763) (145,763) (145,763) (145,4573) (145,4573) (145,4535) (14,136) (1,137) (1,136) (1,137) (1,136) (1,137) (1,136) (1,137) (1,136) (1,137) (1,137) (1,137) (1,137) (1,137) (1,137) (1,137) (1,137) (1,137) (1,136) (1,137) (1,136) (1,137) (1,136) (1,136) (1,136) (1,136) (1,136) (1,136) (1,136) (1,137) (1,136) (1,136) (1,137) (1,136)(FUEL COST REVENUE (H)	PS
1,004,000 0.003284861 0.612395 0.002011632	DS-RTP 3,298 8,379	98.327,269 66,706,359 19,734,217 38,613,844 694,503 35,033 1,767,630 8,543,153 8,26,279 2,98,584 70,036 1,767,630 8,543,153 8,543,153 8,543,153 8,543,153 8,543,153 8,543,153 404,585 1,164,518 70,036 1,260 144,046 142,019 11,012 57,1413 3,250 144,046 142,019 12,408 463,106 240,820,983	BASE PERIOD REVENUE TOTAL (I)	SCHEDULE M-2.1 PAGE 1 OF 1
21,016,000 0.003107061 0.612395 0.001902749	рт-ряן-ятр 65,298 165,906	(%) 40, 27,783 27,783 16,083 0,29 0,01 0,12 0,13 0,13 0,13 0,13 0,13 0,14 0,01 0,02 0,02 0,02 0,02 0,02 0,02 0,02	% OF REV TO TOTAL (J)	
6,988,000 0.003783343 0.612395 0.0023169	DT-SEC-RTP 26,438 67,172			
3,796,067,000 0.003269998 0.612395 0.002002531	Totals 12,413,132 31,538,511			

Case No. 2011-448 Staff-DR-02-006 attachment Page 1 of 1

STAFF-DR-02-007

REQUEST:

Refer to Duke Kentucky's response to Item No. 14 of Staffs First Request.

- a. Explain whether the total Company Labor Program Administration costs of \$227,158 for all programs are new employee costs or if the costs are for existing employees and are included in base rates.
- b. Provide by program, a breakdown by type of costs of the Other costs totaling \$634,682.

RESPONSE:

- a. In its most recent electric base rate case, Case No. 2006-00172, Duke Energy Kentucky included an adjustment to eliminate all costs and all revenue related to DSM because such costs and revenue were addressed in a separate tracker (See Schedule D-2.21 in Company's Application in Case No. 2006-00172). Consequently, there are no costs related to demand-side management or energy efficiency in Duke Energy Kentucky's current base rates. This is how all of the energy efficiency program costs are treated for cost recovery in Duke Energy Kentucky.
- b. See Staff-DR-02-007 Attachment.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: a. William Don Wathen, Jr. b. Richard G. Stevie

STAFF-DR-02-007 Attachment

	External Labor	Marketing Expense	Internal Employee Expenses	Internal Labor, Benefits and Taxes	
Total				axes	
132,592	13,747	3,030	4,865	110,950	Res. Conservation & Energy Education
26,529	2,750	808	973	22,200	Refrigerator Replacement
24,240	2,539	560	868	20,243	Residential Home Energy House Call
20,986	2,177	480	770	17,559	Res. Comprehensive Energy Education Payment Plus Power Manager
39,793	4,126	606	1,460	33,298	Payment Plus
218,294	22,655	4,994	8,017	182,628	Power Manager
52,959				44,284	Energy Star Products
9 5,870	613	135	217	4,905	Energy Efficiency Website
11,788	1,270	280	449	9,789	Personalized Energy Report Program
63,720	6,704		2,372	53,166	Residential SmartSaver
39,627	4,439	979	1,571	32,638	Non-Res High Efficiency Program
7,284	760	168	269	6,087	PowerShare

STAFF-DR-02-008

REQUEST:

Refer to Duke Kentucky's response to Item No. 18, Staffs First Request, page 16 of 19 of the attachment. The Lost Revenues and Shared Savings for July 2010 for the Residential Home Energy House Call program are \$23,202.96 and \$2,111.86, respectively. Also refer to the response to Item No. 28 of Staffs First Request, page 1 of 6 of the attachment. The Lost Revenues 7/10 through 6/11 in column 7 are \$19,054 and the Shared Savings 07/10 through 06/11 in column 8 are (\$967) for the Residential Home Energy House Call program.

