

Name of Respondent	This Report is:	Date of Report	Year/Period of Report
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.	(1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	(Mo, Da, Yr) / /	2011/Q4
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

Duke Energy Carolinas V.C. Summer Nuclear Station Letter of Intent.

In July 2011, Duke Energy Carolinas signed a letter of intent with Santee Cooper related to the potential acquisition by Duke Energy Carolinas of a five percent to ten percent ownership interest in the V.C. Summer Nuclear Station being developed by Santee Cooper and SCE&G near Jenkinsville, South Carolina. The letter of intent provides a path for Duke Energy Carolinas to conduct the necessary due diligence to determine if future participation in this project is beneficial for its customers.

Duke Energy Carolinas Cliffside Unit 6.

On March 21, 2007, the NCUC issued an order allowing Duke Energy Carolinas to build an 800 MW coal-fired unit. Following final equipment selection and the completion of detailed engineering, Cliffside Unit 6 is expected to have a net output of 825 MW. On January 31, 2008, Duke Energy Carolinas filed its updated cost estimate of \$1.8 billion (excluding AFUDC of \$600 million) for the approved new Cliffside Unit 6. In March 2010, Duke Energy Carolinas filed an update to the cost estimate of \$1.8 billion (excluding AFUDC) with the NCUC where it reduced the estimated AFUDC financing costs to \$400 million as a result of the December 2009 rate case settlement with the NCUC that allowed the inclusion of construction work in progress in rate base prospectively. Duke Energy Carolinas believes that the overall cost of Cliffside Unit 6 will be reduced by \$125 million in federal advanced clean coal tax credits, as discussed in Note 5. Cliffside Unit 6 is expected to begin operation by the end of 2012. Also, see Note 5 for information related to the Cliffside Unit 6 air permit.

Duke Energy Carolinas Dan River and Buck Combined Cycle Facilities.

In June 2008, the NCUC issued its order approving the Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) applications to construct a 620 MW combined cycle natural gas fired generating facility at each of Duke Energy Carolinas' existing Dan River Steam Station and Buck Steam Station. The Division of Air Quality (DAQ) issued a final air permit authorizing construction of the Buck and Dan River combined cycle natural gas-fired generating units in October 2008 and August 2009, respectively.

In November 2011, Duke Energy Carolinas placed its 620 MW Buck combined cycle natural gas-fired generation facility in service. This is the first of Duke Energy's key modernization projects to be commissioned. The Dan River project is expected to begin operation by the end of 2012. Based on the most updated cost estimates, total costs (including AFUDC) for the Buck and Dan River projects are \$700 million and \$716 million, respectively.

Duke Energy Indiana Edwardsport IGCC Plant.

On September 7, 2006, Duke Energy Indiana and Southern Indiana Gas and Electric Company d/b/a Vectren Energy Delivery of Indiana (Vectren) filed a joint petition with the IURC seeking a CPCN for the construction of a 618 MW IGCC power plant at Duke Energy Indiana's Edwardsport Generating Station in Knox County, Indiana. The facility was initially estimated to cost approximately \$1.985 billion (including \$120 million of AFUDC). In August 2007, Vectren formally withdrew its participation in the IGCC plant and a hearing was conducted on the CPCN petition based on Duke Energy Indiana owning 100% of the project. On November 20, 2007, the IURC issued an order granting Duke Energy Indiana a CPCN for the proposed IGCC project, approved the cost estimate of \$1.985 billion and approved the timely recovery of costs related to the project. On January 25, 2008, Duke Energy Indiana received the final air permit from the Indiana Department of Environmental Management. The Citizens Action Coalition of Indiana, Inc. (CAC), Sierra Club, Inc., Save the Valley, Inc., and Valley Watch, Inc., all intervenors in the CPCN proceeding, have appealed the air permit.

Name of Respondent	This Report is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report 2011/Q4
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.			
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

On May 1, 2008, Duke Energy Indiana filed its first semi-annual IGCC rider and ongoing review proceeding with the IURC as required under the CPCN order issued by the IURC. In its filing, Duke Energy Indiana requested approval of a new cost estimate for the IGCC project of \$2.35 billion (including \$125 million of AFUDC) and for approval of plans to study carbon capture as required by the IURC's CPCN order. On January 7, 2009, the IURC approved Duke Energy Indiana's request, including the new cost estimate of \$2.35 billion, and cost recovery associated with a study on carbon capture. On November 3, 2008 and May 1, 2009, Duke Energy Indiana filed its second and third semi-annual IGCC riders, respectively, both of which were approved by the IURC in full.

On November 24, 2009, Duke Energy Indiana filed a petition for its fourth semi-annual IGCC rider and ongoing review proceeding with the IURC. As Duke Energy Indiana experienced design modifications, quantity increases and scope growth above what was anticipated from the preliminary engineering design, capital costs to the IGCC project were anticipated to increase. Duke Energy Indiana forecasted that the additional capital cost items would use the remaining contingency and escalation amounts in the current \$2.35 billion cost estimate and add \$150 million, excluding the impact associated with the need to add more contingency. Duke Energy Indiana did not request approval of an increased cost estimate in the fourth semi-annual update proceeding; rather, Duke Energy Indiana requested, and the IURC approved, a subdocket proceeding in which Duke Energy Indiana would present additional evidence regarding an updated estimated cost for the IGCC project and in which a more comprehensive review of the IGCC project could occur. The evidentiary hearing for the fourth semi-annual update proceeding was held April 6, 2010, and an interim order was received on July 28, 2010. The order approves the implementation of an updated IGCC rider to recover costs incurred through September 30, 2009, effective immediately. The approvals are on an interim basis pending the outcome of the sub-docket proceeding involving the revised cost estimate as discussed further below.

