

BEFORE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	
Energy Ohio, Inc., for an Adjustment to)	Case No. 20-0053-GA-RDR
Rider MGP Rates.)	

In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	
Energy Ohio, Inc., for Tariff Approval.)	Case No. 20-0054-GA-ATA

AMENDED TESTIMONY OF

SARAH E. LAWLER

ON BEHALF OF

DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC.

July 7, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE	1
II. HISTORY OF RIDER MGP	3
III. EXPLANATION OF SCHEDULES	6
IV. REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED INCREASE	8
V. CONCLUSION	9

ATTACHMENTS:

AMENDED ATTACHMENT SEL-1:	Detail of MGP Expense – 2019
AMENDED ATTACHMENT SEL-2:	Rider MGP charge – Rate Class
ATTACHMENT SEL-3:	Summary of Changes

I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

1 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.**

2 A. My name is Sarah E. Lawler, and my business address is 139 East Fourth Street,
3 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.

4 **Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?**

5 A. I am employed by Duke Energy Business Services LLC (DEBS) as Director,
6 Rates and Regulatory Planning for Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., (Duke Energy Ohio
7 or Company) and Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. (Duke Energy Kentucky). DEBS
8 provides various administrative and other services to Duke Energy Ohio and other
9 affiliated companies of Duke Energy Corporation (Duke Energy).

10 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND**
11 **PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.**

12 A. I earned a Bachelor of Science in Accountancy from Miami University, Oxford,
13 OH in 1993. I am also a Certified Public Accountant. I began my career in
14 September 1993 with Coopers & Lybrand, L.L.P. as an audit associate and
15 progressed to a senior audit associate. In August 1997, I moved to Kendle
16 International Inc., where I held various positions in the accounting department,
17 ultimately being promoted to Corporate Controller. In August 2003, I began
18 working for Cinergy Corp., the parent of Duke Energy Ohio, as External
19 Reporting Manager, where I was responsible for the Company's Securities &
20 Exchange Commission (SEC) filings. In August 2005, I then moved into the role
21 of Manager, Budgets & Forecasts. In June 2006, following the merger between
22 Cinergy Corp. and Duke Energy, I became Manager, Financial Forecasting. In

1 February 2015, I was promoted to Utility Strategy Director, Midwest where I was
2 responsible for the preparation of business plans and other internal managerial
3 reporting for Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky. In December 2017,
4 I assumed the role of Director, Rates and Regulatory Planning, where I was
5 responsible for the preparation of financial and accounting data used in Duke
6 Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky retail rate filings and changes in various
7 other rate recovery mechanisms. In May 2020, I was promoted to my current role
8 of Vice President, Rates & Regulatory Strategy.

9 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES AS VICE**
10 **PRESIDENT, RATES AND REGULATORY STRATEGY.**

11 A. In this role, I am responsible for all state and federal regulatory rate matters
12 involving Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky.

13 **Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THE PUBLIC**
14 **UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO?**

15 A. Yes.

16 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THESE**
17 **PROCEEDINGS?**

18 A. I will explain the history of Rider MGP and describe the updated schedules filed
19 by Duke Energy Ohio in this proceeding. I will also support the reasonableness of
20 Duke Energy Ohio's request for revised Rider MGP rates.

21 **Q. WHY ARE YOU AMENDING YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THESE**
22 **PROCEEDINGS?**

23 A. My direct testimony was initially filed on April 1, 2020. In the course of

1 discovery, it was discovered that the Company had inadvertently omitted certain
2 expenses from the filing due to the timing of the filing relative to the timing of the
3 payment of the relevant invoices. I am amending my direct testimony, as well as
4 Attachments SEL-1 and SEL-2 (now Amended Attachment SEL-1 and Amended
5 Attachment SEL-2) in order to include these inadvertently omitted expenses, as
6 well as make additional minor corrections. Additionally, I have prepared a new
7 attachment, Attachment SEL-3 to summarize the corrections being made in this
8 testimony. Finally, I am updating this testimony to reflect my recent promotion,
9 as described above.