- a. Explain why these values are not the same.
- b. Explain whether Appendix B that was revised in response to Item No. 28 and the associated tariffs should be revised.

RESPONSE:

- **a.** The Lost Revenues and Shared Savings for July 2010 for the Residential Home Energy House Call program found on page 16 of 19 of Item No. 18, Staff's First Request, are the actual lost revenues and shared savings for the filing period. The Lost Revenues and Shared Savings for the Residential Home Energy House Call program found in column 7 of the attachment to Item No. 28, Staff's First Request, incorporate adjustments, a reduction of \$4,148.49 in Lost Revenues and a reduction of \$3,079.69 in Shared Savings, to the prior filing period's Lost Revenue and Shared Savings calculations, found on page 6 of 6 of the attachment to Item No. 28, Staff's First Revenue and Shared Savings calculations.
- **b.** Appendix B that was revised in response to Item No. 28 and the associated tariffs should not be revised.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE:

Thomas J. Wiles

STAFF-DR-02-009

REQUEST:

Refer to Duke Kentucky's response to Item No. 18 of Staffs First Request. The lost revenue factor used to calculate actual lost revenues on the attachment is \$0.0497/per kWh for residential programs and \$0.01 651per kWh for non-residential programs. The projected lost revenue factor shown on the attachment to the response to Item No. 15 of Staffs First Request is \$0.039768 for all residential programs, except the Residential Smartsaver.

- a. Provide, in an electronic format with formulas unprotected, the calculation and supporting information which shows how the \$0.0497/per kWh was determined.
- b. Provide, in an electronic format with formulas unprotected, the calculation and supporting information which shows how the \$0.0165/per kWh was determined.
- c. Provide, in an electronic format with formulas unprotected, the calculation and supporting information which shows how the \$0.039768/per kWh was determined.
- d. Provide, in an electronic format with formulas unprotected, the supporting information and calculation as to how the \$0.051619/per kWh, from the attachment of the response to Item No. 15 of Staffs First Request, was determined.

RESPONSE:

- a. The calculation appears in STAFF-DR-02-009 Attachment Tab "Response to a and b."
- b. The calculation appears in STAFF-DR-02-009 Attachment Tab "Response to a and b."
- c. The calculation of this rate is not available. This rate was included in the 2004-00389 filing and has been carried forward to present.
- d. The calculation appears in STAFF-DR-02-009 Attachment Tab "Response to d."

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: James E. Ziolkowski

July 10 - June 2011 rates and usage Variable 0&M rate Y TT Rate N Workpaper: Calculation of Rates for Lost Revenues for the Kentucky DSM Application