On April 16, 2010, Duke Energy Indiana filed a revised cost estimate for the IGCC project reflecting an estimated cost increase of \$530 million. Duke Energy Indiana requested approval of the revised cost estimate of \$2.88 billion (including \$160 million of AFUDC), and for continuation of the existing cost recovery treatment. A major driver of the cost increase included quantity increases and design changes, which impacted the scope, productivity and schedule of the IGCC project. On September 17, 2010, an agreement was reached with the OUCC, Duke Energy Indiana Industrial Group and Nucor Steel — Indiana to increase the authorized cost estimate of \$2.35 billion to \$2.76 billion, and to cap the project's costs that could be passed on to customers at \$2.975 billion. Any construction cost amounts above \$2.76 billion would be subject to a prudence review similar to most other rate base investments in Duke Energy Indiana's next general rate increase request before the IURC. Duke Energy Indiana agreed to accept a 150 basis point reduction in the equity return for any project construction costs greater than \$2.35 billion. Additionally, Duke Energy Indiana agreed not to file for a general rate case increase before March 2012. Duke Energy Indiana also agreed to reduce depreciation rates earlier than would otherwise be required and to forego a deferred tax incentive related to the IGCC project. As a result of the settlement, Duke Energy Indiana recorded a pre-tax charge to earnings of approximately \$44 million in the third quarter of 2010 to reflect the impact of the reduction in the return on equity. The charge is recorded in Goodwill and other impairment charges on Duke Energy's Consolidated Statement of Operations. This charge is recorded in Impairment charges on Duke Energy Indiana's Consolidated Statements of Operations. Due to the IURC investigation discussed below, the IURC convened a technical conference on November 3, 2010 related to the continuing need for the Edwardsport IGCC facility. On December 9, 2010, the parties to the settlement withdrew the settlement agreement to provide an opportunity to assess whether and to what extent the settlement agreement remained a reasonable allocation of risks and rewards and whether modifications to the settlement agreement were appropriate. Management determined that the approximate \$44 million charge discussed above was not impacted by the withdrawal of the settlement agreement.

Name of Respondent	This Report is:	Date of Report	Year/Period of Report
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.	(1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	(Mo, Da, Yr) / /	2011/Q4
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

During 2010, Duke Energy Indiana filed petitions for its fifth and sixth semi-annual IGCC riders. Evidentiary hearings are set for April 24, 2012 and April 25, 2012, respectively.

The CAC, Sierra Club, Inc., Save the Valley, Inc., and Valley Watch, Inc. filed motions for two subdocket proceedings alleging improper communications, undue influence, fraud, concealment and gross mismanagement, and a request for field hearing in this proceeding. Duke Energy Indiana opposed the requests. On February 25, 2011, the IURC issued an order which denied the request for a subdocket to investigate the allegations of improper communications and undue influence at this time, finding there were other agencies better suited for such investigation. The IURC also found that allegations of fraud, concealment and gross mismanagement related to the IGCC project should be heard in a Phase II proceeding of the cost estimate subdocket and set evidentiary hearings on both Phase I (cost estimate increase) and Phase II beginning in August 2011. After procedural delays, hearings began on Phase I on October 26, 2011 and on Phase II on November 21, 2011.

On March 10, 2011, Duke Energy Indiana filed testimony with the IURC proposing a framework designed to mitigate customer rate impacts associated with the Edwardsport IGCC project. Duke Energy Indiana's filing proposed a cap on the project's construction costs, (excluding financing costs), which can be recovered through rates at \$2.72 billion. It also proposed rate-related adjustments that will lower the overall customer rate increase related to the project from an average of 19% to approximately 16%. The proposal is subject to the approval of the IURC in the Phase I hearings.

On November 30, 2011, Duke Energy Indiana filed a petition with the IURC in connection with its eighth semi-annual rider request for the Edwardsport IGCC project. Evidentiary hearings for the seventh and eight semi-annual rider requests are scheduled for August 6-7, 2012.

On June 27, 2011, Duke Energy Indiana filed testimony with the IURC in connection with its seventh semi-annual rider request which included an update on the current cost forecast of the Edwardsport IGCC project. The updated forecast excluding AFUDC increased from \$2.72 billion to \$2.82 billion, not including any contingency for unexpected start-up events. On June 30, 2011, the OUCC and intervenors filed testimony in Phase I recommending that Duke Energy Indiana be disallowed cost recovery of any of the additional cost estimate increase above the previously approved cost estimate of \$2.35 billion. Duke Energy Indiana filed rebuttal testimony on August 3, 2011.

In the subdocket proceeding, on July 14, 2011, the OUCC and certain intervenors filed testimony in Phase II alleging that Duke Energy Indiana concealed information and grossly mismanaged the project, and therefore Duke Energy Indiana should only be permitted to recover from customers \$1.985 billion, the original IGCC project cost estimate approved by the IURC. Other intervenors recommended that Duke Energy Indiana not be able to rely on any cost recovery granted under the CPCN or the first cost increase order. Duke Energy Indiana believes it has diligently and prudently managed the project. On September 9, 2011, Duke Energy defended against the allegations in its responsive testimony. The OUCC and intervenors filed their final rebuttal testimony in Phase II on or before October 7, 2011, making similar claims of fraud, concealment and gross mismanagement and recommending the same outcome of limiting Duke Energy Indiana's recovery to the \$1.985 billion initial cost estimate. Additionally, the CAC parties recommended that recovery be limited to the costs incurred on the IGCC project as of November 30, 2009 (Duke Energy Indiana estimates it had committed costs of \$1.6 billion), with further IURC proceedings to be held to determine the financial consequences of this recommendation.

Name of Respondent	This Report is:	Date of Report	Year/Period of Report
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.	(1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	(Mo, Da, Yr) / /	2011/Q4
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

On October 19, 2011, Duke Energy revised its project cost estimate from approximately \$2.82 billion, excluding financing costs, to approximately \$2.98 billion, excluding financing costs. The revised estimate reflects additional cost pressures resulting from quantity increases and the resulting impact on the scope, productivity and schedule of the IGCC project. Duke Energy Indiana previously proposed to the IURC a cost cap of approximately \$2.72 billion, plus the actual AFUDC that accrues on that amount. As a result, Duke Energy Indiana recorded a pre-tax impairment charge of approximately \$222 million in the third quarter of 2011 related to costs expected to be incurred above the cost cap. This charge is in addition to a pre-tax impairment charge of approximately \$44 million recorded in the third quarter of 2010 as discussed above. These charges are recorded in Goodwill and other impairment charges on Duke Energy's Consolidated Statement of Operations, and in Impairment charges on Duke Energy Indiana's Consolidated Statements of Operations. The cost cap, if approved by the IURC, limits the amount of project construction costs that may be incorporated into customer rates in Indiana. As a result of the proposed cost cap, recovery of these cost increases is not considered probable. Additional updates to the cost estimate could occur through the completion of the plant in 2012.