10 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE CORRECTIONS MADE IN THIS AMENDED**
11 **TESTIMONY.**

12 A. The corrections made in this amended testimony are detailed in Attachment SEL-
13 3.

II. HISTORY OF RIDER MGP

14 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE HISTORY OF RIDER MGP.**

15 A. In Case No. 09-0712-GA-AAM, the Commission issued a Finding and Order, on
16 November 12, 2009, authorizing the Company to defer costs related to the
17 environmental investigation and remediation of two former manufactured gas
18 plant (MGP) sites. In that Finding and Order, the Commission specifically found
19 that the “environmental investigation and remediation costs are business costs
20 incurred by Duke [Energy Ohio] in compliance with Ohio regulations and federal
21 statutes.”¹ The Company was also allowed to accrue carrying costs on the

¹ *In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for Authority to Defer Environmental*

1 deferred amounts until the date when recovery would begin at the embedded cost
2 of debt. The Commission further observed that the recovery of these business
3 costs would be addressed in a subsequent base rate case.

4 On July 9, 2012, Duke Energy Ohio filed for an increase in its base rates
5 in Case Nos. 12-1685-GA-AIR, *et al.* (Base Rate Case). As part of the Base Rate
6 Case, Duke Energy Ohio followed the Commission's instructions from the
7 Commission's Finding and Order in Case No. 09-712-GA-AAM and requested to
8 recover amounts that had been deferred, plus carrying charges, from 2008 through
9 the end of the test period or December 31, 2012. As part of a settlement in the
10 Base Rate Case, the Company agreed to withdraw its request for base rate
11 recovery of the deferred MGP costs and to create a new rider, Rider MGP, to
12 recover Commission-approved deferrals for MGP remediation plus carrying costs.

13 After litigating the issues of whether MGP costs were recoverable and the
14 amount of MGP remediation costs to be recovered, the Commission issued an
15 Opinion and Order in the Base Rate Case that allowed the Company to begin
16 recovery of these costs (with certain adjustments) through Rider MGP. In its
17 Opinion and Order, the Commission disallowed certain costs.

18 The initial tariff for Rider MGP was filed on February 21, 2014, with rates
19 effective in March 2014. Collection under Rider MPG was suspended by the Ohio
20 Supreme Court in June 2014, but resumed in January 2015. In the Opinion and
21 Order, the Commission also ordered Duke Energy Ohio to update Rider MGP on
22 an annual basis, presumably with the Company being able to timely recover its

Investigation and Remediation Costs, Case No. 09-712-GA-AAM, Finding and Order, p. 3 (November 12,

1 incurred costs. The first such filing for calendar year 2013 costs was made on
2 March 31, 2014, in Case Nos. 14-0375-GA-RDR, *et al.* The second such filing for
3 calendar year 2014 costs was made on March 31, 2015, in Case Nos. 15-0452-
4 GA-RDR, *et al.* The third such filing for calendar year 2015 costs was made on
5 March 31, 2016, in Case Nos. 16-0542-GA-RDR, *et al.* The fourth such filing for
6 calendar year 2016 costs was made on March 31, 2017, in Case Nos. 17-596-GA-
7 RDR, *et al.* The fifth such filing for calendar year 2017 costs was made on March
8 28, 2018 in Case Nos. 18-283-GA-RDR, *et al.* The sixth such filing for calendar
9 year 2018 costs was made on March 29, 2019 in Case Nos. 19-0174-GA-RDR, *et*
10 *al.* In the 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018 filings, the Company requested that all the
11 rider update filings be consolidated.

