

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application)	
of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for)	Case No. 21-887-EL-AIR
an Increase in Electric)	
Distribution Rates.)	
)	
In the Matter of the Application)	
of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for)	Case No. 21-888-EL-ATA
Tariff Approval.)	
)	
In the Matter of the Application)	
of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for)	Case No. 21-889-EL-AAM
Approval to Change)	
Accounting Methods.)	

**REPLY BRIEF
SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE
STAFF OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

Dave Yost (0056290)
Attorney General

John H. Jones (0051913)
Section Chief

Robert Eubanks (0073386)
(Counsel of Record)
Assistant Attorney General
30 E. Broad St., 26th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
Tel.: 614.466.4395
Fax: 614.644.8764
Robert.Eubanks@OhioAGO.gov

**On Behalf of the Public Utilities
Commission of Ohio**

November 14, 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

I.	THE STIPULATION REFLECTS A DIVERSITY OF NEGOTIATED INTEREST	2
II.	ROE AND CAPITAL STRUCTURE ARE JUST AND REASONABLE	2
III.	THE BASE RATE INCREASE IS GRADUAL, JUST, AND REASONABLE FOR CONSUMERS	3
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	6

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application)	
of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for)	Case No. 21-887-EL-AIR
an Increase in Electric)	
Distribution Rates.)	
)	
In the Matter of the Application)	
of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for)	Case No. 21-888-EL-ATA
Tariff Approval.)	
)	
In the Matter of the Application)	
of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for)	Case No. 21-889-EL-AAM
Approval to Change)	
Accounting Methods.)	

**REPLY BRIEF
SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE
STAFF OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

After reviewing the arguments is Ohio Consumers Counsels' (OCC's) Brief, Staff remains convinced that the Stipulation should be approved by the Commission for all the reasons stated in Staff's Initial Brief. In addition, Staff addresses herein three additional issues raised in OCC's Initial Brief. Specifically, Staff asserts the following: 1) the Stipulation reflects a diversity of negotiated interests; 2) the ROE and capital structure used for Duke are just and reasonable; and 3) the base rate increase resulting from the stipulation is gradual, just, and reasonable.

I. THE STIPULATION REFLECTS A DIVERSITY OF NEGOTIATED INTEREST

Staff considers all regulatory interest when participating in settlement negotiations before the Commission and balances those interest before entering into a Stipulation. Further, Staff receives no benefits for signing a stipulation. Accordingly, OCC assertions that the Stipulation involves signatory parties with limited interest who only signed the stipulation to receive benefits specific to them ignores the fact the Staff is a signatory party.

OCC's arguments also ignore the fact that even if this Stipulation included OCC's signature it would not cure the concerns of which OCC complains. OCC would have been just another signatory party with limited interest seeking benefits in the stipulation specific to its constituency.

Yet, whether it is OCC or other parties seeking benefits in a stipulation specific to their own interest, it is okay and expected given that the stipulation requirement for serious bargain amongst parties demands this type of give and take.

II. ROE AND CAPITAL STRUCTURE ARE JUST AND REASONABLE

Contrary to OCC's protestations to the contrary, the Stipulation's ROE and capital structure is in keeping with the regulatory principle that consumers should pay just and reasonable rates.

The ROE range recommended in the Staff Report is just and reasonable. According to an S&P Global Market Intelligence report, the average authorized return on equity for domestic electric utilities in rate cases decided in the first six

months of 2022 was 9.39 percent.¹ The midpoint of Staff's recommended rate of return range is based on a cost of equity of 9.35 percent, which when compared with the national average is fair and reasonable.² Accordingly, in keeping with R.C. 4909.15(A)(2), the ROE range (9.35 +/- 0.5) recommended in the Staff Report is just and reasonable.³

When calculating its recommended ROE, Staff used the actual capital structure of Duke Ohio because it represents a fair and balanced capital structure that is not outside a reasonable range from peer utility companies.⁴ Staff prefers to utilize a utility's actual capital structure as long as it is within a reasonable range compared to industry peers and produces a fair and reasonable result.⁵ Staff determined that Duke Ohio's actual capital structure in this case produces a fair and reasonable result, which is why Staff adopted it.⁶

The Stipulation's ROE falls within the ROE range recommended in the Staff Report. Thus, by extension, the stipulated ROE of 9.5 is just and reasonable.