Phase I and Phase II hearings concluded on January 24, 2012. Final orders from the IURC on Phase I and Phase II of the subdocket and the pending IGCC rider proceedings are expected no sooner than the end of the third quarter 2012.

Duke Energy is unable to predict the ultimate outcome of these proceedings. In the event the IURC disallows a portion of the plant costs, including financing costs, or if cost estimates for the plant increase, additional charges to expense, which could be material, could occur. Construction of the Edwardsport IGCC plant is ongoing and is currently expected to be completed and placed in-service in 2012.

Duke Energy Indiana Carbon Sequestration.

Duke Energy Indiana filed a petition with the IURC requesting approval of its plans for studying carbon storage, sequestration and/or enhanced oil recovery for the carbon dioxide (CO₂) from the Edwardsport IGCC facility on March 6, 2009. On July 7, 2009, Duke Energy Indiana filed its case-in-chief testimony requesting approval for cost recovery of a \$121 million site assessment and characterization plan for CO₂ sequestration options including deep saline sequestration, depleted oil and gas sequestration and enhanced oil recovery for the CO₂ from the Edwardsport IGCC facility. The OUCC filed testimony supportive of the continuing study of carbon storage, but recommended that Duke Energy Indiana break its plan into phases, recommending approval of only \$33 million in expenditures at this time and deferral of expenditures rather than cost recovery through a tracking mechanism as proposed by Duke Energy Indiana. The CAC, an intervenor, recommended against approval of the carbon storage plan stating customers should not be required to pay for research and development costs. Duke Energy Indiana's rebuttal testimony was filed October 30, 2009, wherein it amended its request to seek deferral of \$42 million to cover the carbon storage site assessment and characterization activities scheduled to occur through the end of 2010, with further required study expenditures subject to future IURC proceedings. An evidentiary hearing was held on November 9, 2009.

Name of Respondent	This Report is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report 2011/Q4
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.			
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

Duke Energy Indiana IURC Investigation.

On October 5, 2010, the Governor of Indiana terminated the employment of the Chairman of the IURC in connection with Duke Energy Indiana's hiring of an attorney from the IURC staff. As requested by the governor, the Indiana Inspector General initiated an investigation into whether the IURC attorney violated any state ethics rules, and the IURC announced it would internally audit the Duke Energy Indiana cases dating from January 1, 2010 through September 30, 2010, on which this attorney worked while at the IURC, which includes the Indiana storm costs deferral request discussed above, as well as all Edwardsport IGCC cases dating back to 2006. Duke Energy Indiana engaged an outside law firm to conduct its own investigation regarding Duke Energy Indiana's hiring of an IURC attorney and Duke Energy Indiana's related hiring practices. On October 5, 2010, Duke Energy Indiana placed the attorney and President of Duke Energy Indiana on administrative leave. They were subsequently terminated on November 8, 2010. On December 7, 2010, the IURC released its internal audit findings concluding that the previous rulings were supported by sound, legal reasoning consistent with the Indiana Rules of Evidence and historical practice and procedures of the IURC and that the previous rulings appeared to be balanced and consistent among the parties. The audit concluded it did not reveal any bias or a resultant unfair advantage obtained by Duke Energy Indiana as a result of the evidentiary rulings of the former IURC attorney. As noted above, in the storm cost deferral case, the IURC found no conflict between the order and the staff report; however, the audit report noted the staff report offered no specific recommendation to either approve or deny the requested relief and that this was the only order that was subject to an appeal. As such, the IURC reopened that proceeding for further review and consideration of the evidence presented. The Inspector General's investigation into whether the former IURC attorney violated any state ethics rules was the subject of an Indiana Ethics Commission hearing that was held on April 14, 2011, and a final report was issued on May 14, 2011. The final report pertained only to the conduct of the former IURC attorney as Duke Energy Indiana was not a subject of the investigation.

Potential Plant Retirements.

Duke Energy Generating Facility Retirements.

Duke Energy Carolinas, Duke Energy Indiana, Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky each periodically file Integrated Resource Plans (IRP) with their state regulatory commissions. The IRPs provide a view of forecasted energy needs over a long term (15-20 years), and options being considered to meet those needs. The IRP's filed by Duke Energy Carolinas, Duke Energy Indiana, Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky in 2011 and 2010 included planning assumptions to potentially retire by 2015, certain coal-fired generating facilities in North Carolina, South Carolina, Indiana, Ohio and Kentucky that do not have the requisite emission control equipment, primarily to meet EPA regulations that are not yet effective. The table below contains, as of December 31, 2011, the net carrying value of these facilities that are in the Consolidated Balance Sheets.

Name of Respondent	This Report is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.		/ /	2011/Q4
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

	Duke Energy	Duke Energy Carolinas ^(a)	Duke Energy Ohio ^{(b)(e)}	Duke Energy Indiana ^(c)
MW	3,329	1,356	1,025	948
Remaining net book value (in millions) ^(d)	\$ 353	\$ 199	\$ 14	\$ 140
Remaining non-current regulatory asset ^(f)	\$ 73	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 73

- (a) Includes Dan River, Riverbend, Lee and Buck units 5 and 6. Duke Energy Carolinas has committed to retire 1,667 MW in conjunction with a Cliffside air permit settlement, of which 311 MW have already been retired as of December 31, 2011. See Note 5 for additional information related to the Cliffside air permit.
- (b) Includes Beckjord and Miami Fort unit 6.
- (c) Includes Wabash River units 2-6 and Gallagher units 1 and 3.
- (d) Included in Property, plant and equipment, net as of December 31, 2011, on the Consolidated Balance Sheets.
- (e) Beckjord has no remaining net book value — See Note 12 for additional information.
- (f) On February 1, 2012, 280 MW for Gallagher units 1 and 3 were retired by Duke Energy Indiana. In its December 28, 2011 order, the IURC allowed recovery of and return on the carrying value of the Gallagher units over the original life of these units and classification of this amount as a regulatory asset.

