

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION OF DUKE ENERGY)	
KENTUCKY, INC. FOR AN ORDER TO ENTER)	CASE NO.
INTO UP TO \$25,000,000 PRINCIPAL AMOUNT)	2024-00320
OF CAPITAL LEASE OBLIGATIONS)	

ORDER

On October 1, 2024, Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. (Duke Kentucky) submitted an application for authority to enter into Capital Lease Obligations (Capital Leases) of up to a \$25 million principal amount over a period ending December 31, 2026.¹ In its application, Duke Kentucky proposed to utilize Capital Leases as another form of financing for capital requirements.² On October 25, 2024, the Commission entered an Order continuing this proceeding beyond the 60-day period specified in KRS 278.300(2) and established a procedural schedule.³

There are no intervenors in this proceeding. Duke Kentucky responded to two rounds of discovery.⁴ The matter now stands submitted to the Commission for a decision.

¹ Application (filed Oct. 1, 2024).

² Application at 2.

³ Order (Ky. PSC Oct. 25, 2024).

⁴ Duke Kentucky's Response to Commission Staff's First Request for Information (Staff's First Request) (filed Nov. 20, 2024); Duke Kentucky Response to Commission Staff's Second Request for Information (Staff's Second Request) (filed Apr. 4, 2025).

LEGAL STANDARD

The Commission reviews requests for financing under the criteria found in KRS 278.300. Three elements must be met for the Commission to approve financing: (1) the financing is for some lawful object within the corporate purposes of the utility; (2) the financing is necessary or appropriate for or consistent with the proper performance by the utility of its service to the public and will not impair the utility's ability to perform that service; and (3) the financing is reasonably necessary and appropriate for such purpose.

More specifically, KRS 278.300 requires Commission authorization before a utility may "issue any securities or evidences of indebtedness, or assume any obligation or liability in respect to the securities or evidences of indebtedness of any other person." KRS 278.300(3) establishes the legal standard and clarifies the scope of Commission review, stating:

The Commission shall not approve any issue or assumption unless, after investigation of the purposes and uses of the proposed issue and proceeds thereof, or of the proposed assumption of obligation or liability, the commission finds that the issue or assumption is for some lawful object within the corporate purposes of the utility, is necessary or appropriate for or consistent with the proper performance by the utility of its service to the public and will not impair its ability to perform that service, and is reasonably necessary and appropriate for such purpose.

KRS 278.300(8) establishes that KRS 278.300 does not apply if the proposed issuance of securities or indebtedness is payable at periods of not more than two years from the issuance date and any renewals of such notes do not exceed six years from the initial issuance date.

PROPOSED CAPITAL LEASES

Duke Kentucky proposed to enter into agreements “from time to time over a period ending December 31, 2026” for up to \$25 million principal amount of Capital Leases.⁵ Duke Kentucky maintained that the Capital Leases will have structures and terms similar to other forms of debt financing, but with the potential to lower the overall cost associated with financing property acquisitions.⁶ According to Duke Kentucky, lessors with credit ratings higher than Duke Kentucky’s can often secure capital at a lower cost and may be able to better utilize tax depreciation benefits than Duke Kentucky could secure and use as lessee, which may result in lower financing costs.⁷

Duke Kentucky stated that the Capital Leases could be used to lease a variety of assets including operating equipment, such as meters, computers, and office equipment; intangible property, including software and site licenses; office buildings; land; plant or equipment in service; plant under construction; or land, plant, or equipment to be acquired or constructed.⁸ Duke Kentucky explained that it does not have immediate plans to enter into a Capital Lease and is requesting authority to do so for “flexibility” in evaluating financing alternatives.⁹ Duke Kentucky further explained that the identity of the lessor, the lease terms, and lease cost would be determined if a Capital Lease was executed.¹⁰

⁵ Application at 2.

⁶ Application at 2.

⁷ Application at 2.

⁸ Application at 3.

⁹ Application at 5.

¹⁰ Application, Exhibit A at 1.

Duke Kentucky asserted that the proceeds from the Capital Leases could be used for the following purposes: (1) necessary acquisitions of property and estimated capital expenditures of approximately \$228 million in 2024, \$281 million in 2025, and \$223 million in 2026; (2) re-financing existing property; and (3) additional expenditures contemplated by KRS 278.300.¹¹

At the end of each initial or renewal lease term, Duke Kentucky anticipates that it will have the following options: (1) renew the lease, (2) purchase the property, or (3) terminate the Capital Lease.¹² Duke Kentucky asserted that it retains the obligation to pursue the best terms available for the Capital Leases selected.¹³

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

Having reviewed the case record and being otherwise sufficiently advised, the Commission finds that Duke Kentucky failed to provide sufficient evidence to satisfy its burden of proof under KRS 278.300. Thus, its application for authorization to enter into Capital Leases should be denied for the following reasons.

