BEFORE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for an Increase in Natural Gas Rates.) Case No. 22-507-GA-AIR)				
In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for Approval of an Alternative Form of Regulation.) Case No. 22-508-GA-ALT				
In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for Tariff Approval.) Case No. 22-509-GA-ATA				
In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for Approval to Change Accounting Methods.) Case No. 22-510-GA-A					
DIRECT TES' SARAH E.					
ON BEH					
DUKE ENERG	Y OHIO, INC.				
Management policies, practice	es, and organization				
Operating income					
Rate Base					
Allocations					
Rate of return					
X Rates and tariffs					
X Other: Rate Case Drivers					

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND AND DRIVERS FOR REQUESTED RATE REI	JEF 3
III. ADDITIONAL RELIEF BEING SOUGHT	5
IV. DUKE ENERGY OHIO'S PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY FO	OR
PREPARATION OF ITS RATE CASE	6
V. UPDATES TO OTHER RIDER MECHANISMS	11
VI. PREVIOUSLY APPROVED ACCOUNTING DEFERRALS	12
VII. REASONABLENESS OF REQUEST	14
VIII. CONCLUSION	14

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

- 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 Vice President,
- Rates and Regulatory Strategy, for Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., (Duke Energy Ohio or
- 7 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 BRIEFLY DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATION AND
- 11 **PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.**
- 12 A. I earned a Bachelor of Science in Accountancy from Miami University, Oxford,
- Ohio, 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
- progressed to a senior audit associate. In August 1997, I moved to Kendle
- International Inc., where I held various positions in the accounting department,
- 17 ultimately being promoted to Corporate Controller. In August 2003, I began
- working for Cinergy Corp., the parent of Duke Energy Ohio, as External Reporting
- Manager, where I was responsible for the Company's Securities & Exchange
- Commission filings. In August 2005, I moved into the role of Manager, Budgets &
- Forecasts. In June 2006, following the merger between Cinergy Corp. and Duke
- Energy, I became Manager, Financial Forecasting. In February 2015, I was

1		promoted to Utility Strategy Director, Midwest, where I was responsible for the
2		preparation of business plans and other internal managerial reporting for Duke
3		Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky. In December 2017, I assumed the role of
4		Director, Rates and Regulatory Planning where I was responsible for the
5		preparation of financial and accounting data used in Duke Energy Ohio and Duke
6		Energy Kentucky retail rate filings and changes in various other rate recovery
7		mechanisms. In May 2020, I was promoted to my current role of Vice President,
8		Rates and Regulatory Strategy where I am responsible for all state and federal
9		regulatory rate matters involving Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky.
10	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES AS VICE PRESIDENT
11		OF RATES AND REGULATORY STRATEGY FOR OHIO AND
12		KENTUCKY.
13	A.	As Vice President of Rates and Regulatory Strategy for Ohio and Kentucky, I am
14		responsible for all state and federal rate matters involving Duke Energy Ohio and
15		its subsidiary, Duke Energy Kentucky.
16	Q.	HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THE PUBLIC
17		UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO?
18	A.	Yes. I have previously testified in a number of cases before the Public Utilities
19		Commission of Ohio (Commission) and other regulatory commissions.
20	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THESE
21		PROCEEDINGS?
22	A.	On behalf of Duke Energy Ohio, I provide some of the background for its request
23		to increase natural gas base revenues and the drivers for Duke Energy Ohio's

