



155 East Broad Street
20th Floor
Columbus, Ohio, 43215

o: 614-222-1330
f: 614-222-1337

January 27, 2017

Ms. Barcy F. McNeal, Secretary
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
180 East Broad Street, 11th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Re: In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., Concerning its Energy Efficiency and Peak Demand Reduction Programs and Portfolio Planning, Case No.16-576-EL-POR.

Dear Ms. McNeal:

Pursuant to a request from the Attorney Examiner in the above-captioned proceeding, Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., (Duke Energy Ohio) is providing a copy of its response to the Staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (Staff); letter dated January 25, 2017.

Duke Energy Ohio respectfully requests that the Attorney Examiner issue an Entry indicating that the testimony is to be filed without further delay and that the hearing is to proceed as currently scheduled on February 21, 2017.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Elizabeth H. Watts

Amy B. Spiller
Deputy General Counsel
Elizabeth H. Watts
Associate General Counsel
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.
139 E. Fourth Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45201-0960

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing was delivered by U.S. mail (postage prepaid), personal delivery, or electronic mail, on this 27th day of January, 2017, to the following parties.

/s/ Elizabeth H. Watts

Elizabeth H. Watts

Bojko@carpenterlipps.com Ghiloni@carpenterlipps.com paul@carpenterlipps.com mfleisher@elpc.org fdarr@mwncmh.com mpritchard@mwncmh.com joliker@igsenergy.com Natalia.Messenger@ohioattorneygeneral.gov John.Jones@ohioattorneygeneral.gov Christopher.Healey@occ.ohio.gov	cmooney@ohiopartners.org tdougherty@theOEC.org jfinnigan@edf.org rick.sites@ohiohospitals.org mwarnock@bricker.com dborchers@bricker.com Dstinson@bricker.com
--	--

RESPONSE TO STAFF DATA REQUEST 1.

All data provided is in kWh. The Company apologizes for the confusion that its unintentional mislabeling in the chart caused and has made the appropriate correction.

The differences in the data regarding projections for 2009 through 2011 is due to the fact that for the Company's Rider SAW, cost recovery mechanism, the Company did not make annual rider filings containing projections of costs and impacts for the next year. For the SAW recovery mechanism for 2009 - 2011, Duke Energy did not have an annual projection, but rather a three year achievement. However, forecasted costs and kWh impacts data were submitted as part of Duke Energy Ohio's first electric security plan Case No.08-920-EL-SSO. Rider SAW was agreed to in stipulation and approved by the Commission prior to the Commission's enactment of rules for implementation of energy efficiency and demand reduction. Once these "Green Rules" were finalized, the Company was required to refile for approval of Rider SAW, pursuant to the newly enacted rules. This data is presented in the updated chart and should be considered the forecasted projections for that time frame.

The 2012 forecast data was submitted within Duke Energy Ohio's second portfolio filing in Case No. 11-4393-EL-POR. The data for years 2013 – 2015 were the results of the annual rider true-up filings. The 2012 forecast cost data was only submitted in the portfolio from Case No. 11-4393-EL-POR. The previous 2012 kWh projection came from a status update filing. The data presented in the updated chart should be considered the forecasted projections for that timeframe as it contains the forecast for costs and kWh from the same Case No. 11-4393-EL-POR.

As previously explained, there were different recovery mechanisms, different filing types (ESP/Rider True-ups/Portfolios), and different achievement levels over time. None of this information appears relevant to the pending application; however the Company has provided this information to assist Staff in understanding the history of these cases and to help Staff understand the Company's different recovery mechanisms.



155 East Broad Street
20th Floor
Columbus, Ohio, 43215

o: 614-222-1334
f: 614-222-1337

Year	Projected costs:	Actual costs	Projected kWh	Actual kWh
2009	\$20,121,175	\$12,271,772	104,753,903	292,333,194
2010	\$24,047,482	\$23,312,812	227,666,651	309,907,597
2011	\$28,217,932	\$25,226,982	364,481,170	215,291,129
2012	\$33,906,873	\$25,147,118	186,241,464	262,436,819
2013	\$25,747,957	\$22,130,677	115,117,713	144,101,736
2014	\$31,528,406	\$30,608,344	115,850,814	152,268,735
2015	\$36,786,357	\$31,531,908	137,756,583	164,010,308

- 2009 Actual kWh includes impacts of 206,669,685 kWh from 2006 - 2008 and 100,443 kWh from non-portfolio low income lighting
- 2010 Actual kWh includes 895,621 kWh from non-portfolio low income lighting
- 2011 Actual kWh includes 54,587 kWh from Mercantile Self-Direct and 348,053 kWh from non-portfolio low income lighting
- If the impacts listed in the footnotes above for 2009 - 2011 are removed, the total is 610,807,647 kWh
- The projected costs and kWh for 2012 are from Case No. 11-4393-EL-POR. Both the costs and kWh were projected in Case No. 11-4393-EL-POR and should be used as the official results

The above table was created from data contained in the following cases:

- Case No. 08-920-EL-SSO
- Case No. 11-4393-EL-POR
- Case No. 12-857-EL-RDR
- Case No. 13-753-EL-RDR
- Case No. 14-457-EL-RDR
- Case No. 15-534-EL-RDR
- Case No. 16-664-EL-RDR