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## To The Honorable Commission:

In accordance with the provisions of R.C. Section 4909.19, the Commission's Staff has conducted its investigation in the above matter and hereby submits its findings in the within Staff Report.

The Staff Report has been jointly prepared by the Commission's Utilities Department and Service Monitoring and Enforcement Department.

In accordance with R.C. Section 4909.19, copies of the Staff Report have been filed with the Docketing Division of the Commission and served by certified mail upon the mayors of all affected municipalities and other public officials deemed representative of the service area affected by the application. A copy of said report has also been served upon the utility or its authorized representative. Interested parties are advised that written objections to any portion of the Staff Report must be filed within thirty (30) days of the date of the filing of said report after which time the Commission will promptly set this matter for public hearing. Written notice of the time, place, and date of such hearing will be served upon all parties to the proceeding.

The Staff Report is intended to present for the Commission's consideration the results of the Staff's investigation. It does not purport to reflect the views of the Commission nor should any party to said proceeding consider the Commission as bound in any manner by the representations or recommendations set forth therein. The Staff Report, however, is legally cognizable evidence upon which the Commission may rely in reaching its decision in this matter. (See Lindsey v. Pub. Util. Comm., 111 Ohio St. 6 (1924)
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## BACKGROUND

The Applicant, Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., (Duke or the Company) was incorporated in Ohio on April 3, 1897, as Cincinnati Gas, Light and Coke Company. It was renamed Cincinnati Gas \& Electric Company (CG\&E) in 1901, and its present name Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. was adopted in 2006. Growth, acquisitions and mergers throughout the years have resulted in the present operation in which the Applicant renders electric or gas service, or both, in ten counties in Ohio. The Applicant is a public utility engaged in the business of distribution and sale of gas to approximately 426,000 customers located in eight counties in the southwest section of Ohio.

On October 24, 1994, Cincinnati Gas \& Electric merged with PSI Resources Inc. to form Cinergy Corporation. Cinergy was the parent Company to both PSI Energy, Inc. (PSI Resources' utility subsidiary) and CG\&E.

On June 1, 2005, Cinergy Corporation and Deer Holding Corporation filed an application with the Commission requesting authorization to merge Cinergy Corporation and Duke Energy Corporation. The Commission approved the merger and the Applicant was renamed Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. effective April 3, 2006.

On June 18, 2007, in Case No. 07-589-GA-AIR, the Applicant filed a notice of intent to file an application for an increase in rates to be charged for gas service for its entire service area subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission. The Applicant's filing also included a notice of intent to file an application for approval of an alternative rate plan for its gas distribution service under Case No. 07-590-GA-ALT. In concert with this latter filing, the Applicant reserved Case No. 07-591-GA-AAM to serve as notice of its intent to file an accounting application.

In the alternative rate application, the Applicant seeks the Commission approval: first, to extend the term of the accelerated main replacement program (Rider AMRP) for another nine years with some modifications; second, to recover its investment in its Utility of the Future initiative through a new rider (Rider AU); and third, to recover sales revenue loss through a new sales decoupling rider (Rider SD).

In its accounting application, the Applicant requested authority to change accounting methods to defer certain costs to be later recovered as part of its AMRP expenditures, and to capitalize the cost of certain property relocations and replacements. Regarding the notice for an increase in rates, the Applicant requested that the test year period be established as the twelve months ending December 31, 2007, and that the date certain be March 31, 2007. By its Entry of September 5, 2007, the Commission approved the requested date certain and test year period.
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The rates proposed by the Applicant when applied to test year sales volumes would generate approximately $\$ 34$ million of additional revenues. This is an increase of $5.71 \%$ over total adjusted current operating revenues.

## OPERATING INCOME AND RATE BASE

## SCOPE OF INVESTIGATION

On August 1, 2007, the Commission authorized the Staff to issue a request for proposal (RFP) to hire a consultant to attest to the accuracy of the financial data contained in the Standard Filing Requirements Section B through Section E. The selected auditor was required to complete the guideline procedures contained in the RFP and was to complete any additional procedures it considered necessary to complete the review.

On September 5, 2007 the Commission selected Blue Ridge Consulting Services, Inc. (Blue Ridge) to conduct the review and the Commission directed Duke to enter into a contract with Blue Ridge for the purpose of providing payment for its services. The cost of providing these services is included in the Staff's rate case expense recommendation.

Blue Ridge completed its investigation and its report has been docketed in this case.

## FORMAT OF THE SCHEDULES

The Applicant provided the Staff and the parties in the case an electronic copy of the standard filing requirements, Schedules A through E. The Staff was able to use the operating income and rate base portions of that electronic filing to format its schedules. The Staff commends the Applicant for the efforts it put into the electronic SFRs. It saved the Staff significant time preparing the Staff Report and it is a tool that helps put the consumer groups and other parties in the case on equal footing with the Applicant.

## REVENUE REQUIREMENTS

Schedule A-1 presents the Staff's determination of the Applicant's revenue requirements. The Staff recommended revenue increase is shown on Staff's Schedule A-1. This determination is based on the examination of the accounts and records of the Applicant for the twelve months ended December 31, 2007, the test year in this proceeding. The results of its examination are summarized in this report, and the schedules that incorporate the Staff's recommended rate of return, rate base, and adjusted test year operating income.

## Common Plant to Gas Allocators

Blue Ridge Consultants recommended that the Common Plant to Gas allocator be updated from the 2004 baseline used in the application (18.68\%) to a 2006 baseline (13.5\%). The Staff's adjusted plant in service, depreciation reserve and property taxes reflect this recommendation. Further discussion of this re-allocation can be found in the Blue Ridge Report.

## RATE BASE

The rate base represents the net value of Applicant's plant and other assets as of the date certain, March 31, 2007, which was used and useful in providing gas utility service to its customers and upon which its investors are entitled to the opportunity to receive a fair and reasonable rate-of-return.

The Staff's recommended rate base is divided into Plant In Service, Depreciation, Construction Work In Progress, Working Capital, and Other Rate Base Items. A comparison of rate base submitted by the Applicant and that, which is recommended by the Staff, is shown on Schedule B-1. Schedules B-2 through B-6 provides additional support to the Staff's figures.

## Plant In Service

As a result of Blue Ridge's investigation and the Staff's review of the application, the Staff recommends certain adjustments be made to the Applicant's date certain plant investment for ratemaking purposes. These adjustments are identified below, summarized on Schedule B-2.2, and are reflected in the calculation of jurisdictional plant in service figures on Schedule B-2.1.

## Hartwell Facility Exclusion

Both the Applicant and the Staff proposed an adjustment to exclude the entire date certain investment in the Hartwell facility. This facility is used primarily for recreational purposes and various outside parties periodically use it. The Staff's jurisdictional adjustment incorporates the use of the composite, common plant allocation factor.

## Depreciation

Depreciation is the process which distributes the original cost of depreciable assets, adjusted for net salvage, over the normal life of the property in a systematic and rational manner. The Staff's investigation of depreciation is segregated into two areas: Depreciation Reserve, and Depreciation Accrual Rates and the corresponding Depreciation Expense. Each of these is discussed in detail in the following sections.

## Depreciation Reserve

The Applicant maintains depreciation reserve, by account, on a total Company basis. The Staff adjusted the Applicant's depreciation reserve to exclude reserve associated with the adjustments as discussed in the Plant in Service section. These adjustments are summarized on Schedule B-3.1.

In order to determine if the Applicant's booked reserve for depreciation is proper and adequate, the Staff generally finds it useful to compare the book reserve with a calculated theoretical reserve, as a guide to whether past accrual rate calculations have been appropriate. The Staff compared the Applicant's booked reserve level with a calculated theoretical reserve, based on the Staff's recommended accrual rates and plant and reserve balances as of December 31, 2006. As is often the case, certain accounts will indicate a theoretical overaccrual, while others indicate an underaccrual. The net effect of these differences is a moderate overaccrual, which is not inconsistent with the depreciation accrual rates proposed. The Staff determined that the overall booked reserve is in sufficient agreement with the theoretical reserve calculation. Therefore, it is the Staff's opinion that the actual jurisdictional reserve for depreciation, as adjusted by the Staff on Schedule B-3, is proper and adequate and should be used for purposes of this proceeding.

## Depreciation Accrual Rates and Depreciation Expense

The Applicant's current depreciation accrual rates were prescribed by this Commission in Case No. 01-1359-GA-AAM for the gas plant accounts and in its Opinion and Order in Case No. 05-59-EL-AIR for the common plant accounts.

The Applicant filed a depreciation study for its gas plant performed by its consultant, Gannett Fleming Valuation and Rate Consultants, Inc. The Applicant's accrual rates, for most gas plant accounts, were developed using the straight-line average service life method of depreciation. For Structures and Improvements - Major and Structures and Improvements - Leaseholds, a lifespan analysis was used. For certain General Plant gas accounts, the annual depreciation amounts were based on amortization accounting. The Applicant's depreciation study included Common Plant accounts that are common to both electric and gas operations.

The Staff conducted a review of the depreciation study provided by the Applicant. The Staff finds itself in general agreement with the service life, projected retirement dispersion and net salvage parameters proposed in the Applicant's study. However, the Staff noted small differences in some accounts between the accrual rates proposed by the Applicant and those that the Staff calculated based on the parameters proposed.

In addition, there is some concern with regard to the treatment of the Asset Retirement Obligation and how it is reflected in the net salvage percentages used in determining the proposed accrual rates. It is at this time unclear to what extent retirements of the type covered by the Asset Retirement Obligation treatment are included in the historical retirements used as part of the determination of the Net Salvage figures. To the extent that the cost of removing environmentally hazardous materials is already reflected in the Net Salvage estimates proposed, there may be a "double counting" of those costs between depreciation expense and the Asset Retirement Obligation treatment. The Staff is continuing its review in this area, and may revise its recommendations based on that review.

The Staff recommended accrual rates are shown on Schedule B-3.2a. The Staff recommends that the Applicant be ordered to use the accrual rates shown on Schedule B-3.2a for book depreciation purposes, effective concurrently with customer rates resulting from this proceeding.

The Staff has long maintained that accrual rates should be thoroughly reviewed at least every three to five years. The Staff, therefore, recommends that in five years Applicant submit a depreciation study for all gas plant accounts.

The Staff's calculation of depreciation expense, based on the adjusted jurisdictional plant in service balances at date certain and the accrual rates discussed above, is shown on Schedule B-3.2.

## Construction Work In Progress

The Applicant did not request any allowance for construction work in progress in its filing and Staff, as shown on Schedule B-4, did not recommend an allowance.

## Working Capital

Working capital has been generally defined as the average amount of capital provided by investors in the Company, over and above the investments in plant and other specifically identified rate base items, to bridge the gap between the time that expenditures are required to provide service and the time collections are received for the service.
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The Applicant's working capital request was a thirteen month average balance for gas enricher liquids, other, gas stored underground, materials and supplies minus a thirteen month balance of customer deposits.

The Applicant did not prepare a lead lag study for this case therefore; the Staff can not recommend a working capital allowance.

## Other Rate Base Items

The Staff reduced rate base by the date certain balances of customer advances for construction, post retirement benefits and accumulated unrestricted investment tax credits. The Staff also reflected a net reduction of deferred taxes created by timing differences of tax to book expense recognition.

The Staff's recommendation reflects the Error/Corrections recommended by Blue Ridge to customer advances for construction.

Other rate base items are detailed on Schedule B-6.

## OPERATING INCOME

The Applicant's test year operating income consists of three months of actual data for the period January 1 through March 31, 2001, and nine months of forecasted data for the period April 1 through December 31, 2001. The Staff adjusted the Applicant's test year operating income as required to render it appropriate as a basis for setting rates.

The Staff's proforma operating income is the Staff's adjusted test year operating income modified to reflect the Applicant's increase in revenues and the associated increases in uncollectible accounts expense and federal income taxes.

Schedules C-1 and C-2 present the Staff's determination of operating income. The calculations, methodologies and rational used to develop the Staff's adjusted and proforma operating income are detailed on Schedules $\mathrm{A}-1.1, \mathrm{C}-3.1$ through $\mathrm{C}-3$. and C 4.

## Proforma Adjustments

Schedule C-1 sets forth the Applicant's proposed increase in operating revenues based on the Applicant's proposed rates and associated increases in uncollectible expenses and federal income taxes.

## Current Adjustments

## Base Revenue

Both the Staff and the Applicant adjusted base revenues to annualize revenues to reflect the most recent rates granted by the Commission with the test year sales. Also included in the adjustment are adjustments to the percentage of income plan rider (PIPP), accelerated main replacement program rider (AMRP), contact commitment cost recovery rider (CCCR), and the gas surcredit rider. The adjustment also eliminates the merger savings credit rider (MSR), unbilled revenue and increases test year revenues to include revenues for the budgeted months for reconnection charges, bad debts charges, rents and miscellaneous Other Revenues.

The Staff's adjustment is presented on Schedule C-3.1.

## Gas Cost Expense

The Staff and the Applicant synchronized the test year gas cost recovery rider revenues (GCR) and gas cost expense by annualizing test year gas sales with an EGC rate of $\$ 8.883 / \mathrm{MCF}$. The adjustment also eliminates unbilled gas cost revenues and unbilled gas cost expenses.

The Staff's gas cost expense adjustment is included in Schedule C-3.1.

## Capitalization of Annual Main Replacement Program (AMRP) Customer Installations

The Applicant proposes to continue the AMRP that was authorized in its last base rate case ( $01-1228-\mathrm{GA}-\mathrm{AIR}$ ). The Applicant requests that curb-to-meter replacement and riser replacement costs be included with the mains replacement program. The Applicant proposes that it retain ownership of the curb to meter replacement costs and that those costs be capitalized. Currently, curb to meter and riser replacement costs are expensed. As a part of this request, the Applicant recommends that the test year curb to meter replacement and riser replacement expense be removed and that these costs be amortized over three years.

The Staff's discussion of the proposed AMRP is included in the Proposed Alternative Regulation Plan section of this report. The Staff recommends that, consistent with its AMRP recommendation, the test year expenses be removed but that these costs be amortized over a five year period instead of a three year period as requested by the Applicant. The Staff's adjustment is shown on Schedule C-3.2.

## Rate Case Expense

The Staff's recommended rate case expense is detailed on Schedule C-3.3. It includes the Applicant's estimate of rate case expense plus Staff's estimate of Blue Ridge consultant's costs amortized over five years.

## Labor Expense

The Applicant adjusted test year labor expenses to annualize wage increases expected to occur throughout the test year. The annualization includes an allocation of the labor-related expenses of employees of the service Company and other affiliated companies.

The Staff reviewed the Applicant's adjustment and recommends it for this proceeding. This recommendation does reflect the Error/Corrections recommended by Blue Ridge. The Staff's labor expense is presented on Schedule C-3.4.

## Depreciation Expense

Depreciation expense was adjusted to reflect the Staff's recommended depreciable plant in service as of the date certain, depreciation accrual rates, and amortization of limited term plant investments. The Staff's adjustment to depreciation is presented on Schedule C-3.5, with supporting calculations provided on Schedule B-3.2. Further discussion on depreciation can be found in the Rate Base Section of this Report.

## Reclassification of Interest on Customers' Deposits

Consistent with the treatment of customers' deposits as an offset to the Applicant's rate base, the Staff reclassified the associated interest expense to operating expenses.

The Staff's adjustment is shown on Schedule C-3.6.

## Ohio Excise Tax Liability Rider

The Staff and the Applicant adjusted test year revenues and expenses to synchronize the Ohio excise tax liability rider (ETR) and the Ohio excise tax expense.

The Staff's adjustment is presented on Schedule 3.7

## Annualized Property Tax Expense

The Applicant's property tax expense is based on date certain investment, actual valuation percentage and actual tax rates. The Staff adjusted the Applicant's calculation to reflect the Error/Corrections and the Common Plant to Gas reallocation recommended by Blue Ridge.

The Staff's adjustment is presented on Schedule 3.8.

## Percentage of Income Payment Plan

The Staff and the Applicant adjusted test year revenues and expenses to synchronize the percentage of income payment plan (PIPP) rider revenues with the expense.

The Staff's adjustment is presented on Schedule C-3.9.

## Interest Expense

The Staff and the Applicant adjusted the federal income tax expense calculation for the deductable interest expense allowance (weighted cost of debt times rate base) and to eliminate the deferred allowance related to allowance for funds used during construction and the deferred allowance related to capitalized interest.

The Staff's adjustment is presented on Schedule C-3.10

## Budget Correction

The Applicant adjusted operating income for known changes in operation and maintenance expenses since the preparation of the official operating budget. The Staff agrees with the adjustment and presents it on Schedule C3-11.

## State Tax Rider

The Staff and the Applicant adjusted test year revenues and expenses to synchronize the state tax (SRT) rider revenues with the expense.

The Staff's adjustment is presented on Schedule C-3.12.

## Hartwell Expense

Both the Applicant and the Staff excluded the expenses associated with the Hartwell Recreation Facility from test year operating expenses. This adjustment
is consistent with the Staff's exclusion of the Hartwell plant investment from rate base.

The Staff's exclusion is shown on Schedule C-3.13.

## Non-Jurisdictional Expenses

The Applicant has proposed an adjustment to eliminate non-jurisdictional expenses from the test year. This adjustment excludes donations, sponsorships, events, and various expenses that are not recoverable in gas distribution rates. The Staff agrees with the adjustment but has made the error correction recommended by Blue Ridge.

The Staff's adjustment is presented on Schedule C-3.14.

## PUCO and OCC Assessments

The Applicant and the Staff have adjusted the test year PUCO and OCC tax assessments to the latest know cost. The Staff's adjustment also reclassifies the assessments from Operation and Maintenance Expense to State and Other Taxes.

The Staff's adjustment is presented on Schedule C-3.15.

## Uncollectible Expense

The Applicant and the Staff have annualized the test year uncollectible expense to reflect the adjustments to operating revenues.

The Staff's adjustment is presented on Schedule C-3.16.

## Pension and Benefits Expense

The Applicant and Staff annualized the pension and benefits expense to reflect adjustments to test year wage expense.

The Staff's adjustment is presented on Schedule C-3.17.

## FICA Taxes

The Applicant and the Staff annualized FICA taxes to reflect adjustments to test year wage expense.

The Staff's adjustment is presented on Schedule C-3.18.

## Unemployment Taxes

The Applicant and the Staff annualized unemployment taxes to reflect adjustments to test year wage expense. The Staff's adjustment does reflect the Error/Corrections recommended by Blue Ridge

The Staff's adjustment is presented on Schedule C-3.19.

## Post In Service Carrying Cost

The Applicant and the Staff adjusted test year expenses to annualize post in service carrying costs accrued as of March 31, 2007. These costs were not included in Duke's budget. The adjustment also adjusts deferred federal income taxes associated with post in service carrying costs.

The Staff's adjustment is presented on Schedule C-3,20.

## Gas Weatherization Program

The Applicant proposed an adjustment to increase the amount spent for the gas weatherization program per the merger agreement. The Staff has not included this adjustment in its recommended revenue requirement. Further discussion of the Staff's position can be found in the Proposed Alternative Regulation Plan section of this report.

## RATE OF RETURN

The Staff recommends a rate of return in the range of $8.17 \%$ to $8.75 \%$. The recommended rate of return was developed using a cost of capital approach, which reflects a market-derived cost of equity, the Applicant's embedded cost of long-term debt, and the embedded capital structure. See Schedule D-1.

## Capital Structure

The Applicant, Duke Energy Ohio, is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Duke Energy Corporation which is a publicly traded, public utility holding company. The Staff used the capital structure of Duke Energy Ohio, from Applicant's D-1A, in the rate of return determination.

## Cost of Long Term Debt

The Staff employed the embedded cost of long term debt of Duke Energy Ohio, as of March 31, 2007, from Applicant's Schedule D-3A. In the calculation of the weighted cost of debt, the annual interest is divided by the carrying value. The debt calculation includes the effect of unamortized debt expense, unamortized discount or premium on sale, and unamortized gain or loss on reacquisition on both the interest cost and the carrying value. Staff utilized the embedded cost of long term debt of $5.87 \%$ on Schedule D-1.

## Cost of Common Equity

The Staff considered a group of utilities which are representative of the industry for purposes of cost of equity estimation. This group consists of companies publicly traded on the New York Stock Exchange, and are categorized as "power" companies in Global Energy's Energy Velocity Suite. These companies have Total Liabilities and Other Credits greater than $\$ 10$ billion. They have Gas Operating Revenues reported in either the Energy Velocity Suite's "power" or "fuels" data bases. Based on these criteria, the Staff selected the following comparable group of nine companies:

| Company Name | Ticker |
| :---: | :---: |
| DTE Energy Comany. | DTE |
| Consolidated Edison, Inc. | ED |
| Edison International | EIX |
| Entergy Corporation | ETR |
| Exelon Corporation | EXC |
| PG\&E Corporation | PCG |
| Public Service Enterprise Group, Inc. | PEG |
| Xcel Energy, Inc. | XEL |
| Duke Energy Corporation | DUK |

The Staff employed a cost of equity estimate for the comparable group companies that is the average of their capital asset pricing model (CAPM) and discounted cash flow (DCF) derived estimates. In calculating its CAPM cost of common equity estimate, the Staff employed the average of the Value Line betas, being .90625 and the lbbotson*1 derived spread of arithmetic mean total returns between large company stocks and long term government bonds (i.e., "risk free return"; 6.5\%). These were used in the CAPM formulation with the weighted average of 10 year and 30 year weekly closing Treasury yields for the period from November 20, 2006 through November 19, 2007. The weighting was done in a manner that emphasized later quarters to a greater degree. The averaged 10 year yield is $4.64 \%$. The averaged 30 year yield is $4.86 \%$. These average to $4.75 \%$. This was added to the product of the beta and the $6.5 \%$ spread, and resulted in a CAPM cost of equity estimate of 10.64\%. See Schedule D-1.2.

In calculating its DCF cost of common equity estimate, for each comparable company, the Staff employed the annual average stock price, the sum of the last four quarterly declared dividends, estimates of the expected rate of growth of earnings, and generic issuance costs related to the external equity financing. The stock price employed is the average weekly closing price for the period from November 20, 2006 through November 19, 2007.

[^0]The DCF model assumes that earnings growth and dividends growth are the same. The Staff averaged earnings per share estimates from Reuters, Yahoo, MSN, and Value Line to get DCF growth estimates for each company. See Schedule D-1.3. The Value Line average incorporates both the explicit long-range earnings estimate shown in the "box" and the implicit continuous growth rate calculated from the estimates of earnings per share. Value Line's 2007 earnings per share (eps) estimate for DTE Energy Company is out of the trend otherwise shown by Value Line. The Staff cannot reconcile this single year growth rate to the long term growth rate. The Staff changed the 2007 Value line eps estimate from $\$ 3.85$ to $\$ 3.00$, in order to reflect the long term growth rate, which brought the calculated growth rate to nearly equal the "boxed" growth rate.

For the Staff's determination of DCF cost of equity, a non-constant DCF growth rate was assumed. Dividends were assumed to grow at a rate derived from financial analysts' growth estimates for the first five years (i.e., long term growth rate). The Staff's DCF growth estimates were used for the first five years, as they are averages of estimates from various investor news services. From the twenty-fifth year on, the growth rate was assumed to equal the long-term growth rate in GNP. For the sixth through twenty-fourth years, dividends vary between the two rates in a linear fashion. See Schedules D-1.4 through D-1.12. The long-term growth rate in GNP was the average annual change in GNP from the U. S. Department of Commerce for 1929 through 2005. See Schedule D-1.13.

Based on long-term GNP growth, the respective company DCF growth estimate and dividend, a stream of annual dividends was calculated. The internal rate of return derived from the dividend stream and the stock price was used for Staff's non-constant growth DCF cost of equity estimate.

The comparable group non-constant DCF cost of equity estimates average $10.77 \%$. When averaged with the $10.64 \%$ CAPM estimate, the result is $10.71 \%$. The Applicant's capital structure has less debt leverage than the comparable group companies (approximately .79 vis-a-vis .96 debt-to-equity ratio), and thus less financial risk. Staff adjusted the baseline return on equity range downward by approximately 42 basis points to reflect the Applicant's reduced risk profile as compared to the comparable group companies. Using a one-hundred basis point range of uncertainty, the cost of equity estimate becomes $9.78 \%$ to $10.78 \%$. See Schedule D-1.1. To provide for this return, allowance must be made for issuance and other costs, as shown on Schedule D-1.1, resulting in an adjustment factor of 1.02267. Applying this factor to the baseline cost of common equity range results in a recommendation of $10.00 \%$ to $11.03 \%$.

Additionally, in its application, the Company has proposed a number of non-traditional measures which are designed to alleviate certain problems. The Company has proposed that the annual caps on the AMRP program be eliminated and that the program be extended through 2015, that the costs of a riser/service line replacement
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program be included in the proposed AMRP rider, and that a Utility of the Future initiative be initiated to recover costs of a new advanced metering program through a new Rider AU. In addition, the Company has advanced a method of decoupling which will reduce volatility of revenues. While the Staff is advocating a different mechanism, the Staff's proposal will serve the same purpose.

These measures would reduce the risks that the Company faces with respect to revenues and cost recovery. Inasmuch as the costs of capital reflect risks, the reductions in business and regulatory risks should be considered.

## RATES AND TARIFFS

By its application in Case No. 07-589-GA-AIR, Duke Energy Ohio requests authority to increase rates to be charged and collected for gas service within its service territory.

The Utilities Department Commission Staff has investigated the rate and tariff matters proposed by the Applicant. The results of the Staff's investigation are reported in this section. It is Staff's intent to provide analysis with regard to the acceptability and reasonableness of the changes in revenue recovery mechanisms contained in the proposed tariffs. Proposals made by the Staff may require adjustments based on the revenue and rate structure authorized by the Commission.

Staff's Tariff Analysis addresses changes specific to individual rate schedules, changes which apply to more than one specific rate class, and tariff additions and deletions. Rate Design will analyze the Current, Applicant Proposed and Staff-Recommended mechanisms for rate recovery. Rate and Revenue Analysis is dedicated to the propriety and impact of the rate schedule proposal. Tables which portray the effects of Current, Proposed, and Staff-Recommended rates on typical bills are presented at the end of the report.

## TARIFF ANALYSIS

The Applicant is proposing various textual changes to its tariffs. Unless noted, Staff recommends approval of these changes as proposed by the Applicant. In addition, Staff is making recommendations to change certain language to reflect the current minimum service standard requirements of 4901:1-13 of the Ohio Administrative Code, which became effective on January 1, 2007. The proposed changes are provided as follows:

## Section I-Service Agreements

Original Sheet No. 20.3: Staff believes the tariff should state that Duke is governed by Minimum Gas Service Standards, and therefore recommends that the following language be added to the beginning of this section:

1. Minimum Service Standards. Duke Energy of Ohio shall comply with the minimum gas service standards for natural gas companies as set forth in Chapter 4901:1-13 of the Ohio Administrative Code, a copy of which may be viewed on the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio's Web site at www.puco.ohio.gov, or obtained from the Public Utilities Commission of

Ohio upon request. Where the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio has granted a waiver to Duke Energy of Ohio for any provision of the minimum gas service standards, Duke Energy of Ohio shall comply with the terms of any Order granting such waiver.

## Original Sheet No. 20.3, "Company's Right to Refuse or to Disconnect Service"

Section 3 (i): the Applicant included language in this section regarding disconnection of service to residential customers for nonpayment. Staff believes that the Applicant should also include language regarding disconnection of small commercial customers for nonpayment. Staff recommends the following language: "For disconnection of service to small commercial customers for nonpayment, the Company shall follow the procedures as set forth in Ohio Administrative Code, Rule 4901:1-13-08."

Section 3 (j) concerns theft of service or any fraudulent representation or practice. The Applicant needs to add a statement that in addressing such practice it shall follow the termination procedures prescribed by Rule 4901:1-13-09, O.A.C. Staff recommends adding the following sentence: "The Company shall follow the procedures as set forth in Rule 4901:1-13-09 of the Ohio Administrative Code prior to termination of service."

## Section II - Supplying and Taking of Service

Original Sheet No. 21.6, "Supplying Service" section: The last sentence in the fourth paragraph incorrectly references Rule 4901:1-18-11 of the O.A.C. The correct reference is Rule 490:1-18-10, O.A.C.

Original Sheet No. 21.6, "Information Relative to Service" section: This section advises customers of information relative to the installation and relocation of piping. Staff recommends that the Applicant add language stating that it shall comply with the installation requirements of Rule 4901:1-13-05, O.A.C.

Original Sheet No. 21.6, "Use of Service" section: The last paragraph in this section addresses reasons for disconnecting a customer for an unauthorized act. Staff recommends that the Applicant add the following language: "The Company shall follow the procedures provided in Rule 4901:1-13-09 of the Ohio Administrative Code concerning the disconnection of service for fraudulent practice, tampering, and theft of gas."

Original Sheet No. 21.6, "Access to Premise" section: The current language in this paragraph states that, "Upon request, the Company's authorized agent will display his/her identification badge or Company pass and state the reasons for requiring access." To make this language consistent with the requirements of Rule 4901:1-13-07 of the O.A.C., Staff recommends that the Company revise it to read, "Upon request, the

Company's authorized agent shall identify himself/herself, provide Company photo identification, and state the reason for the visit."

## Section III-Customer's and Company's Installations

Original Sheet No. 22.6, "Nature and Use of Installation" Section: Duke is proposing new tariff language which states, "The piping and fittings for the distribution of gas after it has passed the meter, may be installed by any competent gas fitter employed by the customer or proprietor of the premises, subject, however, to the inspection, test and approval of the accredited agency having jurisdiction." Staff recommends the following sentence be added to this section, "The Company shall comply with Rule 4901:1-13-05 of the Ohio Administrative Code with respect to testing gas piping downstream of the meter."

Original Sheet 22.6, "Installation, Repair and Replacement of Lines" section: The seventh paragraph of this section requires that "When relocation of service piping or equipment, including the meter is required by the customer such work shall be done by the Applicant at the customer's expense." Staff recommends the Applicant revise the sentence to read, "When relocation of service piping or equipment, including the meter, is required by the customer, such work shall be done by the Company and the Company's actual cost to perform such relocation shall be borne by the customer. "

## SECTION IV - Metering

Original Sheet No. 23.5, "Basis for Bill Adjustment" section: This paragraph concerns billing adjustments to correct overcharges or undercharges due to periods of meter inaccuracy. Staff believes this provision should reference the statute and rule the Applicant must follow when billing for such overcharge or undercharge, and recommends the following language: "The Company shall comply with the requirements of Section 4933.28 of the Ohio Revised Code when billing residential customers for previously undercharged usage, and shall comply with the requirements of Rule 4901:1-$13-04(\mathrm{G})$ of the Ohio Administrative Code when billing small commercial customers for such usage."