12 On June 28, 2018, the Attorney Examiner granted the Company's motion
13 to consolidate the cases and issued a procedural schedule. Commission Staff filed
14 its Staff Report in the consolidated cases on September 28, 2018, recommending
15 a disallowance of \$11,867,900 of costs included in previous rider filings for
16 calendar years 2013-2017. Commission Staff also filed a Staff Report on July 12,
17 2019 recommending a disallowance of \$11,366,242 of costs included in calendar
18 year 2018. The disallowances recommended in both reports were based on the
19 incorrect conclusion that such costs were to remediate areas outside of the former
20 MGP operational sites. A hearing was held November 18 through November 21,
21 2019 for the consolidated cases covering calendar years 2013-2018 and briefs and
22 reply briefs were filed January 17, 2020 and February 14, 2020, respectively. The

1 cases are now awaiting a Commission order.

2 **Q. DOES THE CALCULATION OF ANNUAL MGP DEFERRALS AND**
3 **RIDER MGP COSTS INCLUDE CARRYING CHARGES FOR THE**
4 **DEFERRED BALANCE?**

5 A. No. Although the Commission allowed Duke Energy Ohio to include carrying
6 costs on its deferred balance at the Company's embedded cost of debt when it
7 initially approved the deferral, the Commission reversed that decision in the
8 Opinion and Order in the Base Rate Case, denying the Company any carrying
9 costs, nor was it permitted to continue accruing carrying costs on the deferred
10 balance going forward.

III. EXPLANATION OF SCHEDULES

11 **Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN AMENDED ATTACHMENT SEL-1.**

12 A. Amended Schedule SEL-1 is the detail of the MGP expense incurred in calendar
13 year 2019 by month and by activity. Amended Schedule SEL-1 incorporates the
14 corrections I referred to earlier, which are detailed in Attachment SEL-3. The
15 resulting total amount for calendar year 2019 is \$39,435,627.

16 **Q. DOES THE AMOUNT ON AMENDED ATTACHMENT SEL-1 INCLUDE**
17 **CARRYING COSTS?**

18 A. No. Pursuant to the Opinion and Order in the Base Rate Case, there are no carrying
19 costs included in this Application.

20 **Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN AMENDED ATTACHMENT SEL-2.**

21 A. Amended Schedule SEL-2 provides the proposed Rider MGP charge by rate class
22 using the allocation percentages included in the Stipulation and Recommendation

1 approved by the Commission in the Base Rate Case and incorporating the
2 corrections I referred to earlier. It also provides the number of customer bills for the
3 twelve months ended December 31, 2019.

4 **Q. DOES THE CALCULATION IN AMENDED ATTACHMENT SEL-2**
5 **INCLUDE AMOUNTS INCURRED IN PRIOR YEARS?**

6 A. Yes. It includes costs incurred in calendar years 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017 and
7 2018, which were filed with the Commission in Case Nos. 14-0375-GA-RDR, *et al.*,
8 Case Nos. 15-0452-GA-RDR, *et al.*, Case Nos. 16-0542-GA-RDR, *et al.*, Case Nos.
9 17-596-GA-RDR, *et al.*, Case Nos. 18-0283-GA-RDR, *et al.* and Case Nos. 19-0174-
10 GA-RDR, *et al.* which have not yet been ruled upon, along with costs for calendar
11 year 2019.

12 **Q. WHY DOES THE CALCULATION IN AMENDED ATTACHMENT SEL-2**
13 **NOT INCLUDE COSTS INCURRED THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2012.**

14 A. The costs incurred through December 31, 2012 were fully collected from customers
15 in July 2019 and the Rider MGP was then set to zero.

1 **Q. IS THE COMPANY PROPOSING THE SAME AMORTIZATION PERIOD**
2 **FOR 2013-2019 COSTS THAT IT DID FOR COSTS INCURRED THROUGH**
3 **2012?**

4 A. Yes. The Company is proposing that all remaining costs incurred from 2013-2019 be
5 recovered over a five-year period, consistent with the recovery period for the costs
6 incurred through 2012. Based on this amortization period, the current rates would be
7 as follows: Residential \$2.39 per month, GS/FT Small \$5.43 per month, GS/FT
8 Large \$37.45 per month and IT \$314.10 per month.