1		current revenue deficiency. I also support the reasonableness of this request, as well
2		as the Company's proposed changes to existing riders. I support the request to
3		continue the accounting treatment associated with the Company's previously
4		approved deferral mechanisms. Finally, I summarize the process and methodology
5		for preparing the case.
	II.	BACKGROUND AND DRIVERS FOR REQUESTED RATE RELIEF
6	0	WHEN DID THE COMMISSION ADDROVE DITTE ENERGY OFFICE
6	Q.	WHEN DID THE COMMISSION APPROVE DUKE ENERGY OHIO'S
7	Ų.	CURRENT NATURAL GAS BASE RATES?
	Q. A.	
7	_	CURRENT NATURAL GAS BASE RATES?
7 8	_	CURRENT NATURAL GAS BASE RATES? The Company's current natural gas base rates were approved by the Commission's
7 8 9	_	CURRENT NATURAL GAS BASE RATES? The Company's current natural gas base rates were approved by the Commission's approval of a stipulation on November 13, 2013, in Case No. 12-1685-GA-AIR, et
7 8 9 10	_	CURRENT NATURAL GAS BASE RATES? The Company's current natural gas base rates were approved by the Commission's approval of a stipulation on November 13, 2013, in Case No. 12-1685-GA-AIR, <i>et al.</i> The test period in that proceeding was the twelve months ending December 31,

13 Q. WHY IS DUKE ENERGY OHIO FILING AN NATURAL GAS BASE RATE

CASE AT THIS TIME?

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

A. In Case No. 19-791-GA-ALT, the Commission approved a stipulation wherein the parties agreed that the Company would file a natural gas base rate application on or before June 30, 2022. The Company's Application in this case requests an increase in overall natural gas base revenues of approximately \$49 million, because the Company's current earned return on its investment in the natural gas delivery system is not providing fair and reasonable compensation to its investors.

¹ See In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for Approval of an Alternative Form of Regulation to Establish a Capital Expenditure Program Rider Mechanism, Case No. 19-791-GA-ALT, Opinion and Order, pg. 18-19 (April 21, 2021).

Further, the Company's present natural gas base rates are no longer
sufficient to enable the Company to furnish adequate, efficient, safe, reliable and
reasonable service while also earning a fair rate of return on investments. Duke
Energy Ohio's natural gas operations are projected to earn a 5.32 percent overall
return on rate base for the twelve-month test period ending December 31, 2022,
which is well below the 7.73 percent return found reasonable by the Commission
and approved in the Company's last natural gas base rate case and is also well below
the 7.33 percent return being requested in these proceedings.

Duke Energy Ohio's higher revenue requirement in these proceedings is driven primarily by the Company's significant investments since its last natural gas base rate case in 2012. Since March 31, 2012, the date certain in the prior natural gas rate case, Duke Energy Ohio has invested approximately \$1.4 billion in capital additions and improvements to provide safe and reliable natural gas distribution service to its customers. These investments have driven the Company's rate base to grow by over \$1 billion since the time of that last case.

Due to Company's diligent focus on controlling costs and reduction in Operating and Maintenance (O&M) expense since its last natural gas base rate case, and notwithstanding inflationary pressures, the Company seeks only a modest increase of approximately one million dollars to the overall revenue requirement.

Duke Energy Ohio witness Amy B. Spiller provides additional testimony regarding the drivers of the Company's filing.

III. ADDITIONAL RELIEF BEING SOUGHT

1	Q.	WHAT RATE RELIEF IS DUKE ENERGY OHIO REQUESTING IN
2		THESE PROCEEDINGS?
3	A.	The Company is requesting approval:
4		• To increase natural gas base rates by \$48.8 million;
5		• To roll the capital expenditure program (Rider CEP) revenue requirements
6		into base rates and reset the baseline to the amounts included in base rates,
7		adjust the caps on the rider, and revise the rate design on Rate IT to a
8		volumetric charge (as opposed to a per month charge). Duke Energy Ohio
9		witness Jay P. Brown will discuss these requests in more detail in his direct
10		testimony;
11		• To roll current rates under its accelerated main replacement program (Rider
12		AMRP) into base rates and terminate the rider, which Duke Energy Ohio
13		witness Jay P. Brown will discuss in his direct testimony;
14		• To amortize previously deferred costs, which Duke Energy Ohio witness
15		Jay P. Brown will discuss in his direct testimony;
16		• To recover the costs of offering a fee-free payment option for residential
17		customers who wish to pay their Duke Energy Ohio bill with a credit card,
18		debit card, pre-paid card, or electronic check. Duke Energy Ohio witness
19		Jacob S. Colley discusses this proposal in his testimony;
20		Of miscellaneous tariff changes, which Duke Energy Ohio witness Jeff L.
21		Kern will discuss in his direct testimony;
22		Of new proposed depreciation rates, which Duke Energy Ohio witness John

J. Spanos will discuss in his direct testimony;

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

A.