## SECTION V - Billing and Payment

Original Sheet No. 24.8, "Billing Periods - Time and Place for Payment of Bills": The first paragraph of this section states, "Bills ordinarily are rendered regularly at monthly intervals, but may be rendered more or less, frequently at the Company's option." Giving Duke the option to change billing intervals is contrary to the requirements of Rule 4901:1-13-11 (B), O.A.C., which requires that bills shall be
rendered at regular intervals. Staff recommends that the language, "but may be rendered more or less, frequently at the Company's option" be removed.

In the second paragraph, this section states that if the Company can not obtain an actual meter reading in a twelve month period, it may, at its option, refuse or disconnect service. Staff recommends that the Applicant substitute the following language: "If the Company has been unable to obtain a meter reading for a period of twelve (12) consecutive months, the Company may, at its option and after following its approved meter access plan, disconnect service to the premises in accordance with Section I Paragraph 3."

The fourth paragraph of this section concerns termination of service and allows the Applicant to rely on estimated meter readings for the purpose of the final bill. To comply with Rule 4901:1-13-04 (G) (5) and (6), O.A.C., the Company should revise the second and third sentences to read: "This calculation shall based on an actual meter reading if the meter has not been read within the immediately preceding seventy days of service and access to the meter is provided. If the meter has been read within the immediately preceding seventy days of service, the Applicant shall inform the customer, when the customer contacts the Company, of the option to have an actual meter read, at no charge to the customer.

The fifth paragraph of this section concerns the Applicant's request for initiation of service, and states: "The Company may estimate the reading for the initial date of service." To make this sentence consistent with Rule 4901:1-13 (G)(6), O.A.C., Staff recommends the following sentence be added: "If the meter has been read in the immediately preceding seventy days, the Company shall inform the customer, when the customer contacts the Company, of the option to have an actual meter read, at no charge to the customer."

The last paragraph in this section concerns the priority given to customers' partial payments, but it fails to specify the priority of regulated over unregulated charges. To comply with Rule 4901:1-13-11 (G), O.A.C., Staff recommends the last sentence of the second paragraph be revised as follows: "If a partial payment is made, the amount will be applied to items of indebtedness in the same order as they have accrued, starting with regulated charges followed by the unregulated charges".

Original Sheet No. 24.8, "Bill Adjustment": This section concerns bill adjustments for overcharges and undercharges due to inaccurate billing. Staff recommends the Applicant revise this provision to state: "The Company shall comply with the provisions of Rule 4901:1-13-04 (G) of the Ohio Administrative Code with respect to billing adjustments to correct inaccurate billing to residential and small commercial customers as a result of a meter or metering inaccuracy or other continuing problem under the Company's control."

## Section VI - Disconnection for Non-Payment and Deposit Provisions

Original Sheet 25.7, "Disconnection for Nonpayment: Non-Residential Customers": This section concerns disconnection for nonpayment of nonresidential customers. To comply with the new Minimum Gas Service Standards, the Applicant should add an additional sentence that states: "For small commercial customers the Company will comply with the provisions of the disconnection rules set forth in Rule 4901:1-13-08 of the Ohio Administrative Code as amended."

Original Sheet 25.7, "Deposit Provision": This section concerns the provisions the Applicant must follow when a security deposit is required. The Company should add an additional sentence that states: "For small commercial customers the Company shall comply with the provisions of the disconnection rules set forth in Rule 4901:1-13-08 of the Ohio Administrative Code as amended."

## Riders

The Applicant is proposing only minor changes to the various riders currently in effect.
The Residential Conservation Service and Merger Savings Riders are proposed to be eliminated. The Merger Savings Rider (MSR-G) was established in Case No. 05-732-EL-MER, et al, to pass through a share of the net savings associated with the merger of Cinergy Corp. with Duke Energy. On April 26, 2007 Duke filed a notice in the above referenced docket that they had completed the provision of credits in the full amount agreed to in the Stipulation and requesting the Commission allow the Company to eliminate the riders. Staff recommends the Commission approve the cancellation of Rider MSR-G.

The Residential Conservation Service Program was initially mandated by the National Energy Conservation Policy Act of 1978. The section of the Act that required this program was terminated as of June 30, 1989. Duke is proposing to cancel Rider RCS because it provides direct funding for the types of services that were to be funded by the RCS. Staff recommends the Commission approve the cancellation of Rider RCS.

## Rider GSR - Gas Sur-credit Rider

Rider GSR, Gas Sur-credit Rider is a credit provided to choice customers to compensate for their share of the PUCO and OCC assessments associated with commodity sales that is embedded in base rates. Since choice suppliers are separately charged their share of those assessments based on their intrastate commodity sales, the credit provides an offset to the amount of the base rate assessment associated with the commodity portion of the bill. Without the credit, choice customers would potentially double pay the assessment on their commodity purchases. The credit is proposed to be increased from $\$ 0.0009999$ to $\$ 0.0012479$ per Ccf. Staff recommends approval of this change.

Duke has also proposed the re-approval of the Accelerated Mainline Replacement Program Rider (Rider AMRP), a new Utility of the Future Rider (Rider UF) and a new Sales Decoupling Rider (Rider SD). Each of these is discussed in detail in the Proposed Alternative Regulation Plan section of this report.

## Rate SAC - Retail Natural Gas Supplier and Aggregator Charges

The Applicant is proposing several changes to Rate SAC, Retail Natural Gas Supplier and Aggregator Charges.

A new monthly fee is proposed for additional actively billed retail natural gas supplier rate codes (following the first 25 actively billed rate codes per month). Currently this service is provided at no charge and no supplier has more than 25 rate codes. This is a new charge in response to an increase in rate code requests by suppliers. The $\$ 30$ rate was calculated by applying the fully loaded labor costs of $\$ 60$ per hour to the estimated one half hour per rate code to perform the update. Staff recommends approval of this new charge.

The Returned Check Charge is increased from $\$ 13.50$ to $\$ 20.00$ per check. This increase is consistent with the current Returned Check Charge in tariff Sheet No. 81.4 which applies to all other customers. Staff recommends approval of this increase.

Hourly charge for administrative and technical support to institute program modifications is increase from $\$ 75$ to $\$ 125$ per hour. This reflects an increase in the rate Duke now budgets for IT projects. It reflects the IT costs Duke incurs on behalf of a gas supplier requesting a non-standard supplier rate. Staff recommends approval of this increase.

The charge for a request by a gas supplier or aggregator for a one page duplicate bill is increased from $\$ 0.26$ to $\$ 0.3325$ per bill to reflect Duke's current first-class bulk mailing rate. Staff recommends approval of this increase.

The fee for providing PUCO mandated abandonment notices as bill messages is being reduced from $\$ 0.225$ to $\$ 0.125$. This charge better reflects the actual postage costs Duke incurs from the additional bill page that results from inclusion of an abandonment notice. Staff recommends approval of this change.

## RATE DESIGN AND REVENUE ANALYSIS

## Rate and Revenue Guidelines

General guidelines and objectives are followed in Staff's review of rate schedules and design. The applicable schedules should provide the utility the opportunity of recovering an authorized revenue. The various schedules should represent a reasonable distribution of revenue between and among the various customer groups. The particular schedules should be equitable and reasonable, should provide for customer understanding and continuity of rates, and should cause minimal customer impact.

Rate design criteria are to be viewed as a package, in that they are interrelated. Although each item can be separately identified and applied to rate schedule determinations, no single standard is overriding in determining proper rate design. The rate schedules which comprise a particular utility's tariffs should provide for recovery of expenses found proper in the course of a regulatory proceeding. Normally, and to the extent sufficient information is available, cost of service studies and related expense analyses are necessary to determine the appropriate level of revenue to be generated and the appropriate recovery of such revenue.

From a practicable rate design standpoint, absolute equality between costs and revenues may be difficult to achieve in the short term. While it may be viewed as equitable to set rates at cost, if there is a substantial divergence in the current rates, the resulting impact on individual customers may be viewed as unreasonable. While desiring cost supporting charges, Staff considers such items as resulting typical customer billings and resulting revenue increases which would necessarily occur. These tests help provide benchmarks with regard to reasonableness of charges in rate forms. While it is Staff's position that rate schedules reflect costs, it is also important to consider the continuity associated with current and proposed pricing structures. This may result in movement towards more closely aligning revenue with costs rather than an absolute match at a particular time period.

In summary, gas rates should:

- Be predicated on costs
- Be fair, equitable and reasonable
- Cause minimal impact (sometimes called "gradualism") when changed
- Provide continuity in pricing structures
- Provide the utility the opportunity to recover an authorized revenue by providing for the recovery of costs found proper in a regulatory proceeding

The preceding standards are important and each has value. They are, however subjective, and it is generally impossible to fully accomplish them all. Sometimes one standard (the most obvious being that the rates must provide the utility with the
opportunity to recover its authorized revenue requirement supersedes, to a degree, the others). Sometimes the standards are in conflict and to accomplish one, another might be set aside (e.g. in this application, the need for rates to be predicated on costs may cause changes in pricing structures resulting in greater than minimal impacts on some customers).

## Cost of Service Analysis

Generally, there are three capacity allocations that are commonly used - coincident demand, non-coincident demand, and average and excess demand. The standard filing requirements allow the selection of any of theses approaches, or alternatives, when, in the utility's opinion, the procedure best represents the utility's system characteristics.

The Applicant filed a peak and average method allocating cost to the various classes. This method assumes the minimum capacity is necessary to deliver the total gas used and is equal to average daily deliveries. The remainder of the capacity is allocated based upon the difference between the average daily capacity and between the peak day capacity. Staff finds the methodology reasonable. The Applicant is proposing eliminating $100 \%$ of the subsidy/excess revenues over a three-year period between classes. The first year would eliminate $33 \%$ of the subsidy/excess revenues, the second year the proposed rates would eliminate $67 \%$ of the subsidylexcess revenues, and the final year eliminating $100 \%$. Although the overall proposed revenue remains the same for each year of the three year phase-in, the revenues between classes are adjusted to reflect movement toward cost of service. Staff accepts the proposed allocation method; however, Staff is proposing moving customers towards the cost of service eliminating $67 \%$ of the subsidy/excess revenues instead of the Applicant's 100\%.

## REVENUE ANALYSIS

Rates and charges shown in the rate schedule tables may require adjustment based on the revenue requirement granted by the Commission, and/or changes in the rate areas, or changes in rate structure approved by the Commission.

Staff recommends the Applicants proposed phase-in rates for year 1 and year 2 only. Tables 1 through 4 show the Applicant's proposed as accepted by Staff for the 2 year phase-in period. Applicant's current and proposed increase is shown in Tables 1 and 2, excluding and including gas cost.

The values include Gas Cost of $\$ 8.83$ per Mcf.
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## TABLE 1(a)

Year 1
Total Revenue Excluding Gas Cost

|  | Current |  | Applicant Proposed |  | Increase |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential Service | \$ | 114,214,333 | \$ | 140,333,595 | \$ | 26,119,262 |
| General Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial |  | 34,627,616 |  | 34,635,232 |  | 7,616 |
| Industrial |  | 4,792,252 |  | 5,292,858 |  | 500,606 |
| Other |  | 3,153,690 |  | 3,456,096 |  | 302,406 |
| Total General Service |  | 42,573,558 |  | 43,384,186 |  | 810,628 |
| Transportation Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Transportation |  | 17,141,006 |  | 21,019,556 |  | 3,878,550 |
| Firm Transportation |  | 24,371,224 |  | 26,304,852 |  | 1,933,628 |
| Interruptible Transportation |  | 10,418,276 |  | 11,818,910 |  | 1,400,634 |
| Total Transportation Service |  | 51,930,506 |  | 59,143,318 |  | 7,212,812 |
| Total | \$ | 208,718,397 | \$ | 242,861,099 | \$ | 34,142,702 |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC.
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TABLE 1(b)
Year 2
Total Revenue Excluding Gas Cost

|  | Current |  | Applicant Proposed |  | ncrease |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential Service | \$ | 114,214,333 | \$ | 145,895,806 | \$ | 31,681,473 |
| General Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial |  | 34,627,616 |  | 32,024,175 |  | $(2,603,441)$ |
| Industrial |  | 4,792,252 |  | 4,748,537 |  | $(43,715)$ |
| Other |  | 3,153,690 |  | 3,109,687 |  | (44,003) |
| Total General Service |  | 42,573,558 |  | 39,882,399 |  | $(2,691,159)$ |
| Transportation Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Transportation |  | 17,141,006 |  | 21,859,754 |  | 4,718,748 |
| Firm Transportation |  | 24,371,224 |  | 23,779,221 |  | $(592,003)$ |
| Interruptible Transportation |  | 10,418,276 |  | 11,444,208 |  | 1,025,932 |
| Total Transportation Service |  | 51,930,506 |  | 57,083,183 |  | 5,152,677 |
| Total | \$ | 208,718,397 | \$ | 242,861,388 | \$ | 34,142,991 |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC.
Case No. 07-589-AIR
TABLE 2(a) Year 1

Total Revenue Including Gas Costs and Miscellaneous Revenue

|  | Current |  | Applicant Proposed |  | Increase |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$ | $371,821,853$ | \$ | 397,941,115 | \$ | 26,119,262 |
| Residential Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial |  | 127,631,687 |  | 127,639,303 |  | 7,616 |
| Industrial |  | 24,182,322 |  | 24,682,928 |  | 500,606 |
| Other |  | 15,493,309 |  | 15,795,715 |  | 302,406 |
| Total General Service |  | 167,307,318 |  | 168,117,946 |  | 810,628 |
| Transportation Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Transportation |  | 17,141,006 |  | 21,019,556 |  | 3,878,550 |
| Firm Transportation |  | 24,371,224 |  | 26,304,852 |  | 1,933,628 |
| Interruptible Transportation |  | 10,418,276 |  | 11,818,910 |  | 1,400,634 |
| Total Transportation Service |  | 51,930,506 |  | 59,143,318 |  | 7,212,812 |
| Subtotal | \$ | 591,059,677 | \$ | 625,202,379 | \$ | 34,142,702 |
| Misc. Revenue |  | 6,514,128 |  | 6,514,128 |  | 0 |
| Total | \$ | 597,573,805 | \$ | 631,716,507 | \$ | 34,142,702 |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC.
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TABLE 2 (b)
Year 2

## Total Revenue Including Gas Costs and Miscellaneous Revenue

|  | Current |  | Applicant Proposed |  | Increase |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$ | 371,821,853 | \$ | 403,503,326 | \$ | 31,681,473 |
| Residential Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial |  | 127,631,687 |  | 125,028,246 |  | (2,603,441) |
| Industrial |  | 24,182,322 |  | 24,138,607 |  | $(43,715)$ |
| Other |  | 15,493,309 |  | 15,449,306 |  | $(44,003)$ |
| Total General Service |  | 167,307,318 |  | 164,616,159 |  | $(2,691,159)$ |
| Transportation Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential Transportation |  | 17,141,006 |  | 21,859,754 |  | 4,718,748 |
| Firm Transportation |  | 24,371,224 |  | 23,779,221 |  | $(592,003)$ |
| Interruptible Transportation |  | 10,418,276 |  | 11,444,208 |  | 1,025,932 |
| Total Transportation Service |  | 51,930,506 |  | 57,083,183 |  | 5,152,677 |
| Subtotal | \$ | 591,059,677 | \$ | 625,202,668 | \$ | 34,142,991 |
| Misc. Revenue |  | 6,514,128 |  | 6,514,128 |  | 0 |
| Total | \$ | 597,573,805 | \$ | 631,716,796 | \$ | 34,142,991 |

Applicant's current and proposed revenue distribution, is shown in Tables 3 and 4, excluding and including gas costs.

TABLE 3(a)
Year 1

## Total Revenue Excluding Gas Costs

|  | Applicant <br> Current$\quad$ Proposed |
| :--- | :--- |


| Residential Service | $54.72 \%$ | $57.78 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| General Service |  |  |
| Commercial | $16.59 \%$ | $14.26 \%$ |
| Industrial | $2.30 \%$ | $2.18 \%$ |
| Other | $1.51 \%$ | $1.42 \%$ |
| Total General Service | $20.40 \%$ | $17.86 \%$ |
| Total Transportation | $24.88 \%$ | $24.35 \%$ |
| Total | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |

TABLE 3(b)
Year 2
Total Revenue Excluding Gas Costs

|  | Current | Applicant <br> Proposed |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Residential Service | $62.91 \%$ | $63.65 \%$ |
| General Service |  |  |
| $\quad$ Commercial | $21.59 \%$ | $20.42 \%$ |
| $\quad$ Industrial | $4.09 \%$ | $3.95 \%$ |
| Other | $\underline{2.62 \%}$ | $\underline{2.53 \%}$ |
| Total General Service | $28.31 \%$ | $26.89 \%$ |
| Total Transportation | $8.79 \%$ | $9.46 \%$ |
| Total | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |

TABLE 4(a)
Year 1
Total Revenue Including Gas Costs

|  | Current | Applicant <br> Proposed |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Residential Service | $62.91 \%$ | $63.65 \%$ |
| General Service |  |  |
| Commercial | $21.59 \%$ | $20.42 \%$ |
| Industrial | $4.09 \%$ | $3.95 \%$ |
| Other | $\underline{2.62 \%}$ | $\underline{2.53 \%}$ |
| Total General Service | $28.31 \%$ | $2.89 \%$ |
| Total Transportation | $8.79 \%$ | $9.46 \%$ |
| Total | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |

TABLE 4(b)
Year 2
Total Revenue Including Gas Costs

|  | Current | Applicant <br> Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential Service | 62.91\% | 64.54\% |
| General Service |  |  |
| Commercial | 21.59\% | 20.00\% |
| Industrial | 4.09\% | 3.86\% |
| Other | 2.62\% | 2.47\% |
| Total General Service | 28.31\% | 26.33\% |
| Total Transportation | 8.79\% | 9.13\% |
| Total | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |

## Rate Design

Staff has traditionally recommended and supported a rate design for the natural gas distribution component consisting of a minimal customer charge and a volumetric rate or blocks of rates. That structure, while not truly cost-reflective, sufficed to allow the utility the opportunity to recover the recommended revenue requirement as long as gas consumption remained level or increased. In recent years, due primarily to the volatile
and relatively high cost of gas (to be recovered through the Gas Cost Recovery mechanism), the trend of gradually increasing gas consumption, per customer, has been reversed. Therefore, Duke, and other gas utilities, has seen the recovery of distribution costs deteriorate as the volume of gas used decreased.

In this case, Staff recommends a rather significant change in its rate structure policy. Rather than recovery via a minimal customer charge and relatively high volumetric rates, Staff recommends that the Commission approve a rate structure primarily based on a fixed distribution service charge. In reality, most distribution-related costs are fixed. The distribution facilities required to serve a small residence are most likely the same as those required to serve a larger residence. The distribution facilities required to serve a minimum number of gas appliances in a residential unit are most likely the same as those required to serve a residence with multiple gas appliances. The costs to the utility vary only slightly, if at all, by the volume of gas used.

In addition to a better reflection of cost causation, the primarily fixed-charge-based rate structure accomplishes other rate objectives. It levelizes the distribution component of a customers' bill, providing rate certainty. It reduces the revenue deterioration of a utility in a time of reduced consumption; thus, reducing the need for frequent rate cases. It alleviates the need for a decoupling mechanism which requires frequent controversial reconciliations and weather adjustments. From the companies' point of view, it eliminates its natural disincentive to promote energy conservation which, when rate are volume-based, causes revenue erosion.

Staff is keenly aware, however, of the pitfalls of this significant change in the design of rates. The biggest negative impact being that the change from a primarily volumebased rate to a primarily fixed charge rate often results in large price increases to low use customers (or, if the fixed charge is "blocked," to the lower use customers in the block). A secondary disadvantage is that the fixed charge structure reduces the incentive on the part of the customer to reduce its usage. Staff, however, finds that this argument is much less relative in the case of distribution rates. The distribution portion of a customer's bill is relatively small compared to the total bill. The cost of gas to be recovered through the Gas Cost Recovery mechanism will continue to serve as the incentive to a customer to keep its usage to a minimum. Finally, the current rate schedules are designed as "residential" or "general service" in nature. General Service customers are much less homogeneous than residential customers and a simple fixed charge may not be the appropriate cost recovery mechanism.

With all of these things in mind, Staff proposes and recommends a change in rate design that phases in the change from a primarily volumetric rate to a primarily fixed charge rate. The following table illustrates the phased-in concept.

| Residential Service. |  | Monthly Billing Determinates |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Current | Year 1 <br> Applicant <br> Proposed | Year 1 <br> Staff <br> Proposed | Year 2 <br> Applicant <br> Proposed | Year 2 <br> Staff Proposed |
|  | Customer Charge | \$ 6.00 | \$ 15.00 |  | \$ 15.00 |  |
|  | Fixed Distribution Service | Charge |  |  |  |  |
|  | < 50 ccf annually |  |  | \$ 10.00 |  | \$ 12.50 |
|  | > 50 cof annually |  |  | \$ 20.25 |  | \$ 25.33 |
|  | Volumetric Charge 0 | 0.185910 | 0.227960 | 0.153942 | 0.247140 | 0.099103 |
| General Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Customer Charge $\quad \$$ | \$ 21.00 | \$ 40.00 |  | \$ 40.00 |  |
|  | Fixed Distribution Service Charge $<50$ ccf annually |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$ 25.00 |  | \$ 27.50 |
|  | $>50<2000 \text { ocf }$ |  |  | \$ 35.25 |  | \$ 40.33 |
|  | >2000 < 4000 ccf annually |  |  | \$ 50.00 |  | \$ 55.00 |
|  | > 4000 ccf annuaily |  |  | \$ 130.00 |  | \$ 180.00 |
|  | Volumetric Charge |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1st 1000 ccf | 0.163000 | 0.194740 |  | 0.169800 |  |
|  | Next 4000 ccf | 0.157000 | 0.187740 |  | 0.162800 |  |
|  | $>5000 \mathrm{ccf}$ | 0.154000 | 0.183730 |  | 0.158800 |  |
|  | All ccf |  |  | 0.153527 |  | 0.099052 |

## Staff Discussion of Recommendation

The table represents a Staff "concept" of a two-year-phase-in to a primarily fixed charge rate. Because the filing does not "block" consumption by annual blocks, it is likely that the Staff proposed rates do not exactly produce the Applicant's proposed annual revenues; but, from information provided to Staff by the Applicant in data requests, the recommendations should serve as a reasonable facsimile for discussion purposes. The rates are meant to reflect the Applicant's proposed revenue for each of the two years (i.e. Applicant has proposed an increasing revenue requirement for the Residential class and a corresponding decreasing revenue requirement for the General Service class). While Staff recommends the phased-in revenue requirement adjustments, this table should in no way be taken as a recommendation by the Staff of the Rates and Tariffs Division as to the overall revenue requirement recommended by the appropriate Staff in other sections to this report. The table is meant to reflect the revenue requested by the Applicant for comparative purposes only. It is intended to reflect changes to the rate design that the Applicant has proposed.

Staff is also aware that the test year data in the blocked format may not be readily available. Further, Staff is aware that such a significant change in rate design may require modifications to the current billing system. Due to these, and perhaps other unknown limitations, Staff prefers to characterize its recommendation as a "concept"
which may require modifications based on the availability of data and the limitations of the billing system.

There are other "twists" to the Staff's recommendation which should be noted. While Staff is recommending the fixed charge approach as a replacement for the Applicant's proposed decoupling mechanism, Staff recommends limiting the "phase in" to two years (a) to evaluate the results, and (b) to reduce the overall impact of the annual increases to the residential revenue requirement and decreases to the general service revenue requirement.

Next, it is apparent that there are a significant number of residential and general service accounts that use such small volumes of gas that it is likely that the usage is for something other than space or water heating. While Staff's proposal attempts to mitigate the rate increase to these customers to alleviate drastic changes, from a cost causation viewpoint, these customers are no different than other customers. Staff recommends that the Applicant work with these customers to notify them that, in the future, they may see significant increases simply by taking limited service.

Finally, it is likely that the traditional "residential/general service" schedules may not be the appropriate mechanisms to reflect cost causation through rates. A more appropriate mechanism for rate differentials may be a more "facilities-based" approach. Staff recommends that the Commission require the Applicant to perform an analysis addressing this issue. If the analysis indicates a change is appropriate, the Applicant should so reflect that change in its next distribution rate case.

While not part of Staff's recommendation, it has been suggested that the "fixed" component of the proposed residential rate could be "seasonal." For example, instead of twelve months at $\$ 20 /$ month, there could be four summer months at $\$ 10 / \mathrm{month}$ and eight shoulder and winter months at $\$ 25 /$ month. The rationale for that format would be to keep the summer gas bill low as customers are accustomed. On the other hand, some have suggested going the other way. For example, there could be eight warm weather months at $\$ 25 /$ month and four colder weather months at $\$ 10 / \mathrm{month}$. The rationale for that format would be to lower the distribution component of the bill to offset the higher GCR component during the colder months when the volumes used are higher. Staff welcomes comment on this seasonal variation.

## Rate IT - Interruptible Transportation Service

Staff is not proposing any changes to the current rate structure for interruptible customers and recommends approval at the Applicant's proposed second year phasein. The Applicant is proposing eliminating the floor rate of $\$ .030$ per Cof as referenced in the "Competitive Flexibility" section of this tariff. In data request response No. 12, the Applicant states that the current rate can potentially limit Duke's ability to encourage some customers to use gas instead of alternative fuels. Staff believes the Applicant should have the latitude in negotiating interruptible transportation agreements, but should recover the appropriate costs. Staff recommends the Applicant add the following language; "The rate may be flexed between the upper bound of the basic transportation rate and a lower bound that recovers all variable costs of service and provides a contribution to the Company's fixed costs of providing service. Such reduced rates may be determined based on competitive services available to the customer, the quality of service and the Company's need to achieve load preservation or the economic recovery of costs of the Company."

## TYPICAL BILLS

Monthly typical bills are shown in E-5 Schedules of the end of this report. Calculation of the typical bills uses a gas cost of $\$ 8.83$ per Mcf.

## PIPELINE SAFETY

Staff has conducted natural gas pipeline safety (GPS) audits of the Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. (Duke) distribution and transmission systems. The purpose of the audits was to assess Duke's compliance with state and federal pipeline safety regulations outlined in Administrative Code 4901:1-16 and the Code of Federal Regulations, 49 C.F.R. Parts 191, 192, 199, and 40.

GPS audits involve the following:

- Review of records of compliance with gas pipeline safety regulations.
- Physical site visits to verify compliance with safety inspections standards.
- Review of operations plans, emergency plans and associated standards and procedures for compliance with emergency response, construction, operations and maintenance requirements.
- Review of drug and alcohol programs for employees and contractors.
- Review of Public Awareness Program and associated records.
- Review of Operator Qualification programs and records.
- Inspection of gas pipeline construction projects in the field for code compliance with safety regulations and the operators own construction procedures.
- Review of the Ohio Utilities Protection Service and Call Before You Dig Programs.
- Review of the Pipeline Integrity Management Program and associated records.


## Scheduled Annual Audit Inspections: For calendar years 2005, 2006 and 2007

Staff conducted gas pipeline safety audits and field inspections on Duke for the calendar years of 2005, 2006 and 2007. The records audits were performed out of the Applicant's headquarters building at 139 East Fourth Street Cincinnati, Ohio. The field inspections were conducted at different pipeline facilities and consisted of pressure regulator stations, critical valves, corrosion test point stations, rectifiers, leakage survey areas, odorant testing, and inspection of exposed pipe locations in the Duke gas system. GPS audits are conducted on an annual basis and are required to confirm that Duke is complying with federal and state gas pipeline safety regulations.

## Findings: Scheduled Annual Audit Inspections

During the records review portion of the GPS audit a number of areas were reviewed such as: valve maintenance, pressure regulation, corrosion control, leakage survey, pipeline patrolling, drug and alcohol records, operator qualification, public awareness, damage prevention, pressure testing, odorization, and emergency response. All records were reviewed for compliance with the appropriate timeline of inspection and maintenance on the gas pipeline system. Staff noted that in the 2006 records review section of the audit of the previous year, the Applicant missed inspecting six critical valves in 2005. Section 49 C.F.R. $\S 192.747$ requires critical valves to be inspected on an annual basis not to exceed 15 months. As a result of Duke's failure to inspect some of their critical valves in compliance with 49 C.F.R. § 192.747, Staff sent the Applicant a letter of probable noncompliance.

In response to the letter of probable non compliance Duke adopted a primary and secondary means of tracking critical valve documents. The primary tracking mechanism is a feature of the Smallworld GIS system which lists critical valves yet to be inspected at 12 month intervals, not to exceed 15 months. The secondary measure is a separate database used to track the status of the critical valve inspections. The use of both methods will allow the Applicant to identify the valves that have not been inspected and prevent reoccurrence of the code violation.

## Pipeline Safety Incidents and Outages

In 2006, Duke was involved in a natural gas incident ${ }^{1}$ involving a house explosion in Middletown, Ohio resulting from a breach of a sewer line by a gas service line that had been installed by directional boring. A letter of probable noncompliance was issued to the Applicant for the violation of their own plans and procedures under 49 CFR §192.13 (c), which requires each operator to maintain, modify as appropriate, and follow the plans, procedures, and programs that it is required to establish under this code section.

In response to the letter of probable non compliance Duke adopted a new installation procedure in 2006 which requires a pre-locate of sewer lines before mains can be installed. In addition the location of the sewer lines are video recorded after the gas main installation is completed, to ensure that no sewer line is breached during the gas main installation process. Duke also limited the situations where they will allow installation of curb to meter service lines using directional boring.