Duke Kentucky failed to demonstrate that the Capital Leases are for a lawful object within Duke Kentucky's corporate purpose. Duke Kentucky's lawful corporate purpose, pursuant to KRS 278.030, is to provide adequate, efficient and reasonable service to the public in exchange for fair, just and reasonable rates for the service rendered. Duke Kentucky asserted that the expected use of the proceeds for the Capital Leases was for a corporate purpose, but the expected use contained an open-ended, broad list of

¹¹ Application at 6.

¹² Application at 5.

¹³ Application at 5.

possible uses for the hypothetical proceeds. Duke Kentucky failed to identify the specific use, costs, or terms for the Capital Leases; Duke Kentucky does not have specific plans to enter into Capital Leases; and Duke Kentucky provided expected, but ultimately speculative, uses for the estimated proceeds of the Capital Leases. Duke Kentucky similarly failed to provide substantial evidence that demonstrated that the Capital Lease would not impair Duke Kentucky's ability to provide service and is necessary to provide service. There is no evidence in the record that Duke Kentucky intends to enter into Capital Leases, nor is there definitive information regarding the costs, terms, or projected proceeds of Capital Leases. Duke Kentucky provides only theoretical, conclusory statements to support its request.

In its final Order in Duke Kentucky's prior lease authorization request in Case No. 2022-00335, the Commission encouraged Duke Kentucky to provide specific or example information regarding potential Capital Leases, including the property being leased, the lessor, the lease amount and terms, and the use of the proceeds.¹⁴ The Commission notes that the information contained in the application in this proceeding is almost identical to the application in the prior proceeding, and again fails to provide specific or example information regarding potential Capital Leases. When asked for additional information to what was provided in its application, Duke Kentucky stated it does not have any further information to provide.¹⁵ Because Duke Kentucky cannot provide specific evidence upon which the Commission can render a decision, the Commission cannot

¹⁴ Case No. 2022-00335, *Electronic Application of Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. For An Order to Enter into Up To \$25,000,000 Principal Amount of Capital Lease Obligations* (Ky PSC Dec. 3, 2022), Order.

¹⁵ Duke Kentucky's Response to Staff's Second Request, Item 1.

determine that the Capital Leases would not impair Duke Kentucky's ability to provide service or that the Capital Leases are necessary to provide service.

Finally, for the same reasons set forth above, Duke Kentucky failed to provide sufficient evidence that the Capital Leases are reasonably necessary and appropriate for Duke Kentucky's lawful corporate purpose. Because Duke Kentucky cannot provide specific evidence upon which the Commission can render a decision, the Commission cannot determine that the Capital Leases are reasonably necessary and appropriate for Duke Kentucky's lawful corporate purpose.

Duke Kentucky noted that, in the past, the Commission approved similar requests regarding Capital Leases, including its prior application in Case No. 2022-00335.¹⁶ The Commission notes that past approval of certain types of financing does not guarantee that all future applications for the same type of financing will be approved because each application stands on its own facts and circumstances. The Commission further notes that in Case No. 2022-00335, the Commission, in fact, denied Duke Kentucky's request, and entered a finding of fact that Duke Kentucky failed to provide sufficient evidence to support its request and that the failure to provide specific information precluded the Commission from rendering a decision in that matter.¹⁷ As in the prior case, the evidence of record in this case is also speculative, broad, and overly vague. Duke Kentucky continues to not have specific plans to enter into a Capital Lease and continues to be unable to provide the specific or example information on the financing terms, costs, or proceeds that the Commission requires to make an informed decision based upon the

¹⁶ Case No. 2022-00335, Oct. 3, 2022 Application.

¹⁷ Case No. 2022-00335, Dec. 3, 2022 Order.

evidence of record. If Duke Kentucky files a similar application in the future, the Commission continues to encourage Duke Kentucky to provide specific information regarding potential Capital Leases, including the property being leased, the lessor, the lease amount and terms, and the use of the proceeds.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Duke Kentucky's application for authorization to enter into Capital Leases is denied.
2. This case is closed and removed from the Commission's docket.

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION


Chairman

Vice Chairman


Commissioner

ATTEST:


Executive Director



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

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

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

*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