III. THE BASE RATE INCREASE IS GRADUAL, JUST, AND REASONABLE FOR CONSUMERS

Considering the rate of return, allocation increase in total revenues, and average bill increase for residential customers that results from the stipulation, the base rate increase for residential customer is gradual, just, and reasonable. First, the residential

¹ James G. Zell's Testimony in Response to Objections to the Staff Report, p. 3.

² *Id.*

³ *Id.* at p. 4.

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *Id.*

class is currently being subsidized. Currently the residential class has a rate of return of 3.08% while the average is 5.18%.⁷ And the residential class will still be subsidized after moving to a 64% allocation of total revenues.⁸ Second, the movement to 64% is less than a 2% allocation increase in total revenues for the residential class.⁹ Third, the allocation of 64% of total revenues for the residential class “results in an overall average increase to residential customers of approximately 2.5 percent.”¹⁰

⁷ Staff Report, p. 27 (Table 1).

⁸ Sarah Lawler’s second supplemental testimony, p. 19.

⁹ Staff Report, p.28 (Table 2); and OCC’s Brief, p.22 (table 1) - The residential class is currently paying over 62% of the total Company revenues.

¹⁰ Sarah Lawler’s second supplemental testimony, p. 19.

Respectfully submitted,

Dave Yost (0056290)
Attorney General

John H. Jones (0051913)
Section Chief

/s/ Robert Eubanks

Robert Eubanks (0073386)
(Counsel of Record)
Assistant Attorney General
30 E. Broad St., 26th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
Tel.: 614.466.4395
Fax: 614.644.8764
Robert.Eubanks@OhioAGO.gov

**On Behalf of the Public Utilities
Commission of Ohio**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing **Reply Brief** has been served upon the following parties this 14th day of November 2022.

/s/ Robert Eubanks

Robert Eubanks
Assistant Attorney General

SERVICE LIST

Rocco.D'Ascenzo@duke-energy.com	khernstein@bricker.com ;
Elyse.Akhbari@duke-energy.com	ktreadway@oneenergylc.com ;
Jeanne.Kingery@duke-energy.com	jdunn@oneenergylc.com ;
Angela.O'Brien@occ.ohio.gov ;	dromig@nationwideenergypartners.com ;
Ambrosia.Wilson@occ.ohio.gov ;	DBorchers@bricker.com
mkurtz@BKLlawfirm.com ;	dparram@bricker.com
kboehm@BKLlawfirm.com ;	KRuffin@bricker.com
jkylercohn@bkllawfirm.com	jang@calfee.com
michael.nugent@igs.com ;	GWhaling@calfee.com
evan.betterton@igs.com ;	bojko@CarpenterLipps.com
stacie.cathcart@igs.com ;	sfranson@calfee.com ;
mwarnock@bricker.com ;	fdarr2019@gmail.com
CPirik@dickinson-wright.com	trent@hubaydougherty.com
TODonnell@dickinson-wright.com	paul@CarpenterLipps.com
dwilliamson@spilmanlaw.com	RDove@keglerbrown.com
alex.kronauer@walmart.com	Larisa.Vaysman@duke-energy.com
MMcDonnell@dickinson-wright.com	cgrundmann@spilmanlaw.com
wygonski@CarpenterLipps.com	

Attorney Examiners:

Matthew.Sandor@puco.ohio.gov
Nicholas.Walstra@puco.ohio.gov

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities
Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

11/14/2022 4:37:13 PM

in

Case No(s). 21-0887-EL-AIR, 21-0888-EL-ATA, 21-0889-EL-AAM

Summary: Reply REPLY BRIEF SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE STAFF OF
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO electronically filed by Mr. Shaun P
Lyons on behalf of PUCO