[^1]
## CUSTOMER SERVICE AUDIT

Staff performs customer service audits to ensure compliance with pertinent statutes, rules, and tariffs. Staff completed a customer service audit of Duke in October 2007 regarding the customer service performance, practices, and procedures of the Applicant. Staff found that overall, the Applicant was in compliance with the rules and regulations set forth by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio. However a review of Duke's billing practices revealed that the Applicant was bundling the customer's excise tax with the gas cost recovery rate. Administrative Code 4901:1-13-11 (B) (9) requires the gas cost recovery rate to be expressed in dollars and cents per mof or ccf, which would not include the associated excise tax. Staff brought this discrepancy to the Applicants's attention and as a result Duke agreed as of September 1, 2007 to include the following notice on all bills received by gas customers who are not part of the customer choice program: "This month's Gas Cost Recovery (GCR) charge of \$xxxx per CCF includes a base GCR of $\$ x x x$ and Ohio excise tax of $\$ 0.0426$." The message will change quarterly as the GCR rate changes. Staff has no further recommendations at this time.

## Customer Service Assessment

Staff reviewed the contacts made by the Applicant's customers to the Commission's call center for the period of June 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. The Applicant's customers made 2,733 contacts with the call center during this time period, with 1,286 from June 1, 2006 through December 31, 2006 and 1447 from January 1, 2007 through August 31, 2007. The 2,733 contacts were coded in the Investigation and Audit Division's data system as either gas or combination gas and electric concerns. The greatest numbers of contacts (605) were regarding disconnection issues. The following contact categories compose the disconnect code: "Customer has received a disconnect notice, the service is off, issues concerning winter reconnect, or customer has concerns about Duke's turn-off procedures." Five hundred thirty-six customers called the Commission's call center before calling the Applicant. Most of these customers were seeking account information and were directed back to the Applicant to give them the first opportunity to respond to their customers. Billing disputes accounted for 251 contacts and billing inquiries were another 183 contacts. Customers who contacted the Commission's call center regarding rates and tariffs numbered 104. The rates and tariffs code include contacts regarding rates or procedures that are tariffed and pending rate case comments. The chart below represents the remainder of the distribution of contacts and issues for June 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007.

Overall, the audit team found the customer service practices and policies of Duke to be in compliance with the applicable rules and regulations set forth by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.


## PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE REGULATION PLAN

The alternative regulation plan consists of 3 components: 1) re-approval of the existing Rider AMRP (Accelerated Main Replacement Program); 2) approval of Rider AU (Advanced Utility); and 3) approval of Rider SD (Sales Decoupling).

## ACCELERATED MAINLINE REPLACEMENT PROGRAM

In Case No. 01-1228-GA-AIR, the last gas base rate case for Duke Energy Ohio, the Commission approved an initial Rider AMRP. This rider permits the Company to recover the costs for its accelerated cast iron and bare steel main line replacement program. In that proceeding, the Commission limited its AMRP approval to investments made through 2006 only. Launched in 2001, this program was designed to replace all of its cast iron and bare steel gas mains of twelve inches diameter and less on an accelerated basis, in order to improve safety and reliability, and to reduce the leak rate for these parts of Duke's system.

Through this filing, Duke seeks re-approval of the rider for an additional nine years, the duration of this construction/replacement program. Additionally, there are other modifications which are being proposed. Duke proposes that the costs associated with its Riser Replacement Program, and the costs associated with the Company's ownership assumption of the curb-to-meter service lines, also be recovered through Rider AMRP.

Duke's existing AMRP was itself a replacement for Duke's previously-existing cast iron and bare steel gas mains replacement programs. At that time, the Company's leak rate for its cast iron/bare steel mains was 1.3 leaks per mile, while polyethylene and coated steel was rated at 0.05 leaks per mile. Considering the aging of its system at that time (some of its cast iron mains dated from "circa 1873"), the Company justified the AMRP due to it providing enhanced safety, improved reliability, reduced operating \& maintenance costs, and being able to operate at a higher rated pressure. All of these factors were cited also as enhancements to the Company's ability to serve distributed generation load, such as fuel cells and micro turbines, in the future.

Staff supports Duke's ongoing AMRP for the replacement of all cast iron and bare steel pipelines and the resulting improvements it has made to pipeline safety. To date Duke has replaced approximately 559 miles of cast iron and bare steel mains in their gas pipeline system. This has resulted in a decrease in the incidence of leaks repaired from 6,223 in 2002 to approximately 4,913 in 2006. That decrease has in turn caused Duke's O\&M costs to decline from the $\$ 6.4$ million embedded in current rates to $\$ 4.1$ million in 2006. Customers have realized approximately $\$ 8.5$ million in O\&M savings to date that has been credited back through Rider AMRP.

The AMRP program has had an impact on reducing the number of incidents reported to Staff since the initiation of the program. In reviewing the incidents reported to Staff over the last ten years, Duke reported five reportable incidents and one non-reportable incident involving cast iron or bare steel line breaks or leaks (see chart below). Since Duke has not had any reportable incidents involving cast iron or bare steel since the AMRP program began, Staff supports the continued replacement of this older generation pipeline.

| Date | Street | Damages | Injuries | Reportable | Cause |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 / 30 / 97$ | Skokian <br> Drive | $100000+$ | 1 | Yes | Cast Iron Main Break |
| $10 / 27 / 98$ | Veazey St. | $175,000+$ | 1 | Yes | Bare Steel Service line leak |
| $2 / 12 / 00$ | Belfast | $180,000+$ | 0 | Yes | Cast Iron Main Break |
| $11 / 24 / 00$ | River Road | 85,000 | 0 | Yes | Cast Iron Main Break |
| $12 / 23 / 01$ | Timberview | 170,000 | 0 | Yes | Cast Iron Main Break |
| $7 / 25 / 02$ | Pleasant <br> Ridge | $<50,000$ | 0 | No | Copper Tap into a Cast Iron <br> Main failed |

Since 2003, Staff has conducted annual audits of the AMRP according to procedures established by the stipulation and approved by the Commission in Case No. 01-1228-GA-AIR. Duke pre-filed an application each November containing support for the rider, with the formal application made by February of the following year. Based on those applications, Staff conducted an annual investigation of the program's implementation as well as the accuracy of the rider calculations. A Staff report containing its recommendations for modifications to the program as well as the amount of increase to the rider for the subsequent 12 month period was submitted. Parties had the opportunity to file objections to the Staff report, and the goal was that an approved rider would be implemented for the first billing cycle of the May revenue month. Each of these annual reviews resulted in a stipulation signed by Duke the PUCO Staff, the Office of Consumers' Counsel (OCC) and Industrial Energy Users Ohio. ${ }^{1}$ Staff is satisfied, based on the annual reviews, that the AMRP program was being efficiently managed and the costs were reasonable. Staff is recommending the Commission reapprove the AMRP through its completion in 2015 and to continue the annual audits according to the previously established procedures.

Duke has also requested the AMRP be re-approved without the rate caps that were part of the initial AMRP approval. According to the direct testimony of Company witness Wathen, the caps limit the Company's ability to timely recover its costs which is the fundamental purpose of the rider. The witness also states that the inclusion of the Riser Replacement Program costs will push the annual revenue requirement over the previously approved annual caps. Based on the Company's performance in managing the AMRP to date, and the inclusion of the costs of the Riser Replacement Program Staff is recommending the caps be eliminated.

[^2]Company witness, Hebbeler's direct testimony also addresses the issue of replacement of plastic pipe within the AMRP. Under the AMRP, Duke replaces any plastic main-tocurb services and short segments of plastic mains that it encounters while replacing the cast iron and bare steel mains. Duke states that it is more economical to replace this pipe than to try to re-use it. The inclusion of costs associated with replacement of plastic mains and main-to-curb services in Rider AMRP has been a source of contention in the annual audits of the AMRP program. Staff believes that, where it is more economic to replace these plastic sections, that it makes sense to allow those costs to also be recovered through Rider AMRP. Staff recommends the Commission explicitly permit such recovery in its re-approval of Rider AMRP.

As a final matter, Company witness Walthen commits Duke to filing a new base rate proceeding no later than 2016 in order to incorporate the Rider AMRP rate base and revenue requirement into base rates and to eliminate Rider AMRP. Staff has been supportive of Rider AMRP in part to eliminate the need for multiple rate cases as the AMRP progresses. Deferral of base rate proceedings is also part of the rationale behind Staff's rate design changes discussed elsewhere in this Staff report. Staff is thus not recommending a mandated rate case by 2016 solely for the purpose of incorporating Rider AMRP into base rates. If in fact a new base rate case is otherwise not necessary by that time, the annual AMRP reviews can continue to be the vehicle to revise the AMRP downward as necessary.

## Riser Replacement Program

In the current rate case application, Duke has proposed to implement a Riser Replacement Program. This program plans to replace an estimated 87,000 service head adaptor (SHA) style risers by 2015. SHA risers are field assembled and compose the vast majority of risers in Duke's service territory.

Duke's proposed Riser Replacement Program is in addition to its Riser Optimization Program that was established in December 2004. Duke's Riser Optimization Program, analyzes riser failure data and targets for replacement risers that have characteristics similar to those with a high incidence of leakage. Over the three years since implementing the Riser Optimization Plan Duke has replaced 4448 SHA risers in 2005 and 2124 risers in 2006 with plans to complete the replacement of over 2000 risers in 2007.

Duke has projected a combined total of SHA riser replacements occurring through the combined efforts of the riser optimization plan, the Riser Replacement Program, the AMRP, and normal operations and maintenance activities to be as follows:

SHA Riser Replacements

$$
\begin{array}{r}
2008-12,088 \\
2009-11,736 \\
2010-11,394 \\
2011-11,062 \\
2012-10,740 \\
2013-10,427 \\
2014-10,124 \\
2015-9,429
\end{array}
$$

Duke estimates that about $4 \%$ or roughly 3,480 SHA style risers will be replaced by the AMRP. Since the inception of the Riser Optimization Program in 2000, an average of 2857 SHA style risers have been replaced annually and 231 leaking or stressed SHA style risers were replaced during the same period. Analysis of the above numbers leads to the conclusion that the vast majority of the annual SHA style riser replacements will be through the Riser Replacement Program.

Staff believes that the Riser Replacement Program is necessary to address a valid safety concern, but takes issue with Duke requiring until 2015 to replace risers identified as prone to failure ${ }^{2}$ In its report, Staff recommended among other things that that distribution operators be put on notice that Design-A risers, (SHA risers), when subjected to certain conditions, are more prone to failure ${ }^{3}$. In addition, Staff has

[^3]recently testified in support of another Ohio LDC's application to systematically replace, over an approximately three year period, all risers identified as prone to failure. ${ }^{4}$

By the end of 2007, Duke will have replaced over 14,986 SHA style risers identified as prone to fail, but this leaves the Applicant with another 87,000 to address. Staff notes that since removing these types of risers from their supplier's approved list, as well as targeting specific SHA style risers for replacement through the riser optimization plan, riser failures have been reduced. However Duke is still experiencing SHA style riser failures and in 2007 Duke reported 50 such riser failures.

Duke currently employs one local and one out of town contractor to handle all riser replacements for the Riser Optimization Program, risers in stress replacements, and the AMRP. Duke has used other contractors to perform this work in the past and these contractors could be utilized for future work. The Applicant has received bids from eight contractors for the 2008 AMRP program work and anticipates awarding all eight contracts for the AMRP program. Duke has indicated that they plan to increase their contractor work force, but the Applicant has not provided information to demonstrate to what extent the work force will be increased.

Staff recommends that Duke increase their riser contractor work force so that the remaining 87,000 SHA style risers can be replaced over a three year period to promptly address this safety concern.

## Customer Owned Service Lines

As part of this application, Duke proposes to take ownership of customer service lines when the Applicant performs maintenance on these lines and whenever it replaces or installs a new service line. Staff supports this proposal because it gives Duke complete responsibility for all pipelines covered by the federal pipeline safety regulations and provides for a uniform approach to correcting pipeline safety concerns.

Company ownership of customer service lines also establishes a clear line of responsibility between the utility and consumer, with the customer continuing to have responsibility for all inside piping and the Company all outside pipe. Staff has recently testified in support of another Ohio LDC's application to take ownership of customer service lines that have been maintained, repaired or replaced by the utility. ${ }^{5}$ Staff believes Duke's proposal to assume ownership of curb-to-meter service lines and risers will significantly enhance pipeline safety. Ibid ob cit

[^4]
## UTILITY OF THE FUTURE PROJECT

Staff reviewed the Applicant's proposal to implement its Utility of the Future Project and to recover the gas-related costs of that project through proposed Rider AU. According to the direct testimony of Company witness Mohler, this project would transform Duke's "gas and electric distribution system into an integrated, digital network - much like a computer network - to produce operating efficiencies, enhanced customer and utility information and communications, innovative services, and other benefits." A major component of this project is Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI), a metering and communications system that records customer usage data, and transmits it over an advanced communications network to a centralized data management system. The AMI equipment for gas meters consists of a microprocessor (installed under the glass of the meter) which scans the dials of the meter, and a telemetry device which transmits the meter's usage data either over a fixed network or via radio transmission.

Although AMI lays the groundwork for a much wider range of benefits on the electric side, its benefits on the gas side are primarily associated with meter reading. These benefits include reduced meter reading costs, fewer meter-reading errors, fewer estimated meter readings, fewer billing adjustments, and reduced need to enter customers' homes to read inside meters. These benefits are especially pertinent to the nearly 184,000 of Duke's customers ( 41 percent of its gas customers) who have gas meters inside their residence and the more than 60,000 of these customers who have given Duke keys to their homes to enable the meter reader to gain access to inside meters. Other large gas utilities are addressing this problem by installing automated meter reading (AMR) devices. These are similar to the AMI attachment for gas meters, but instead of transmitting to a centralized data management system, the AMR transmits either to a meter reader's hand-held recorder (outside the house) or to a van that drives down the street to collect the transmitted meter reading data. AMI devices are more appropriate then AMR devices for Duke, because it is a combination utility, whose meter readers collect both gas and electric meter readings on the same visit. Duke therefore has an opportunity with AMI to avoid the meter-reading trip (either by foot or by van) for both gas and electric meters while generating additional benefits on the electric side.

Staff believes the potential benefits of AMI to the Applicant's gas customers justify adopting Rider AU as a place-holder. Staff therefore recommends the Commission approve Duke's Rider-AU and order the Applicant to maintain this Rider at a zero-dollar balance until Staff and the Commission have an opportunity to assess the costs and benefits of the Utility of the Future Project as a whole and the AMI portion for gas customers in particular.

According to witness Mohler's testimony, Duke's proposed Rider AU would recover the revenue requirement (adjusted for meter reading savings) related to the Utility of the Future Project. Full implementation of this project would go far beyond meter reading on the electric side and generate many benefits that only electric customers would
realize. Staff believes the costs related to those electric benefits should not be borne by Duke's gas customers. Staff therefore recommends that Rider AU should only recover: (1) the cost of the AMI equipment and its installation on customer gas meters; and (2) only those other project-related costs that Duke incurs in extending AMI to gas meters.

Staff assumes that while Duke's personnel or contractors are on the customer's premise to install AMI devices on gas meters, Duke may find it necessary or economical to perform other activities on the same visit. They may find, for example, that the customer's meter needs to be replaced because it is inoperative or, due to age or obsolescence, is incompatible with the AMI device. They may also be instructed to perform routine maintenance or inspections while on site. While Staff has no issues with Duke performing such activities on the same visit or in conjunction with the installation of AMI devices, Staff does not believe the cost of such meter replacements, routine maintenance, or inspections should be recovered through Rider AU, but rather through conventional cost recovery mechanisms. Staff therefore recommends that these costs be excluded from such recovery should the Commission subsequently approve recovery of dollars through Rider AU.

Witness Mohler's testimony also states that the Applicant would implement the Rider AU according to the same schedule it currently uses for the Rider AMRP. Below is Duke's proposed filing schedule for the first two years of the Utility of the Future project.

| Date | Event |
| :--- | :--- |
| August 1, 2008 | DE files deployment plan for 2009 |
| November 1, 2008 | DE files preliminary costs for 2008 <br> (9 months actual + 3 months estimated) |
| February 28, 2009 | DE files first-year application with 12 <br> months of actual costs for 2008 |
| August 1, 2009 | DE files deployment plan for 2010 |
| November 1, 2009 | DE files preliminary costs for 2009 <br> (9 months actual + 3 months estimated) |

The above table indicates that although Duke would file a deployment plan in August 2008 for activities planned for 2009, Duke would file no such plan for 2008 (the first year of the project) even though it plans to file costs for that same year. Staff believes it is important that it have an opportunity to review in advance those activities (and associated costs) planned for the first year of the project. Staff therefore recommends that Duke amend its filing schedule to include a deployment plan for 2008, and that the Commission require Duke to file such a plan within 60 days following the Opinion and Order in this case.

Finally, witness Mohler's testimony requests that if some unexpected change results in a decision by Duke to suspend or abandon all or part of the Utility of the Future Project, the Applicant be permitted to recover such costs even though they may not meet the Commission's traditional "used and useful" standard for cost recovery. Staff has no
opinion on the recovery of these costs at this time. Should this condition arise, the appropriate recovery should be determined through another proceeding.

## SALES DECOUPLING RIDER

As part of its Alternative Regulation plan, Duke has proposed implementation of a Sales Decoupling rider. Sales decoupling has become a significant regulatory issue in recent years as gas utilities attempt to address the revenue erosion that has resulted from a steady decline in average customer usage. Historically, the PUCO has designed rates such that the vast majority of a gas utility's cost recovery is through the volumetric component of its distribution rates. The cost of operating and maintaining a utility's pipeline system, however, is largely independent of the volume of gas flowing through that system. As use per customer has fallen in response to rising prices, utilities are under-recovering their fixed costs, resulting in a need to file more frequent base rate cases to reset those rates.

Duke has proposed to address this issue in two ways. The first is to shift a larger portion of its rate recovery into the monthly customer charge and the second is implementation of a new Sales Decoupling Rider (Rider SD). Rider SD, as proposed, would true-up any future differences between actual, weather normalized revenue per customer, and the revenue per customer implicitly approved as part of this rate case. Rider SD would apply to all Duke's sales and transportation customers except Rate IT customers.

Staff believes that tying a utility's earnings to the volumes of gas consumed has been problematic as residential use per customer has been steadily declining. This decline has been especially pronounced in recent years in response to the large increases in natural gas prices since the winter of 2000/2001.

| Historical use per Residential Customer ${ }^{6}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| Year | Usage <br> (Mcf) |
|  |  |
| 1990 | 111.19 |
| 1991 | 109.18 |
| 1992 | 108.72 |
| 1993 | 106.6 |
| 1994 | 103.41 |
| 1995 | 101.37 |
| 1996 | 100.48 |
| 1997 | 98.97 |
| 1998 | 95.67 |
| 1999 | 93.63 |
| 2000 | 94.57 |
| 2001 | 87.15 |
| 2002 | 88.36 |
| 2003 | 90.9 |
| 2004 | 86.37 |
| 2005 | 86.41 |
| 2006 | 79.4 |

As the data shows, a decline in weather normalized use per residential customer of $1.75 \%$ per year occurred between 1990 and 1999, and a $2.67 \%$ per year reduction from 2000 to 2006. Making a Company's actual earnings a function of future sales volumes rather than what was authorized, increases the likelihood of under-recovery of that authorized return and the need for additional subsequent base rate cases. Decoupling seeks to break the volumetric underpinnings of that traditional regulatory construct and more directly allows the utility to earn what the Commission determined was a fair return.

Decoupling will also eliminate the disincentive a utility otherwise would have to promote energy efficiency and conservation. Under the existing construct, a utility is incented to increase sales in order to protect its earnings. Once sales volumes and revenues are decoupled, utilities are in a position to more aggressively assist customers in their efforts to consume less natural gas. On a national scale, environmental concerns associated with coal fired generating facilities, uncertainty about the future role of nuclear power, and the resulting increased use of natural gas to fuel electric generation, have all combined to put upward pressure on energy prices. In this environment, conservation and energy efficiency have an important role to play in mitigating rising energy costs. Decoupling of sales and revenues can be a key component in encouraging natural gas utilities to promote of that role.

[^5]Duke's application proposed a decoupling mechanism that would calculate the difference between actual revenues per customer for each month, and the implicit revenues per customer for the like month in the rate case test year. Actual revenue per customer would be weather normalized, such that Duke would not be compensated for revenues lost due to warmer than normal weather. Monthly revenue per customer is also adjusted to reflect any changes in the number of customers. Duke would defer these calculated monthly differences and recover the accumulated amounts through an annual adjustment to Rider SD. The amount of the rider would be calculated by dividing the accumulated monthly differences by projected sales volumes over the next twelve months. Any under or over- recovery due to differences between actual and projected sales volumes would be reconciled through future adjustments to Rider SD.

Staff supports the concept of decoupling but is proposing to address the issue through a change in its rate structure policy rather than through adoption of Rider SD. The proposed change, discussed in the Rate Design section of this report, largely accomplishes the goals of decoupling without the need for an annual audit of the decoupling mechanism and subsequent true-ups.

## COMMITMENTS

Administrative Code Section 4901:1-19-05(C)(3) requires an Applicant filing an alternative rate plan to include in its application those commitments to customers, that it is willing to make in promoting the state policy as defined in Revised Code Section 4929.02. The extent of these commitments should be dependent upon the degree of freedom the Applicant is requesting from traditional ratemaking procedures.

The direct testimony of Company witness Sandra P. Meyer describes how Duke's proposal to continue the AMRP program promotes the state policies in Section 4929.02 O.R.C.:

- Continuation of the AMRP program provides safe, reliable and reasonably-priced service;
- Continued improvement to the distribution system's leak rate;
- Enhanced safety and reliability;
- O\&M savings will continue to be passed on to customers through offsets to Rider AMRP on a real time basis.

Duke is also proposing to expand its current programs to assist low-income residential customers. The Heat Share program, administered by the Salvation Army, provides assistance to eligible customers facing disconnection of service, in paying their winter heating bills. Duke shareholders contribute $\$ 1.00$ for each $\$ 2.00$ donated by customers to the Heat Share Program. In 2006, Duke increased the level of shareholder contribution to $\$ 200,000$ from $\$ 100,000$. Duke is proposing to continue that increased level of funding through December 31, 2010. Duke is also proposing to fund its low-income weatherization program at $\$ 3$ million annually. Annual funding had been at $\$ 2$ million per year with the exception of a one-time increase of $\$ 1$ million in 2006 . Duke is proposing to continue that
increased funding through 2010. Duke's application proposed a $\$ 1$ million increase in O\&M expense to reflect this increase in ratepayer funding. Finally, Duke is proposing to extend its Customer Service Collaborative (CSC) through December 31, 2010. The CSC consists of low-income consumer advocates, governmental agencies, social service agencies, the Ohio Consumers' Counsel and PUCO Staff. The CSC works on a collaborative basis to address the service needs of low-income customers.

Staff recommends the Commission find the Company's commitments in compliance with Administrative Code Section 4901:1-19-05(C)(3) with two modifications. We recommend the additional $\$ 1$ million in funding for the weatherization program come from Duke shareholders rather than ratepayers. This will be reflected in the elimination of the $\$ 1$ million increase in O\&M expense shown on Schedule C-3.21. We also recommend the commitments related to the weatherization program, the Heat Share program and the Customer Service Collaborative should run through December 31, 2016, or the establishment of new base rates subsequent to this proceeding, whichever comes first. Staff believes this is appropriate given our recommendation of approval of Rider AMRP through December 31, 2016.

## MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS REVIEW

Section 4909.154 of the Ohio Revised Code states that the Public Utilities Commission shall consider the management policies, practices, and organization of public utilities in fixing the just, reasonable, and compensatory rates, joint rates, tolls, classification, charges or rentals to be observed and charged for service of any public utility.

In 1985, the Commission approved an amendment to the Standard Filing Requirements. This amendment (4901-7-01) requires medium and large utilities to include in their rate filings a concisely written summary of their management policies, practices, and organization. Among other things, the summary is to include a discussion of policy and goal setting, strategic and long range planning, organization structure, decision making and controlling, and communications for the company's executive management process (Schedule S-4.1) as well as for numerous functional areas common to most large utility companies (Schedule S4.2).

Staff routinely reviews the S-4.1 and S-4.2 schedules, applicant performance, and various events relating to the applicant's management. As a result of these review activities, Staff selects certain management topics for rate case reporting. In the current rate case, Staff reports on Duke's programs for Energy Conservation and Demand-Side Management (DSM).

## ENERGY CONSERVATION \& DEMAND-SIDE MANAGEMENT (DSM)

Energy conservation and DSM, as a tool of utility company strategy and as a public policy direction has had a spotty history in Ohio over the last twenty years. Commission Staff has traditionally viewed DSM programs as organized electric utility activities that are intended to affect the amount and timing of customer electricity usage. DSM programs include peak clipping, strategic conservation, load shifting, valley filling, and strategic load growth options. A DSM program is a series of measures intended to encourage specific groups of customers to modify their energy usage patterns in a manner consistent with the utility's objectives while maintaining customer satisfaction.

DSM for natural gas utilities has not enjoyed comparable support as that for electric utility industry DSM. Natural gas as a commodity cost is directly passed to the consumer via the utility company's gas cost recovery mechanism. Thus, the consumer is directly rewarded for any conservation measures they can implement on their own. Socializing the costs of implementing individual conservation measures has been viewed as a controversial policy as only those
receiving the conservation measure benefit, while all the utility company's ratepayers pick up the costs for the programs.

In the past, the Commission has expressed the opinion that natural gas DSM programs do not provide benefits to customers other than those who participate in the programs - i.e. there are no system-wide benefits. Consequently natural gas DSM has rarely been endorsed by the Commission while natural gas conservation programs have been limited to only those targeted to low income customers who would lack the resources to make efficiency improvements absent the DSM program. Nevertheless, in the last few years, the Commission has approved some conservation measures for natural gas customers as a Natural Gas DSM pilot program.

To review Duke's current conservation and DSM programs, Staff developed an encompassing data request to gather the significant information related to each energy conservation and DSM program. In response, Duke supplied information relating to their energy conservation programs. Staff also reviewed the recent history of Duke's natural gas DSM programs which are being implemented as a pilot project for gathering market intelligence and evaluating energy demand impacts.

## DUKE ENERGY OHIO'S WEATHERIZATION PROGRAM

Duke funds a home weatherization program designed to make the homes of its low income gas and electric residential customers more energy efficient. The program includes the installation of energy saving devices and provides energy education to these consumers. The cost for these services to the low income customer is zero.

Services under this program are provided by two agencies: People Working Cooperatively and Working In Neighborhoods. In previous years, costs related to the weatherization program totaled approximately $\$ 2$ million per year. Duke committed $\$ 3$ million to this program in 2006. In the present case, as part of the Company's alternative regulation proposal, Duke commits to continuing this program at the $\$ 3$ million annual funding level through December, 2010. Staff's comments on the funding for the Duke Weatherization Program are included in this Staff Report regarding Duke's Alternative Regulation Proposal.

Duke conducted an in-depth evaluation of its low income natural gas home weatherization program in 2005 and conducts high-level verifications on an annual basis for installations and quality control of the overall program. The evaluation study findings identified a benefit from the consumer education measure of 106 therms per year on average. The combination of the education measure and the installation of conservation measures resulted in an average savings of 299 therms per year (therm $=$ a unit of heat equal to 100,000 Btu's or
about 97 cubic feet of natural gas). The Duke evaluation did not attempt to analyze the cost effectiveness of the conservation measures investment, focusing only on measuring the impact or savings from the program.

## NATURAL GAS DEMAND-SIDE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Duke's DSM program is a three year pilot project expected to run from 2007 to 2010. The DSM pilot project has 2 DSM measures in operation, the Home Energy House Call and the Smart Saver Natural Gas Furnace Program.

1. Home Energy House Call Program is an in-home energy analysis that helps consumers determine the most cost-effective steps they can apply/install in their home to save energy. The analysis looks at efficiency improvements from insulation to equipment replacement. The homeowner is mailed the results. The Energy Audit is free to customers and no incentives are provided for measures; however, each participant receives a free low-cost measure kit which includes 2 compact fluorescent bulbs, a low flow showerhead, faucet aerators, a motion sensor night light and outlet gaskets. The program is also deployed in Indiana and Kentucky which helps keep administrative program expenses to a minimum.
2. Smart Saver Natural Gas Furnace - this program is designed to increase the energy efficiency of natural gas furnaces installed in either new homes or when a customer is seeking a replacement. Incentives are available to three parties: builders, heating/AC dealers, and consumers. The incentive for existing homes is a $\$ 200$ rebate for installation of a new high efficiency natural gas furnace of $90 \%$ AFUE or greater. The incentive for new home builds is a $\$ 300$ rebate for the installation of a new high efficiency furnace of $90 \%$ AFUE or greater. This program extends to include a combination a high efficiency natural gas furnace combined with a new, qualifying air conditioner or heat pump with a $\$ 400$ rebate for existing homes or a $\$ 600$ for new home builds.

## Conclusion:

Staff concludes that Duke is making strides in implementing the pilot natural gas DSM programs as proposed in the stipulated agreement from case 06-0091-ELUNC, et al. The current DSM program offerings appear to be well designed and are intuitive first cuts as conservation measures for residential consumer's use of natural gas. The funding for Duke's DSM programs is separate from this rate case with the funds held in a DSM Program Rider. Duke is working with a group called the Duke Energy Community Partnership (DECP), in consultation with Staff, regarding the evaluation of its DSM programs. In the Commission's Finding and Order for case 06-0091-EL-UNC, et al. Duke's DSM program evaluation costs are capped at $5 \%$ of each program's expenditures with leftover
program funds from canceled programs available for investment in other DECP favored DSM measures.

## Recommendation:

It is not yet apparent what new state laws, policy initiatives, or regulations might impact energy conservation and demand-side management efforts, both in the electric utility industry and in the natural gas utility industry. Nevertheless, on a national scale, environmental concerns associated with coal fired generating facilities, uncertainty about the future role of nuclear power, and the resulting increased use of natural gas to fuel electric generation, have all combined to put upward pressure on energy prices. Given this environment, conservation and energy efficiency have a positive role to play in controlling energy costs.

Until such State laws, initiatives, or regulations for restructuring the utility industry are forthcoming, Staff has no specific recommendations regarding Duke's Conservation and DSM Programs. However, as Duke's DSM programs mature, it is recommended that these programs be evaluated for their costs and benefits. At that point in time, perhaps a framework will be in place to better identify the true costs and benefits while assuring that the benefits, like the costs, can be shared by the ratepayers funding the programs.