Workpaper: Calculation o	f Rates for Lost Revenue	es for the Kentucky D	SM Application					
Residential	Tail-Block							
Energy Charge Variable O&M Blank Blank	Rate \$0 085379 -\$0 001900							
Blank Blank Blank Blank Blank								
Sub-Total less: Embedded Fuel Total	\$0 083479 \$0.033760 \$0.049719							
Non-Residential								
Energy Charge Variable O&M Blank Blank Blank Blank Blank	Rate DS First 6000 kWh \$0 091568 -\$0 001900	Next 300 kWh/kW \$0 060042 -\$0 001900	Additional kWh \$0 050966 -\$0 001900	First 15kW \$0 000000	Additional Kw \$7 750000	Total		
Blank	\$0 089668	\$0.058142	\$0 049066	\$0 000000	\$7,750000			
Sub-Total less: Embedded Fuel	\$0.033760	\$0.033760	\$0.033760	\$0 000000	\$7 750000			
Total	\$0 055908	\$0 024382	\$0 015306				Multiple days Date	
kWh by rate block Weighted average rate	379.976.386 Rate DP	597.043.730	105.820.331	1.419.310	2.615.322	1.082,840,447 <u>\$0.053276</u>	Weighted Avg Rate	0.02301555 702.864,061
Energy Charge Variable O&M Blank Blank Blank Blank	First 300 kWh/kW \$0 060991 -\$0 001900	Additional kWh \$0 053121 -\$0 001900	Ali kW \$7.080000				Weighted Avg of DS	, DT, DP 0 016468
Blank Blank								
Sub-Total less: Embedded Fuel Total	\$0 059091 \$0.033760 \$0 025331	\$0 051221 \$0.033760 \$0 017461	\$7 080000 \$7 080000					
kWh by rate block Weighted average rate	13.114.149	5.839.606	46097			18,953,755 <u>\$0.040125</u>	Weighted Avg Rate	0 02290627 18.953.755
Energy Charge Variable O&M Blank Blank Blank Blank Blank	Rate DT Summer On-Peak \$0 054118 -\$0 001900	Winter On-Peak \$0 052118 -\$0 001900	Off-Peak \$0 046118 -\$0 001900	On Peak kW \$12 296667	Off Peak kW S1 150000	Total		
Blank Blank								
Sub-Total less: Embedded Fuel	\$0.052218 \$0.033760	\$0.050218 \$0.033760	\$0.044218 \$0.033760	\$12.296667 \$0.000000	\$1 150000 \$0.000000			
Total	\$0 018458	\$0.016458	\$0 010458	\$12 296667	\$1 150000			
kWh by rate block Weighted average rate	126.213.684	224,354.627	827.600.302	2.503.328	43.777	1.178,168,614 <u>\$0.038628</u>	Weighted Avg Rate	0 012457576 1,178.168,614
Energy Charge Variable O&M Blank Blank Blank Blank Blank Blank	Rate EH \$0 071447 -\$0 001900							
Blank Sub-Total	\$0 069547							
less: Embedded Fuel Total	\$0.033760 \$0.035787							
kWh	14386431					14,386,431 \$ <u>0,035787</u>		
RateTT Energy Charge Variable O&M Blank Blank Blank Blank Blank	\$0 052571 -\$0 001900	\$6 693333	OffPK kW \$1 150000					
Blank Sub-Total	\$0.050671	\$6 693333	\$1,150000					
less: Embedded Fuel Tolai	\$0.033760 \$0.016911		\$0.000000 \$1.150000					
kWh	223.895.817		30.087			\$ <u>0.000000</u>		
Total kWh Weighted average lost re	evenue non-residential ra	te				2.294,349,247 \$ 0.045536		

Notes: ¹ Rates are those approved in Case No 2008-00522 ² KWh based on July 2010 through June 2011

2010 Rates using Jan - Dec 2009 Usage

Variable O&M rate

Workpaper: Calculation of Rates for Lost Revenues for the Kentucky DSM Application

Residential	Tail-Block <u>Rate</u>
Energy Charge	\$0 085379
Variable O&M	\$0 000000
Blank	
Sub-Total	\$0 085379
less: Embedded Fuel	\$0.033760
Total	\$0.051619

Ν

Non-Residential

Notes:

¹ Rates are those approved in Case No 2008-00522

² kWh based on Jan through Dec 2009

. .
REQUEST:

Refer to the responses to Item Nos. 16 and 18 of Staffs First Request. The following table shows the projected and actual shared savings/measures per participant for residential programs.