Duke Energy continues to evaluate the potential need to retire these coal-fired generating facilities earlier than the current estimated useful lives, and plans to seek regulatory recovery for amounts that would not be otherwise recovered when any of these assets are retired.

Other Matters.

Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky Regional Transmission Organization Realignment.

Duke Energy Ohio, which includes its wholly-owned subsidiary Duke Energy Kentucky, transferred control of its transmission assets to effect a Regional Transmission Organization (RTO) realignment from the Midwest Independent Transmission System Operator, Inc. (Midwest ISO) to PJM, effective December 31, 2011.

Name of Respondent	This Report is:	Date of Report	Year/Period of Report
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.	(1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	(Mo, Da, Yr) / /	2011/Q4
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

On December 16, 2010, FERC issued an order related to the Midwest ISO's cost allocation methodology surrounding Multi-Value Projects (MVP), a type of Midwest ISO Transmission Expansion Planning (MTEP) project cost. The Midwest ISO expects that MVP will fund the costs of large transmission projects designed to bring renewable generation from the upper Midwest to load centers in the eastern portion of the Midwest ISO footprint. The Midwest ISO approved MVP proposals with estimated project costs of approximately \$5.2 billion prior to the date of Duke Energy Ohio's exit from the Midwest ISO on December 31, 2011. These projects are expected to be undertaken by the constructing transmission owners from 2012 through 2020 with costs recovered through the Midwest ISO over the useful life of the projects. The FERC order did not clearly and expressly approve the Midwest ISO's apparent interpretation that a withdrawing transmission owner is obligated to pay its share of costs of all MVP projects approved by the Midwest ISO up to the date of the withdrawing transmission owners' exit from the Midwest ISO. Duke Energy Ohio, including Duke Energy Kentucky, has historically represented approximately five-percent of the Midwest ISO system. The impact of this order is not fully known, but could result in a substantial increase in the Midwest ISO transmission expansion costs allocated to Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky subsequent to a withdrawal from the Midwest ISO. Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky, among other parties, sought rehearing of the FERC MVP order. On October 21, 2011, the FERC issued an order on rehearing in this matter largely affirming its original MVP order and conditionally accepting Midwest ISO's compliance filing as well as determining that the MVP allocation methodology is consistent with cost causation principles and FERC precedent. The FERC also reiterated that it will not prejudice any settlement agreement between an RTO and a withdrawing transmission owner for fees that a withdrawing transmission owner owes to the RTO. The order further states that any such fees that a withdrawing transmission owner owes to an RTO are a matter for those parties to negotiate, subject to review by the FERC. The FERC also ruled that Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky's challenge of the Midwest ISO's ability to allocate MVP costs to a withdrawing transmission owner is beyond the scope of the proceeding. The Order further stated that Midwest ISO's tariff withdrawal language establishes that once cost responsibility for transmission upgrades is determined, withdrawing transmission owners retain any costs incurred prior to the withdrawal date. In order to preserve their rights, Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky filed an appeal of the FERC order in the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. The case was consolidated with appeals of the FERC order by other parties in the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals.

Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky have entered into settlements or have received state regulatory approvals associated with the RTO realignment if ultimately allocated to Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky. On December 22, 2010, the KPSC issued an order granting approval of Duke Energy Kentucky's request to effect the RTO realignment, subject to several conditions. The conditions accepted by Duke Energy Kentucky include a commitment to not seek to double-recover in a future rate case the transmission expansion fees that may be charged by the Midwest ISO and PJM in the same period or overlapping periods. On January 25, 2011, the KPSC issued an order stating that the order had been satisfied and is now unconditional.

On April 26, 2011, Duke Energy Ohio, Ohio Energy Group, The Office of Ohio Consumers' Counsel and the Commission Staff filed an Application and a Stipulation with the PUCO regarding Duke Energy Ohio's recovery via a non-bypassable rider of certain costs related to its proposed RTO realignment. Under the Stipulation, Duke Energy Ohio would recover all MTEP costs, including but not limited to MVP costs, directly or indirectly charged to Duke Energy Ohio retail customers. Duke Energy Ohio would not seek to recover any portion of the Midwest ISO exit obligation, PJM integration fees, or internal costs associated with the RTO realignment and the first \$121 million of PJM transmission expansion costs from Ohio retail customers. Duke Energy Ohio also agreed to vigorously defend against any charges for MVP projects from Midwest ISO. On May 25, 2011, the Stipulation was approved by the PUCO. An application for rehearing filed by Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy was denied by the PUCO on July 15, 2011.

Name of Respondent	This Report is:	Date of Report	Year/Period of Report
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.	(1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	(Mo, Da, Yr) / /	2011/Q4
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

On October 14, 2011, Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky filed an application with the FERC to establish new wholesale customer rates for transmission service under PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff. In this filing, Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky are seeking recovery of their legacy MTEP costs. The new rates went into effect, subject to refund, on January 1, 2012. Protests were filed by certain transmission customers. The matter is pending response from FERC.

On November 2, 2011, the Midwest ISO, the Midwest ISO Transmission Owners, Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky jointly submitted to the FERC a filing that addresses the treatment of MTEP costs, excluding MVP costs. The November 2, 2011 filing, which was accepted by the FERC on December 30, 2011, provides that the MISO Transmission Owners will continue to be obligated to construct the non-MVP MTEP projects, for which Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky will continue to be obligated to pay a portion of the costs. Likewise, transmission customers serving load in the Midwest ISO will continue to be obligated to pay a portion of the costs of a previously identified non-MVP MTEP project that Duke Energy Ohio has constructed.