Staff recommends that Duke's DSM programs be reviewed in concert with monitoring efforts from the DECP. Staff intends to monitor the progress of Duke's natural gas DSM programs and review the natural gas DSM evaluation studies to determine whether the rebates offered actually increase the saturation of high efficiency natural gas furnaces.
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | DESCRIPTION | Supporting Schedule Reference | Applicant | Staff |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| 1 | Rate Base | B-1 | 702,414,915 | 649,287,448 | 649,287,448 |
| 2 | Current Operating Income | C-1 | 39,491,958 | 43,972,403 | 43,972,403 |
| 3 | Earned Rate of Return (Line 2 / Line 1) |  | 5.62\% | 6.77\% | 6.77\% |
| 4 | Requested Rate of Return | D-1A | 8.73\% | 8.18\% | 8.75\% |
| 5 | Required Operating Income (Line $1 \times$ Line 4) |  | 61,320,822 | 53,111,713 | 56,812,652 |
| 6 | Operating Income Deficiency (Line 5-Line 2) |  | 21,828,864 | 9,139,310 | 12,840,249 |
| 7 | Gross Revenue Conversion Factor | C-10/A-1.1 | 1.5641209 | 1.5615205 | 1.5615205 |
| 8 | Revenue Deficiency (Line $6 \times$ Line 7) |  | 34,142,983 | 14,271,220 | 20,050,312 |
| 9 | Adjusted Operating Revenues | C-1 | 597,573,805 | 597,573,805 | 597,573,805 |
| 10 | Revenue Requirements (Line $9+$ Line 10) |  | 631,716,507 | 611,845,025 | 617,624,117 |
| 11 | Revenue Increase Requested/Recommended |  | 34,142,702 | 14,271,220 | 20,050,312 |
| 12 | Percent Increase |  | 5.71\% | 2.39\% | 3.36\% |
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|  |  | PERCENT OF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LINE | INCREMENTAL |  |
| NO. | DESCRIPTION | GROSS |
|  |  | REVENUE |

## $100.00000 \%$
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JURISDICTIONAL RATE BASE SUMMARY
AS OF MARCH 31, 2007

|  |  |  | STAFF REPORT <br> SCHEDULE B-1 <br> PAGE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

(a) Contributions in aid of construction are already netted against gross plant per FPC Order No. 490.
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$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { DUKE ENERGY OHIO } \\
\text { CASE NO. O7-589-GA-AIR } \\
\text { PLANT IN SERVICE BY ACCOUNTS AND SUBACCOUNTS } \\
\text { AS OF MARCH 31, } 2007 \\
\text { MANUFACTURED GAS PRODUCTION PLANT }
\end{gathered}
$$

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | F.E.R.C. ACCT. NO. | $\begin{gathered} \text { COMPANY } \\ \text { ACCT. } \\ \text { NO. } \end{gathered}$ | ACCOUNT TITLE | TOTAL COMPANY | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALIOCATION } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ALLOCATED } \\ & \text { TOTAL } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ADJUSTMENTS | ADJUSTED JURISDICTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| 1 | 304 | 2040 | Land and Land Rights | 427,814 | 100.00 | 427,814 |  | 427,814 |
| 2 | 304 | 2041 | Rights of Way | 4,147 | 100.00 | 4,147 |  | 4,147 |
| 3 | 305 | 2050 | Structures \& Improvements | 3,705,658 | 100.00 | 3,705,658 |  | 3,705,658 |
| 4 | 311 | 2110 | Liquefied Petroleum Gas Equipment | 5,401,368 | 100.00 | 5,401,368 |  | 5,401,368 |
| 5 | 320 | 2200 | Other Equipment | 30.095 | 100.00 | 30,095 |  | 30.095 |
| 6 |  |  | Total Manufactured Gas Production Plant | 9,569,082 |  | 9,569,082 |  | 9,569,082 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NO. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | F.E.R.C. ACCT. NO. | $\begin{gathered} \text { COMPANY } \\ \text { ACCT. } \\ \text { NO. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ACCOUNT TITLE | TOTAL COMPANY | $\underset{\%}{\text { ALLOCATION }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALLOCATED } \\ \text { TOTAL } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ADJUSTMENTS | AD.JUSTED JURISDICTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| 1 | 374 | 2740 | Land and Land Rights | 133,008 | 100.00 | 133,008 |  | 133,008 |
| 2 | 374 | 2741 | Rights of Way | 6,817,467 | 100.00 | 6,817,467 |  | 6,817,467 |
| 3 | 374 | 2742 | City Gate Check Station | 3,663 | 100.00 | 3,663 |  | 3,663 |
| 4 | 375 | 2750 | Structures \& Improvements | 1,132,021 | 100.00 | 1,132,021 |  | 1,132,021 |
| 5 | 376 | 2761 | Mains - Cast Iron \& Copper | 12,417,594 | 100.00 | 12,417,594 |  | 12,417,594 |
| 6 | 376 | 2762, 2767 | Mains - Steel | 256,465,460 | 100.00 | 256,465,460 |  | 256,465,460 |
| 7 | 376 | 2763, 2768 | Mains - Plastic | 314,553,206 | 100.00 | 314,553,206 |  | 314,553,206 |
| 8 | 376 | 2765, 2769 | Mains - Feeder | 75,595,527 | 100.00 | 75,595,527 |  | 75,595,527 |
| 9 | 378 | 2780 | System Meas. \& Reg. Station Equipment | 14,431,020 | 100.00 | 14,431,020 |  | 14,431,020 |
| 10 | 378 | 2781 | System Meas. \& Reg. Station Equipment-Elec | 2,839,554 | 100.00 | 2,839,554 |  | 2,839,554 |
| 11 | 378 | 2782 | District Regulating Equipment | 3.240.252 | 100.00 | 3,240,252 |  | 3,240,252 |
| 12 | 379 | 2790 | Meas. \& Reg.- City Gate | 263,232 | 100.00 | 263,232 |  | 263,232 |
| 13 | 380 | 2801 | Services- Cast Iron \& Copper | 9,935,057 | 100.00 | 9,935,057 |  | 9,935,057 |
| 14 | 380 | 2802, 2804 | Services-Steel | 18,686,179 | 100.00 | 18,686,179 |  | 18,686,179 |
| 15 | 380 | 2803, 2805.2807 | 7 Services-Plastic | 219,123,546 | 100.00 | 219,123,546 |  | 219,123,546 |
| 16 | 381 | 2810.2811 | Meters | 35,629,894 | 100.00 | 35,629,894 |  | 35,629,894 |
| 17 | 382 | 2820,2821 | Meter Instalations | 24,898,583 | 100.00 | 24,898,583 |  | 24,898,583 |
| 18 | 383 | 2830,2831 | House Regulators | 17,660,726 | 100.00 | 17,660,726 |  | 17,660,726 |
| 19 | 384 | 2840,2841 | House Regulator Installations | 12,496,754 | 100.00 | 12,496,754 |  | 12,496,754 |
| 20 | 385 | 2850 | Large Industrial Meas. \& Reg. Equiprnent | 2,749,950 | 100.00 | 2,749,950 |  | 2,749,950 |
| 21 | 385 | 2851 | Large Industrial Meas. \& Reg. Equipment - Comm | 726,303 | 100.00 | 726,303 |  | 726,303 |
| 22 | 387 | 2870 | Other Equipment - Other | 76,253 | 100.00 | 76,253 |  | 76,253 |
| 23 | 387 | 2871 | Street Lighting Equipment | 765,241 | 100.00 | 765,241 |  | 765,241 |
| 24 | 388 |  | Gas ARO | 6,305,213 | 100.00 | 6,305,213 |  | 6,305,213 |

$\begin{array}{llll}1,036,945,703 & 1.036,945.703 & 0 & 1,036,945,703\end{array}$

Total Distribution Plant

ฝ๊

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07 -589-GA-AIR
PLANT IN SERVICE BY ACCOUNTS AND SUBACCOUNTS AS OF MARCH 31,2007
GENERAL PLANT

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | F.E.R.C. ACCT. No. | $\begin{gathered} \text { COMPANY } \\ \text { ACCT. } \\ \text { NO. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ACCOUNT TITLE | TOTAL COMPANY | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALLOCATION } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALLOCATED } \\ \text { TOTAL } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ADJUSTMENTS | ADJUSTED JURISDICTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| 1 | 000 | 2030 | Miscellaneous Intangible Plant | 4,848,935 | 100.00 | 4,848,935 |  | 4,848,935 |
| 2 | 389 | 2890 | Land | 0 | 100.00 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 3 | 390 | 2900 | Structures \& Improvernents | 1,823,807 | 100.00 | 1,823,807 |  | 1,823,807 |
| 4 | 391 | 2910 | Office Furniture \& Equipment | 679,592 | 100.00 | 679,592 |  | 679,592 |
| 5 | 391 | 2911 | Electronic Data Processing Equipment | 0 | 100.00 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 6 | 392 | 2920 | Transportation Equipment | 76,251 | 100.00 | 76,251 |  | 76.251 |
| 7 | 392 | 2921 | Trailers | 512,305 | 100.00 | 512,305 |  | 512.305 |
| 8 | 394 | 2940 | Toois, Shop \& Garage Equipment | 7,451,609 | 100.00 | 7,451,609 |  | 7,451,609 |
| 9 | 395 | 2950 | Laboratory Equipment | 234,056 | 100.00 | 234,056 |  | 234,056 |
| 10 | 396 | 2960 | Power Operated Equipment | 118,621 | 100.00 | 118,621 |  | 118,621 |
| 11 | 397 | 2970 | Communication Equipment | 118.431 | 100.00 | 118,431 |  | 118.431 |
| 12 |  |  | Total General Plant | 15,863,607 |  | 15,863,607 |  | 15,863,607 |
| 13 |  |  | Total Gas Plant | 1,062,378,392 |  | 1,062,378,392 |  | 1,062,378.392 |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
 AS OF MARCH 31, 2007 COMMON PLANT
STAFF REPORT
SCHEDULE B-2. 1
PAGE 4 OF 4

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NO. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | F.E.R.C. ACCT. NO. | COMPANY ACCT. NO. | ACCOUNT TITLE | TOTAL COMPANY | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALLOCATION } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALLOCATED } \\ \text { TOTAL } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ADJUSTMENTS | ADJUSTED JURISDICTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| 1 |  | 1030 | Miscellaneous Intangible Plant | 97,231,124 | 100.00 | 97,231,124 |  | 97,231,124 |
| 2 |  | 1890 | Land and Land Rights | 2,121,648 | 100.00 | 2,121,648 |  | 2,121.648 |
| 3 |  | 1891 | Rights of Way | 37,969 | 100.00 | 37,969 |  | 37.969 |
| 4 |  | 1900 | Structures \& Improvements | 91,476,285 | 100.00 | 91,476,285 | (1,798,890) | 89,677,395 |
| 5 |  | 1910 | Office Furniture \& Equipment | 15,135,378 | 100.00 | 15,135,378 | $(38,681)$ | 15,096,697 |
| 6 |  | 1911 | Electronic Data Processing Equipment | 0 | 100.00 | 0 | $(3,8)$ | 0 |
| 7 |  | 1920 | Transportation Equipment | 85,312 | 100.00 | 85,312 |  | 85,312 |
| 8 |  | 1921 | Trailers | 389,753 | 100.00 | 389,753 |  | 389,753 |
| 9 |  | 1930 | Stores Equipment | 663,997 | 100.00 | 663,997 |  | 663,997 |
| 10 |  | 1940 | Tools, Shop \& Garage Equipment | 1,209,959 | 100.00 | 1,209,959 | $(56,502)$ | 1,153,457 |
| 11 |  | 1950 | Laboratory Equipment | 9,888 | 100.00 | 9,888 |  | 9,888 |
| 12 |  | 1960 | Power Operated Equipment | 42,047 | 100.00 | 42,047 |  | 42,047 |
| 13 |  | 1970 | Commurication Equipment | 15,313,973 | 100.00 | 15,313,973 |  | 15,313,973 |
| 14 |  | 1980 | Miscellaneous Equipment | 317,530 | 100.00 | 317,530 | $(16,165)$ | 301,365 |
| 15 |  |  | Total Common Plant | 224,034,863 |  | 224,034,863 | (1,910,238) | 222,124,625 |
| 16 |  | 13.50 | Common Plant Allocated to Gas | 30,244,707 |  | 30,244,707 | $(257,882)$ | 29,986,825 |
| 17 |  |  | Total Gas Plant Including Allocated Common | 1,092,623,099 |  | 1,092,623,099 | $(257,882)$ | 1,092,365,217 |

[^6]| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | F.E.R.C. ACCT. NO. | $\begin{gathered} \text { COMPANY } \\ \text { ACCT. } \\ \text { NO. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ACCOUNT TITLE | TOTAL COMPANY ADJUSTMENT | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALLOCATION } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | JURISDICTIONAL ADJUSTMENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | COMMON PLANT (a) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  | 1900 | Structures \& Improverrents | (1,798,890) | 100.00 | (1,798,890) |
| 3 |  | 1910 | Office Furniture \& Equipment | $(38,681)$ | 100.00 | $(38,681)$ |
| 4 |  | 1940 | Tools, Shop \& Garage Equipment | $(56,502)$ | 100.00 | $(56,502)$ |
| 8 |  | 1980 | Miscellaneous Equipment | $(16,165)$ | 100.00 | $(16,165)$ |
| 9 |  |  | Total Common Plant | $(1,910,238)$ |  | $(1,910,238)$ |
| 10 |  | $13.50 \%$ | Common Allocated to Gas | (257,882) |  | (257,882) |

Description and Purpose of Adjustments:
(a) To eliminate from rate base the Hartwell Recreation Facilities not used by Company

GROSS ADDITIONS. RETIREMENTS \& TRANSFERS
FROM APRIL 1.2001 TO MARCH 31, 2007
MANUFACTURED GAS PRODUCTION PLANT
DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
RROSS AODITIONS. RETIREMENTS \& TRANSFE
FROM APRIL 1, 2001 TO MARCH 31, 2007
DISTRIBUTION PLANT


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | f.E.R.C. ACCT. No. | COMPANY ACCT. NO. | ACCOUNT TITLE | beginning BALANCE | ADDITIONS | RETIREMENTS | TRANSFERS/RECLASSIFICATIONS |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ENOING } \\ & \text { BALANCE } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | AMOUNT | EXPLANATION OF TRANSFER | OTHER ACCTS. INVOLVED |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |  |  | \$ |
| 1 | 374 | 2740 | Land | 415,828 | (188,704) | 32,612 | (61,504) |  |  | 133,008 |
| 2 | 374 | 2741 | Rights of Way | 2.113,774 | 4,642,189 | , | 81,504 |  |  | 6,817,467 |
| 3 | 374 | 2742 | City Gate Check Station | 3.663 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.663 |
| 4 | 375 | 2750 | Structures \& Improvements | 811,402 | 340,710 | 43,118 | 23,027 |  |  | 1,132,021 |
| 5 | 376 | 2761-2769 | Mains | 378,262,956 | 304,749,301 | 19,799,166 | $(4,181,306)$ |  |  | 659,031,785 |
| 6 | 378 | 2780 | System Meas. \& Reg. Station Equipment - Genert | 9,941,569 | 4,390,850 | 275,803 | 374,404 |  |  | 14,431,020 |
| 7 | 378 | 2781 | System Meas \& Reg. Station Equipment - Electric | 1,175,191 | 1,763,179 | 128,472 | 29,716 |  |  | 2,839,554 |
| 8 | 378 | 2782 | District Regulating Equipment | 3,131,979 | 243.487 | 135,214 | - |  |  | 3,240,252 |
| 9 | 379 | 2790 | Meas. \& Reg - City Gate | 263,232 |  |  |  |  |  | 263,232 |
| 10 | 380 | 2801-2807 | Services | 176,034,215 | 88,793,413 | 21,411,605 | 4,328.761 |  |  | 247,744,784 |
| 11 | 381 | 2810, 2811 | Meters | 29.772.694 | 7,624,866 | 1,458,940 | (308,726) |  |  | 35,629,894 |
| 12 | 382 | 2820. 2821 | Meter Installations | 18,671,516 | 7,045,650 | 677.896 | (140,687) |  |  | 24,898,583 |
| 13 | 383 | 2830, 2831 | House Regulators | 9,507,688 | 8,153,038 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 17,660,726 |
| 14 | 384 | 2840, 2841 | House Regulator installations | 7,313,103 | 5,993.719 | 810,068 | 0 |  |  | 12.496 .754 |
| 15 | 385 | 2850 | Large industrial Meas. \& Reg. Equipment | 2,573,786 | 178,783 | 2,619 | 0 |  |  | 2,749,950 |
| 16 | 385 | 2851 | Large Industrial Meas. \& Reg. Equipment - Comm | 419,375 | 306,928 |  |  |  |  | 726,303 |
| 17 | 387 | 2870 | Other Equipment - Other | ${ }_{156.573}$ | (80,320) | 0 | 0 |  |  | 76,253 |
| 18 | 387 | 2871 | Street Lighting Equipment | 765,707 | 115 | 466 | (115) |  |  | 765,241 |
| 19 | 388 |  | Gas ARO | 0 | 6,305,213 | 0 | O |  |  | 6.305,213 |
| 20 |  |  | Total Distribution Plant | 641,334,191 | 440.262.417 | 44,755,979 | 125,074 |  |  | 1.036.945.703 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | F.E.R.C. ACCT NO. | COMPANY ACCT. NO. | ACCOUNT TITLE | BEGINNING BALANCE | ADDITIONS | RETIREMENTS | TRANSFERS/RECLASSIFICATIONS |  |  | ENDING BALANCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | AMOUNT | EXPLANATION OF TRANSFER | OTHER ACCTS. INVOLVED |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |  |  | \$ |
| 1 | 000 | 2030 | Miscerlaneous intangible Plant | 1,248,694 | 2,397,497 | 0 | 1,202,744 |  |  | 4,848,935 |
| 2 | 389 | 2890 | Land | 46.782 | 0 | 46,782 | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| 3 | 390 | 2900 | Structures \& Improvements | 215,467 | 829,604 | 84.987 | 863.723 |  |  | 1,823,807 |
| 4 | 391 | 2910 | Office Fumiture \& Equipment | 822,426 | 302,735 | 651,057 | 205,488 |  |  | 679,592 |
| 5 | 391 | 2911 | Electronic Data Processing Equipment | 141.147 | 0 | 141.147 | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| 6 | 392 | 2920 | Transportation Equipment | 4,318,354 | 0 | 4,242.103 | 0 |  |  | 76,251 |
| 7 | 392 | 2921 | Trailers | 421,690 | 174,240 | 83,625 | 0 |  |  | 512,305 |
| 8 | 394 | 2940 | Tools, Shop \& Garage Equipment | 5.937,888 | 1,405.552 | 1,365,844 | 1.474,013 |  |  | 7,451.609 |
| 9 | 395 | 2950 | Laboratory Equipment | 348,059 | 0 | 114,003 | 0 |  |  | 234,056 |
| 10 | 396 | 2960 | Power Operated Equipment | 1,152,547 | 0 | 1,033,896 | 0 |  |  | 118,621 |
| 11 | 397 | 2970 | Communication Equipment | 19,350 | 99.081 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 118,431 |
| 12 |  |  | Total General Plant | 14.672,374 | 5,208.709 | 7,763,444 | 3,745.968 |  |  | 15.863,607 |
| 13 |  |  | Total Gas Piant | 664,005,513 | 447.495,185 | 53.423 .629 | 4,301,323 |  |  | 1,062,378.392 |





STAFF REPORT
SCHEDULE B-2.4
PAGE 1 OF 1

| IDENTIFICATION OR REFERENCE NUMBER | DESCRIPTION OF TYPE AND USE OF PROPERTY | NAME OF LESSOR | $\begin{gathered} \text { FREQUENCY } \\ \text { OF } \\ \text { PAYMENT } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | AMOUNT OF LEASE PAYMENT | DOLLAR VALUE OF PROPERTY INVOLVED | EXPLAIN METHOD OF CAPITALIZATION | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { INCLUDED } \\ & \text { IN } \\ & \text { RATE BASE } \\ & \text { (YESNO) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2811 \& 2821 | Meters \& Meter Installations | Bank of America | Monthly | \$195,917 | \$18,916,123 | Per Regulatory and GAAP Guidelines | Yes |
| 1900 | Fourth \& Wainut (Clopay) (1) | Jones Lang LaSalle |  |  | \$4,671,209 |  | Yes |
| 1900 | Atrium II (1) | Atrium II Development Co. |  |  | \$257,952 |  | Yes |
| 2831 \& 2841 | Regulators \& Regulator Installations | Bank of America | Monthly | \$ 133,292 | \$ 12,869,047 |  | Yes |

(1) These expenditures are capitalized as Leasehold improvements and are included in Account 1900.
These improvements are amortized over the life of the lease.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | COMPANY ACCT. NO. | DESCRIPTION OF EXCLUDED PROPERTY | $\begin{gathered} \text { IN-SERVICE } \\ \text { DATE } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ORIGINAL } \\ \text { COST } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ACCUM. DEPRE. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NET } \\ & \text { ORIGINAL } \\ & \text { COST } \end{aligned}$ | TEST YEARREVENUE \& EXPENSES |  |  | REASONFOR EXCLUSION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | AMOUNT | $\begin{gathered} \text { ACCT. } \\ \text { NO. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | DESCRIP. |  |
| 1 | 1900 | Structures \& Improvements | 1944 | 5,857 | 2,542 | 3.315 |  |  |  | Hartwell Recreation Facilities |
| 2 |  |  | 1948 | 730 | 297 | 433 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  | 1949 | 41,064 | 16,404 | 24.660 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  | 1950 | 2,089 | 820 | 1.269 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  | 1951 | 186,023 | 71,738 | 114.287 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  | 1952 | 5,459 | 2,067 | 3.392 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  | 1953 | 5,774 | 2,147 | 3.627 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  | 1954 | 874 | 319 | 555 |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  | 1955 | 701 | 251 | 450 |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  | 1957 | 291,203 | 100,211 | 190.992 |  |  |  |  |
| 11 |  |  | 1960 | 11,628 | 3,760 | 7.868 |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  | 1961 | 4,663 | 1,476 | 3.187 |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  | 1962 | 1,565 | 484 | 1.081 |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  | 1965 | 783 | 226 | 557 |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  | 1966 | 87,744 | 24,733 | 63.011 |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  | 1972 | 1.765 | 424 | 1.341 |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  | 1974 | 4,382 | 993 | 3.389 |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  | 1975 | 4,990 | 1,096 | 3.894 |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  | 1976 | 3,510 | 768 | 2.842 |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  | 1978 | 491 | 98 | 393 |  |  |  |  |
| 21 |  |  | 1980 | 5,637 | 1.043 | 4.594 |  |  |  |  |
| 22 |  |  | 1981 | 3,018 | 538 | 2.480 |  |  |  |  |
| 23 |  |  | 1982 | 89,168 | 15,265 | 73.903 |  |  |  |  |
| 24 |  |  | 1983 | 16,375 | 2,690 | 13.685 |  |  |  |  |
| 25 |  |  | 1984 | 1,583 | 265 | 1.418 |  |  |  |  |
| 26 |  |  | 1985 | 8,727 | 1.313 | 7.414 |  |  |  |  |
| 27 |  |  | 1986 | 7,578 | 1,088 | 6.490 |  |  |  |  |
| 28 |  |  | 1988 | 18,636 | 2,417 | 16,219 |  |  |  |  |
| 29 |  |  | 1989 | 103,683 | 12,730 | 90,953 |  |  |  |  |
| 30 |  |  | 1990 | 1,727 | 200 | 1.527 |  |  |  |  |
| 31 |  |  | 1991 | 29,559 | 3,220 | 26.339 |  |  |  |  |
| 32 |  |  | 1992 | 44,047 | 4,494 | 39,553 |  |  |  |  |
| 33 |  |  | 1994 | 134,933 | 11,900 | 123,033 |  |  |  |  |
| 34 |  |  | 1995 | 4,931 | 401 | 4,530 |  |  |  |  |
| 35 |  |  | 1998 | 132,006 | 7.990 | 124,016 |  |  |  |  |
| 36 |  |  | 1999 | 253,156 | 13,571 | 239,585 |  |  |  |  |
| 37 |  |  | 2000 | 51,576 | 2,408 | 49.168 |  |  |  |  |
| 38 |  |  | 2001 | 70,482 | 2,803 | 67,679 |  |  |  |  |
| 39 |  |  | 2002 | 48,954 | 1,608 | 47,346 |  |  |  |  |
| 40 |  |  | 2003 | 33,161 | 860 | 32.301 |  |  |  |  |
| 41 |  |  | 2005 | 17.609 | 213 | 17,396 |  |  |  |  |
| 42 |  |  | 2006 | 60,849 | 316 | 60.533 |  |  |  |  |
| 43 |  | Total |  | 1,798,890 | 318,185 | 1.480.705 |  |  |  |  |


|  | COMPANY |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { NET } \\ \text { ORIGINAL } \\ \text { COST } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | TEST YEARREVENUE \& EXPENSES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ACCT. } \\ & \mathrm{NO} . \end{aligned}$ |  | EXCLUDED PROPERTY | $\begin{gathered} \text { IN-SERVICE } \\ \text { DATE } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ORIGINAL } \\ \text { COST } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ACCUM. DEPRE |  | AMOUNT | ACCT. No. | DESCRIP. | REASON FOR EXCLUSION |
| 1 | 1940 | Tools, Shop \& Garage |  | 1982 | 573 | 415 | 158 |  |  |  | Hartwell Recreation Facilifies |
| 2 |  | Equipment |  | 1983 | 584 | 406 | 178 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  | 1984 | 2,436 | 1.621 | 815 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  | 1988 | 1,276 | 700 | 576 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  | 1989 | 11,754 | 6,104 | 5.650 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  | 1990 | 4,808 | 2,356 | 2,452 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  | 1991 | 18,522 | 8.535 | 9.987 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  | 1993 | 16,549 | 6,657 | 9,892 |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  | Total |  |  | 56,502 | 26.794 | 29,708 |  |  |  |  |


AS OF MARCH 31. 2007
STAFF REPORT
SCHEDULE B-2.5
PAGE 4 OF 4

|  | COMPANY ACCT. NO. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DESCRIPTION OF } \\ & \text { EXCLUDED PROPERTY } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | NETORIGINAL COST | TEST YEAR REVENUE \& EXPENSES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NQ. } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { IN-SERVICE } \\ \text { DATE } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ORIGINAL } \\ \text { COST } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ACCUM. DEPRE |  | AMOUNT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ACCT. } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | DESCRIP. | REASON FOR EXCLUSION |
| 1 | 1980 | Miscellaneous Equipment | 1989 | 2,004 | 1.841 | 163 |  |  |  | Harlwell Recreation Facilities |
| 2 |  |  | 1990 | 8,902 | 7.717 | 1.185 |  |  |  | Harwell Recreaton Facilies |
| 3 |  |  | 1993 | 5,259 | 3.742 | 1.517 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  | Total |  | 16,165 | 13.300 | 2.865 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  | Grand Total - Hartwelf Recreation Facilities |  | $1.910,238$ | 377,426 | 1.532.812 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 408 | Prop Tax | Expenses related to Harwell |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 920 | O\&M | Recreation Facilites |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,579 | 921 | O\&M |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 926 | O\&M |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 935 | O\&M |  |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  | Tota! | 1.579 |  |  |  |