- To recover an existing natural gas distribution regulatory asset for integrity
 management costs based on accounting deferrals that were previously
 authorized by the Commission in Case No. 16-387-GA-AAM, to
 discontinue the deferral of those costs, and instead to include those ongoing
 annual costs in base rates; and
- To continue the accounting treatment associated with the Company's previously approved deferral mechanisms.

IV. <u>DUKE ENERGY OHIO'S PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY FOR</u> <u>PREPARATION OF ITS RATE CASE</u>

9 O. WHAT IS THE OVERALL GOAL OF THE RATEMAKING PROCESS?

The overall goal of the ratemaking process is to give the regulated utility the opportunity to recover all of its prudently incurred operating expenses and to earn a fair return on its capital invested in the business. The Ohio Revised Code succinctly recognizes traditional ratemaking. In particular, as I understand based upon my experience, R.C. 4905.22 states that all charges for service shall be just and reasonable and not more than allowed by law or by order of the Commission. Again, based upon my experience and training, that is precisely the objective of the normal ratemaking process, and such a goal is achieved by charging rates that fairly assign the costs of service to the customers in a manner that, as practicably as possible, reflects the costs of serving those customers.

Q. HOW DOES DUKE ENERGY OHIO PREPARE A NATURAL GAS BASE

2 RATE CASE?

1

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

A.

3 A. The lengthy and often complicated natural gas base rate case preparation process 4 essentially consists of three primary steps: (1) determine the annual revenue 5 requirement; (2) develop a cost-of-service study that assigns and allocates the 6 revenue requirement to each retail rate schedule based on the applicable cost to 7 serve; and (3) design the retail rates and rate schedules to yield the necessary 8 revenue requirement. In addition, the filing of a base rate case provides an 9 opportunity to review existing tariffs to see if there are needed changes, and to 10 propose additional regulatory mechanisms that may be appropriate in the current 11 regulatory environment.

Q. PLEASE GIVE AN OVERVIEW OF THE REVENUE REQUIREMENT

DETERMINATION PROCESS EMPLOYED BY DUKE ENERGY OHIO

14 FOR ITS NATURAL GAS BUSINESS.

Duke Energy Ohio's revenue requirement process focuses on determining: (1) the current level of capital invested by the Company for the purpose of providing safe and reliable natural gas delivery service; (2) the appropriate capital structure and cost of capital needed to compensate investors for financing the investment needed to provide natural gas delivery service; and (3) the ongoing "normalized" level of annual expenses related to operating and maintaining the natural gas delivery system. Duke Energy Ohio witness Jay P. Brown supports the determination of Duke Energy Ohio's jurisdictional revenue requirement in his direct testimony.

1	Q.	PLEASE GIVE AN OVERVIEW OF THE RETAIL COST-OF-SERVICE
2		STUDY PROCESS EMPLOYED BY DUKE ENERGY OHIO FOR ITS
3		NATURAL GAS BUSINESS.
4	A.	The cost-of-service study assigns each component of the revenue requirement
5		formula to the various retail rate classes. The components are directly assigned, or
6		allocated, based on operational and/or accounting data, with the objective being to
7		allocate costs to customers in a manner that reflects the costs the Company incurs
8		to serve them. Duke Energy Ohio witness James E. Ziolkowski discusses Duke
9		Energy Ohio's cost-of-service study and the Company's proposal to address
10		existing subsidies and excesses among rate classes in his direct testimony.
11	Q.	WHAT ARE THE OBJECTIVES OF THE RATE DESIGN PROCESS?
12	A.	The primary objectives of the rate design process are to develop rates that: (1)
13		provide the utility with the opportunity to recover its annual revenue requirement;
14		and (2) distribute the revenue recovery among customers within each retail rate
15		schedule in a manner that is consistent with the cost of providing those customers
16		with natural gas delivery service. Mr. Jeff L. Kern supports Duke Energy Ohio's
17		proposed rate design in his direct testimony.
18	Q.	WHAT IS DUKE ENERGY OHIO'S REQUEST REGARDING THE
19		ESTABLISHMENT OF A CAPITAL STRUCTURE IN THESE
20		PROCEEDINGS?
21	A.	Duke Energy Ohio is recommending using the standalone Duke Energy Ohio
22		operating company's capital structure for setting rates. Duke Energy Ohio witness
23		Christopher R. Bauer sponsors Duke Energy Ohio's capital structure as of the date