9 These costs date back as far as 2013 (over seven years old) and as I have
10 mentioned earlier, the Company is not accruing carrying costs. Some consideration
11 should be given to the timely recovery of such costs and increasing the amortization
12 period any longer than what was authorized by the Commission for the costs
13 incurred through 2012 would exacerbate that issue.

IV. REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED INCREASE

14 **Q. HAVE YOU REVIEWED DUKE ENERGY OHIO'S APPLICATION IN**
15 **THESE PROCEEDINGS?**

16 A. Yes.

17 **Q. DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION REGARDING WHETHER DUKE**
18 **ENERGY OHIO'S REQUEST FOR NEW RIDER MGP RATES IS**
19 **REASONABLE?**

20 A. Yes.

1 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR OPINION.**

2 A. Duke Energy Ohio's rate request is fair and reasonable. I believe that the costs of
3 service are properly allocated to customer classes and the rate design was
4 properly performed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Stipulation
5 and Recommendation in the Base Rate Case, as approved by the Commission.

V. CONCLUSION

6 **Q. WERE AMENDED ATTACHMENTS SEL-1, SEL-2, AND ATTACHMENT**
7 **SEL-3 PREPARED BY YOU OR AT YOUR DIRECTION AND UNDER**
8 **YOUR CONTROL?**

9 A. Yes.

10 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR AMENDED DIRECT TESTIMONY?**

11 A. Yes.

Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.
Detail of MGP expense
12 Months ended December 31, 2019