MANUFACTURED GAS PRODUCTION PLANT

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | F.E.R.C. ACCT. NO. | $\begin{gathered} \text { COMPANY } \\ \text { ACCT. } \\ \text { NO. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ACCOUNT TITLE | TOTAL COMPANY PLANT INVESTMENT | TOTAL COMPANY | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALLOCATION } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ALLOCATED } \\ & \text { TOTAL } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ADJUSTMENTS | ADJUSTED JURISDICTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | \$ |  | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| 1 | 304 | 2040 | Land and Land Rights | 427,814 | $(2,113)$ | 100.00 | $(2,113)$ |  | $(2,113)$ |
| 2 | 304 | 2041 | Rights of Way | 4,147 | 3,701 | 100.00 | 3.701 |  | 3,701 |
| 3 | 305 | 2050 | Structures a improvements | 3,705,658 | 3,219,859 | 100.00 | 3,219,859 |  | 3,219,859 |
| 4 | 319 | 2110 | Liquefied Petroleum Gas Equipment | 5,401,368 | 4,436,324 | 100.00 | 4,436,324 |  | 4,436,324 |
| 5 |  | 2200 | Other Equipment | 30,095 | 34,582 | 100.00 | 34,582 |  | 34,582 |
| 6 |  | 108 | Retirement Work in Progress |  | $(2,537)$ | 100.00 | $(2,537)$ |  | $(2,537)$ |
| 7 |  |  | Total Manufactured Gas Production Plant | 9,569,082 | 7,689,816 |  | 7,689,816 |  | 7,689,816 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { F.E.R.C. } \\ & \text { ACCT. } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | COMPANY АССт. NO. | ACCOUNT TITLE | TOTAL COMPANY PLANT investment | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \\ & \text { COMPANY } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALLOCATION } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ALLOCATED } \\ & \text { TOTAL } \end{aligned}$ | ADJUSTMENTS | ADJUSTED JURISDICTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | \$ |  | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| 1 | 374 | 2740 | Land and Land Rights | 133,008 | 3,536 | 100.00 | 3,536 |  | 3,536 |
| 2 | 374 | 2741 | Rights of Way | 6.817.467 | 462,664 | 100.00 | 462.664 |  | 462,664 |
| 3 | 374 | 2742 | City Gate Check Station | 3,663 | - | 100.00 | - |  | 0 |
| 4 | 375 | 2750 | Structures \& Improvements | 1,132.021 | 459.668 | 100.00 | 459,668 |  | 459,668 |
| 5 | 376 | 2761 | Mains - Cast Iron \& Copper | 12,417,594 | 13,408,256 | 100.00 | 13,408.156 |  | 13,408.156 |
| 6 | 376 | 2762,2767 | Mains - Steel | 256,465,460 | 98,672,591 | 100.00 | 98.672,591 |  | 98,672,591 |
| 7 | 376 | 2763.2768 | Mains - Plastic | 314,553,206 | 44.029,578 | 100.00 | 44.029,578 |  | 44,029,578 |
| 8 | 376 | 2765,2769 | Mains - Feeder | 75,595,527 | 29,963,663 | 100.00 | 29,963,663 |  | 29,963,663 |
| 9 | 378 | 2780 | System Meas. \& Reg, Station Equipment | 14.431.020 | 2,775,058 | 100.00 | 2,775,058 |  | 2,775,058 |
| 10 | 378 | 2781 | System Meas. \& Reg. Station Equipment-Elec | 2,839,554 | 1,953,264 | 100.00 | 1,953,264 |  | 1,953,264 |
| 11 | 378 | 2782 | District Reguating Equipment | 3,240,252 | 1.815.418 | 100.00 | 1.815,418 |  | 1.815.418 |
| 12 | 379 | 2790 | Meas. \& Reg. - City Gate Station | 263,232 | 249.149 | 100.00 | 249.149 |  | 249,149 |
| 13 | 380 | 2801 | Services- Cast Iron \& Copper | 9.935 .057 | 11,099,246 | 100.00 | 11,099,246 |  | 11,099,246 |
| 14 | 380 | 2802,2804 | Services-Steel | 18,686,179 | 7,884,426 | 100.00 | 7.884,426 |  | 7,884,426 |
| 15 | 380 | 2803,2805,2807 | Services-Plastic | 219,123,546 | 57,601,833 | 100.00 | 57,601,833 |  | 57,601,833 |
| 16 | 381 | 2810,2811 | Meters | 35,629,894 | 9,191,415 | 100.00 | 9,191.415 |  | 9,191,415 |
| 17 | 382 | 2820,2821 | Meter Installations | 24,898.583 | 8.128 .151 | 100.00 | 8,128,151 |  | 8,128,151 |
| 18 | 383 | 2830,2831 | House Regulators | 17,660,726 | 3,124,309 | 100.00 | 3,124,309 |  | 3,124.309 |
| 19 | 384 | 2840,2841 | House Regulator Installations | 12,496,754 | 2,101,903 | 100.00 | 2,101,903 |  | 2,101,903 |
| 20 | 385 | 2850 | Large Industriat Meas. \& Reg. Equipment | 2,749,950 | 1,048,946 | 100.00 | 1,048,946 |  | 1.048,946 |
| 21 | 385 | 2851 | Large Industrial Meas. \& Reg. Equipment - Comr | 726.303 | 305.119 | 100.00 | 305,119 |  | 305,719 |
| 22 | 387 | 2870 | Other Equipment - Other | 76,253 | 55,027 | 100.00 | 55,027 |  | 55.027 |
| 23 | 387 | 2871 | Street Lighting Equipment | 765,241 | 441.116 | 100.00 | 441.116 |  | 441,116 |
| 24 |  | 108 | Retirement Work in Progress |  | $(3,012,488)$ | 100.00 | (3,012,488) |  | (3,012.488) |
| 25 | 388 |  | Gas ARO | 6,305,213 | 2.620.401 | 100.00 | 2,620,401 |  | 2,620,401 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { F.E.R.C. } \\ \text { ACCT. } \\ \text { NO. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | COMPANY АССТ. NO. | ACCOUNT TITLE | TOTAL COMPANY PLANT INVESTMENT | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { COMPANY } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALLOCATION } \\ \hline \% \end{gathered}$ | Allocated TOTAL | ADJUSTMENTS | ADJUSTED JURISDICTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | \$ |  | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| 1 | 000 | 2030 | Miscellaneous intangible Plant | 4,848,935 | 3,483,408 | 100.00 | 3,483,408 |  | 3,483,408 |
| 2 | 389 | 2890 | Land | 0 | 0 | 100.00 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 3 | 390 | 2900 | Strucures \& Improvements | 1.823,807 | 333,504 | 100.00 | 333.504 |  | 333,504 |
| 4 | 391 | 2910 | Office Furniture \& Equipment | 679,592 | 202,658 | 100.00 | 202.658 |  | 202,658 |
| 5 | 391 | 2911 | Electronic Data Processing Equipment | 0 | (31,917) | 100.00 | $(31,917)$ |  | ( 31,977 ) |
| 6 | 392 | 2920 | Transportation Equipment | 76,251 | 92,666 | 100.00 | 92.665 |  | 92,666 |
| 7 | 392 | 2921 | Trallers | 512,305 | 310,919 | ${ }^{100.00}$ | 310,919 |  | 310,919 |
| 8 | 394 | 2940 | Tools, Shop \& Garage Equipment | 7,451,609 | 2,642,013 | 100.00 | 2,642,013 |  | 2.642.013 |
| 9 | 395 | 2950 | Laboratory Equipment | 234,056 | 87.071 | 100.00 | 87,071 |  | 87,071 |
| 10 | 396 | 2960 | Power Operated Equipment | 118,621 | 56.101 | 100.00 | 56.101 |  | 56,101 |
| 11 | 397 | 2970 | Communication Equipment | 118.431 | 56,686 | 100.00 | 56,686 |  | 56,686 |
| 12 |  | 108 | Retirement Work in Progress |  | 185,171 | 100.00 | 185.171 |  | 185.171 |
| 13 |  |  | Total General Plant | 15.863.607 | 7,418.280 |  | 7.418,280 |  | 7,418,280 |
| 14 |  |  | Total Gas Plant | 1,062,378,392 | 309,490,245 |  | 309,490,245 |  | 309,490,245 |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
ACCUMULATED DEPRECIATION AND AMORTIZATION
OF MARCH 31. 2007



| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { F.E.R.C. } \\ & \text { ACCT. } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | COMPANY ACCT. NO. | ACCOUNTTITLE | $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { COMPANY } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALLOCATION } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | allocated | ADJUSTMENTS | adjusted JURISDICTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | \$ |  | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| 1 |  | 1030 | Miscellaneous intangibe Plant | 97,231,124 | 61,176,513 | 100.00 | 61,176,513 |  | 61,176,513 |
| 2 |  | 1890 | Land and Land Rights | 2,121.648 | 106.907 | 100.00 | 106,907 |  | 106,907 |
| 3 |  | 1891 | Rights of Way | 37,969 | 0 | 100.00 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 4 |  | 1900 | Structures \& Improvements | 91,476.285 | 15,763,018 | 100.00 | 15,763,018 | $(318,185)$ | 15,444,833 |
| 5 |  | 1910 | Office Furniture \& Equipment | 15,135,378 | 7,626,533 | 100.00 | 7,626,533 | $(19,147)$ | 7,607,386 |
| 6 |  | 1911 | Electronic Data Processing Equipmert | 0 | - | 100.00 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 7 |  | 1920 | Transportation Equipment | 85,312 | 85,282 | 100.00 | 85.282 |  | 85,282 |
| 8 |  | 1921 | Trailers | 389,753 | 108,603 | 100.00 | 108,603 |  | 108,603 |
|  |  | 1930 | Stores Equipment | 663,997 | 304,138 | 100.00 | 304,138 |  | 304,138 |
| 10 |  | 1940 | Tools, Shop \& Garage Equipment | 1.209,959 | 390.340 | 100.00 | 390,340 | (26,794) | 363,546 |
| 11 |  | 1950 | Laboratory Equipment | 9,888 | 7.267 | 100.00 | 7,267 |  | 7,267 |
| 12 |  | 1960 | Power Operated Equipment | 42,047 | 42,046 | 100.00 | 42.046 |  | 42,046 |
| 13 |  | 1970 | Communication Equipment | 15,313,973 | 4,954,136 | 100.00 | 4,954,136 |  | 4,954,136 |
| 14 |  | 1980 | Miscellaneous Equipment | 317.530 | 87,350 | 100.00 | 87,350 | (13,300) | 74,050 |
| 15 |  | 108 | Retirement Work in Progress |  | (334,471) | 100.00 | ( 334,471 ) |  | ( 334,471 ) |
| 16 |  |  | Total Common Plant | 224,034,863 | 90,317,662 |  | 90,317,662 | $(377,426)$ | 89,940,236 |
|  |  |  | Common Plant Allocated to Gas |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  | 13.50\% | Original Cost | 30,244,707 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  | 13.50\% | Reserve |  | 12,192,884 | 100.00 | 12,192,884 | (50,953) | 12,141,931 |
| 19 |  |  | Total Gas Plant Including Allocated Common | 1,092,623,099 | 321,683,129 |  | 321.683.129 | (50.953) | 321,632,176 |


ADJUSTMENTS TO ACCUMULATED DEPRECIATION AND AMORTIZATION
AS OF MARCH 31,2007


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | F.E.R.C. ACCT. NO. | COMPANY ACCT. NO. | ACCOUNT TITLE | TOTAL COMPANY ADJUSTMENT | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALLOCATION } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | JURISDICTIONAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Common Plant (b) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  | 1900 | Structures \& Improvements | 318,185 | 100.00 | 318,185 |
| 3 |  | 1910 | Office Furniture \& Equipment | 19,147 | 100.00 | 19,147 |
| 4 |  | 1940 | Tools, Shop \& Garage Equipment | 26,794 | 100.00 | 26,794 |
| 5 |  | 1980 | Miscellaneous Equipment | 13,300 | 100.00 | 13,300 |
| 6 |  |  | Total | 377,426 |  | 377,426 |
| 7 |  |  | Common Allocated to Gas | 50,953 |  | 50,953 |

Description and Purpose of Adjustments:
(a) To remove from rate base the effect of the Asset Retirement Obligation
(b) To eliminate from rate base the Hartwell Recreation Facilities not used by Company


DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
depreciation accrual rates, depreciation expense, and
JURISDICTIONAL. ACCUMULATED BALANCES BY ACCOUNTS, FUNCTIONAL CLASS OR MAJOR PROPERTY GROUP
AS OF MARCH 31, 2007
DISTRIBUTION PLANT

STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE B-3.2
PAGE 2 OF 4

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NO. } \\ & \text { (A) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { F.E.R.C. } \\ \text { ACCT. } \\ \text { NO. } \\ (B-1) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COMPANY } \\ & \text { ACCT. } \\ & \text { NO. } \\ & (B-2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ACCOUNT TITLE OR MAJOR PROPERTY GROUPING (C) | ADJUSTED JURISDICTION |  | CURRENT ACCRUAL RATE (F) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CALCULATED } \\ & \text { DEPR. } \\ & \text { EXPENSE } \\ & (\mathbf{G}=\mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{F}) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | PLANT INVESTMENT (D) | ACCUMULATED <br> BALANCE <br> (E) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | \$ | \% | \$ |
| 1 | 374 | 2740 | Land and Land Righls | 133,008 | 3,536 | 0.00 | 0 |
| 2 | 374 | 2741 | Rights of Way | 6,817,467 | 462,664 | 1.54 | 104,989 |
| 3 | 374 | 2742 | Cily Gate Check Station | 3,663 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| 4 | 375 | 2750 | Structures \& Improvements | 1,132,021 | 459,668 | 2.00 | 22,640 |
| 5 | 376 | 2761 | Mains - Cast Iron \& Copper | 12,417,594 | 13,408,156 | 2.17 | 269,462 |
| 6 | 376 | 2762 | Mains - Steel | 256,465,460 | 98,672,591 | 1.54 | 3,949,568 |
| 7 | 376 | 2763 | Mains - Plastic | 314,553,206 | 44,029,578 | 1.82 | 5,724,868 |
| 8 | 376 | 2765 | Mains - Feeder | 75,595,527 | 29,963,663 | 1.54 | 1,164,171 |
| 9 | 378 | 2780 | System Meas. \& Reg. Station Equipment | 14,431,020 | 2,775,058 | 2.22 | 320.369 |
| 10 | 378 | 2781 | System Meas. \& Reg. Station Equipment-Elec | 2,839,554 | 1,953,264 | 6.67 | 189,398 |
| 11 | 378 | 2782 | District Regulating Equipment | 3,240,252 | 1,815,418 | 2.00 | 64,805 |
| 12 | 379 | 2790 | Meas. \& Reg. - City Gate | 263,232 | 249,149 | 10.00 | 26,323 |
| 13 | 380 | 2801 | Services- Cast Iron \& Copper | 9,935,057 | 11,099,246 | 2.70 | 268.247 |
| 14 | 380 | 2802 | Services-Steal | 18,686,179 | 7,884,426 | 2.63 | 491,447 |
| 15 | 380 | 2803 | Services-Plastic | 219,123,546 | 57,601.833 | 3.13 | 6,858,567 |
| 16 | 381 | 2810,2811 | Meters | 35,629,894 | 9,191,415 | 2.22 | 790,984 |
| 17 | 382 | 2820,2821 | Meter Installations | 24,898,583 | 8,128,151 | 2.17 | 540,299 |
| 18 | 383 | 2830 | House Regulators | 17,660,726 | 3,124,309 | 2.00 | 353,215 |
| 19 | 384 | 2840 | House Regulator Instalations | 12,496,754 | 2,101,903 | 2.22 | 277.428 |
| 20 | 385 | 2850 | Large Industrial Meas, \& Reg. Equipment | 2,749,950 | 1,048,946 | 2.86 | 78,649 |
| 21 | 385 | 2851 | Large Industrial Meas. \& Reg. Equipment - Comm | 726.303 | 305.119 | 2.86 | 20,772 |
| 22 | 387 | 2870 | Other Equipment - Other | 76,253 | 55,027 | 7.69 | 5,864 |
| 23 | 387 | 2871 | Street Lighting Equlpment | 765,241 | 441.116 | 2.38 | 18,213 |
| 24 |  | 108 | Retirement Work In Progress |  | $(3,012,488)$ |  | 0 |
| 25 |  |  | Gas ARO | 6,305,213 | 2,620.401 |  |  |
| 26 |  |  | Total Distribution Plant | 1,036,945,703 | 294,382,149 |  | 21,540,278 |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RATES, DEPRECIATION EXPENSE, AND
JURISDICTIONAL ACCUMULATED BALANCES BY ACCOUNTS, FUNCTIONAL CLASS OR MAJOR PROPERTY GROUP AS OF MARCH 31, 2007

GENERAL PLANT

STAFF REPORT
SCHEDULE B-3.2
PAGE 3 OF 4

| LINE NO. <br> (A) | F.E.R.C. COMPANYACCT. ACCT. |  | ACCOUNT TITLE OR MAJOR PROPERTY GROUPING (C) | ADJUSTED JURISDICTION |  | CURRENT ACCRUAL RATE (F) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CALCULATED } \\ & \text { DEPR. } \\ & \text { EXPENSE } \\ & (\mathrm{G}=\mathrm{D} \times \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ACCT. NO. (B.1) | ACCT. NO. (B-2) |  | PLANT INVESTMENT (D) | ACCUMULATED balance (E) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | \$ | \% | \$ |
| 1 | 000 | 2030 | Miscellaneous Intangible Plant | 4.848,935 | 3,483,408 | Various | 410.976 |
| 2 | 389 | 2890 | Land | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 3 | 390 | 2900 | Structures \& Improvements | 1,823,807 | 333,504 | 3.33 | 60.733 |
| 4 | 391 | 2910 | Office Furniture \& Equipment | 679,592 | 202,658 | 5.00 | 33,980 |
| 5 | 391 | 2911 | Electronic Data Processing Equipment | 0 | $(31,917)$ |  | 0 |
| 6 | 392 | 2920 | Transportation Equipment | 76,251 | 92,666 | 10.00 | Charged to Transp. Exp. |
| 7 | 392 | 2921 | Trailers | 512,305 | 310.919 | 6.67 | Charged to Transp. Exp. |
| 8 | 394 | 2940 | Tools, Shop \& Garage Equipment | 7,451,609 | 2,642,013 | 4.00 | 298.064 |
| 9 | 395 | 2950 | Laboratory Equipment | 234,056 | 87,071 | 6.67 | 15,612 |
| 10 | 396 | 2980 | Power Operated Power Equipment | 118,621 | 56,101 | 9.09 | Charged to Transp. Exp. |
| 11 | 397 | 2970 | Communication Equipment | 118,431 | 56,686 | 6.67 | 7,899 |
| 12 |  | 108 | Relirement Work in Progress |  | 185,171 |  | 0 |
| 13 |  |  | Total General Plant | 15,863,607 | 7,418,280 |  | 827,264 |
| 14 |  |  | Total Gas Plant | 1,062,378,392 | 309,490,245 |  | 22,578,921 |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RATES, DEPRECIATION EXPENSE, AND
JURISDICTIONAL. ACCUMULATED BALANCES BY ACCOUNTS, FUNCTIONAL CLASS OR MAJOR PROPERTY GROUP AS OF MARCH 31, 2007

## COMMON PLANT

STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE B-3.2

PAGE 4 OF 4

| LINE NO. (A) | F.E.R.C. ACCT. NO. (B-1) | COMPANY ACCT. NO. (B-2) | ACCOUNT TITLE OR MAJOR PROPERTY GROUPING (C) | ADJUSTED JURISDICTION |  | CURRENT ACCRUAL RATE (F) | CALCULATED DEPR. EXPENSE ( $\mathrm{G}=\mathrm{DXF}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | PLANTT | ACCUMULATED |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | INVESTMENT <br> (D) | balance <br> (E) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | \$ | \% | \$ |
| 1 |  | 1030 | Miscellaneous Intangible Plant | 97,231,124 | 61,176,513 | Various | 9,566,576 |
| 2 |  | 1890 | Land and Land Rights | 2,121,648 | 106,907 |  | 0 |
| 3 |  | 1891 | Righls of Way | 37,969 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 4 |  | 1900 | Structures \& Improvements | 84,748,235 | 10,449,740 | 2.91 | 2,466,174 |
| 5 |  | 1900 | Structures \& Improvements - Alrium II | 257,952 | 157,107 | 25.37 | 65,442 |
| 6 |  | 1900 | Structures \& Improvements - Clopay 4th 5th 6th Floor | 754,773 | 754,773 | 0.00 (1) | 0 |
| 7 |  | 1900 | Structures \& Improvements - Clopay Bldg | 3,916,435 | 4,083,213 | 0.00 (1) | 0 |
| 8 |  | 1910 | Office Furniture \& Equipment | 15,096,697 | 7,607,386 | 5.00 | 754.835 |
| 9 |  | 1911 | Electronic Data Processing Equipment | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 10 |  | 1920 | Transportation Equipment | 85,312 | 85,282 | 10.00 | Charged to Transp. Exp. |
| 11 |  | 1921 | Trailers | 389,753 | 108,603 | 6.67 | Charged to Transp. Exp. |
| 12 |  | 1930 | Stores Equipment | 663,997 | 304,138 | 5.00 | 33,200 |
| 13 |  | 1940 | Tools, Shop \& Garage Equipment | 1,153,457 | 363,546 | 4.00 | 46,138 |
| 14 |  | 1950 | Laboratory Equlpment | 9,888 | 7,267 | 6.67 | 660 |
| 15 |  | 1960 | Power Operated Equipment | 42,047 | 42,046 | 9.09 | Charged to Transp, Exp. |
| 16 |  | 1970 | Communication Equipment | 15,313,973 | 4,954,136 | 6.67 | 1,021,442 |
| 17 |  | 1980 | Miscellaneous Equipment | 301,365 | 74,050 | 6.67 | 20,101 |
| 18 |  | 108 | Retirement Work ln Progress |  | ( 334,471 ) |  |  |
| 19 |  |  | Total Common Plant | 222,124,625 | 89,940,236 |  | 13,974,568 |
|  |  |  | Common Plant Allocated to Gas |  |  |  |  |
| 21 |  | 13.50\% | Original Cost | 29,986,825 | 12,141,931 |  |  |
| 22 |  | 13.50\% | Annual Provision |  |  |  | 1,886,567 |
| 23 |  |  | Total Gas Plant Including Allocated Common | 1,092,365,217 | 321,632,176 |  | 24,465,488 |

(1) Fully Depreciated

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RATES

## MANUFACTURED GAS PRODUCTION PLANT

STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE B-3.2a PAGE 1 OF 4

|  | F.E.R.C. | COMPANY | ACCOUNT TITLE | PROPOSED |  | AVERAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LINE | ACCT. | ACCT. | OR MAJOR | ACCRUAL | \% NET | SERVICE | CURVE |
| NO. | NO. | NO. | PROPERTY GROUPING | RATE | SALVAGE | LIFE | FORM |
| (A) | $(\mathrm{B}-1)$ | (B-2) | (C) | (F) | (H) | (I) |  |

(A) (B-1) (B-2)
(F).
$\%$

| 1 | 304 | 2040 | Land and Land Rights |  | Perpetual Life |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 304 | 2041 | Rights of Way | 2.00 | 0 | 50 | SQ |
| 3 | 305 | 2050 | Struclures \& Improvements | 2.00 | -5 | 50 | R2.5 |
| 4 | 311 | 2110 | Liquefied Pelroleum Gas Equipment | 2.50 | -5 | 40 | R1.5 |
| 5 | 320 | 2200 | Other Equipment | 7.14 | 0 | 14 | L0.5 |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RATES

DISTRIBUTION PLANT

STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE B-3.2a PAGE 2 OF 4

| LINE NO. $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { F.E.R.C. } \\ \text { ACCT. } \\ \text { NO. } \\ \text { (B-1) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | COMPANY <br> ACCT. <br> NO. <br> $(\mathrm{B}-2)$ | ACCOUNT TITLE OR MAJOR PROPERTY GROUPING (C) | $\qquad$ | \% NET SALVAGE (H) | AVERAGE SERVICE LIFE (I) | CURVE FORM (J) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | \% |  |  |  |
| 1 | 374 | 2740 | Land and Land Rights | 0.00 |  | Perpetual Life |  |
| 2 | 374 | 2741 | Rights of Way | 1.54 | 0 | 65 | R3 |
| 3 | 374 | 2742 | Cily Gate Check Station | 0.00 |  | Perpetual Life |  |
| 4 | 375 | 2750 | Structures \& Improvements | 2.00 | -15 | 50 | R1.5 |
| 5 | 376 | 2761 | Mains - Cast Iron \& Copper | 2.17 | -25 | 46 | R2.5 |
| 6 | 376 | 2762 | Mains - Steel | 1.54 | -25 | 65 | R2. |
| 7 | 376 | 2763 | Mains - Plastic | 1.82 | -25 | 55 | R3 |
| 8 | 376 | 2765 | Mains - Feeder | 1.54 | -25 | 65 | R2 |
| 9 | 378 | 2780 | System Meas. \& Reg. Station Equipment | 2.22 | -10 | 45 | R0.5 |
| 10 | 378 | 2781 | System Meas. \& Reg. Station Equipment-Elec | 6.67 | -5 | 15 | L2 |
| 11 | 378 | 2782 | District Regulating Equipment | 2.00 | -15 | 50 | R1.5 |
| 12 | 379 | 2790 | Meas. \& Reg. - City Gate | 10.00 | 0 | 10 | L0 |
| 13 | 380 | 2801 | Services- Cast Iron \& Capper | 2.70 | -20 | 37 | R1.5 |
| 14 | 380 | 2802 | Services-Steel | 2.63 | -20 | 38 | R1 |
| 15 | 380 | 2803 | Services-Plastic | 3.13 | -20 | 32 | R2 |
| 16 | 381 | 2810,2811 | Meters | 2.22 | 0 | 45 | R2 |
| 17 | 382 | 2820,2821 | Meter Installations | 2.17 | 0 | 46 | R2.5 |
| 18 | 383 | 2830 | House Regulators | 2.00 | 0 | 50 | R2.5 |
| 19 | 384 | 2840 | House Regulator Installations | 2.22 | 0 | 45 | R1 |
| 20 | 385 | 2850 | Large Indusirial Meas, \& Reg. Equipment | 2.86 | -10 | 35 | R1 |
| 21 | 385 | 2851 | Large Indusitial Meas. \& Reg. Equipment - Comm | 2.86 | -10 | 35 | R1 |
| 22 | 387 | 2870 | Other Equipment - Other | 7.69 | 0 | 13 | S1 |
| 23 | 387 | 2871 | Street Lighling Equipment | 2.38 | -20 | 42 | R2 |

STAFF REPORT SCHEDULEB-3.2a PAGE 3 OF 4

| LINE NO. (A) | $\begin{gathered} \text { F.E.R.C. } \\ \text { ACCI. } \\ \text { NO. } \\ (\mathrm{B}-1) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { COMPANY } \\ \text { ACCT. } \\ \text { NO. } \\ (B-2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ACCOUNT TITLE OR MAJOR PROPERTY GROUPING (C) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROPOSED } \\ & \text { ACCRUAL } \\ & \text { RATE } \\ & \text { (F) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \% NET SALVAGE $\qquad$ <br> (H) | AVERAGE SERVICE LIFE (I) | CURVE FORM (J) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | \% |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 389 | 2890 | Land |  |  | Perpetual Life |  |
| 3 | 390 | 2900 | Structures \& Improvements | 3.33 | 0 | 30 | S0. 5 |
| 4 | 391 | 2910 | Office Furniture \& Equipment | 5.00 | 0 | 20 | SQ |
| 6 | 392 | 2920 | Transportation Equipment | 10.00 | 10 | 10 | S2.0 |
| 7 | 392 | 2921 | Trailers | 6.67 | 15 | 15 | \$1.5 |
| 8 | 394 | 2940 | Tools, Shop \& Garage Equipment | 4.00 | 0 | 25 | SO |
| 9 | 395 | 2950 | Laboratory Equipment | 6.67 | 0 | 15 | SQ |
| 10 | 396 | 2960 | Power Operated Power Equipment | 9.09 | 30 | 11 | R2.5 |
| 11 | 397 | 2970 | Communication Equipment | 6.67 | 0 | 15 | SQ |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RATES
COMMON PLANT

STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE B-3.2a

PAGE 4 OF 4

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO OT-SB9-GA-AIR
DEPRECIATION RESERVE ACCOUNTS. RETIREMENTS AND TRANSFERS
MANUFACTURED GAS PRODUCTION PLANT
STAFF REPORT
SCHEDULE B-3.3
PAGE 1 OF 4

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { F.E.R.R.C. } \\ & \text { ACCT. } \end{aligned}$No. | $\begin{gathered} \text { COMPANY } \\ \text { ACGI. } \\ \text { NO. } \end{gathered}$ | ACCOUnt tite | BEGINNINGBALANCE | ACCRUAL | salvage |  | RETIREMENTS | COSTOFREMOVAL | RANS FERSRRECLASSIFILATIONS |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { ENDING } \\ \text { BALANCE } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LiNe } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | amount | EXPLANATION | OTHER ACCTS. INVOLVED |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | s | s |  | s | s | $s$ |  |  | s |
| 1 | 304 | 2040 | Land | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |  | 0 | 4,758 | 0 | 2,4 |  |  | (2,113) |
| 2 | 304 | 2041 | Rights of Way | 3.300 | 401 |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | 0 |  |  |  | 3.701 |
| 3 | 305 | 2050 | Structures \& 1 mproverents | 3,151,853 | 454,397 |  | 0 | 475,743 | (88,543) |  |  |  | 3,219,259 |
| 4 | ${ }^{311}$ | 2110 | Liquefied Petroleum Gas Equipment | 4.084,757 | 694.736 |  | 0 | 403,705 | (60,322) |  |  |  | 4.436,324 |
| 5 6 | 320 | 2200 108 | Oither Equipment Refirement Work in Progress | 30.095 (5,492) | 4,487 0 |  | $\bigcirc$ | (2,955) | (60 |  |  |  | 34.582 <br> $(2.537)$ |
| 6 |  | 108 | Retirement Work in Progress | (5,492) |  |  | 0 | (2,955) |  |  |  |  | (2,537) |
| 7 |  |  | Total Manutactures Gas Production Plant | 7,264,513 | 1,154,021 |  | 0 | 881,251 | (148,865) |  |  |  | 7,889,816 |

DEPRECIATION RESERVE ACCOUNTS. RETREMENTS AND TRANSFERS
general plant


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { F.E.R.C. } \\ & \text { ACCT. } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { COMPANY } \\ \text { ACCT. } \\ \text { NO. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ACCOUNT TITLE | BEGINNING balance | ACCRUAL | SALVAGE | RETIREMENTS | COST OFREMOVAL | TRANSFERS/RECLASSIFICATIONS |  |  | ENDINGBALANCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | AMOUNT | EXPLANATION OF TRANSFER | OTHER ACCTS. INVOLVED |  |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |
| 1 |  | 1030 | Miscellaneous Intangible Plant | 25,826.392 | 59,337.244 | 0 | 26.749.703 | 0 | 2,762,580 |  |  | 64,176,513 |
| 2 |  | 1890 | Land and Land Rights | 109.552 | 0 | 736.812 | 695.043 | 3.882 | (40,532) |  |  | 106.907 |
| 3 |  | 1891 | Rights of Way | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 4 |  | 1900 | Structures \& Improvements | 18,408,046 | 12,184,437 | 4,952,003 | 18,611,071 | 1,179,908 | 9,511 |  |  | 15,763,018 |
| 5 |  | 1910 | Office Fumiture \& Equipment | 6,407,232 | 3,799,554 | 42,595 | 2,589,824 | 889 | (32.135) |  |  | 7,626,593 |
| 6 |  | 1971 | Electronic Data Processing Equipment | 155,881 | 86,340 | 0 | 242.221 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| 7 |  | 1920 | Transportation Equipment | 918,838 | 0 | 117,716 | 833.526 | (14.510) | (132.356) |  |  | 85,282 |
| 8 |  | 1921 | Trailers | 58,055 | 94.222 | 675 | 50.864 | 0 | 6.515 |  |  | 108,603 |
| 9 |  | 1930 | Stores Equipment | 533.915 | 188.289 | 0 | 418,066 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 304,138 |
| 10 |  | 1940 | Tools, Shop \& Garage Equipment | 430,209 | 199,625 | 0 | 238,751 | 0 | (743) |  |  | 390.340 |
| 11 |  | 1950 | Laboratory Equipment | 9,880 | 3,050 | 0 | 5,663 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 7,267 |
| 12 |  | 1960 | Power Operated Equipment | 127,622 | 0 | 15,265 | 85,575 | $(31,437)$ | $(46,703)$ |  |  | 42,046 |
| 13 |  | 1970 | Communication Equipment | 2,401,301 | 2,580,281 | 0 | 7.350 | 0 | (20,096) |  |  | 4,954,136 |
| 14 |  | 1980 | Miscellaneous Equipment | 52,626 | 42,738 | 7,946 | 15,557 | 403 | 0 |  |  | 87,350 |
| 15 |  | 108 | Retirement Work in Progress | 208,035 | 0 | 0 | 542.506 | 0 | 0 |  |  | $(334,471)$ |
| 16 |  |  | Total Common Plant | 55,647.584 | 78,515,780 | 5,873,012 | 51,085,720 | 1,139,035 | 2,506,041 |  |  | 90,317,662 |





[^7]| Line <br> No. <br> (A) | Project No. (B) |  | Accumulated Costs |  |  | Allocation <br> \% <br> (G) | TotalJurisdictionalCost atDate Certain(H) | Estimated <br> Physical Percent Completion (I) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Description of Project (C) | Construction Dollars (D) | $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Cost } \\ (F=D+E) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| Pollution Control Projects: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 The Company has not included any Construction Work in Progress in this Rate Case. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Projects: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
ALLOWANCE FOR WORKING CAPITAL
AS OF MARCH 31,2007


| LINE <br> NO. | WORKING CAPITAL COMPONENT | DESCRIPTION Of METHODOLGY <br> USED to DETERMINE <br> JURISDICTIONALREQUIREMENT | WORKPAPER <br> REFERENCE <br> NUMBER | JURISDICTION |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
OTHER RATE BASE ITEMS SUMMARY
AS OF MARCH 31, 2007

(A) Total Company is $100 \%$ Jurisdictional.
(B) The company elected the immediate flow through option under Section $46(e)(3)$ in regards to the 1971 election and the rateable flow through option provided under Section $46(f)(2)$ in regards to the 1975 election.
(C) Corrected per Blue Ridge Report

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR

STAFF REPORT
SCHEDULE C-1
PAGE 1 OF 1

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | DESCRIPTION | ADJUSTED REVENUE \& EXPENSES | PROPOSED INCREASE |  | PROFORMA REVENUE \& EXPENSES |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (A) | (B) |  | (C) |  |
| 1 | Operating Revenues | \$ 597,573,805 | \$ | 34,142,702 | \$ | 631,716,507 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Operation \& Maintenance | 459,440,009 | 504,185 |  | 459,944,194 |  |
| 5 | Depreciation | 24,465,488 |  | 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 24,465,488 \\ 53,826,141 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| 6 | Taxes - Other | 53,826,141 |  | 0 |  |  |
| 7 | Operating Expenses before Income Taxes | 537,731,638 |  | 504,185 | 538,235,823 |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Federal Income Taxes | 15,869,764 |  | 11,773,481 | 27,643,245 |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Total Operating Expenses | 553,601,402 | 12,277,666 |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Net Operating Income | \$ 43,972,403 | \$ | 21,865,036 | \$ | 65,837,439 |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | Rate Base | \$ 649,287,448 |  |  | \$ 649,287,448 |  |
| 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | Rate of Return | 6.77\% |  |  |  | 10.14\% |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { (A) } & \text { Staff's Schedule C-2 } \\
\text { (B) } & \text { Staff's WPC-1a } \\
\text { (C) } & \text { Column (A) }+ \text { Column (B) }
\end{array}
$$

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
ADJUSTED TEST YEAR OPERATING INCOME
FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
OPERATING REVENUE AND EXPENSES BY ACCOUNTS - JURISDICTIONAL ALLOCATION FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

(A) Tolal Utility is $100 \%$ Jurisdictional.