On December 29, 2011, Midwest ISO filed with FERC a Schedule 39 to the Midwest ISO's tariff. Schedule 39 provides for the allocation of MVP costs to a withdrawing owner based on the owner's actual transmission load after the owner's withdrawal from the Midwest ISO, or, if the owner fails to report such load, based on the owner's historical usage in the Midwest ISO assuming annual load growth. On January 19, 2012, Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky filed with FERC a protest of the allocation of MVP costs to them under Schedule 39. On February 27, 2012, the FERC accepted Schedule 39 as a just and reasonable basis for the Midwest ISO to charge for MVP costs, a transmission owner that withdraws from the Midwest ISO after January 1, 2012. The FERC set hearing and settlement procedures regarding whether the Midwest ISO's proposal to use the methodology in Schedule 39 to calculate the obligation of transmission owners who withdrew from the Midwest ISO prior to January 1, 2012 (such as Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Kentucky) to pay for MVP costs is consistent with the MVP-related withdrawal obligations in the tariff at the time that they withdrew from the Midwest ISO, and, if not, what amount of, and methodology for calculating, any MVP cost responsibility should be.

On December 31, 2011, Duke Energy Ohio recorded a liability for its Midwest ISO exit obligation and share of MTEP costs, excluding MVP, of approximately \$110 million. This liability was recorded within Other in Current liabilities and Other in Deferred credits and other liabilities on Duke Energy Ohio's consolidated balance sheet upon exit from the Midwest ISO on December 31, 2011. Approximately \$74 million of this amount was recorded as a regulatory asset while \$36 million was recorded to Operation, maintenance and other in Duke Energy Ohio's consolidated statement of operations. In addition to the above amounts, Duke Energy Ohio may also be responsible for costs associated with the Midwest ISO MVP projects. Duke Energy Ohio is contesting its obligation to pay for such costs. However, depending on the final outcome of this matter, Duke Energy Ohio could incur material costs associated with MVP projects, which are not reasonably estimable at this time. Regulatory accounting treatment will be pursued for any costs incurred in connection with the resolution of this matter.

Name of Respondent	This Report is:	Date of Report	Year/Period of Report
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.	(1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	(Mo, Da, Yr) / /	2011/Q4
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

5. COMMITMENTS AND CONTINGENCIES

General Insurance

The Duke Energy Registrants carry insurance and reinsurance coverage either directly or through indemnification from Duke Energy's captive insurance company, Bison, and its affiliates, consistent with companies engaged in similar commercial operations with similar type properties. The Duke Energy Registrants' coverage includes (i) commercial general liability coverage for liabilities arising to third parties for bodily injury and property damage resulting from the Duke Energy Registrants' operations; (ii) workers' compensation liability coverage to statutory limits; (iii) automobile liability coverage for all owned, non-owned and hired vehicles covering liabilities to third parties for bodily injury and property damage; (iv) insurance policies in support of the indemnification provisions of the Duke Energy Registrants' by-laws and (v) property coverage for all real and personal property damage, excluding electric transmission and distribution lines, including damages arising from boiler and machinery breakdowns, earthquake, flood damage and extra expense. All coverage is subject to certain deductibles or retentions, sublimits, terms and conditions common for companies with similar types of operations.

The cost of the Duke Energy Registrants' coverage can fluctuate year to year reflecting the changing conditions of the insurance and reinsurance markets.

Nuclear Insurance

Duke Energy Carolinas owns and operates the McGuire and Oconee Nuclear Stations and operates and has a partial ownership interest in the Catawba Nuclear Station. The McGuire and Catawba Nuclear Stations each have two nuclear reactors and the Oconee Nuclear Station has three. Nuclear insurance includes: nuclear liability coverage; property, decontamination and premature decommissioning coverage; and business interruption and/or extra expense coverage. The other joint owners of the Catawba Nuclear Station reimburse Duke Energy Carolinas for certain expenses associated with nuclear insurance premiums per the Catawba Nuclear Station joint owner agreements. The Price-Anderson Act requires Duke Energy to provide for public nuclear liability claims resulting from nuclear incidents to the maximum total financial protection liability, which currently is \$12.6 billion.

Primary Nuclear Liability Insurance.

Duke Energy has purchased the maximum reasonably available private primary nuclear liability insurance as required by law, which currently is \$375 million.

Excess Nuclear Liability Program.

This program provides \$12.2 billion of coverage through the Price-Anderson Act's mandatory industry-wide excess secondary financial protection program of risk pooling. The \$12.2 billion is the sum of the current potential cumulative retrospective premium assessments of \$117.5 million per licensed commercial nuclear reactor. This would be increased by \$117.5 million for each additional commercial nuclear reactor licensed, or reduced by \$117.5 million for nuclear reactors no longer operational and may be exempted from the risk pooling program. Under this program, licensees could be assessed retrospective premiums to compensate for public nuclear liability damages in the event of a nuclear incident at any licensed facility in the U.S. If such an incident should occur and public nuclear liability damages exceed primary nuclear liability insurance, licensees may be assessed up to \$117.5 million for each of their licensed reactors, payable at a rate not to exceed \$17.5 million a year per licensed reactor for each incident. The assessment and rate are subject to indexing for inflation and may be subject to state premium taxes. The Price-Anderson Act provides for an inflation adjustment at least every five years with the last adjustment effective October 2008.

Name of Respondent	This Report is:	Date of Report	Year/Period of Report
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.	(1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	(Mo, Da, Yr) / /	2011/Q4
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

Duke Energy Carolinas is a member of Nuclear Electric Insurance Limited (NEIL), which provides property and accidental outage insurance coverage for Duke Energy Carolinas' nuclear facilities under three policy programs:

Primary Property Insurance.

This policy provides \$500 million of primary property damage coverage, with a \$2.5 million deductible per occurrence obligation, for each of Duke Energy Carolinas' nuclear facilities.

Excess Property Insurance.

This policy provides excess property, decontamination and decommissioning liability insurance: \$2.25 billion for the Catawba Nuclear Station and \$1 billion each for the Oconee and McGuire Nuclear Stations. The Oconee and McGuire Nuclear Stations also share an additional \$1 billion insurance limit above their dedicated \$1 billion underlying excess. This shared additional excess \$1 billion limit is not subject to reinstatement in the event of a loss.

Accidental Outage Insurance.