Line No.	Description	East End - 2019														Total 2019
		January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December			
1	Investigation	\$ 90,977.93	\$ 31,161.50	\$ 32,530.39	\$ 11,628.50	\$ 32,509.00	\$ 84,989.47	\$ 16,222.75	\$ 477,595.15	\$ 726,501.63	\$ 362,133.00	\$ 31,258.42	\$ 611,219.28	\$ 2,508,727.02		
2	Air Monitoring	\$ 116,915.90	\$ -	\$ 55,350.00	\$ 25,200.00	\$ 31,750.00	\$ 44,440.75	\$ 25,400.00	\$ 9,492.00	\$ 12,700.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 21,000.00	\$ 342,248.65		
3	Analytical Laboratory	\$ 6,593.00	\$ 262.50	\$ -	\$ 1,400.00	\$ 10,360.00	\$ 5,606.50	\$ 6,546.00	\$ 11,993.00	\$ 81,577.99	\$ 8,113.79	\$ 75,009.28	\$ 39,846.48	\$ 247,308.54		
4	Contractor Support	\$ 1,973.25	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,243.75	\$ -	\$ 3,309.00	\$ 1,189.25	\$ 2,655.25	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,426.50	\$ 26,583.75		
5	Constr. Mgmt./Detailed Design	\$ 147,954.66	\$ 1,744,408.33	\$ 778,566.49	\$ 903.00	\$ 947,466.67	\$ 1,228,314.55	\$ 864,435.60	\$ 1,334,057.39	\$ (132,938.50)	\$ 726,515.01	\$ 415,251.04	\$ 1,258,395.81	\$ 9,313,330.05		
6	Vibration Monitoring	\$ 15,348.00	\$ 23,022.00	\$ 15,348.00	\$ 15,348.00	\$ 15,348.00	\$ -	\$ 28,969.35	\$ 21,907.65	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 135,291.00		
7	Miscellaneous	\$ 787.50	\$ 1,569.91	\$ 1,733.53	\$ 2,162.50	\$ 3,547.50	\$ 615.00	\$ -	\$ 3,715.02	\$ 1,662.57	\$ 100.00	\$ -	\$ 356.50	\$ 16,250.03		
8	Soil Disposal/Landfill	\$ 155,002.31	\$ 29,068.69	\$ 37,670.89	\$ 126,364.81	\$ 24,924.24	\$ 112,558.08	\$ 8,248.66	\$ 23,683.62	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 529,556.02		
9	Duke Internal Expenses	\$ 79.21	\$ 1,324.04	\$ 1,259.24	\$ 1,137.83	\$ 897.46	\$ 3,583.54	\$ 1,223.15	\$ 2,068.41	\$ 1,866.15	\$ 3,501.42	\$ 3,328.04	\$ (6,639.59)	\$ 13,628.90		
10	Duke Laboratory Labor	\$ 1,664.22	\$ 2,019.38	\$ -	\$ 267.75	\$ 2,317.76	\$ 1,027.80	\$ 2,790.41	\$ 1,806.45	\$ 12,352.45	\$ 911.72	\$ 11,175.94	\$ 6,318.57	\$ 42,652.45		
11	Duke MGP PM/Construction Oversight	\$ 17,442.26	\$ 21,676.01	\$ 39,436.65	\$ 22,471.35	\$ 39,725.30	\$ 39,308.55	\$ 44,036.11	\$ 48,513.47	\$ 45,766.84	\$ 21,274.11	\$ 17,231.10	\$ 13,471.44	\$ 370,353.19		
12	EAST END TOTALS	\$ 554,738.24	\$ 1,854,512.36	\$ 961,895.19	\$ 215,127.49	\$ 1,108,845.93	\$ 1,523,753.24	\$ 999,061.28	\$ 1,937,487.41	\$ 736,789.13	\$ 1,152,070.52	\$ 553,253.82	\$ 1,948,394.99	\$ 13,545,929.60		
13	West End - 2019															
13	Investigation	\$ 171,527.61	\$ 61,623.96	\$ 20,157.25	\$ 8,460.75	\$ 43,264.59	\$ 85,924.40	\$ 35,064.25	\$ 33,596.50	\$ 323,360.00	\$ 229,341.28	\$ (189,087.95)	\$ 497,045.34	\$ 1,320,277.98		
14	Air Monitoring	\$ -	\$ 37,662.50	\$ 26,200.00	\$ 26,200.00	\$ 32,750.00	\$ 34,981.75	\$ 26,200.00	\$ 26,200.00	\$ 32,750.00	\$ (8,971.50)	\$ 26,200.00	\$ 118,891.50	\$ 379,064.25		
15	Security	\$ 15,020.57	\$ 12,737.50	\$ 10,823.80	\$ 11,744.39	\$ 11,472.53	\$ -	\$ 22,357.21	\$ 11,580.96	\$ 12,191.01	\$ 12,167.85	\$ 12,433.69	\$ 11,024.24	\$ 143,553.75		
16	Analytical Laboratory	\$ 725.00	\$ 6,276.00	\$ -	\$ 1,188.00	\$ 29,077.94	\$ (15,555.94)	\$ 14,550.00	\$ 66,181.26	\$ 49,999.96	\$ 51,819.32	\$ 11,840.64	\$ 85,996.00	\$ 302,098.18		
17	Constr. Mgmt./Detailed Design	\$ 177,953.79	\$ 1,533,909.06	\$ 1,836,836.05	\$ 2,248,258.33	\$ 2,763,852.54	\$ 1,126,655.80	\$ 1,840,908.59	\$ 1,974,021.85	\$ 957,605.20	\$ 1,874,597.04	\$ 1,837,592.21	\$ 3,190,224.67	\$ 21,362,415.13		
18	Miscellaneous	\$ (155,454.00)	\$ 9,009.00	\$ 22,697.13	\$ 10,164.00	\$ 12,963.00	\$ 9,954.00	\$ 12,432.00	\$ 8,547.00	\$ 8,526.00	\$ 8,190.00	\$ 9,891.00	\$ 12,516.00	\$ (30,564.87)		
19	Soil Disposal/Landfill	\$ -	\$ 64,534.77	\$ 279,303.37	\$ 456,092.24	\$ 307,159.80	\$ 517,929.85	\$ 140,949.80	\$ 165,660.81	\$ -	\$ 193,875.60	\$ 11,541.64	\$ 22,744.47	\$ 2,159,792.35		
20	Duke Internal Expenses	\$ 34.76	\$ 1,172.54	\$ 10,385.92	\$ 7,450.24	\$ 1,603.68	\$ 4,776.05	\$ 2,239.17	\$ 958.55	\$ 6,770.43	\$ -	\$ 4,012.61	\$ 368.29	\$ 39,772.24		
21	Duke Laboratory Labor	\$ 108.75	\$ 941.40	\$ -	\$ 178.20	\$ 1,850.10	\$ 178.20	\$ 2,182.50	\$ 9,927.19	\$ 7,696.13	\$ 7,772.90	\$ 1,776.10	\$ 11,792.77	\$ 44,404.24		
22	Duke MGP PM/Constr. Oversight	\$ 13,170.49	\$ 16,652.33	\$ 9,015.51	\$ 15,645.02	\$ 11,895.33	\$ 9,091.64	\$ 10,213.32	\$ 18,468.17	\$ 9,876.84	\$ 18,239.71	\$ 22,787.06	\$ 13,829.05	\$ 168,884.47		
23	WEST END TOTALS	\$ 223,086.97	\$ 1,744,519.06	\$ 2,215,419.03	\$ 2,785,381.17	\$ 3,215,889.51	\$ 1,773,935.75	\$ 2,107,096.84	\$ 2,315,142.29	\$ 1,408,775.57	\$ 2,387,032.20	\$ 1,748,987.00	\$ 3,964,432.33	\$ 25,889,697.72		
24	Grand Total	\$ 777,825.21	\$ 3,599,031.42	\$ 3,177,314.22	\$ 3,000,508.66	\$ 4,324,735.44	\$ 3,297,688.99	\$ 3,106,158.12	\$ 4,252,629.70	\$ 2,145,564.70	\$ 3,539,102.72	\$ 2,302,240.82	\$ 5,912,827.32	\$ 39,435,627.32		