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
OPERATING REVENUE AND EXPENSES BY ACCOUNTS - JURISDICTIONAL ALLOCATION
FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

(A) Total Ulility is $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ Jurisdictional.

OUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
OPERATING REVENUE AND EXPENSES BY ACCOUNTS - JURISDICTIONAL ALLOCATION FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

(A) Total Ulility is $100 \%$ Jurisdictional.

(A) Total Utility is $100 \%$ Jurisdictional.

(A) Total Utility is $100 \%$ Jurisdictional.

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
OPERATING REVENUE AND EXPENSES BY ACCOUNTS - JURISDICTIONAL ALLOCATION FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007


(A) Total Utility is $100 \%$ Jurisdiclional.


DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL. ADJUSTMENTS
TO OPERATING INCOME
FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | STAFF REPCRT SCHEDULE C-3 PAGE 2 OF 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LINE NO. | TITLE OF ACCOUNT | CUSTOMER SERVICE DEPOSITS | $\begin{gathered} \text { OHIO } \\ \text { EXCISE } \\ \text { TAX } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ANNÜLIZE } \\ \text { PROPERTY } \\ \text { TAX } \end{gathered}$ | SYNCHRONIZE <br> FIPP REVENUE <br> ANO EXPENSE | $\begin{gathered} \text { INTEREST } \\ \text { EXPENSE } \\ \text { DEDUCTIBLE } \end{gathered}$ | BUDGET ADJUSTMENT |
|  | ELEMENT Of OPERATING INCOME | C-3.6 | C-3.7 | C-3.8 | C-3.9 | C-3. 50 | C-3.11 |
| 1 | OPERATING REVENUE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Base |  | 5,712.444 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Gas Cosis |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Qther |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Tolal Revenue | 0 | 5,712,444 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | OPERATING EXPENSES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Operation and Maintenance Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Production Expanses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Liquilied Pelfoleum Gas |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Oiher |  |  |  |  |  | 502,152 |
| 12 | Tolal Production Expense | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 502,152 |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | Other Gas Supply Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | Purchased Gas |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | Tolal Olher Gas Supply Expense | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | Transmission Expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | Oistribution Expense |  |  |  |  |  | 34.176 |
| 21 | Cuslomer Accounts Expense | 282.710 |  |  | (384,108) |  |  |
| 22 | Cuslomer Serv \& Info Expense |  |  |  |  |  | (2.522,933) |
| 23 | Sales Expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | Adminislrative \& General Expense |  |  |  |  |  | 1.924.762 |
| 25 | Amortization of Deferred Expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 | Tolal Operation and Maintenance Expenses | 282,710 | 0 | 0 | (384,108) | 0 | (61,843) |
| 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 | Depreciation Expense | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | Texes Other Than Income Taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 31 | Other Federal Taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | Slate and Other Taxes |  | (3,962,446) | (791.780) |  |  |  |
| 33 | Tolal Taxes Other Than income Tax | 0 | $(3,962,446)$ | (791,780) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35 | Federal Income Taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36 | Normal and Surtax | (98,949) | 3,386,212 | 277,123 | 134.438 | $803.648$ | 21,645 |
| 37 | Prov Defarred Inc Tax (Deferrals) |  |  |  |  | $67.049$ |  |
| 38 | Prav Defarred Inc Tax (Wrilebacks) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39 | Tolal Federal Inc Tex Expense | (98,949) | 3,386,212 | 277,123 | 134.438 | 870,697 | 21.645 |
| 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 41 | Total Oper. Expenses and Tax | 183,761 | (576,234) | (514,657) | (249,670) | 870.697 | (40,198) |
| 42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43 | Not Operating Income | (183,761) | 6,288,678 | 514,657 | 249,670 | (870,697) | 40,198 |
|  |  | 35.00\% | 35.00\% | 35.00\% | 35.00\% | \#DIVIO1 | 35.00\% |




DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
ANNUALIZED REVENUE
FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007
STAFF REPORT
SCHEDULE C-3.1
PAGE 1 OF 2

| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION |  | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To reflect adjustments to operating revenues to reclassify and annualize base and gas cost recovery revenue, to eliminate unbilled revenues and to adjust other operating revenues. |  |  |
| Base Revenue | To Sch C-3 Summary <-- | \$3,871,039 |
| Gas Cost Revenue | To Sch C-3 Summary <-.- | $(105,608,114)$ |
| Other Revenue | To Sch C-3 Summary <--- | 1,092,114 |
| Total |  | \$ (100,644,961) |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  | 100\% |
| Jurisdictional amount |  | \$ $100,644,961)$ |


| DUKE ENERGY OHIO |
| ---: |
| CASE NO. O7-589-GA-AIR |
| ANNUALIZED GAS COST |

FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007 | STAFF REPORT |
| ---: |
| SCHEDULE C-3.1 |
| PAGE 2 OF 2 |

| DUKE ENERGY OHIO <br> CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR <br> CAPITALIZE CUSTOMER INSTALLATION EXPENSE <br> FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | STAFF REPORT SCHEDULEC-3.2 PAGE 1 OF 1 |  |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION |  |  | OUNT |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To reclassify certain customer installation expenses (curb to meter expenses) from operations to capital. |  |  |  |
| Reclassification of Curb-to-Meter Expense |  | \$ | $(8,548,123)$ |
| Amortization of Expense Over 5 Years |  |  | 1,709,625 |
| Total |  | \$ | (6,838,498) |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  |  | 100\% |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch C-3 Summary <--- | \$ | (6,838,498) |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
RATE CASE EXPENSE
FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

|  |  | STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C-3.3 <br> PAGE 1 OF 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION |  | AMOUNT |  |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To reflect the estimated cost of presenting this case |  |  |  |
| Total |  | \$ | 97,000 |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  |  | 100\% |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch C-3 Summary <--- | \$ | 97,000 |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
ANNUALIZED WAGE ADJUSTMENT
FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

|  |  | STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C.3.4 PAGE 1 OF 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION |  | AMOUNT |  |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To reflect base payroll costs for full-time, part-time and temporary employees as of April 23, 2007 using wage rates in effect at April 23, 2007. |  |  |  |
| Total |  | \$ | $(6,062,046)$ |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  |  | 100\% |
| Jurisdictional amaunt | To Sch C-3 Summary <-.. | \$ | (6,062,046) |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
ANNUALIZED DEPRECIATION EXPENSE FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

|  |  | STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C-3.5 PAGE 1 OF 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION |  | AMOUNT |  |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To reflect the adjustment to annualize depreciation expense as calculated on Schedule B-3.2 based on plant at March 31, 2007. |  |  |  |
| Total |  | \$ | $(6,930,838)$ |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  |  | 100\% |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch C-3 Summary <--- | \$ | (6,930,838) |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR ANNUALIZED DEPRECIATION EXPENSE FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

|  |  | STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C-3.5 PAGE 2 OF 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION |  | AMOUNT |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To reflect the adjustment to deferred income taxes as a result of the annualization of book depreciation based on plant at March 31, 2007. |  |  |
| Total | \$ | 2,425,793 |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  | 100\% |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch C-3 Summary <--- \$ | 2,425,793 |


| DUKE ENERGY OHIO CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR <br> INTEREST ON CUSTOMER SERVICE DEPOSITS <br> FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C-3.6 PAGE 1 OF 1 |  |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION |  |  | NT |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To reflect the interest on Customer Service Deposits as an operating expense as calculated on WPB-5.1e. |  |  |  |
| Total 282,710 |  |  |  |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage $\quad 100 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch C-3 Summary <--- | \$ | 282,710 |

## DUKE ENERGY OHIO

CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR OHIO EXCISE TAX
FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

|  |  | STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C-3.7 <br> PAGE 1 OF 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION |  | AMOUNT |  |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To synchronize Ohio Excise Tax revenue and expense. |  |  |  |
| Ohio Excise Tax Revenue |  | \$ | 5,712,444 |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  |  | 100\% |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch C-3 Summary <--- | \$ | 5,712,444 |
| Ohio Excise Tax Expense |  | \$ | $(3,962,446)$ |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  |  | 100\% |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch C-3 Summary <-- | \$ | (3,962,446) |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
PROPERTY TAX ADJUSTMENT
FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

|  |  | STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C-3.8 PAGE 1 OF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION |  | AMOUNT |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To reflect the change in expense if property taxes were calculated in accordance with S.B. 287 and based on plant in service as of March 31, 2007 |  |  |
| Total |  | \$ (791,780) |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  | 100\% |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch C-3 Summary <-... | \$ (791, 780 ) |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
SYNCHRONIZE PIPP REVENUE AND EXPENSE
FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

|  |  | STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C-3.9 PAGE 1 OF 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION |  | AMOUNT |  |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To adjust the level of PIPP uncollectible expense to match the normalized PIPP revenue to be collected by Rider PIPP. |  |  |  |
| Total |  | \$ | $(384,108)$ |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  |  | 100\% |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch C-3 Summary <-.- | \$ | $(384,108)$ |


| DUKE ENERGY OHIO <br> CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR <br> INTEREST EXPENSE DEDUCTIBLE |
| :--- |
| FOR THE TWEL.VE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007 |

> DUKE ENERGY OHIO
> CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR INTEREST EXPENSE DEDUCTIBLE FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

|  | STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C-3.10 PAGE 2 OF 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION | TOTAL AMOUNT |  |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To reflect the elimination of federal deferred lax expenses related to Allowance for Funds Used During Construction and Capitalized Interest. |  |  |
| Deferrals: <br> Capitalized Interest <br> AFUDC - PUCO | \$ | $\begin{aligned} & 117,085 \\ & (50,036) \end{aligned}$ |
| Total Adjustment | \$ | 67,049 |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  | 100\% |
| Jurisdictional amount To Sch C-3 Summary <--- | \$ | 67,049 |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
BUDGET ADJUSTMENT
FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

|  |  | STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C-3.11 PAGE 1 OF 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION |  | AMOUNT |  |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To adjust the corporate budget for known changes to O\&M. |  |  |  |
| Other Production Expense |  | \$ | 502,152 |
| Distribution Expense |  |  | 34,176 |
| Customer Service \& Information Expense |  |  | 522,933) |
| Administrative \& General Expense |  |  | 924,762 |
| Total |  | \$ | $(61,843)$ |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentag: |  |  | 100\% |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch C-3 Summary <- | \$ | $(61,843)$ |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
STATE TAX RIDER
FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

|  |  | STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C-3. 12 PAGE 1 OF 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION |  |  | UNT |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To synchronize the State Tax Rider revenue and expense. |  |  |  |
| Revenue |  | \$ | (170,576) |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  |  | 100\% |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch C-3 Summary <--- | \$ | $(170,576)$ |
| Taxes Other Than Income Taxes |  | \$ | $(133,853)$ |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  |  | 100\% |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch C-3 Summary <-- | \$ | $(133,853)$ |

# DUKE ENERGY OHIO <br> CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR <br> ELIMINATION OF HARTWELL EXPENSES <br> FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007 

|  |  | STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C-3.13 PAGE 1 OF 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION |  | AMOUNT |  |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To reflect the elimination of non business expenses related to Hartwell. |  |  |  |
| Administrative \& General Expense |  | \$ | $(1,579)$ |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  |  | 100\% |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch C-3 Summary <--- | \$ | (1,579) |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
ELIMINATE NON-JURISDICTIONAL EXPENSE
FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C-3.14 PAGE 1 OF 1
PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION AMOUNT

PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To eliminate non-jurisdictional operating expenses.

| Transmission Expense |  | \$ | $(1,654)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Customer Accounts Expense |  |  | $(1,308)$ |
| Customer Service \& Information Expense |  |  | $(65,917)$ |
| Administrative \& General Expense |  |  | $(284,434)$ |
| Other Federal Taxes |  |  | $(5,600)$ |
| Total Adjustment |  | \$ | $(358,913)$ |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  |  | 100\% |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch C-3 Summary <--- | \$ | $(358,913)$ |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
ANNUALIZATION OF PUCO AND OCC ASSESSMENTS FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To annualize and reclassify the PUCO and OCC assessments to the latest known level.

| Administrative and General Expenses |  | \$ 8663,412 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  | 100.000\% |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch C-3 Summary <--- | \$ 863,412$)$ |
| State and Other Taxes |  | \$802,602 |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  | 100.000\% |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch C-3 Summary <--- | \$802,602 |


| DUKE ENERGY OHIO <br> CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR <br> ADJUST UNCOLLECTIBLE EXPENSE <br> FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C-3.16 PAGE 1 OF |  |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION |  |  | OUNT |
| PURPOSE AND DESCRIPTION: To annualize uncollectible expense. |  |  |  |
| Total |  | \$ | (1,821,733) |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  |  | 100\% |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch C-3 Summary <...- | \$ | $(1,821,733)$ |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. O7-589-GA-AIR
ANNUALIZE PENSION AND BENEFITS EXPENSE
FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

STAFF REPORT
SCHEDULE C-3.17
PAGE 1 OF 1

PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION AMOUNT

PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To annualize pension and benefits expense based on annualized wages as of April 23, 2007.

| Total | (489,776) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage | \$ |  |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch $\mathrm{C}-3$ Summary $<\cdots$ | $\$ 00 \%$ |

```
DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
ANNUALIZE FICA TAXES
FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007
```

STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C-3.18

PAGE 1 OF 1

PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION
AMOUNT

PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To annualize payroll taxes based on annualized wages as of April 23, 2007.

Total
$\$ \quad(677,345)$


To Sch C-3 Summary

## DUKE ENERGY OHIO

CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
ANNUALIZE UNEMPLOYMENT TAXES
FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C-3.19 PAGE 1 OF 1

## PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION

AMOUNT
PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To annualize unemployment taxes
based on annualized wages as of April 23, 2007.
$\$ \quad(63,300)$
$\downarrow$

To Sch C-3 Summary

## DUKE ENERGY OHIO

CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
ANNUALIZE AMORTIZATION OF PISCC
FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

| . |  | STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C-3.20 PAGE 1 OF 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION |  | AMOUNT |  |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To reflect the adjustment to annualize amortization of Post In Service Carrying Costs accrued as of March 31, 2007. |  |  |  |
| Tolal |  | \$ | 101,182 |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  |  | 100\% |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch C-3 Summary <... | \$ | 101,182 |

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO, 07-589-GA-AIR
ANNUALIZE AMORTIZATION OF PISCC
FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

|  |  | STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C-3.20 PAGE 2 OF 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION |  | AMOUNT |  |
| PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To reflect the adjusiment to current and deferred income taxes as a result of the annualization of amortization of PISCC accrued as of March 31, 2007. |  |  |  |
| Deferred Income Tax |  | \$ | $(35,414)$ |
| Jurisdictional allocation percentage |  |  | 100\% |
| Jurisdictional amount | To Sch C-3 Summary <-.. To Sch C-4, LIne 16 <-... | \$ | $(35,414)$ |

# DUKE ENERGY OHIO <br> CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR <br> GAS WEATHERIZATION PROGRAM <br> FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007 

STAFF REPORT
SCHEDULE C-3.21
PAGE 1 OF 1
PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION AMOUNT

PURPOSE and DESCRIPTION: To eliminate the the applicant's
proposed adjustment to the gas weatherization program per the merger agreement

Total

Jurisdictional allocation percentage
\$

Jurisdictional amount

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
ADJUSTED JURISDICTIONAL FEDERAL INCOME TAXES
FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C-4 PAGE 1 OF 1

(A) Calculation may be different due to rounding

DUKE ENERGY OHIO
CASE NO. 07-589-GA-AIR
DEVELOPMENT OF JURISDICTIONAL FEDERAL INCOME TAXES BEFORE ADJUSTMENTS
FOR THE TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2007

|  |  | STAFF REPORT SCHEDULE C-4.1 PAGE 1 OF 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LINE } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ | DESCRIPTION | UNADJUSTED JURISDICTION |


| Operating Income before Federal |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income Taxes |  |  |  |  | 34,551,580 |
| Reconciling Items: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Charges |  |  |  |  | (19,369,179) |
| Net Interest Charges |  |  |  |  | (19,369,179) |
| Tax Depreciation |  |  |  |  | (45,227,318) |
| Book Depreciation |  |  |  |  | 31,396,326 |
| Excess of Tax over Book Depreciation |  |  |  |  | (13,830,992) |
| Other Reconciling Items: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permanent Differences |  |  |  |  | 133,512 |
| Temporary Differences |  |  |  |  | $(1,520,239\rangle$ |
| Total Oiher Reconciling Items |  |  |  |  | $(1,386,727)$ |
| Total Reconciling items |  |  |  |  | ( $34,586,898$ ) |
| Federal Taxable Income |  |  |  |  | $(35,318)$ |
| Federal Income Taxes: |  |  |  |  |  |
| First \$50,000 | 50,000 | @ | 15\% | 7,500 |  |
| Next \$25,000 | 25,000 | @ | 25\% | 6,250 |  |
| Next \$25,000 | 25,000 | @ | 34\% | 8,500 |  |
| Next \$235,000 | 235,000 | @ | 39\% | 91,650 |  |
| Next \$9,665,000 | 9,665,000 | @ | 34\% | 3,286,100 |  |
| Next \$5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | @ | 35\% | 1,750,000 |  |
| Next \$3,333,333 | 3,333,333 | @ | 38\% | 1,266,667 |  |
| Over \$18,333,333 | (18,368,651) | @ | 35\% | $(6,429,028)(\mathrm{A})$ |  |
| Federal Income Taxes | $(35,318)$ |  |  | $(12,361)$ | $(12,361)$ |
| Deferred Income Taxes: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tax Depreciation |  |  |  | $(45,227,318)$ |  |
| Tax S/L Depreciation |  |  |  | 31,224,021 (B) |  |
| Excess of Tax over S $/$. |  |  |  | $(14,003,297)$ |  |
| Deferred Income Tax on Depreciation (Line 33*35\%) |  |  |  |  | 4,901,154 |
| Other Deferred Income Taxes - Net (Line 14*35\%) |  |  |  |  | 532,084 |
| Deferred income Tax Adjustment - ARAN |  |  |  |  | (57,254) |
| Deferred Income Tax Adjustment - Flow-Througt |  |  |  |  | 1,006,301 |
| Amortization of Investment Tax Credit |  |  |  |  | $(222,564)$ |
| Total Deferred income Taxes |  |  |  |  | 6,159,721 |
| Total Federal Income Tax Expense |  |  |  |  | 6,147,360 |

(A) Calculation may be different due to rounding
(B) Book Depreciation less Depreciation on AFUDC Equity

## Rate of Return Summary <br> Duke Energy Ohio <br> Capital Structure as of March 31,2007

|  | Amount <br> $\$$ |  | $\%$ of <br> Total | $\%$ <br> Cost |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long Term Debt | $\$ 1,752,639,770$ | $44.24 \%$ | $5.87 \%$ | Weighted <br> Cost $\%$ |
| Preferred Stock | $\$ 0$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $2.60 \%$ |
| Common Equity | $\$ 2,209,036,300$ | $55.76 \%$ | $10.00 \%-11.03 \%$ | $5.58 \%-6.15 \%$ |
| Total Capital $\$ 3,961,676,070$ $100.00 \%$ |  | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |

## Equity Issuance Cost Adjustment Duke Energy Ohio March 31, 2007

(1) Retained Earnings ${ }^{1}$ ..... $\$ 828,010,000$
(2) Total Common Equity ${ }^{2}$ ..... \$2,209,036,300
(3) Ratio of (1) to (2) ..... 0.68833
(4) Generic Issuance Cost, f ..... 3.50\%
(5) External Equity Ratio, w [1.0-(3)] ..... 0.62517
(6) Net Adjustment Factor, $(w /(1-f))+(1-w)$ ..... 1.02267
(7) Low End Equity Cost [10.21\% x (6)] ..... $10.00 \%$
(8) High End Equity Cost [11.21\% x (6)] ..... 11.03\%

Sources:
1 Pate Testimony, Attachment LGP-1
2 Applicant's Schedule D-1A

## CAPM Cost of Equity Estimate

Date: |  | Closing 10Yr Yld (\%) | Closing 30 Yr Yld (\%) |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 20-Nov-06 | 4.59 | 4.68 |
| 21-Nov-06 | 4.58 | 4.66 |
| 22-Nov-06 | 4.57 | 4.65 |
| 24-Nov-06 | 4.55 | 4.63 |
| 27-Nov-06 | 4.54 | 4.62 |
| 28-Nov-06 | 4.51 | 4.6 |
| 29-Nov-06 | 4.52 | 4.61 |
| 30-Nov-06 | 4.46 | 4.56 |
| 1-Dec-06 | 4.43 | 4.54 |
| 4-Dec-06 | 4.43 | 4.55 |
| 5-Dec-06 | 4.44 | 4.57 |
| 6-Dec-06 | 4.48 | 4.6 |
| 7-Dec-06 | 4.48 | 4.6 |
| 8-Dec-06 | 4.55 | 4.66 |
| 11-Dec-06 | 4.52 | 4.63 |
| 12-Dec-06 | 4.49 | 4.61 |
| 13-Dec-06 | 4.58 | 4.69 |
| 14-Dec-06 | 4.59 | 4.72 |
| 15-Dec-06 | 4.6 | 4.72 |
| 18-Dec-06 | 4.59 | 4.71 |
| 19-Dec-06 | 4.6 | 4.73 |
| 20-Dec-06 | 4.59 | 4.72 |
| 21-Dec-06 | 4.55 | 4.69 |
| 22-Dec-06 | 4.62 | 4.76 |
| 26-Dec-06 | 4.6 | 4.73 |
| 27-Dec-06 | 4.65 | 4.78 |
| 28-Dec-06 | 4.69 | 4.81 |
| 29-Dec-06 | 4.71 | 4.82 |
| 3-Jan-07 | 4.66 | 4.77 |
| 4-Jan-07 | 4.62 | 4.72 |
| 5-Jan-07 | 4.65 | 4.74 |
| 8-Jan-07 | 4.66 | 4.74 |
| 9-Jan-07 | 4.66 | 4.74 |
| 10-Jan-07 |  | 4.77 |

Date: |  | Closing 10Yr Yld (\%) | Closing 30 Yr Yld (\%) |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 11-Jan-07 | 4.74 | 4.82 |
| 12-Jan-07 | 4.77 | 4.86 |
| 16-Jan-07 | 4.75 | 4.84 |
| 17-Jan-07 | 4.79 | 4.88 |
| 18-Jan-07 | 4.75 | 4.85 |
| 19-Jan-07 | 4.77 | 4.86 |
| 22-Jan-07 | 4.76 | 4.85 |
| 23-Jan-07 | 4.8 | 4.9 |
| 24-Jan-07 | 4.81 | 4.91 |
| 25-Jan-07 | 4.87 | 4.96 |
| 26-Jan-07 | 4.88 | 4.98 |
| 29-Jan-07 | 4.89 | 4.98 |
| 30-Jan-07 | 4.88 | 4.98 |
| 31-Jan-07 | 4.83 | 4.93 |
| 1-Feb-07 | 4.84 | 4.93 |
| 2-Feb-07 | 4.83 | 4.93 |
| 5-Feb-07 | 4.81 | 4.91 |
| 6-Feb-07 | 4.76 | 4.87 |
| 7-Feb-07 | 4.74 | 4.85 |
| 8-Feb-07 | 4.73 | 4.84 |
| 9-Feb-07 | 4.78 | 4.86 |
| 12-Feb-07 | 4.8 | 4.89 |
| 13-Feb-07 | 4.81 | 4.9 |
| 14-Feb-07 | 4.73 | 4.83 |
| 15-Feb-07 | 4.71 | 4.8 |
| 16-Feb-07 | 4.69 | 4.79 |
| 20-Feb-07 | 4.68 | 4.78 |
| 21-Feb-07 | 4.69 | 4.79 |
| 22-Feb-07 | 4.73 | 4.83 |
| 23-Feb-07 | 4.68 | 4.78 |
| 26-Feb-07 | 4.63 | 4.73 |
| 27-Feb-07 | 4.51 | 4.63 |
| 28-Feb-07 | 4.55 | 4.67 |
| 1-Mar-07 | 4.56 | 4.68 |
| 2-Mar-07 | 4.51 | 4.65 |
| 5-Mar-07 | 4.52 | 4.65 |
| 6-Mar-07 | 4.53 | 4.66 |
| 7-Mar-07 | 4.5 | 4.64 |
|  |  |  |

## CAPM Cost of Equity Estimate

Date: |  | Closing 10Yr Yld (\%) | Closing 30Yr Yld (\%) |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 8-Mar-07 | 4.51 | 4.65 |
| 9-Mar-07 | 4.59 | 4.72 |
| 12-Mar-07 | 4.55 | 4.69 |
| 13-Mar-07 | 4.49 | 4.66 |
| 14-Mar-07 | 4.52 | 4.69 |
| 15-Mar-07 | 4.54 | 4.69 |
| 16-Mar-07 | 4.55 | 4.7 |
| 19-Mar-07 | 4.57 | 4.72 |
| 20-Mar-07 | 4.55 | 4.71 |
| 21-Mar-07 | 4.52 | 4.7 |
| 22-Mar-07 | 4.59 | 4.78 |
| 23-Mar-07 | 4.61 | 4.8 |
| 26-Mar-07 | 4.59 | 4.78 |
| 27-Mar-07 | 4.61 | 4.81 |
| 28-Mar-07 | 4.62 | 4.83 |
| 29-Mar-07 | 4.63 | 4.83 |
| 30-Mar-07 | 4.65 | 4.85 |
| 2-Apr-07 | 4.64 | 4.84 |
| 3-Apr-07 | 4.66 | 4.85 |
| 4-Apr-07 | 4.65 | 4.84 |
| 5-Apr-07 | 4.67 | 4.87 |
| 9-Apr-07 | 4.74 | 4.92 |
| 10-Apr-07 | 4.72 | 4.91 |
| 11-Apr-07 | 4.74 | 4.91 |
| 12-Apr-07 | 4.74 | 4.91 |
| 13-Apr-07 | 4.76 | 4.93 |
| 16-Apr-07 | 4.74 | 4.89 |
| 17-Apr-07 | 4.69 | 4.85 |
| 18-Apr-07 | 4.65 | 4.82 |
| 19-Apr-07 | 4.67 | 4.84 |
| 20-Apr-07 | 4.67 | 4.84 |
| 23-Apr-07 | 4.65 | 4.83 |
| 24-Apr-07 | 4.62 | 4.83 |
| 25-Apr-07 | 4.65 | 4.87 |
| 26-Apr-07 | 4.89 |  |
| 27-Apr-07 |  |  |