This policy provides business interruption and/or extra expense coverage resulting from an accidental property damage outage of a nuclear unit. Each McGuire and Catawba unit is insured for up to \$3.5 million per week, and the Oconee units are insured for up to \$2.8 million per week. Coverage amounts decline if more than one unit is involved in an accidental outage. Initial coverage begins after a 12-week deductible period for Catawba and a 26-week deductible period for McGuire and Oconee and continues at 100% for 52 weeks and 80% for the next 110 weeks. The McGuire and Catawba policy limit is \$490 million and the Oconee policy limit is \$392 million.

Losses resulting from non-certified acts of terrorism are covered as common occurrence, such that if non-certified terrorist acts occur against one or more commercial nuclear power plants insured by NEIL within a 12 month period, they would be treated as one event and the owners of the plants where the act occurred would share one full limit of liability (currently \$3.2 billion)

In the event of large industry losses, NEIL's Board of Directors may assess Duke Energy Carolinas for amounts up to 10 times its annual premiums. The current potential maximum assessments are: Primary Property Insurance — \$37 million, Excess Property Insurance — \$43 million and Accidental Outage Insurance — \$22 million.

Pursuant to regulations of the NRC, each company's property damage insurance policies provide that all proceeds from such insurance be applied, first, to place the plant in a safe and stable condition after a qualifying accident, and second, to decontaminate before any proceeds can be used for decommissioning, plant repair or restoration.

In the event of a loss, the amount of insurance available might not be adequate to cover property damage and other expenses incurred. Uninsured losses and other expenses, to the extent not recovered by other sources, could have a material effect on Duke Energy Carolinas' results of operations, cash flows or financial position.

The maximum assessment amounts include 100% of Duke Energy Carolinas' potential obligation to NEIL for the Catawba Nuclear Station. However, the other joint owners of the Catawba Nuclear Station are obligated to assume their pro rata share of liability for retrospective premiums and other premium assessments resulting from the Price-Anderson Act's excess secondary financial protection program of risk pooling, or the NEIL policies.

Name of Respondent Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.	This Report is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report 2011/Q4
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

Environmental

Duke Energy is subject to international, federal, state and local regulations regarding air and water quality, hazardous and solid waste disposal and other environmental matters. Duke Energy Carolinas, Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Indiana are subject to federal, state and local regulations regarding air and water quality, hazardous and solid waste disposal and other environmental matters. These regulations can be changed from time to time, imposing new obligations on the Duke Energy Registrants.

The following environmental matters impact all of the Duke Energy Registrants.

Remediation Activities.

The Duke Energy Registrants are responsible for environmental remediation at various contaminated sites. These include some properties that are part of ongoing operations and sites formerly owned or used by Duke Energy entities. In some cases, Duke Energy no longer owns the property. Managed in conjunction with relevant federal, state and local agencies, activities vary with site conditions and locations, remediation requirements, complexity and sharing of responsibility. If remediation activities involve statutory joint and several liability provisions, strict liability, or cost recovery or contribution actions, the Duke Energy Registrants could potentially be held responsible for contamination caused by other parties. In some instances, the Duke Energy Registrants may share liability associated with contamination with other potentially responsible parties, and may also benefit from insurance policies or contractual indemnities that cover some or all cleanup costs. Reserves associated with remediation activities at certain sites have been recorded and it is anticipated that additional costs associated with remediation activities at certain sites will be incurred in the future. All of these sites generally are managed in the normal course of business or affiliate operations.

The Duke Energy Registrants have accrued costs associated with remediation activities at some of its current and former sites, as well as other relevant environmental contingent liabilities. Management, in the normal course of business, continually assesses the nature and extent of known or potential environmental-related contingencies and records liabilities when losses become probable and are reasonably estimable. Costs associated with remediation activities within the Duke Energy Registrants' operations are typically expensed unless regulatory recovery of the costs is deemed probable.

As of December 31, 2011, Duke Energy Ohio had a total reserve of \$28 million, related to remediation work at certain former manufactured gas plant (MGP) sites. Duke Energy Ohio has received an order from the PUCO to defer the costs incurred. As of December 31, 2011, Duke Energy Ohio has deferred \$69 million of costs related to the MGP sites. The PUCO will rule on the recovery of these costs at a future proceeding. Management believes it is probable that additional liabilities will be incurred as work progresses at Ohio MGP sites; however, costs associated with future remediation cannot currently be reasonably estimated.

Clean Water Act 316(b).

The EPA published its proposed cooling water intake structures rule on April 20, 2011. Duke Energy submitted comments on the proposed rule on August 16, 2011. The proposed rule advances one main approach and three alternatives. The main approach establishes aquatic protection requirements for existing facilities and new on-site facility additions that withdraw 2 million gallons or more of water per day from rivers, streams, lakes, reservoirs, estuaries, oceans, or other U.S. waters for cooling purposes. Based on the main approach proposed, most, if not all of the 23 coal and nuclear-fueled generating facilities in which the Duke Energy Registrants are either a whole or partial owner are likely affected sources. Additional sources, including some combined-cycle combustion turbine facilities, may also be impacted, at least for intake modifications.

Name of Respondent Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.	This Report is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report 2011/Q4
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

The EPA has plans to finalize the 316(b) rule in July 2012. Compliance with portions of the rule could begin as early as 2015. Because of the wide range of potential outcomes, including the other three alternative proposals, the Duke Energy Registrants are unable to estimate its costs to comply at this time.

Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR).

On August 8, 2011, the final Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR) was published in the Federal Register. The CSAPR established state-level annual SO₂ and NO_x budgets that were to take effect on January 1, 2012, and state-level ozone-season NO_x budgets that were to take effect on May 1, 2012, allocating emission allowances to affected sources in each state equal to the state budget less an allowance set-aside for new sources. The budget levels were set to decline in 2014 for many states, including each state that the Duke Energy Registrants operate in, except for South Carolina where the budget levels were to remain constant. The rule allowed both intrastate and interstate allowance trading.