- 1 certain in this case, March 31, 2022, in his direct testimony.
- 2 Q. WHY IS THE COMPANY RECOMMENDING USING DUKE ENERGY
- 3 OHIO'S STANDALONE CAPITAL STRUCTURE FOR ESTABLISHING
- 4 RATES IN THESE PROCEEDINGS?
- 5 A. In addition to the long-standing precedent in Ohio to use the operating company's 6 capital structure rather than the capital structure of the operating company's parent, 7 Duke Energy Ohio believes its Duke Energy Ohio's standalone capital structure is the 8 appropriate capital structure to use as the basis for setting Duke Energy Ohio's natural 9 gas base rates. The use of an alternative capitalization, such as Duke Energy Ohio's 10 consolidated capital structure, would cause the rates in these proceedings to be 11 impacted by a number of factors unrelated to Duke Energy Ohio's natural gas delivery 12 operations. For instance, Duke Energy's consolidated capitalization and its cost of 13 capital reflect the practices of and events in its regulated operations in other states, as 14 well as its non-regulated operations. Duke Energy Ohio continues to believe that, for 15 purposes of establishing retail rates, it is appropriate to use the Duke Energy Ohio 16 standalone capital structure rather than a capital structure influenced by affiliates that 17 are not regulated by the Commission.
- 18 Q. IS THE COMPANY MAKING ANY ADJUSTMENTS TO ITS CAPITAL
 19 STRUCTURE FOR RATE SETTING PURPOSES?
- 20 A. Yes. As described in the direct testimony of Duke Energy Ohio witness Bryan T.

 21 Manges, Duke Energy Ohio's capital structure, as of March 31, 2022, has been

 22 adjusted to eliminate any remaining purchase accounting impacts associated with

1		the Duke Energy/Cinergy Corp. merger ² and to eliminate the impact of formerly
2		owning generating assets transferred to Duke Energy Ohio from Duke Energy
3		North America.
4	Q.	AFTER ADJUSTING THE ACTUAL CAPITAL STRUCTURE TO
5		ELIMINATE THE IMPACTS OF PURCHASE ACCOUNTING AND OF
6		FORMERLY OWNING TRANSFERRED GENERATING ASSETS, WHAT
7		IS THE CAPITALIZATION OF DUKE ENERGY OHIO FOR PURPOSES
8		OF THESE PROCEEDINGS?
9	A.	Duke Energy Ohio's capital structure on March 31, 2022, as adjusted, is
10		approximately 47.66 percent debt and 52.34 percent common equity. This is shown
11		on Schedule D-1A.
12		It should be noted that the equity ratio underlying the Company's requested
13		revenue requirement is well above the minimum established by the Federal Energy
14		Regulatory Commission (FERC) and this Commission. The FERC and this
15		Commission imposed a minimum limit on the equity ratio of 30 percent. The limit
16		reflects the FERC orders that approved the Duke Energy/Cinergy merger ³ and the
17		Commission orders that approved an accounting modification to address the impact
18		of required accounting treatment for the purchase accounting associated with the
19		Duke Energy/Cinergy merger from 2006. ⁴

.