## CAPM Cost of Equity Estimate

| Date: | Closing 10Yr Yid (\%) | Closing 30Yr Yld (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30-Apr-07 | 4.63 | 4.82 |
| 1-May-07 | 4.64 | 4.82 |
| 2-May-07 | 4.65 | 4.82 |
| 3-May-07 | 4.67 | 4.84 |
| 4-May-07 | 4.64 | 4.8 |
| 7-May-07 | 4.64 | 4.79 |
| 8-May-07 | 4.63 | 4.8 |
| 9-May-07 | 4.67 | 4.84 |
| 10-May-07 | 4.65 | 4.83 |
| 11-May-07 | 4.67 | 4.85 |
| 14-May-07 | 4.69 | 4.86 |
| 15-May-07 | 4.71 | 4.88 |
| 16-May-07 | 4.71 | 4.87 |
| 17-May-07 | 4.76 | 4.91 |
| 18-May-07 | 4.8 | 4.96 |
| 21-May-07 | 4.79 | 4.94 |
| 22-May-07 | 4.83 | 4.98 |
| 23-May-07 | 4.86 | 5.01 |
| 24-May-07 | 4.86 | 5.01 |
| 25-May-07 | 4.86 | 5.01 |
| 29-May-07 | 4.88 | 5.01 |
| 30-May-07 | 4.88 | 5.01 |
| 31-May-07 | 4.89 | 5.01 |
| 1-Jun-07 | 4.96 | 5.06 |
| 4-Jun-07 | 4.93 | 5.02 |
| 5 -Jun-07 | 4.98 | 5.07 |
| 6 -Jun-07 | 4.97 | 5.08 |
| 7-Jun-07 | 5.1 | 5.2 |
| 8-Jun-07 | 5.12 | 5.22 |
| 11-Jun-07 | 5.14 | 5.24 |
| 12-Jun-07 | 5.25 | 5.36 |
| 13-Jun-07 | 5.2 | 5.28 |
| 14-Jun-07 | 5.22 | 5.29 |
| 15-Jun-07 | 5.17 | 5.26 |
| 18-Jun-07 | 5.14 | 5.25 |
| 19-Jun-07 | 5.09 | 5.2 |
| 20-Jun-07 | 5.12 | 5.23 |
| 21-Jun-07 | 5.16 | 5.28 |

## CAPM Cost of Equity Estimate

| Date: | Closing 10 Yr Yld (\%) | Closing 30Yr YId (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22-Jun-07 | 5.14 | 5.26 |
| 25-Jun-07 | 5.08 | 5.2 |
| 26-Jun-07 | 5.1 | 5.22 |
| 27-Jun-07 | 5.07 | 5.19 |
| 28-Jun-07 | 5.12 | 5.22 |
| 29-Jun-07 | 5.03 | 5.13 |
| 2-Jul-07 | 5 | 5.1 |
| 3-Jul-07 | 5.05 | 5.15 |
| 5-Jul-07 | 5.14 | 5.24 |
| 6-Jul-07 | 5.2 | 5.28 |
| 9-Jul-07 | 5.16 | 5.25 |
| 10-Jul-07 | 5.04 | 5.13 |
| 11-Jul-07 | 5.08 | 5.18 |
| 12-Jul-07 | 5.12 | 5.21 |
| 13-Jul-07 | 5.11 | 5.19 |
| 16-Jul-07 | 5.04 | 5.13 |
| 17-Jul-07 | 5.08 | 5.16 |
| 18-Jul-07 | 5.01 | 5.1 |
| 19-Jul-07 | 5.03 | 5.12 |
| 20-Jul-07 | 4.96 | 5.06 |
| 23-Jul-07 | 4.96 | 5.07 |
| 24-Jul-07 | 4.94 | 5.06 |
| 25-Jul-07 | 4.9 | 5.03 |
| 26-Jul-07 | 4.78 | 4.95 |
| 27-Jul-07 | 4.79 | 4.95 |
| 30-Jul-07 | 4.8 | 4.96 |
| 31-Jul-07 | 4.77 | 4.92 |
| 1-Aug-07 | 4.76 | 4.91 |
| 2-Aug-07 | 4.75 | 4.9 |
| 3-Aug-07 | 4.7 | 4.87 |
| 6-Aug-07 | 4.73 | 4.91 |
| 7-Aug-07 | 4.74 | 4.9 |
| 8-Aug-07 | 4.86 | 5.02 |
| 9-Aug-07 | 4.79 | 5.03 |
| 10-Aug-07 | 4.78 | 5.01 |
| 13-Aug-07 | 4.78 | 5.01 |
| 14-Aug-07 | 4.73 | 4.99 |
| 15-Aug-07 | 4.71 | 5.01 |

## CAPM Cost of Equity Estimate

Date: |  | Closing 10Yr Yld (\%) | Closing 30Yr Yld (\%) |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 16-Aug-07 | 4.6 | 4.93 |
| 17-Aug-07 | 4.67 | 5 |
| 20-Aug-07 | 4.63 | 4.97 |
| 21-Aug-07 | 4.59 | 4.94 |
| 22-Aug-07 | 4.62 | 4.95 |
| 23-Aug-07 | 4.62 | 4.92 |
| 24-Aug-07 | 4.63 | 4.9 |
| 27-Aug-07 | 4.6 | 4.86 |
| 28-Aug-07 | 4.53 | 4.86 |
| 29-Aug-07 | 4.55 | 4.88 |
| 30-Aug-07 | 4.5 | 4.82 |
| 31-Aug-07 | 4.54 | 4.83 |
| 4-Sep-07 | 4.56 | 4.84 |
| 5-Sep-07 | 4.47 | 4.78 |
| 6-Sep-07 | 4.5 | 4.79 |
| 7-Sep-07 | 4.37 | 4.69 |
| 10-Sep-07 | 4.32 | 4.64 |
| 11-Sep-07 | 4.36 | 4.65 |
| 12-Sep-07 | 4.41 | 4.69 |
| 13-Sep-07 | 4.48 | 4.74 |
| 14-Sep-07 | 4.46 | 4.72 |
| 17-Sep-07 | 4.47 | 4.71 |
| 18-Sep-07 | 4.48 | 4.76 |
| 19-Sep-07 | 4.52 | 4.82 |
| 20-Sep-07 | 4.67 | 4.94 |
| 21-Sep-07 | 4.63 | 4.89 |
| 24-Sep-07 | 4.62 | 4.88 |
| 25-Sep-07 | 4.61 | 4.89 |
| 26-Sep-07 | 4.62 | 4.89 |
| 27-Sep-07 | 4.57 | 4.84 |
| 28-Sep-07 | 4.58 | 4.83 |
| 1-Oct-07 | 4.56 | 4.8 |
| 2-Oct-07 | 4.53 | 4.78 |
| 3-Oct-07 | 4.54 | 4.79 |
| 4-Oct-07 | 4.52 | 4.77 |
| 5-Oct-07 | 4.64 | 4.87 |
| 8-Oct-07 | 4.64 | 4.86 |
| 9-Oct-07 | 4.65 |  |
|  |  |  |

CAPM Cost of Equity Estimate

Date: |  | Closing 10Yr Yld (\%) Closing 30Yr Yld (\%) |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 10-Oct-07 | 4.65 | 4.86 |
| 11-Oct-07 | 4.66 | 4.88 |
| 12-Oct-07 | 4.69 | 4.91 |
| 15-Oct-07 | 4.67 | 4.91 |
| 16-Oct-07 | 4.66 | 4.91 |
| 17-Oct-07 | 4.55 | 4.81 |
| 18-Oct-07 | 4.5 | 4.78 |
| 19-Oct-07 | 4.4 | 4.69 |
| 22-Oct-07 | 4.39 | 4.67 |
| 23-Oct-07 | 4.41 | 4.69 |
| 24-Oct-07 | 4.33 | 4.64 |
| 25-Oct-07 | 4.35 | 4.66 |
| 26-Oct-07 | 4.39 | 4.68 |
| 29-Oct-07 | 4.38 | 4.66 |
| 30-Oct-07 | 4.38 | 4.67 |
| 31-Oct-07 | 4.47 | 4.75 |
| 1-Nov-07 | 4.36 | 4.65 |
| 2-Nov-07 | 4.29 | 4.59 |
| 5-Nov-07 | 4.32 | 4.62 |
| 6-Nov-07 | 4.36 | 4.65 |
| 7-Nov-07 | 4.33 | 4.67 |
| 8-Nov-07 | 4.27 | 4.66 |
| 9-Nov-07 | 4.22 | 4.6 |
| 12-Nov-07 | 4.21 | 4.59 |
| 13-Nov-07 | 4.26 | 4.61 |
| 14-Nov-07 | 4.27 | 4.6 |
| 15-Nov-07 | 4.16 | 4.53 |
| 16-Nov-07 | 4.15 | 4.52 |
| 19-Nov-07 | 4.08 | 4.48 |
| Averages: |  |  |
| Last 63days | 4.4687 | 4.7568 |
| Last 126 days | 4.6869 | 4.9257 |
| Last 188 days | 4.6820 | 4.8851 |
| Last 251 days |  | 4.8563 |
| Average |  | 4.8560 |
|  |  |  |

Average of 10 and
30 Year Yields
4.7466

CAPM Cost of
Equity Estimate
10.6372

Source: Yahoo.com
CAPM $=$ risk free return $+\beta$ ( large company total return - risk free return) $=4.7466 \%+.90625(6.5 \%)$

Value Line Betas:

| 0.7 ED |
| ---: |
| 0.8 DTE |
| 0.85 ETR |
| 0.9 EXC |
| 0.95 PEG |
| 0.95 PCG |
| 1.05 XEL |
| 1.05 EIX |
| 0.90625 |


|  | DTE | ED | EIX | ETR | EXC | PCG | PEG | XEL | DUK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11/20/06 | 46.8100 | 47.8600 | 46.3300 | 89.3700 | 57.9000 | 45.1700 | 65.1100 | 22.6300 | 17.9550 |
| 11/21/06 | 46.8500 | 47.8200 | 46.1300 | 89.0300 | 58.7200 | 45.2800 | 64.7100 | 22.6900 | 17.8070 |
| 11/22/06 | 47.0000 | 47.7900 | 46.0500 | 89.3500 | 59.2700 | 45.2600 | 65.2600 | 22.6600 | 17.8410 |
| 11/24/06 | 46.7400 | 47.8500 | 46:0500 | 89.3100 | 59.6500 | 45.4800 | 65.3900 | 22.6900 | 17.8300 |
| 11/27/06 | 46.5200 | 47.5200 | 45.2000 | 89.2900 | 59.3200 | 45.1000 | 65.1600 | 22.4800 | 17.5000 |
| 11/28/06 | 46.6000 | 47.8800 | 45.1800 | 89,9100 | 59.7700 | 45.4600 | 65.3400 | 22.6500 | 17.7670 |
| 11/29/06 | 46.9000 | 48.1800 | 45.7400 | 91.4700 | 60.5800 | 45.9000 | 67.1200 | 22.8500 | 17,9890 |
| 11/30/06 | 47.0900 | 48.2200 | 45.9800 | 91.3200 | 60.7300 | 45.9300 | 67.2200 | 22.9600 | 18.0520 |
| 12/01/06 | 47.3100 | 48.2200 | 46.2000 | 90.8300 | 61.3900 | 46.3800 | 67.2000 | 22.8500 | 18.0350 |
| 12/04/06 | 47.7700 | 48.4000 | 46.6800 | 92.0000 | 61.9000 | 46.7800 | 67.7200 | 23.0000 | 18.6210 |
| 12/05/06 | 47.7600 | 48.4000 | 46.8100 | 91.9500 | 62.4300 | 46.6800 | 67.6500 | 23.0100 | 18.6040 |
| 12\%06/06 | 47.6000 | 48.2200 | 46.8500 | 92.1200 | 62.0500 | 46.4400 | 66.2600 | 22.9100 | 18.4900 |
| 12/07/06 | 47.2900 | 48.0400 | 46.6900 | 91.5300 | 61.8500 | 46.4500 | 66.2500 | 22.9200 | 18.4450 |
| 12/08/06 | 47.2200 | 47.8300 | 46.8700 | 91.2300 | 61.4500 | 45.8800 | 66.1200 | 22.8200 | 18.6100 |
| 12/11/06 | 47.8300 | 47.9900 | 46.9500 | 91.8800 | 61.7600 | 46.3000 | 66.3700 | 23.0000 | 18.8540 |
| 12/12/06 | 48.5900 | 48.6600 | 46.2800 | 92.2800 | 61.9400 | 46.9200 | 66.0500 | 23.1500 | 18.9170 |
| 12/13/06 | 48.7500 | 48.6100 | 46.2600 | 92.3400 | 62.1100 | 47.0100 | 66.2800 | 23.3000 | 19.2640 |
| 12/14/06 | 48.7800 | 49.1300 | 45.2500 | 92.4200 | 62.4200 | 47.2200 | 66.8800 | 23.4700 | 19.1450 |
| 12/15/06 | 48.7200 | 48.6700 | 44.9800 | 92.6000 | 62.6000 | 47.3000 | 67.3000 | 23.3200 | 19.0710 |
| 12/18/06 | 48.2300 | 48.2200 | 45.1000 | 92.3500 | 61.7500 | 47.3600 | 66.7700 | 23.1400 | 18.8770 |
| 12/19/06 | 48.5100 | 48.3800 | 45.7300 | 93.2300 | 61.8300 | 47.9800 | 67.4200 | 23.3100 | 18.9000 |
| 12/20/06 | 48.3700 | 47.9100 | 45.8000 | 93.2800 | 61.8400 | 47.6500 | 67.0500 | 23.3000 | 18.6950 |
| 12/21/06 | 48.3800 | 47.8000 | 45.8700 | 93.0000 | 61.7100 | 47.4700 | 66.6500 | 23.3600 | 18.8370 |
| 12/22/06 | 48.3000 | 47.7600 | 45.5400 | 92.8000 | 61.4300 | 47.2700 | 66.4200 | 23.2200 | 18.7920 |
| 12/26/06 | 48.7900 | 47.9200 | 46.1000 | 92.9900 | 61.8100 | 47.6700 | 66.8600 | 23.1000 | 18.8890 |
| 12/27/06 | 49.1900 | 48.1900 | 45.8100 | 93.0200 | 62.0300 | 47.7600 | 66,8800 | 23.2300 | 18.8770 |
| 12/28/06 | 48.6100 | 48.1400 | 45.8600 | 92.3400 | 61.7700 | 47.6200 | 66.6300 | 23.1500 | 18.7920 |
| 12/29/06 | 48.4100 | 48.0700 | 45.4800 | 92.3200 | 61.8900 | 47.3300 | 66.3800 | 23.0600 | 18.9000 |
| 01/03/07 | 49.2000 | 48.3900 | 45.4600 | 92.9800 | 62.4300 | 47.2700 | 66.6700 | 23.4300 | 19.1400 |
| 01/04/07 | 48.7700 | 48.3100 | 44.9200 | 94.0800 | 61.8800 | 46.6200 | 66.4600 | 23.4500 | 19.1800 |
| 01/05/07 | 47.6700 | 47.6300 | 43.9800 | 91.7600 | 60.3900 | 45.4900 | 64.9600 | 22.9800 | 18.7400 |
| 01/08/07 | 47.4700 | 47.5600 | 43.7400 | 91.0700 | 60.2400 | 45.9300 | 64.9900 | 22.9800 | 18.7700 |
| 01/09/07 | 47.2500 | 47.7000 | 43.6600 | 91.0100 | 60.2400 | 46.1500 | 66.3700 | 22.9700 | 18.6800 |
| 01/10/07 | 47.1700 | 47.8100 | 43.5800 | 91.9600 | 60.7700 | 46.7700 | 66.0000 | 23.0900 | 18.6000 |
| 01/11/07 | 46.7800 | 47.7500 | 43.1000 | 91.8800 | 60.5600 | 46.9000 | 65.6600 | 23.0600 | 18.6500 |
| 01/12/07 | 45.9500 | 47.3600 | 42.9500 | 90.4600 | 59.6500 | 46.1800 | 65.4600 | 22.8700 | 18.5600 |
| 01/16/07 | 46.2900 | 47.5300 | 42.9400 | 90.7100 | 59.6900 | 46.1700 | 65.8500 | 23.0100 | 18.6200 |
| 01/17/07 | 46.3700 | 47.6000 | 42.9500 | 90.7500 | 59.8500 | 46.2600 | 65.7100 | 23.0400 | 18.5900 |
| 01/18/07 | 46.0600 | 47.6300 | 43.2700 | 90.4500 | 59.9500 | 46.1700 | 65.9100 | 22.8700 | 18.6800 |
| 01/19/07 | 46.0500 | 47.7400 | 43.5500 | 91.0300 | 60.2600 | 46.0400 | 66.0000 | 22.9700 | 18.7400 |
| 01/22/07 | 45.9000 | 48.2500 | 43.6700 | 92.1200 | 59.9600 | 45.8000 | 66.0200 | 22.9900 | 18.6400 |
| 01/23/07 | 45.9000 | 48.3300 | 44.1700 | 92.0900 | 60.2300 | 46.1700 | 66.4500 | 22.9900 | 18.6700 |
| 01/24/07 | 46.5300 | 48.5300 | 44.2000 | 92.4500 | 60.0700 | 46.6800 | 67.2200 | 23.3200 | 18.7500 |
| 01/25/07 | 46.1000 | 48.0300 | 44.3100 | 91.8200 | 59.0500 | 45.8500 | 67.3100 | 23.2200 | 18.9200 |
| 01/26/07 | 46.0400 | 48.1000 | 44.5600 | 91.8800 | 59.1800 | 46.0300 | 67.4000 | 23.1700 | 19.0800 |
| 01/29/07 | 46.2000 | 47.9400 | 44.6600 | 92.1600 | 59.3800 | 46.2700 | 67.1300 | 23.2400 | 19.1900 |
| 01/30/07 | 46.3100 | 47.9300 | 45.3300 | 92.5900 | 59.3100 | 46.3100 | 67.6700 | 23.3100 | 19.4700 |
| 01/31/07 | 46.3700 | 48.2800 | 44.9800 | 92.8500 | 59.9900 | 46.6800 | 67.0300 | 23.3300 | 19.6900 |
| 02/01/07 | 46.7000 | 48.4000 | 45.3300 | 94.6200 | 61.0300 | 46.9800 | 67.2100 | 23.4600 | 19.8500 |
| 02/02107 | 46.9400 | 48.4600 | 45.4300 | 95.1300 | 60.7500 | 47.0400 | 68.1300 | 23.5500 | 19.9900 |
| 02/05/07 | 47.1000 | 48.6400 | 45.7900 | 97.7000 | 62.1100 | 47.6900 | 68.9100 | 23.7500 | 20.2900 |
| 02/06/07 | 47.2200 | 48.7400 | 46.0800 | 97.9200 | 63.3600 | 47.6200 | 69.5600 | 24.0300 | 20.0600 |
| 02/07/07 | 47.2400 | 48.9200 | 45.9800 | 97.9200 | 63.2500 | 47.6800 | 69.6900 | 24.0300 | 19.9900 |
| 02/08/07 | 47.4200 | 48.9300 | 45.9600 | 98.2400 | 63.5100 | 48.1700 | 70.4300 | 24.1800 | 20.1600 |
| 02/09/07 | 47.3200 | 49.0300 | 46.1600 | 98.1200 | 64.0600 | 47.7000 | 71.0900 | 24.0000 | 20.1600 |
| 02/12/07 | 46.7400 | 48.4200 | 46.2100 | 97.9200 | 63.7100 | 47.8400 | 71.5000 | 23.9900 | 20.2000 |
| 02/13/07 | 48.0000 | 48.7200 | 46.3600 | 99.5200 | 63.4200 | 48.4100 | 72.0200 | 24.2100 | 20.3900 |
| 02/14/07 | 48.3200 | 48.8100 | 46.7500 | 99.9500 | 63.7800 | 48.3000 | 73.5400 | 24.3000 | 20.0600 |
| 02/15/07 | 48.0800 | 48.5800 | 46.4500 | 99.2400 | 62.8200 | 48.4300 | 73.1000 | 24.2600 | 20.0000 |
| 02/16/07 | 47.9900 | 48.7200 | 46.4800 | 99.6600 | 63.1900 | 48.2300 | 73.6900 | 24.2600 | 19.9600 |
| 02/20/07 | 47.9900 | 49.0200 | 46.7000 | 99.8300 | 63.6400 | 48.0000 | 74.4600 | 24.3500 | 19.9500 |
| 02/21/07 | 47.7900 | 48.7500 | 46.2300 | 99.6200 | 63.5100 | 47.9100 | 74.6100 | 24.3000 | 19.9500 |
| 02/22/07 | 47.7600 | 49.5400 | 46.1500 | 99.9400 | 64.2300 | 47.8500 | 74.9400 | 24.2500 | 19.8200 |
| 02/23/07 | 47.7500 | 49.3300 | 46.9700 | 100.9500 | 66.9300 | 47.7700 | 75.1500 | 24.1800 | 19.9100 |
| 02/26/07 | 47.8900 | 49.7400 | 48.0600 | 102.8500 | 69.3800 | 47.9700 | 76.7000 | 24.4400 | 20.0100 |
| 02/27/07 | 46.6400 | 48.6200 | 46.8300 | 98.5700 | 65.9900 | 46.4200 | 74.0900 | 23.7100 | 19.6200 |
| 02/28/07 | 46.3000 | 48.5800 | 46.9200 | 98.7000 | 65.9300 | 46.4200 | 74.9000 | 23.6300 | 19.6900 |
| 03/01/07 | 46.7600 | 48.6800 | 47.5800 | 98.5600 | 66.0100 | 46.6500 | 74.9400 | 23.5400 | 19.8100 |
| 03/02/07 | 46.6400 | 48.0800 | 47.3100 | 96.2500 | 64.2200 | 45.6600 | 73.8700 | 23.2900 | 19.4900 |
| 03/05/07 | 45.8200 | 47.5600 | 47.4100 | 95.5800 | 63.7900 | 45.2500 | 73.2000 | 22.8100 | 19.1200 |
| 03/06/07 | 46.4200 | 48.1700 | 48.3700 | 96.4900 | 64.8100 | 45.7100 | 73.9400 | 23.0500 | 19.5500 |
| 03/07/07 | 46.3100 | 47.9900 | 48.3500 | 96.5600 | 64.4600 | 46.4800 | 73.3400 | 23.1100 | 19.5400 |
| 03/08/07 | 46.2300 | 48.4400 | 48.6200 | 97.8800 | 64.5000 | 46.3600 | 73.6200 | 23.4100 | 19.4400 |
| 03/09/07 | 46.4800 | 48.4000 | 48.9400 | 97.8300 | 64.4900 | 46.1500 | 75.0000 | 23.4300 | 19.2500 |
| 03/12/07 | 46.5000 | 48.4900 | 49.0100 | 99.1000 | 66.1200 | 46.3900 | 76.4500 | 23.5400 | 19.5900 |
| 03/13/07 | 46.1200 | 48.0400 | 47.7200 | 98.5500 | 64.9500 | 45.6900 | 76.0400 | 23.2200 | 19.3400 |
| 03/14/07 | 46.3200 | 48.4800 | 48.3600 | 98.9900 | 65.4600 | 45.7900 | 77.0100 | 23.3200 | 19.3900 |
| 03/15/07 | 46.4800 | 48.7900 | 48.7700 | 100.1300 | 66.3000 | 46.5000 | 78.2500 | 23.7100 | 19.6700 |
| 03/16/07 | 46.3100 | 48.6100 | 48.3800 | 99.7800 | 65.7800 | 46.0100 | 77.5600 | 23.5100 | 19.5600 |
| 03/19/07 | 46.8200 | 49.0500 | 48.9700 | 100.6500 | 66.7100 | 46.3000 | 77.9200 | 23.6900 | 19.6900 |
| 03/20/07 | 47.4 | 49. | 49 | 10 | 68 | 47 | 78.3300 | 24.1300 | 20.2100 |



Stock Prices1 (\$):