Numerous petitions for review of the CSAPR and motions for stay of the CSAPR were filed with the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. On December 30, 2011 the court ordered a stay of the CSAPR pending the court's resolution of the various petitions for review. Based on the court's order, the EPA continues to administer the Clean Air Interstate Rule that the Duke Energy Registrants have been complying with since 2009 and which was to be replaced by the CSAPR beginning in 2012. Oral arguments in the case are scheduled for April 13, 2012, with a court decision expected in the third quarter of 2012.

The stringency of the 2012 and 2014 CSAPR requirements varied among the Duke Energy Registrants. Where the CSAPR requirements were to be constraining, activities to meet the requirements could include purchasing emission allowances, power purchases, curtailing generation and utilizing low sulfur fuel. The CSAPR was not expected to result in Duke Energy Registrants adding new emission controls. Technical adjustments to the CSAPR recently finalized by the EPA will not materially impact the Duke Energy Registrants. The Duke Energy Registrants cannot predict the outcome of the litigation or how it might affect the CSAPR requirements as they apply to the Duke Energy Registrants. See Note 12 for further information regarding impairment of emissions allowances as a result of the CSAPR.

Coal Combustion Product (CCP) Management.

Duke Energy currently estimates that it will spend \$259 million (\$78 million at Duke Energy Carolinas, \$63 million at Duke Energy Ohio and \$118 million at Duke Energy Indiana) over the period 2012-2016 to install synthetic caps and liners at existing and new CCP landfills and to convert some of its CCP handling systems from wet to dry systems to comply with current regulations. The EPA and a number of states are considering additional regulatory measures that will contain specific and more detailed requirements for the management and disposal of CCPs, primarily ash, from the Duke Energy Registrants' coal-fired power plants. On June 21, 2010, the EPA issued a proposal to regulate, under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, coal combustion residuals (CCR), a term the EPA uses to describe the CCPs associated with the generation of electricity. The EPA proposal contains two regulatory options whereby CCRs not employed in approved beneficial use applications would either be regulated as hazardous waste or would continue to be regulated as non-hazardous waste. Duke Energy cannot predict the outcome of this rulemaking. However, based on the proposal, the cost of complying with the final regulation will be material, and are not included in the estimates discussed above. The EPA Administrator has indicated that the Agency could issue a final rule in late 2012.

Name of Respondent Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.	This Report is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report 2011/Q4
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

Mercury and Air Toxics Standards (MATS).

On February 16, 2012, the final Mercury and Air Toxics Standards rule (previously referred to as the Utility MACT Rule) was published in the Federal Register. The final rule establishes emission limits for hazardous air pollutants, including mercury, from new and existing coal-fired electric generating units. The rule requires sources to comply with the emission limits by April 16, 2015. Under the Clean Air Act, permitting authorities have the discretion to grant up to a 1-year compliance extension, on a case-by-case basis, to sources that are unable to complete the installation of emission controls before the compliance deadline. The Duke Energy Registrants are evaluating the requirements of the rule and developing strategies for complying with the rule's requirements. Strategies to achieve compliance with the final MATS rules are likely to include installation of new or upgrades to existing air emission control equipment, the development of monitoring processes and accelerated retirement of some coal-fired electric-generating units. Refer to Note 4, Regulatory Matters, regarding potential plant retirements. Based on a preliminary review, the cost to the Duke Energy Registrants to comply with the final regulation will be material.

While the ultimate regulatory requirements for the Duke Energy Registrants for MATS, Clean Water Act 316(b), CSAPR and CCRs will not be known until all the rules have been finalized, for planning purposes, the Duke Energy Registrants currently estimate the cost of new control equipment that may need to be installed to comply with this group of rules could total \$4.5 billion to \$5 billion over the next 10 years. The Duke Energy Registrants will seek regulatory recovery of amounts incurred in conjunction with these rulings.

Litigation

Duke Energy Carolinas, Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Indiana

New Source Review (NSR).

In 1999-2000, the DOJ, acting on behalf of the EPA and joined by various citizen groups and states, filed a number of complaints and notices of violation against multiple utilities across the country for alleged violations of the NSR provisions of the Clean Air Act (CAA). Generally, the government alleges that projects performed at various coal-fired units were major modifications, as defined in the CAA, and that the utilities violated the CAA when they undertook those projects without obtaining permits and installing the best available emission controls for SO₂, NO_x and particulate matter. The complaints seek injunctive relief to require installation of pollution control technology on various generating units that allegedly violated the CAA, and unspecified civil penalties in amounts of up to \$32,500 per day for each violation. A number of the Duke Energy Registrants' plants have been subject to these allegations. The Duke Energy Registrants assert that there were no CAA violations because the applicable regulations do not require permitting in cases where the projects undertaken are "routine" or otherwise do not result in a net increase in emissions.

In 2000, the government brought a lawsuit against Duke Energy Carolinas in the U.S. District Court in Greensboro, North Carolina. The EPA claims that 29 projects performed at 25 of Duke Energy Carolinas' coal-fired units violate these NSR provisions. Three environmental groups have intervened in the case. In August 2003, the trial court issued a summary judgment opinion adopting Duke Energy Carolinas' legal positions on the standard to be used for measuring an increase in emissions, and granted judgment in favor of Duke Energy Carolinas. The trial court's decision was appealed and ultimately reversed and remanded for trial by the U.S. Supreme Court. At trial, Duke Energy Carolinas will continue to assert that the projects were routine or not projected to increase emissions. On February 11, 2011, the trial judge held an initial status conference and on March 22, 2011, the judge entered an interim scheduling order. The parties have filed a stipulation in which the United States and Plaintiff-Intervenors have dismissed with prejudice 16 claims. In exchange, Duke Energy Carolinas dismissed certain affirmative defenses. The parties have filed motions for summary judgment on the remaining claims. No trial date has been set, but a trial is not expected until the second half of 2012, at the earliest.