Duke Energy Ohio
Per Bill Rates Based On Recovering MGP Deferral Over Five Years

	Allocation % ^(a)	Annual Allocated \$	Bills ^(a)	\$/Bill
<u>Calendar Year 2013-2019 Activity</u>				
RS/RFT/RSLL/RSPP	68.26%	\$11,633,906	4,872,985	\$2.39
GS/FT Small	7.76%	\$1,322,577	243,758	\$5.43
GS/FT Large	21.68%	\$3,695,035	98,671	\$37.45
IT	2.30%	\$392,001	1,248	\$314.10
	<u>100.00%</u>	<u>\$17,043,519</u>	<u>5,216,662</u>	
Total 2013-2019 Activity		\$85,217,594		
2013 Activity		\$8,282,890		
2014 Activity Per Schedule PAL-1		\$686,031		
2015 Activity Per Schedule PAL-1		\$1,061,056		
2016 Activity Per Schedule SEL-1		\$1,296,160		
2017 Activity Per Schedule SEL-1		\$14,651,798		
2018 Activity Per Schedule SEL-1		\$19,804,031		
2019 Activity Per Schedule SEL-1		\$39,435,627		

Notes: (a) From CMS customer count statistics for 12 months ended December 31, 2019

Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.
MGP Summary of Adjustments to Original Attachment SEL-1