² In the Matter of the Joint Application of Cinergy Corp., on Behalf of The Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company, and Duke Energy Holding Corp. for Consent and Approval of a Change of Control of The Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company, Case No. 05-732-EL-MER, et al., Finding and Order (December 21, 2005).

³ The Cincinnati Gas and Electric Company d/b/a Duke Energy Ohio and The Union Light, Heat and Power Company, d/b/a Duke Energy Kentucky, FERC Order, EL06-66-000.

⁴ In the Matter of Duke Energy Ohio's Application for Change in Accounting Methods, Case No. 09-620-GE-AAM and In the Matter of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.'s Application to Change Accounting Methods, Case No. 11-5985-GE-AAM.

V. <u>UPDATES TO RIDER MECHANISMS</u>

1	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN THE CHANGES NECESSARY TO THE COMPANY'S
2		RIDER CEP.
3	A.	The Company is proposing to reset the baseline used to calculate the rider revenue
4		requirements in Rider CEP and to reset the caps on the rider. In his direct testimony,
5		Mr. Brown explains these proposals in detail.
6	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN THE CHANGES NECESSARY TO THE COMPANY'S
7		RIDER AMRP.
8	A.	Upon implementation of new base rates in these proceedings, Rider AMRP will be
9		reset to zero and the rider will be terminated.
10	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN THE CHANGES NECESSARY TO THE COMPANY'S
11		GAS TAX CUTS AND JOBS ACT RIDER (RIDER GTCJA).
12	A.	There will be no changes to Rider GTCJA. It will continue to credit customers for
13		the amortization of excess deferred income taxes (EDIT). Although the Company
14		has included EDIT as an offset to rate base in these proceedings, the amortization
15		of those EDITs will continue in Rider GTCJA and has not been reflected in base
16		rates in these proceedings.
17	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN THE CHANGES THE COMPANY IS PROPOSING TO
18		ITS UNCOLLECTIBLE RIDER.
19	A.	As outlined in Mr. Colley's testimony, the Company is proposing to recover,
20		through its existing uncollectible rider, the costs of offering a fee-free payment
21		option for residential customers who wish to pay their Duke Energy Ohio bill with
22		a credit card, debit card, pre-paid card or electronic check. The Company would

1 include these costs in its next uncollectible rider filing.

VI. PREVIOUSLY APPROVED ACCOUNTING DEFERRALS

2	O.	WILL	YOU	SUMMARIZE	\mathbf{THE}	ACCOUNTING	DEFERRALS	FOR
_	~•	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	100		1 111			101

3 WHICH DUKE ENERGY OHIO IS SEEKING BASE RATE RECOVERY

4 IN THIS CASE?

17

5 A. Yes. The Company has established as a regulatory asset, an accounting deferral for 6 integrity management costs as approved by the Commission in Case No. 16-387-GA-AAM,⁵ as well as an accounting deferral for infrastructure and information 7 technology costs approved by the Commission in Case No. 19-791-GA-ALT,⁶ 8 9 pending approval in Case No. 21-618-GA-RDR, and the costs deferred through the 10 first three months of 2022. The Company has established as a regulatory asset, an 11 accounting deferral for its Smartgrid and Rider AMRP costs, as previously 12 approved by the Commission in Case Nos. 07-589-GA-AIR and 01-1228-GA-AIR, respectively. The Company has established as a regulatory asset, an accounting 13 14 deferral for smart grid investments, pursuant to the stipulation approved by the Commission in Case No. 19-664-GA-RDR.⁸ In addition, the Company has also 15 16 established deferral accounts for the decommissioning of its propane facilities and

its customer information system. Mr. Brown discusses these regulatory assets and

⁵ See generally, In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for Approval to Change Accounting Methods Associated With Its Integrity Management Program, Case No. 16-387-GA-AAM, Opinion and Order (January 4, 2017).

⁶ See generally In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for Approval of an Alternative Form of Regulation to Establish a Capital Expenditure Program Rider Mechanism, Case No. 19-791-GA-ALT, Opinion and Order, pg. 18-19 (April 21, 2021).