Program Descriptions Residential Conservation & Energy Education	Projected Shared SavingsIMeasure per Participant (\$1 1.66)	Actual Shared Savings Rate \$27.3589
Refrigerator Replacement	\$6.00	(\$1 05.6000)
Home Energy House Call	\$71.40	\$41.3280
Power Manager	\$69.60	\$19.3086
Energy Star Products	\$1.57	\$3.2930
Energy Efficiency Web Site	\$1.62	\$1 7.1 864
Personalized Energy Report Program	\$8.13	\$74.2914
Residential SmartSaver	\$42.55	N/A

a. Provide by program, in an electronic format with formulas unprotected, the calculations which show how each projected shared savings/measure per participant shown in the attachment to the response to Item No. 16 of Staffs First Request was determined.

- b. Provide by program, in an electronic format with formulas unprotected, the calculations which show how each actual shared savings rate shown in the response to Item No. 18 of Staffs First Request was determined.
- c. Explain by program why differences of these magnitudes exist between the projected shared savings/measure per participant and the actual shared savings rate.

RESPONSE:

.

- a. See Staff-DR-02-010 Attachment, Tab STAFF-DR-02-010a
- b. See Staff-DR-02-010 Attachment, Tab STAFF-DR-02-010b
- c. See Staff-DR-02-010 Attachment, Tab STAFF-DR-02-010c

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: a. Richard Stevie b,c. Thomas J. Wiles

,

.....

	_	-					
				Residential Proie	Residential Projected Shared Savings		
10a				Neolaelliai FToje	cted offaled odvillige		
		Original				Projected	
	Projected	Utility	Projected	Projected	Projected	Number of	Shared Savings/Measure
Residential - Programs/Measures	Program Costs	Cost Test	Savings	Net Savings	Shared Savings	Participants	or Participant
Residential Conservation & Energy Education	\$ 499,800	0.93	\$ 464,814	\$ (34,986)	\$ (3,499)	300	\$ (11.66)
Refrigerator Replacement	\$ 100,000	1.03	\$ 103,000	\$ 3,000 \$	\$ 300	05	\$ 6.00
Home Energy House Call	\$ 150,000	3.38	\$ 507,000 \$	\$ 357,000 \$	\$ 35,700	500	\$ 71.40
Residential Comprehensive Energy Education			NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Home Energy Assistance Plus			NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Power Manager	\$ 750,000	3.32	\$ 2,490,000	\$ 1,740,000	\$ 174,000	2,500	\$ 69.60
	*			5 CON 100	¢ 63 460		c 1 C7
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		÷				
Energy Efficiency Web Site	\$ 31,110	1.95	\$ 60,665	\$ 29,555	\$ 2,955	1,830	\$ 1.62
Personalized Energy Report Pilot Program	\$ 153,000	5.78	\$ 884,340	\$ 731,340	\$ 73,134	9,000	\$ 8.13
Residential SmartSaver (Total)	\$ 448,520	2.20 \$	986,744	\$ 538,224	\$ 53,822	1,265	\$ 42.55
Total Residential Projected Shared Savings					\$ 399,863		

-

10b				Residential Ac	Residential Actual Shared Savings			
		Actual				Actual		
	Actual	Utility	Actual	Actual	Actual	Number of	Shared Savings/Measure	easure
Residential - Programs/Measures	Program Costs	Cost Test	Savings	Net Savings	Shared Savings	Participants	or Participant (1)	(1)
Residential Conservation & Energy Education	\$ 640,199	1.01 \$	\$ 646,601	\$ 6,402	\$ 640	234	\$	2.74
Refrigerator Replacement	\$ 72,957	0.89	\$ 64,932	\$ (8,025) \$) \$ (803)	76	\$	(10.56)
Home Energy House Call	\$ 140,792	1.15	\$ 161,911	\$ 21,119	\$ 2,112	511	\$	4.13
Residential Comprehensive Energy Education	\$ 78,880		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Payment Plus (Home Energy Assistance Plus)	\$ 97,444		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Power Manager	\$ 1,082,096	1.17	\$ 1,266,053	\$ 183,956	\$ 18,396	5 9,527	\$	1.93
Enerny Char Droducts (Total)	¢ 177 046	\$ 75 1	FUC 151 >	\$ 45 157	4.516	13.712	\$	0.33
Energy Efficiency Web Site	\$ 13,667	1.21 \$	\$ 16,538	\$ 2,870	\$ 287	7 167	Ş	1.72
Personalized Energy Report Pilot Program	\$ 90,693	3.77 \$	\$ 341,914	\$ 251,220	1 \$ 25,122	2 3,381	\$	7.43
Residential SmartSaver (Total)	\$	NA	NA	NA	A	NA	NA	
Total Residential Actual Shared Savings					\$ 50,270	0		
(1) The values previously provided in response to Item No. 18 of Staff's First Data Request were incorrectly labeled as "SS Rate", or "Shared Savings Rate". These values should have	o. 18 of Staff's First Data Re	equest were incorre	ectly labeled as "SS F	Rate", or "Shared Savings	Rate". These values should i	have been labeled "Total Savings Rate	avings Rate'	
The Shared Savings Rate, used to compute shared savings, is 10% of the Total Savings Rate, and is provided in column H above	s, is 10% of the Total Savin	gs Rate, and is prov	ided in column H at	DOVE				