|  | DTE | ED | EIX | ETB | EXC | PCG | PEG | XEL | DUK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 107 | 50.0900 | 45.5700 | 57.4700 | 107.7700 | 77.6600 | 44.8300 | 88.9300 | 20.5700 | 17.9400 |
| 07/18/07 | 50.4300 | 45.7300 | 58.1300 | 109.4200 | 78.6200 | 45.3500 | 90.8000 | 20.7200 | 18.0400 |
| 07/19/07 | 51.3400 | 46.0100 | 59.1600 | 109.7200 | 82.0500 | 46.6600 | 92.5600 | 21.0800 | 18.0500 |
| 07/20/07 | 50.8900 | 45.3700 | 57.8700 | 106.7600 | 78.8900 | 45.8400 | 90.4100 | 20.8700 | 17.9600 |
| 04/30/04 | 51.2100 | 45.1500 | 59.2500 | 107.6000 | 80.3700 | 46.4500 | 91.1800 | 20.9700 | 18.0100 |
| 07/24/07 | 49.5000 | 44.4000 | 56.3000 | 102.8500 | 75.9400 | 44.6300 | 87.2000 | 20.2100 | 17.5900 |
| 07/25/07 | 49.7300 | 45.3000 | 56.6100 | 103.4900 | 74.4400 | 45.3500 | 86.9300 | 20.9700 | 17.6700 |
| 07/26/07 | 48.6200 | 44.7700 | 54.3200 | 99.5100 | 70.9000 | 45.1500 | 82.5200 | 20.8900 | 17.5600 |
| 07/27/07 | 46.3500 | 43.6500 | 52.7000 | 97.8400 | 69.6200 | 43.7700 | 81.4200 | 20.3100 | 17.2100 |
| 07/30/07 | 47.3300 | 44.0100 | 52.7000 | 98.4000 | 69.5200 | 43.4900 | 83.3300 | 20.4600 | 17.1900 |
| 07/31/07 | 46.3800 | 43.6800 | 52.8900 | 99.9600 | 70.1500 | 42.8100 | 86.1500 | 20.3000 | 17.0300 |
| 08/01/07 | 48.2200 | 44.9400 | 54.9500 | 101.1900 | 74.1000 | 44.3700 | 82.5000 | 20.7600 | 00 |
| 08/02/07 | 48.1200 | 45.4600 | 55.8600 | 102.6600 | 74.8700 | 44.2400 | 86.6000 | 20.8100 | 17.9800 |
| 08/03/07 | 46.2200 | 43.8700 | 53.4500 | 98.5600 | 71.0900 | 42.8300 | 82.3900 | 19.8000 | 00 |
| 08/06/07 | 48.4300 | 45.7300 | 56.0900 | 103.6100 | 74.2700 | 45.1600 | 86.4800 | 20.5700 | 17.9000 |
| 08/07/07 | 49.1500 | 47.1900 | 56.3000 | 104.4100 | 74.5600 | 46.3600 | 89.2700 | 20.9900 | 18.8600 |
| 08/08/07 | 49.8900 | 47.0000 | 56.3000 | 102.7000 | 76.4000 | 46.2400 | 88.8000 | 21.1400 | 19.5400 |
| 08/09/07 | 48.2600 | 46.9400 | 52.7600 | 98.5900 | 75.2500 | 43.7700 | 85.1100 | 20.0900 | 19.4000 |
| 08/10/07 | 48.0400 | 47.4300 | 53.1400 | 97.9900 | 72.8500 | 45.4500 | 82.5900 | 20.9100 | 19.5100 |
| 08/13/07 | 49.1900 | 46.0200 | 54.8800 | 100.0000 | 72.8000 | 45.1400 | 85.9000 | 20.9500 | 19.0000 |
| 08/14/07 | 47.5200 | 45.6800 | 52.9100 | 98.5300 | 70.7900 | 44.1400 | 82.5300 | 20.8700 | 18.5500 |
| 08/15/07 | 46.5500 | 45.0300 | 52.7200 | 95.9800 | 69.1200 | 44.1200 | 81.0700 | 20.1800 | 18.0400 |
| 08/16/07 | 46.7800 | 45.6200 | 52.1900 | 96.5100 | 67.3700 | 44.5400 | 80.5000 | 20.3400 | 18.2300 |
| 08/17/07 | 47.6900 | 45.9600 | 53.3300 | 99.8400 | 71.3200 | 45.3000 | 84.0000 | 20.7000 | 18.3600 |
| 08/20/07 | 47.4700 | 46.1100 | 52.9800 | 99.6900 | 71.3900 | 44.9700 | 85.3300 | 20.7500 | 18.3000 |
| 08/21/07 | 48.0600 | 46.7800 | 53.6000 | 100.0000 | 71.4200 | 44.5300 | 86.9700 | 20.6600 | 18.3800 |
| 08/22/07 | 48.2700 | 47.0000 | 54.3700 | 102.3400 | 72.6800 | 45.0000 | 86.4200 | 20.7600 | 18.4900 |
| 08/23/07 | 48.2200 | 46.6600 | 54.3600 | 103.0300 | 72.4300 | 44.9800 | 87.1000 | 20.8300 | 18.4800 |
| 08/24/07 | 49.0600 | 46.8000 | 54.8000 | 105.1100 | 73.1400 | 45.0500 | 87.6500 | 20.9800 | 18.5400 |
| 08/27/07 | 47.5500 | 45.6700 | 52.6200 | 101.5200 | 70.1400 | 43.8500 | 83.5200 | 20.2700 | 17.8200 |
| 08/28/07 | 46.6000 | 45.0800 | 52.1200 | 99.2400 | 69.1700 | 43.4000 | 81.7500 | 20.0700 | 17.7100 |
| 08/29107 | 48.1200 | 46.0600 | 53.9800 | 102.9200 | 71.1900 | 44.5800 | 85.8700 | 20.7600 | 18.3400 |
| 08/30/07 | 47.6200 | 45.9300 | 52.7200 | 102.3900 | 70.1100 | 44.3700 | 84.6500 | 20.4900 | 18.0700 |
| 08/31/07 | 47.8100 | 45.9400 | 52.7100 | 103.6200 | 70.6700 | 44.5000 | 84.9900 | 20.6100 | 18.3400 |
| 09/04/07 | 48.5400 | 46.4200 | 54.6300 | 105.2600 | 73.5100 | 45.0800 | 87.1000 | 20.7800 | 18.7100 |
| 09/05/07 | 48.3700 | 46.2200 | 53.3600 | 103.8300 | 73.0400 | 44.5600 | 85.1300 | 20.5300 | 18.3900 |
| 09/06/07 | 48.4800 | 46.2000 | 54.1300 | 106.2900 | 74.6400 | 44.5000 | 86.4900 | 20.8300 | 18.7500 |
| 09/07/07 | 47.7300 | 45.5400 | 52.9100 | 104.4400 | 73.2600 | 43.9700 | 83.3100 | 20.7700 | 18.7800 |
| 09/10/07 | 47.7200 | 45.5300 | 53.2100 | 104.2400 | 73.3900 | 44.2100 | 83.8700 | 20.9900 | 18.7100 |
| 09/11/07 | 48.0800 | 45.8700 | 54.1600 | 104.9000 | 74.9400 | 44.3800 | 85.6400 | 21.0600 | 18.6000 |
| 09/12/07 | 48.2800 | 46.0300 | 54.1700 | 105.1200 | 74.7500 | 45.2300 | 85.1000 | 21.0800 | 18.6600 |
| 09/13/07 | 48.3800 | 45.9200 | 54.8400 | 105.4600 | 76.0100 | 45.5400 | 85.7900 | 21.0000 | 18.6800 |
| 09/14/07 | 48.7600 | 46.2600 | 55.3300 | 105.7000 | 76.4700 | 46.9000 | 85.9300 | 21.0600 | 18.6600 |
| 09/17/07 | 48.2100 | 46.0700 | 55.1100 | 105.1100 | 74.7700 | 46.0200 | 86.4600 | 21.0300 | 18.5500 |
| 09/18/07 | 49.0100 | 46.9000 | 56.5000 | 106.9800 | 76.7100 | 46.9600 | 89.5300 | 21.9200 | 18.9200 |
| 09/19/07 | 49.5400 | 47.3000 | 57.8300 | 109.1900 | 78.3600 | 47.9600 | 89.7600 | 22.0000 | 19.0900 |
| 09/20/07 | 48.9100 | 47.0200 | 56.7500 | 108.8000 | 77.2800 | 47.4300 | 87.9700 | 21.9500 | 18.6900 |
| 09/21/07 | 49.2200 | 46.9800 | 57.2400 | 109.5900 | 77.7500 | 48.2000 | 89.0300 | 22.0200 | 18.7600 |
| 09/24/07 | 49.2000 | 47.0400 | 57.3600 | 109.6000 | 78.1700 | 47.7500 | 89.9600 | 21.8500 | 18.6900 |
| 09/25/07 | 49.1800 | 46.8200 | 56.9900 | 109.7700 | 77.8900 | 48.0700 | 88.8300 | 21.7700 | 18.8500 |
| 09/26/07 | 49.6100 | 47.1200 | 57.3100 | 110.9600 | 78.2700 | 48.5000 | 89.5500 | 21.9800 | 19.0000 |
| 09/27107 | 49.5800 | 46.8200 | 56.6700 | 110.5500 | 76.9600 | 48.2700 | 88.7600 | 21.8600 | 18.9200 |
| 09/28/07 | 48.4400 | 46.3000 | 55.4500 | 108.2900 | 75.3600 | 47.8000 | 87.9800 | 21.5400 | 18.6900 |
| 10/01/07 | 49.0800 | 46.9800 | 56.2900 | 110.3400 | 75.7900 | 48.2100 | 89.5800 | 22.0500 | 19.0300 |
| 10/02/07 | 48.8800 | 46.9700 | 56.0700 | 109.7600 | 76.1300 | 48.1000 | 89.0000 | 22.0000 | 19.1000 |
| 10/03/07 | 48.4400 | 47.1000 | 55.8900 | 110.5900 | 75.3900 | 48.3700 | 88.2800 | 21.9500 | 19.2100 |
| 10/04!07 | 48.9800 | 47.2400 | 56.5500 | 112.7000 | 76.0600 | 48.9000 | 89.2500 | 21.9200 | 19.3000 |
| 10/05/07 | 48.9400 | 47.2700 | 56.6300 | 114.5900 | 76.6000 | 48.9600 | 89.6900 | 22.0800 | 19.4300 |
| 10/08/07 | 48.9800 | 47.2000 | 56.0500 | 113.7500 | 76.8600 | 48.5600 | 89.4900 | 21.9100 | 19.2400 |
| 10/09/07 | 50.0400 | 47.7600 | 57.2100 | 115.9900 | 78.1900 | 48.8900 | 91.2600 | 22.1200 | 19.3200 |
| 10/10/07 | 49.9700 | 47.1700 | 56.7600 | 115.0100 | 77.3200 | 48.2000 | 90.7100 | 21.9700 | 19.1600 |
| 10/11/07 | 50.3900 | 46.8600 | 56.9500 | 114.8500 | 78.7500 | 48.2200 | 90.6900 | 21,7500 | 18.9000 |
| 10/12/07 | 50.5300 | 46.7700 | 56.5200 | 115.4200 | 79.1800 | 48.5500 | 91.0300 | 21,7300 | 19.0800 |
| 10/15/07 | 49.6800 | 46.4200 | 55.8200 | 114.1200 | 78.3100 | 47.9500 | 90.1600 | 21.4100 | 18.8900 |
| 10/16/07 | 49.2700 | 46.3500 | 55.8900 | 113.8300 | 78.0000 | 47.6500 | 89.5000 | 21.4400 | 18.9600 |
| 10/17/07 | 48.7600 | 46.4900 | 56.2500 | 113.6600 | 77.2500 | 47.3600 | 90.1700 | 21.5100 | 18.7700 |
| 10/18/07 | 48.7700 | 46.1400 | 55.9500 | 114.7400 | 77.0000 | 46.8300 | 90.0900 | 21.3500 | 18.8100 |
| 10/19/07 | 47.5300 | 45.1200 | 54.1600 | 112.1900 | 75.1400 | 45.7000 | 88.3800 | 21.0200 | 18.4100 |
| 10/22/07 | 48.0800 | 45.2400 | 55.0400 | 113.5400 | 75.7800 | 46.3700 | 88.3700 | 21.1900 | 18.5600 |
| 10/23/07 | 47.5400 | 45.4200 | 54.9600 | 113.4600 | 76.2000 | 46.3100 | 88.3500 | 21.1000 | 18.5400 |
| 10/24/07 | 47.9600 | 45.8200 | 54.5200 | 114.8500 | 76.4400 | 46.4000 | 89.3000 | 21.0400 | 18.6500 |
| 10/25/07 | 48.5500 | 46.3900 | 55.1600 | 117.7800 | 78.2300 | 46.9900 | 90.6800 | 21.8600 | 18.7100 |
| 10/26/07 | 48.9700 | 46.6700 | 56.6400 | 119.4900 | 80.2200 | 47.5800 | 92.8000 | 22.1000 | 18.8000 |
| 10/29/07 | 49.1100 | 46.5100 | 56.6100 | 119.7000 | 80.8700 | 47.9300 | 93.4200 | 22.1200 | 19.0400 |
| 10/30/07 | 49.1400 | 46.5500 | 57.3000 | 119.5900 | 80.9600 | 48.2500 | 93.2800 | 22.1700 | 18.9700 |
| 10/31/07 | 49.6000 | 47.0900 | 58.1500 | 119.8700 | 82.7800 | 48.9300 | 95.6000 | 22.5500 | 19.1700 |
| 11/01/07 | 48.7200 | 46.2700 | 56.4300 | 117.9600 | 81.1800 | 46.2500 | 94.0700 | 21.7600 | 18.8200 |
| 11/02/07 | 48.9900 | 46.9000 | 57.4200 | 118.6900 | 81.7700 | 45.6600 | 94.4000 | 21.6300 | 19.0300 |
| 11/05/07 | 48.9700 | 47.2800 | 58.0500 | 124.1500 | 83.9200 | 45.0400 | 94.1200 | 21.6500 | 19.3600 |
| 11/06/07 | 48.7000 | 47.0800 | 58.0800 | 123.5400 | 83,8800 | 44.4800 | 93.3500 | 22.0000 | 19.4300 |
| 11/07/07 | 47.1200 | 46.1500 | 56.4800 | 120.3800 | 81.6600 | 43.7100 | 90.1200 | 21.6600 | 19.0300 |
| 11/08/07 | 48.5600 | 47.1400 | 57.7800 | 122.2100 | 83.3600 | 45.4500 | 92.1400 | 22.2000 | 19.5000 |



[^8]| $g=$ | 5.82\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { non const } \\ & \text { dcf= } \end{aligned}$ | 10.99\% | const <br> dcf= | 10.43\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $D=$ | \$2.12 |  |  | $\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{e})=$ | 6.77\% |
|  |  | $P=$ | \$48.69 |  |  |
|  | GROWTH |  |  |  |  |
| YEAR | RATE |  | DIVIDEND |  |  |
| 1 | 5.82\% |  | \$2.24 |  |  |
| 2 | 5.82\% |  | \$2.37 |  |  |
| 3 | 5.82\% |  | \$2.51 |  |  |
| 4 | 5.82\% |  | \$2.66 |  |  |
| 5 | 5.82\% |  | \$2.81 |  |  |
| 6 | 5.87\% |  | \$2.98 |  |  |
| 7 | 5.92\% |  | \$3.15 |  |  |
| 8 | 5.96\% |  | \$3.34 |  |  |
| 9 | 6.01\% |  | \$3.54 |  |  |
| 10 | 6.06\% |  | \$3.76 |  |  |
| 11 | 6.11\% |  | \$3.99 |  |  |
| 12 | 6.15\% |  | \$4.23 |  |  |
| 13 | 6.20\% |  | \$4.50 |  |  |
| 14 | 6.25\% |  | \$4.78 |  |  |
| 15 | 6.30\% |  | \$5.08 |  |  |
| 16 | 6.34\% |  | \$5.40 |  |  |
| 17 | 6.39\% |  | \$5.74 |  |  |
| 18 | 6.44\% |  | \$6.11 |  |  |
| 19 | 6.48\% |  | \$6.51 |  |  |
| 20 | 6.53\% |  | \$6.94 |  |  |
| 21 | 6.58\% |  | \$7.39 |  |  |
| 22 | 6.63\% |  | \$7.88 |  |  |
| 23 | 6.67\% |  | \$8.41 |  |  |
| 24 | 6.72\% |  | \$8.97 |  |  |
| 25 | 6.77\% |  | \$9.58 |  |  |
| 26 | 6.77\% |  | \$10.23 |  |  |
| 27 | 6.77\% |  | \$10.92 |  |  |
| 28 | 6.77\% |  | \$11.66 |  |  |
| 29 | 6.77\% |  | \$12.45 |  |  |
| 30 | 6.77\% |  | \$13.29 |  |  |

This schedule is truncated; the calculation extends to 400 years to ensure the stability of the calculation.
g, D, P are from Schedule D-1.3 $\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{e})$ is from Schedule D-1.13

ED Non-Constant DCF Calculation

| $g=$ | 3.46\% | non const $\mathrm{dcf}=$ | 10.43\% | const dcf= | 8.48\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $D=$ | \$2.32 |  |  | $g(\mathrm{e})=$ | 6.77\% |
|  |  | $\mathrm{P}=$ | \$47.87 |  |  |
|  | GROWTH |  |  |  |  |
| YEAR | RATE |  | DIVIDEND |  |  |
| 1 | 3.46\% |  | \$2.40 |  |  |
| 2 | 3.46\% |  | \$2.48 |  |  |
| 3 | 3.46\% |  | \$2.57 |  |  |
| 4 | 3.46\% |  | \$2.66 |  |  |
| 5 | 3.46\% |  | \$2.75 |  |  |
| 6 | 3.63\% |  | \$2.85 |  |  |
| 7 | 3.79\% |  | \$2.96 |  |  |
| 8 | 3.96\% |  | \$3.08 |  |  |
| 9 | 4.13\% |  | \$3.20 |  |  |
| \$10 | 4.29\% |  | \$3.34 |  |  |
| 11 | 4.46\% |  | \$3.49 |  |  |
| 12 | 4.62\% |  | \$3.65 |  |  |
| 13 | 4.79\% |  | \$3.82 |  |  |
| 14 | 4.95\% |  | \$4.01 |  |  |
| 15 | 5.12\% |  | \$4.22 |  |  |
| 16 | 5.28\% |  | \$4.44 |  |  |
| 17 | 5.45\% |  | \$4.68 |  |  |
| 18 | 5.61\% |  | \$4.95 |  |  |
| 19 | 5.78\% |  | \$5.23 |  |  |
| 20 | 5.94\% |  | \$5.54 |  |  |
| 21 | 6.11\% |  | \$5.88 |  |  |
| 22 | 6.27\% |  | \$6.25 |  |  |
| 23 | 6.44\% |  | \$6.65 |  |  |
| 24 | 6.60\% |  | \$7.09 |  |  |
| 25 | 6.77\% |  | \$7.57 |  |  |
| 26 | 6.77\% |  | \$8.09 |  |  |
| 27 | 6.77\% |  | \$8.63 |  |  |
| 28 | 6.77\% |  | \$9.22 |  |  |
| 29 | 6.77\% |  | \$9.84 |  |  |
| 30 | 6.77\% |  | \$10.51 |  |  |

This schedule is truncated; the calculation extends
to 400 years to ensure the stability of the calculation.
g, D, P are from Schedule D-1.3
$\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{e})$ is from Schedule D-1.13

EIX Non-Constant DCF Calculation


This schedule is truncated; the calculation extends to 400 years to ensure the stability of the calculation.
g, D, P are from Schedule D-1.3 $g(e)$ is from Schedule D-1.13

ETR Non-Constant DCF Calculation

| $g=$ | 10.45\% | non const dcf= | 10.65\% | const <br> dcf= | 13.17\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $D=$ | \$2.58 | $P=$ | \$104.89 | $g(\mathrm{e})=$ | 6.77\% |
|  | GROWTH |  |  |  |  |
| YEAR | RATE |  | DIVIDEND |  |  |
| 1 | 10.45\% |  | \$2.85 |  |  |
| 2 | 10.45\% |  | \$3.15 |  |  |
| 3 | 10.45\% |  | \$3.48 |  |  |
| 4 | 10.45\% |  | \$3.84 |  |  |
| 5 | 10.45\% |  | \$4.24 |  |  |
| 6 | 10.27\% |  | \$4.68 |  |  |
| 7 | 10.09\% |  | \$5.15 |  |  |
| 8 | 9.90\% |  | \$5.66 |  |  |
| 9 | 9.72\% |  | \$6.21 |  |  |
| 10 | 9.53\% |  | \$6.80 |  |  |
| 11 | 9.35\% |  | \$7.44 |  |  |
| 12 | 9.16\% |  | \$8.12 |  |  |
| 13 | 8.98\% |  | \$8.85 |  |  |
| 14 | 8.80\% |  | \$9.62 |  |  |
| 15 | 8.61\% |  | \$10.45 |  |  |
| 16 | 8.43\% |  | \$11.33 |  |  |
| 17 | 8.24\% |  | \$12.27 |  |  |
| 18 | 8.06\% |  | \$13.26 |  |  |
| 19 | 7.87\% |  | \$14.30 |  |  |
| 20 | 7.69\% |  | \$15.40 |  |  |
| 21 | 7.51\% |  | \$16.56 |  |  |
| 22 | 7.32\% |  | \$17.77 |  |  |
| 23 | 7.14\% |  | \$19.04 |  |  |
| 24 | 6.95\% |  | \$20.36 |  |  |
| 25 | 6.77\% |  | \$21.74 |  |  |
| 26 | 6.77\% |  | \$23.21 |  |  |
| 27 | 6.77\% |  | \$24.78 |  |  |
| 28 | 6.77\% |  | \$26.46 |  |  |
| 29 | 6.77\% |  | \$28.25 |  |  |
| 30 | 6.77\% |  | \$30.16 |  |  |

This schedule is truncated; the calculation extends to 400 years to ensure the stability of the calculation.
g, D, P are from Schedule D-1.3
$\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{e})$ is from Schedule D-1.13

## EXC Non-Constant DCF Calculation



This schedule is truncated; the calculation extends to 400 years to ensure the stability of the calculation.
g, D, P are from Schedule D-1.3
$\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{e})$ is from Schedule D-1.13 $\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{e})$ is from Schedule D-1.13

PCG Non-Constant DCF Calculation


This schedule is truncated; the calculation extends to 400 years to ensure the stability of the calculation.
g, D, P are from Schedule D-1.3 $g(e)$ is from Schedule D-1.13

PEG Non-Constant DCF Calculation

| $g=$ | 14.60\% | non const dcf= | 13.13\% | const <br> dcf= | 17.85\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D= | \$2.33 |  |  | $g(e)=$ | 6.77\% |
|  |  | $P=$ | \$81.97 |  |  |
|  | GROWTH |  |  |  |  |
| YEAR | RATE |  | DIVIDEND |  |  |
| 1 | 14.60\% |  | \$2.66 |  |  |
| 2 | 14.60\% |  | \$3.05 |  |  |
| 3 | 14.60\% |  | \$3.50 |  |  |
| 4 | 14.60\% |  | \$4.01 |  |  |
| 5 | 14.60\% |  | \$4.60 |  |  |
| 6 | 14.21\% |  | \$5.25 |  |  |
| 7 | 13.82\% |  | \$5.97 |  |  |
| 8 | 13.43\% |  | \$6.78 |  |  |
| 9 | 13.04\% |  | \$7.66 |  |  |
| 10 | 12.64\% |  | \$8.63 |  |  |
| 11 | 12.25\% |  | \$9.69 |  |  |
| 12 | 11.86\% |  | \$10.84 |  |  |
| 13 | 11.47\% |  | \$12.08 |  |  |
| 14 | 11.08\% |  | \$13.42 |  |  |
| 15 | 10.69\% |  | \$14.85 |  |  |
| 16 | 10.29\% |  | \$16.38 |  |  |
| 17 | 9.90\% |  | \$18.00 |  |  |
| 18 | 9.51\% |  | \$19.71 |  |  |
| 19 | 9.12\% |  | \$21.51 |  |  |
| 20 | 8.73\% |  | \$23.39 |  |  |
| 21 | 8.34\% |  | \$25.34 |  |  |
| 22 | 7.94\% |  | \$27.35 |  |  |
| 23 | 7.55\% |  | \$29.41 |  |  |
| 24 | 7.16\% |  | \$31.52 |  |  |
| 25 | 6.77\% |  | \$33.65 |  |  |
| 26 | 6.77\% |  | \$35.93 |  |  |
| 27 | 6.77\% |  | \$38.36 |  |  |
| 28 | 6.77\% |  | \$40.96 |  |  |
| 29 | 6.77\% |  | \$43.73 |  |  |
| 30 | 6.77\% |  | \$46.69 |  |  |

This schedule is truncated; the calculation extends to 400 years to ensure the stability of the calculation.
g, D, P are from Schedule D-1.3 $\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{e})$ is from Schedule D-1.13

## XEL Non-Constant DCF Calculation

|  | $g=$ | 5.64\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { non const } \\ & \text { dcf= } \end{aligned}$ | 10.59\% | const dcf= | 9.89\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $D=$ | \$0.91 |  |  | $\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{e})=$ | 6.77\% |
|  |  |  | $P=$ | \$22.52 |  |  |
|  |  | GROWTH |  |  |  |  |
| YEAR |  | RATE |  | DIVIDEND |  |  |
|  | 1 | 5.64\% |  | \$0.96 |  |  |
|  | 2 | 5.64\% |  | \$1.01 |  |  |
|  | 3 | 5.64\% |  | \$1.07 |  |  |
|  | 4 | 5.64\% |  | \$1.13 |  |  |
|  | 5 | 5.64\% |  | \$1.19 |  |  |
|  | 6 | 5.70\% |  | \$1.26 |  |  |
|  | 7 | 5.75\% |  | \$1.33 |  |  |
|  | 8 | 5.81\% |  | \$1.41 |  |  |
|  | 9 | 5.87\% |  | \$1.49 |  |  |
|  | 10 | 5.92\% |  | \$1.58 |  |  |
|  | 11 | 5.98\% |  | \$1.68 |  |  |
|  | 12 | 6.04\% |  | \$1.78 |  |  |
|  | 13 | 6.09\% |  | \$1.89 |  |  |
|  | 14 | 6.15\% |  | \$2.00 |  |  |
|  | 15 | 6.21\% |  | \$2.13 |  |  |
|  | 16 | 6.26\% |  | \$2.26 |  |  |
|  | 17 | 6.32\% |  | \$2.40 |  |  |
|  | 18 | 6.37\% |  | \$2.55 |  |  |
|  | 19 | 6.43\% |  | \$2.72 |  |  |
|  | 20 | 6.49\% |  | \$2.89 |  |  |
|  | 21 | 6.54\% |  | \$3.08 |  |  |
|  | 22 | 6.60\% |  | \$3.29 |  |  |
|  | 23 | 6.66\% |  | \$3.51 |  |  |
|  | 24 | 6.71\% |  | \$3.74 |  |  |
|  | 25 | 6.77\% |  | \$3.99 |  |  |
|  | 26 | 6.77\% |  | \$4.27 |  |  |
|  | 27 | 6.77\% |  | \$4.55 |  |  |
|  | 28 | 6.77\% |  | \$4.86 |  |  |
|  | 29 | 6.77\% |  | \$5.19 |  |  |
|  | 30 | 6.77\% |  | \$5.54 |  |  |

This schedule is truncated; the calculation extends to 400 years to ensure the stability of the calculation.
g, D, P are from Schedule D-1.3 $g(e)$ is from Schedule D-1.13

## DUK Non-Constant DCF Calculation



This schedule is truncated; the calculation extends to 400 years to ensure the stability of the calculation.
g, D, P are from Schedule D-1.3 $g(e)$ is from Schedule D-1.13

Growth in U.S. Gross National Product, 1929 to 2005

| Year | GNP <br> (\$billion) | Change <br> (\$billion) | Growth\% |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1929 | 104.4 |  |  |
| 1930 | 91.90 | -12.70 | $-12.32 \%$ |
| 1931 | 77.00 | -14.60 | $-16.15 \%$ |
| 1932 | 59.10 | -17.80 | $-23.48 \%$ |
| 1933 | 56.70 | -2.40 | $-4.14 \%$ |
| 1934 | 66.30 | 9.50 | $17.09 \%$ |
| 1935 | 73.60 | 7.10 | $10.91 \%$ |
| 1936 | 84.00 | 10.30 | $14.27 \%$ |
| 1937 | 92.20 | 7.90 | $9.58 \%$ |
| 1938 | 86.50 | -5.70 | $-6.31 \%$ |
| 1939 | 92.50 | 6.60 | $7.79 \%$ |
| 1940 | 101.70 | 9.10 | $9.97 \%$ |
| 1941 | 127.20 | 25.10 | $25.00 \%$ |
| 1942 | 162.30 | 33.50 | $26.69 \%$ |
| 1943 | 198.90 | 33.70 | $21.19 \%$ |
| 1944 | 220.10 | 18.70 | $9.70 \%$ |
| 1945 | 223.40 | 2.00 | $0.95 \%$ |
| 1946 | 22.90 | -1.00 | $-0.47 \%$ |
| 1947 | 24.30 | 22.80 | $10.73 \%$ |
| 1948 | 270.60 | 26.40 | $11.22 \%$ |
| 1949 | 268.60 | -1.20 | $-0.46 \%$ |
| 1950 | 295.20 | 27.90 | $10.71 \%$ |
| 1951 | 341.20 | 45.10 | $15.64 \%$ |
| 1952 | 360.30 | 18.20 | $5.46 \%$ |
| 1953 | 381.30 | 20.00 | $5.69 \%$ |
| 1954 | 382.50 | 0.90 | $0.24 \%$ |
| 1955 | 417.20 | 33.40 | $8.97 \%$ |
| 1956 | 440.30 | 22.30 | $5.49 \%$ |
| 1957 | 464.10 | 22.80 | $5.32 \%$ |
| 1958 | 469.80 | 5.80 | $1.29 \%$ |
| 1959 | 509.30 | 53.50 | $11.71 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |

Growth in U.S. Gross National Product, 1929 to 2005

| Year | GNP <br> (\$billion) | Change <br> (\$billion) | Growth\% |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1960 | 529.50 | 20.30 | $3.98 \%$ |
| 1961 | 548.20 | 18.70 | $3.52 \%$ |
| 1962 | 589.70 | 41.40 | $7.54 \%$ |
| 1963 | 622.20 | 32.50 | $5.50 \%$ |
| 1964 | 668.50 | 46.20 | $7.41 \%$ |
| 1965 | 724.40 | 56.10 | $8.38 \%$ |
| 1966 | 792.90 | 69.00 | $9.51 \%$ |
| 1967 | 838.00 | 45.00 | $5.66 \%$ |
| 1968 | 916.10 | 78.10 | $9.30 \%$ |
| 1969 | 990.70 | 73.90 | $8.05 \%$ |
| 1970 | $1,044.90$ | 54.60 | $5.51 \%$ |
| 1971 | $1,134.70$ | 90.10 | $8.61 \%$ |
| 1972 | $1,246.80$ | 112.90 | $9.94 \%$ |
| 1973 | $1,395.30$ | 149.10 | $11.94 \%$ |
| 1974 | $1,515.50$ | 118.50 | $8.48 \%$ |
| 1975 | $1,651.30$ | 131.70 | $8.68 \%$ |
| 1976 | $1,842.10$ | 192.60 | $11.68 \%$ |
| 1977 | $2,051.20$ | 211.10 | $11.47 \%$ |
| 1978 | $2,316.30$ | 265.90 | $12.96 \%$ |
| 1979 | $2,595.30$ | 281.30 | $12.14 \%$ |
| 1980 | $2,823.70$ | 231.50 | $8.91 \%$ |
| 1981 | $3,161.40$ | 335.30 | $11.84 \%$ |
| 1982 | $3,291.50$ | 129.60 | $4.09 \%$ |
| 1983 | $3,573.80$ | 276.10 | $8.38 \%$ |
| 1984 | $3,969.50$ | 396.30 | $11.10 \%$ |
| 1985 | $4,246.80$ | 270.30 | $6.81 \%$ |
| 1986 | $4,480.60$ | 229.90 | $5.42 \%$ |
| 1987 | $4,757.40$ | 287.90 | $6.44 \%$ |
| 1988 | $5,127.40$ | 370.60 | $7.79 \%$ |
| 1989 | $5,510.60$ | 382.60 | $7.46 \%$ |
| 1990 | $5,837.90$ | 322.80 | $5.86 \%$ |

Growth in U.S. Gross National Product, 1929 to 2005

| Year | GNP <br> (\$billion) | Change <br> (\$billion) | Growth\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1991 | 6,026.30 | 178.70 | 3.06\% |
| 1992 | 6,367.40 | 331.40 | 5.51\% |
| 1993 | 6,689.30 | 324.40 | 5.11\% |
| 1994 | 7,098.40 | 404.40 | 6.07\% |
| 1995 | 7,433.40 | 349.80 | 4.95\% |
| 1996 | 7,851,90 | 410.30 | 5.53\% |
| 1997 | 8,337,30 | 473.80 | 6.05\% |
| 1998 | 8,768.30 | 445.00 | 5.36\% |
| 1999 | 9,302.20 | 486.20 | 5.56\% |
| 2000 | 9,855,90 | 553.70 | 5.95\% |
| 2001 | 10,171.60 | 315.70 | 3.20\% |
| 2002 | 10,514.10 | 342.50 | 3.37\% |
| 2003 | 11,059.20 | 545.10 | 5.18\% |
| 2004 | 11,778.90 | 719.70 | 6.51\% |
| 2005 | 12,520.80 | 741.90 | 6.30\% |
| Average |  |  | 6.77\% |
| Economic Analysis and Econostats; BEA Data; NIPA Index; Section 1. Domestic Product and Income Table 1.7.5 Relation of Gross Domestic Product, Gross National Product, Net National Product, National Income, and Personal Income. (2) U. S. Department of Commerce; Survey of Current of the United States Business and Historical Statistics |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |


| Staff | Staff <br> Proposed <br> Rates |
| :--- | ---: |
| Proposed |  |
|  | Rates |
| 10 | 20.25 |
| 1.53942 | 1.53942 |




Rate RS/RFT
Typical Bill Comparison Typical Bill Comparison




¢䓂

Year 1

©










|  | Applicant Proposed Rates | Staff Proposed Rates | Staff <br> Proposed Rates |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cust chg | 15 | 12.50 | 25.33 |
| mcf | 2.4714 | 0.99103 | 0.99103 |
| pip (mcf) | 0.169 |  |  |
| gcr (mcf) | 8.883 |  |  |
| STR (mcf) |  |  |  |
| First 100 | 0.1593 |  |  |
| Next 1900 | 0.0877 |  |  |
| Addt. | 0.0411 |  |  |
|  | 0.0489 |  |  |
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The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Ted Strickland, Governer * Alan R. Schriber, Chairman
180 E. Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793 • An Equal Opportunity Employer and Service Provider


[^0]:    | * Ibbotson Associates 2007 Yearbook: Stocks, Bonds, Bills and Inflation; Valuation Edition

[^1]:    1 Administrative Code 4901:1-16-01 (1) "Incident" means an event that involves a release of gas from an intrastate gas pipeline facility and results in any of the following: (1) a death, (2) personal injury requiring inpatient hospitalization, (3) estimated property damage of fifty thousand dollars or more, which is the sum of: (a) the estimated cost of repairing and/or replacing the physical damage to the pipeline facility, (b) the cost of material, labor and equipment to repair the leak, and light up, (c) the cost of gas lost by an operator or person or both. Cost of gas lost shall not include the cost of gas in a planned operational release of gas by an operator, which is performed in compliance with the pipeline safety code, (d) the estimated cost of repairing and/or replacing other damaged property of the operator or others, or both.

[^2]:    1 OCC was not a signatory party to the April 5, 2005 stipulation but did not oppose that stipulation.

[^3]:    2 A Report by the Staff of Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, In the Matter of the Investigation of the Installation, Use, and Performance of Natural Gas Scrvice Risers Throughout the State of Ohio-and Related Matters, Case No. 05-463-GA-COI, pgs 14,15.
    3 Jbid. Proper installation of Design-A risers is critical and Design-A risers with a low gasket force retention that are subjected to certain tensilc loading and low temperature cycling are more prone to failure.

[^4]:    1 Case No. 07-478-GA-UNC, In the Matter of the Application of Coumbia Gas of Ohio, Inc,, for Approval of Tariffs to Recover, through an Automatic Adjustment Clause, Cost Associated with the Establishment of an Infrastructure Replacement Program and for approval of Certain Accounting treatment, Prepared Testimony of Edward M Stecle, submitted: October 24, 2007.

    5 Ibid.

[^5]:    ${ }^{6}$ Source: Attachment DLS_3, Direct Testimony of Donald L. Storck on Behalf of Duke Energy Ohio

[^6]:    

[^7]:    (a) These expenditures are capitalized as Leasehold Improvements and are included in Account 1900. (b) Fully Amortized.

[^8]:    Sources:
    1 MSN Invostor
    2 MSN Investor \& Value Line Investment Guide
    3 investor.reuters.com
    4 moneycentral.msn.com
    5 finance.yahoo.com
    6 Value Line Invesiment Guide