⁷ See In re Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., Case No. 07-589-GA-AIR, et al., Opinion and Order (May 28, 2008) (approving stipulation that included deployment plan for smart grid system).

⁸ See generally In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. to Adjust Rider AU for 2018 Grid Modernization Costs, Case No. 19-664-GA-RDR, Finding and Order (February 10, 2021).

1		the requested recovery in more detail in his direct testimony. The Company is
2		requesting authority to recover these costs in base rates in these proceedings. Duke
3		Energy Ohio is also seeking deferral of its rate case expenses associated with this
4		case, as well as authority to include amortization of this expense in base rates.
5	Q.	HOW IS THE COMPANY RECOMMENDING THESE DEFERRALS BE
6		RECOVERED IN THIS RATE CASE?
7	A.	Traditional ratemaking involves amortizing the balance of a regulatory asset over a
8		period of time that is fair and reasonable to the customer and the shareholder. In
9		this case, Duke Energy Ohio is recommending an amortization of these regulatory
10		assets over various appropriate amortization periods as explained in Mr. Brown's
11		direct testimony.
12	Q.	IS THE COMPANY REQUESTING ANY OTHER AUTHORITY AS IT
13		RELATES TO ACCOUNTING TREATMENT OF DEFERRALS?
14	A.	Although approved in previous proceedings, the Company is requesting continued
15		authority of all appropriate accounting treatment associated with the Company's
16		existing deferral mechanisms and any accounting treatment necessary to continue
17		certain riders and implement new riders.

VII. <u>REASONABLENESS OF REQUEST</u>

1	Q.	WOULD YOU SUMMARIZE THE MAGNITUDE OF THE INCREASES
2		CUSTOMERS ARE LIKELY TO SEE IF THE COMMISSION APPROVES
3		THE COMPANY'S REQUESTS IN THIS APPLICATION?
4	A.	Yes. As shown in Schedule E-5, sponsored by Mr. Kern, most customers will see
5		only modest increases in their utility bills as result of this case. Although the
6		increase being requested results in a 9.8% increase in natural gas distribution
7		revenues as shown in Schedule E-4, it only represents a 5.6% increase in total
8		natural gas revenues as shown on Attachment JLK-1 to Mr. Kern's testimony.
		VIII. <u>CONCLUSION</u>
9	Q.	HAVE YOU REVIEWED DUKE ENERGY OHIO'S APPLICATION IN
10		THESE PROCEEDINGS?
11	A.	Yes. I have also reviewed the testimony and exhibits of all Company witnesses. I
12		believe that the Company's total natural gas revenue requirement is properly
13		computed, the costs of service are properly allocated to customer classes, and the
14		rate design is equitable.
15	Q.	DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION REGARDING WHETHER DUKE ENERGY
16		OHIO'S RATE REQUEST IS REASONABLE?
17	A.	Yes.
18	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR OPINION.
19	A.	Duke Energy Ohio's rate request is fair and reasonable. The date certain in Duke
20		Energy Ohio's last rate case was March 31, 2012, and the date certain for this case
21		is March 31, 2022. Despite ten years of inflationary pressures, Duke Energy Ohio

- is requesting an overall increase in rates that will result in only a 5.6 percent increase in total natural gas rates. Through aggressive cost management practices, the Company has been able to make significant investments in its natural gas delivery system to provide customers with safe reliable service and hold its increase requested to a reasonable level.
- 6 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR PRE-FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY?
- 7 A. Yes.

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

7/14/2022 9:31:21 AM

in

Case No(s). 22-0507-GA-AIR, 22-0508-GA-ALT, 22-0509-GA-ATA, 22-0510-GA-AAM

Summary: Testimony Direct Testimony of Sarah E. Lawler on Behalf of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. electronically filed by Mrs. Tammy M. Meyer on behalf of Duke Energy Ohio Inc. and D'Ascenzo, Rocco and Kingery, Jeanne W. and Akhbari, Elyse Hanson and Vaysman, Larisa and Elizabeth M. Brama