100 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Differences Between Residential Projected and Actual Shared Savings/Measure of Participar			
				a contraction of the contraction
Residential - Programs/Measures Residential Conservation & Energy Education	(Actual - Projected) Explanation 14.00 The initial projector had a UCT less than one, which resulted in regaline shared savings. Actual results for the test period resulted in a UCT greater than one which resulted in positive shared savings.			
Refrigerator Replacement	\$ {15.56} The initial projection had a UCT greater than one, which resulted in positive shared savings. Actual results for the test period resulted in a UCT less than one, and			
Home Energy House Call	(67,27) The initial projection had a higher UCT zone than the UCT using actual results for the test period. This resulted in a lower shared savings than projected.			
				the second
Residential Comprehensive Energy Education Payment Plus (Home Energy Assistance Plus) Power Manager	NA NA 5 (67.67) The actual result for the test period had a lower UCT score than the initial projection. This resulted in a lower level of thaned savings than projected for the test	-		
Energy Star Products (Total)	5 (1.24) The initial projection had a higher UCT score than the actual UCT score for the test period, which resulted in a lower level of shared savings than projected.			
Energy Efficiency Web Sile	5 0.10 The initial projection was based on higher program costs and participation than the actual results for the test period. The drop in participation was more applicant than the decrease in saving, which resulted in slightly accessed savings per participation.			
Fundation and and and	5 [0.70] The initial projection had a higher UCT score than the UCT using actual results for the test period. This resulted in a lower shared savings than projected.		-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Personalized Energy Report Pilot Program				The second secon

REQUEST:

Refer to Duke Kentucky's response to Item No. 20 of Staffs First Request. Staff requested a comparison of actual program costs versus projected program costs and an explanation for each residential and commercial program with a difference of 20 percent of more by program, whether the difference was positive or negative.

- a. For each residential or commercial program that did not reach its projected participation goal, regardless of the percentage difference, if not previously provided, provide an explanation for why the projected participation goal was not met.
- b. Provide, by program, a description of Duke Kentucky's efforts to
 (1) educate applicable customers about the need for greater energy efficiency, for both electricity and natural gas; and
 - (2) promote its demand-side management programs, due to the rising cost of electric energy and the strain of electric usage on the utility system at times of peak demand.

RESPONSE:

a.

Commercial High Efficiency Program

Participation and spending in the lighting and HVAC technologies has remained constant since 2007 which is comparable to the filed projections for these technologies. Participation and spending in the motors, pumps, and drives technology has remained fairly constant since 2009. The projected program costs of \$100,678 set for this technology in 2008 is consistently 90% more than needed since the program began. In 2011, incentives were discontinued for NEMA Premium motors in response to the efficiency standard revisions for motors under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, taking effect December, 2010. Duke Energy continues to provide incentives for

high efficiency pumps and variable frequency drives. Economic conditions in the greater Cincinnati and Northern Kentucky area resulted in reduced participation in the programs.