Line No.	Description	Original SEL-1 2019												Total Adjustments	Adjusted SEL-1 2019
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
East End - 2019															
1	Investigation	\$ 2,337,346.77	\$ (9,969.75)	\$ 175,000.00	\$ -	\$ 6,350.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 171,380.25	\$ 2,508,727.02
2	Air Monitoring	\$ 342,248.65	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 342,248.65
3	Analytical Laboratory	\$ 344,609.85	\$ -	\$ (97,308.75)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7.44	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (97,301.31)	\$ 247,308.54
4	Contractor Support	\$ 26,583.75	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,583.75
5	Constr. Mgmt./Detailer Design	\$ 9,313,350.05	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,313,350.05
6	Vibration Monitoring	\$ 135,291.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 135,291.00
7	Miscellaneous	\$ 16,250.03	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,250.03
8	Soil Disposal/Landfill	\$ 529,556.02	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 529,556.02
9	Duke Internal Expenses	\$ 20,275.63	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (6,646.73)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (6,646.73)	\$ 13,628.90
10	Duke Laboratory Labor	\$ 42,652.45	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 42,652.45
11	Duke MGP PM/Construction Over:	\$ 370,353.19	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 370,353.19
12	EAST END TOTALS	\$ 13,478,497.39	\$ (9,969.75)	\$ 175,000.00	\$ (97,308.75)	\$ 6,350.00	\$ (6,646.73)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7.44	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 67,432.21	\$ 13,545,929.60
West End - 2019															
13	Investigation	\$ 991,249.24	\$ 9,969.75	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (6,350.00)	\$ -	\$ 331,795.49	\$ 2,584.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (8,971.50)	\$ -	\$ 329,028.74	\$ 1,320,277.98
14	Air Monitoring	\$ 421,892.25	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (42,828.00)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (42,828.00)	\$ 379,064.25
15	Security	\$ 143,553.75	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 143,553.75
16	Analytical Laboratory	\$ 294,720.62	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 210.00	\$ 7,175.00	\$ (7.44)	\$ -	\$ 7,377.56	\$ 302,098.18
17	Constr. Mgmt./Detailer Design	\$ 21,319,587.13	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 42,828.00	\$ 21,362,415.13
18	Miscellaneous	\$ (30,564.87)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (30,564.87)
19	Soil Disposal/Landfill	\$ 2,159,792.35	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,159,792.35
20	Duke Internal Expenses	\$ 39,772.24	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 39,772.24
21	Duke Laboratory Labor	\$ 44,404.24	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 44,404.24
22	Duke MGP PM/Constr. Oversight	\$ 168,884.47	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 168,884.47
23	WEST END TOTALS	\$ 25,553,291.42	\$ 9,969.75	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (6,350.00)	\$ -	\$ 331,795.49	\$ 2,584.00	\$ -	\$ 210.00	\$ 7,175.00	\$ (7.44)	\$ (8,971.50)	\$ 25,889,697.72
24	Grand Total	\$ 39,031,788.81	\$ -	\$ 175,000.00	\$ (97,308.75)	\$ -	\$ (6,646.73)	\$ 331,795.49	\$ 2,584.00	\$ -	\$ 210.00	\$ 7,175.00	\$ -	\$ (8,971.50)	\$ 39,435,627.32

Adjustments

- Anchor invoice for \$9,969.75 is a West End cost but was incorrectly accounted for as a East End cost
- EMS invoice for \$175,000 was inadvertently excluded from Attachment SEL-1 in error
- Analytical Laboratory invoices totaling \$97,308.75 should not have been included in the rider filing
- Environmental Management Specialists should have been included in investigation costs for East End, not West End
- Lab Labor totaling \$6,646.73 should not have been included in the rider filing
- Halley Aldrich invoice IN00044219 for \$331,796.49 which was inadvertently excluded from Attachment SEL-1 in error
- EMS invoice for \$2,584 was inadvertently excluded from Attachment SEL-1 in error
- Two invoices from Fox Construction totaling \$42,828 should have been included in Construction Mgmt costs not Air Monitoring costs.
- Pace Analytical Services, LLC invoice for \$210 that was inadvertently excluded from Attachment SEL-1 in error
- Pace Analytical Services, LLC invoice for \$7,175 that was inadvertently excluded from Attachment SEL-1 in error
- Pace Analytical Services, LLC invoice for \$7.44 should have been included in Analytical Lab costs for East End, not West End
- The AECOM Technical Services Inc invoice totaling \$8,971.50 was properly included in the rider, but the duplicate for the same amount should not have been included in the rider filing

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

7/7/2020 5:07:10 PM

in

Case No(s). 20-0053-GA-RDR, 20-0054-GA-ATA

Summary: Testimony Amended Testimony of Sarah E. Lawler on Behalf of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. electronically filed by Carys Cochern on behalf of Duke Energy