Duke Energy personnel continue ongoing discussions with Kentucky K-12 customers to educate them on the benefits of energy efficiency and how Duke's Custom Incentive program can help them achieve energy goals. These conversations led to the energy assessments referenced in the filing leading to this discovery. Recommendations from those assessments are under review by school personnel. Additionally, the interaction has led to recently received, but not yet approved, applications for one school district.

PowerShare®

PowerShare® actual program costs were over 53% above the projected program costs due to the actual participation level being much higher than was anticipated when the projections were created. The actual program costs for the current period were an 18% increase over the previous year (\$344,772). Curtailable load contracted on the program increased by 11%, and the program experienced existing participants migrating to the option with the highest maximum of economic events—and the accompanying highest capacity incentive.

Residential Comprehensive Energy Education (NEED)

The NEED program spent \$78,880 of the \$81,500 allocated for the program. The majority of the funds were spent on outreach and recruitment of teachers. Workshops are offered to interested teachers to explain the program and provide training on how the energy curriculum could be utilized in their classrooms. Participation is based upon the number of Energy Efficiency Starter Kits distributed to DE-KY served families, but the number of students receiving curriculum is typically higher. Many teachers are reluctant to commit to distributing kits to the students because it's difficult.

1) Energy Efficiency Program	s
Program Name	Education and Outreach Activities
Commercial High Efficiency	Trade ally outreach through the program vendor (WECC), personal contact with DE-KY representatives, DE website, electronic newsletters and direct mail.
Residential Conservation and Energy Education	Coordination of communication with low income agencies and companies in the area, direct mail, bill inserts and web based information. Customers receive educational materials about saving energy and how to operate/ maintain the measures

b.

	installed.
Refrigerator Replacement	Coordination with low income agencies and companies that perform weatherization work. This program is part of the weatherization work completed on qualified residences.
Payment Plus	Coordination with low income firms and direct mail to qualified customers. The Payment Plus program educates families about finicial management and energy saving actions.
Personalized Energy Report	Direct mail where customers can receive customer specific information about their home's energy use and opportunities to save.
Energy Efficiency Website	Web based tools provide interactive experience for customers to input information about their home and receive customized recommendations. There are also appliance specific tools that allow for more specific savings estimates.
Home Energy House Call	Direct mail and DE Website are used for customer acquisition. The in home assessment provides face to face interaction with an energy expert. The customer receives specific recommendations abouttheir home and can have measures installed during the assessement.
Residential Comprehensive Energy Education (NEED)	Personal contact with educators, direct mail and educator workshops are used for enrollment. Students receive interactive curriculum that can be used in their homes
Residential Smart Saver®	Trade ally recruitment, direct mail and web based information is used to informa trade allies and educate customers.
2) Demand Response Program	ms (referred to as DSM programs above)
PowerShare®	Direct marketing through Duke Energy Account Managers with commercial and industrial accounts. Customers are targeted for annual campaign to coincide with required registrations with RTOs. During these meetings, customers are also provided information about Duke Energy's energy conservation programs.
Power Manager®	Marketed to residential customers through direct mail and by providing web based information about the program.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Kevin Bright/Commercial High Efficiency Program & PowerShare® Rick Mifflin/Residential programs

REQUEST:

Refer to Duke Kentucky's response to Item No. 21 of Staff's First Request. In the table provided, in the column labeled Program, the Reason for Difference for Other, Duke states, "[f]or the projected lost revenues, the mixture of measures had an average impact of 1,679 kWh and the actual mixture of measures had an average impact of 202 kWh." Provide an explanation for a difference of this amount between the 1,679 kWh projected and the actual 202 kWh.

RESPONSE:

The projected average impacts and actual average impacts for the "Other" category are different due to the differences in participation between the projected measures installed and actual measures installed. An example of this is the "Moisture Traps - Condensate Drain Valve" measure, which has a projected participation of 72, but did not have any participation during the three years of Lost Revenues calculated for this filing period. The lower actual average impact is due to higher actual participation in lower impact measures than projected.

The table below compares the projected participation for the "Other" category to the actual participation.

Other Measures	Projected Participation	Actual Participation
Setback/Programmable Thermostat	138	35
Engineered Nozzles - COMPRESS AIR	72	0
Zone Shutoff Valves -COMPRESSED AIR	14	0
Dew Point Controlled Desiccant Dryers - Compressed air	2	0
Moisture Traps - Condensate Drain Valve	72	0
Chilled Water Reset	8	0
Central Lighting Control	30	0
Switching Controls for Multilevel Lighting	30	0
Daylight Sensor controls	30	0
Trim Impellers/Reduce Throttling Pumps	8	0

Unoccupied Cycle - CONTROLS	8	0
Commercial Clothes Washers - Washer Only	88	0
Commercial Clothes Washers - Electric Dryer & Washer	88	0
Supply Air Reset -Controls	8	0
Ventilation Scheduling - Controls	8	0
Optimal Start /Stop - Controls	8	0
Economizer Cycle - Controls	30	0
Vending Equipment Controller	72	73
Barrel Wraps (Inj Mold & Extruders)	14	10
High Efficiency Units - Refrigeration Display Cases	8	2
Efficient condensor Refrigerator	2	0
Head Pressure Control	4	0
Night covers for displays	30	114
Window Film	1456	22955
Air Flow Restriction Curtains	2	0
Pellet Dryer Tanks & Ducts	8	0
HI-EFF Multiplex Compressor	0	0
Anti-Sweat Heater Controls	0	16
SAW Anti-Sweat Heater Controls	0	13
Ice Machine > 1000 lbs, 24 hours	0	5
Combination Oven (90 lbs_hr)	0	1

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Thomas J. Wiles

-

Duke Energy Kentucky Case No. 2011-448 Staff Second Set Data Requests Date Received: February 3, 2012

STAFF-DR-02-013

REQUEST:

Refer to Duke Kentucky's response to Item Nos. 23 and 24 of Staff's First Request. The last paragraph of each response states, "[t]he Company proposes to work with the Collaborative to develop a revision to the spreadsheet model in order to allow for more matching between costs and revenues, and submit its proposed model to Commission Staff for review and approval." Explain when Duke Kentucky intends to begin work with its Collaborative and when the Commission might be made aware of the proposed revision to the spreadsheet model.

RESPONSE:

Work with the Collaborative will begin in the third quarter of 2012 to make adjustments to the spreadsheet model and once a finalized recommendation is suggested, Duke Energy Kentucky will file the spreadsheet model for approval.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: James E. Ziolkowski

,

Duke Energy Kentucky Case No. 2011-448 Staff Second Set Data Requests Date Received: February 3, 2012

STAFF-DR-02-014

REQUEST:

Refer to Duke Kentucky's response to Item No. 28 of Staff's First Request, page 6 of 6 of the attachment. Explain where the values listed in the Increase (Decrease) in Values - Lost Revenues of (\$4,148) and Shared Values (\$3,079) can be found on pages 1-5.

RESPONSE:

The values listed on page 6 of 6 of Item No. 28, Staff's First Request, are incorporated by reference into the formulas found on page 1 of 6, in cells H12 and I12.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Thomas J. Wiles

REQUEST:

Refer to Duke Kentucky's response to Item No. 34 of Staffs First Request. Door-to-door canvassing was one of the additional marketing efforts that Duke Kentucky might utilize in its Residential Smart Saver CFL Program.

- a. Explain whether any Duke Energy subsidiary utility has experience conducting door-to-door canvassing.
- b. If the answer to part a. is yes, provide the results of the canvassing and explain whether this has been an effective outreach tool to customers.

RESPONSE:

- a. Not on a broad scale, but Duke Energy Kentucky recently received information from a potential vendor. The draft proposal had an attractive cost structure coupled with individual reporting of results. Duke Energy Kentucky continues to evaluate the proposal to determine value and risks.
- b. N/A

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Rick Mifflin