Name of Respondent	This Report is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report 2011/Q4
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.			
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

In November 1999, the U.S. brought a lawsuit in the U.S. Federal District Court for the Southern District of Indiana against Cinergy, Duke Energy Ohio, and Duke Energy Indiana alleging various violations of the CAA for various projects at six owned and co-owned generating stations in the Midwest. Three northeast states and two environmental groups intervened in the case. A jury verdict was returned on May 22, 2008. The jury found in favor of Cinergy, Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Indiana on all but three units at Duke Energy Indiana's Wabash River Station, including Duke Energy Indiana's Gallagher Station units discussed below. Additionally, the plaintiffs had claimed that these were a violation of an Administrative Consent Order entered into in 1998 between the EPA and Cinergy relating to alleged violations of Ohio's State Implementation Plan provisions governing particulate matter at Duke Energy Ohio's W.C. Beckjord Station. On May 29, 2009, the court issued its remedy ruling for violations previously established at the Wabash River and W.C. Beckjord Stations and ordered the following relief: (i) Wabash River Units 2, 3 and 5 to be permanently retired by September 30, 2009; (ii) surrender of SO₂ allowances equal to the emissions from Wabash River Units 2, 3 and 5 from May 22, 2008 through September 30, 2009; (iii) civil penalty in the amount of \$687,500 for W.C. Beckjord violations; and (iv) installation of a particulate continuous emissions monitoring system at W.C. Beckjord Units 1 and 2. The civil penalty has been paid. On October 12, 2010, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals issued a decision reversing the trial court and ordered issuance of judgment in favor of Cinergy (*USA v. Cinergy*), which includes Duke Energy Indiana and Duke Energy Ohio. The plaintiff's motion for rehearing was denied on December 29, 2010. On January 6, 2011, the mandate from the Seventh Circuit was issued returning the case to the District Court and on April 15, 2011, the District Court issued its Final Amended Judgment in favor of Cinergy. Plaintiffs did not file a petition for certiorari with the United State Supreme Court prior to the March 29, 2011 filing deadline. This ruling allowed Wabash River Units 2, 3 and 5 to be placed back into service.

Regarding the Gallagher Station units, on October 21, 2008, plaintiffs filed a motion for a new liability trial claiming that defendants misled the plaintiffs and the jury by, among other things, not disclosing a consulting agreement with a fact witness and by referring to that witness as "retired" during the liability trial when in fact he was working for Duke Energy Indiana under the referenced consulting agreement in connection with the trial. On December 18, 2008, the court granted plaintiffs' motion for a new liability trial on claims for which Duke Energy Indiana was not previously found liable. On May 19, 2009, the jury announced its verdict finding in favor of Duke Energy Indiana on four of the remaining six projects at issue. The two projects in which the jury found violations were undertaken at Gallagher Station Units 1 and 3. The parties to the remedy trial reached a negotiated agreement on those issues and filed a proposed consent decree with the court, which was approved and entered on March 18, 2010. The substantive terms of the proposed consent decree require: (i) conversion of Gallagher Station Units 1 and 3 to natural gas combustion by 2013 (or retirement of the units by February 2012); (ii) installation of additional pollution controls at Gallagher Station Units 2 and 4 by 2011; and (iii) additional environmental projects, payments and penalties. Duke Energy Indiana estimates that these and other actions in the settlement will cost \$88 million. Due to the NSR remedy order and consent decree, Duke Energy Indiana requested several approvals from the IURC including approval to add a dry sorbent injection system on Gallagher Station Units 2 and 4, approval to convert to natural gas or retire Gallagher Station Units 1 and 3, and approval to recover expenses for certain SO₂ emission allowance expenses required to be surrendered. On September 8, 2010, the IURC approved the implementation of the dry sorbent injection system. On September 28, 2010, Duke Energy Indiana filed a petition requesting the recovery of costs associated with the Gallagher consent decree. Testimony in support of the petition was filed in early December 2010. Duke Energy Indiana subsequently requested the IURC suspend the procedural schedule to allow it time to do a solicitation for capacity options to compare to the proposed conversion of Gallagher Units 1 and 3 to natural gas. On December 28, 2011, the IURC granted Duke Energy Indiana's request to recover the costs associated with the Gallagher consent decree, but denied the request to recover the SO₂ emission allowance expenses under the consent decree.

Name of Respondent	This Report is:	Date of Report	Year/Period of Report
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.	(1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	(Mo, Da, Yr) / /	2011/Q4
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

On January 12, 2012, after receiving approval from the FERC and the IURC, Duke Energy Indiana purchased a portion of the Vermillion Generating Station from its affiliate, Duke Energy Vermillion II, LLC, an indirect wholly-owned subsidiary of Duke Energy Ohio. Refer to Note 3 for further information on the Vermillion transaction. Following the purchase, Duke Energy Indiana retired Gallagher Units 1 and 3 effective February 1, 2012.

On April 3, 2008, the Sierra Club filed another lawsuit in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Indiana against Duke Energy Indiana and certain affiliated companies alleging CAA violations at Edwardsport Station. On October 20, 2009, the defendants filed a motion for summary judgment alleging that the applicable statute of limitations bars all of the plaintiffs' claims. On September 14, 2010, the Court granted defendants' motion for summary judgment in its entirety; however, entry of final judgment was stayed pending a decision from the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals in *USA v. Cinergy*, referenced above, on a similar and potentially dispositive statute of limitations issue pending before that court. On October 12, 2010, the Seventh Circuit issued its decision in *USA v. Cinergy* in which the court ruled in favor of Cinergy and declined to address the referenced statute of limitations issue. The Seventh circuit issued its mandate on January 6, 2011 and the District Court issued final judgment in favor of Duke Energy Indiana on March 1, 2011. On March 2, 2011, the Sierra Club agreed not to pursue an appeal of the case in exchange for Duke Energy Indiana's waiver of its right to seek reimbursement of costs.

As discussed above, all matters related to Cinergy, Duke Energy Ohio and Duke Energy Indiana have been resolved without significant impacts. It is not possible to estimate the damages, if any, that might be incurred in connection with the unresolved matters related to Duke Energy Carolinas discussed above. Ultimate resolution of these matters could have a material effect on the consolidated results of operations, cash flows or financial position or Duke Energy Carolinas and Duke Energy. However, the appropriate regulatory treatment will be pursued for any costs incurred in connection with such resolution.

Duke Energy

CO₂ Litigation.

In July 2004, the states of Connecticut, New York, California, Iowa, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Vermont, Wisconsin and the City of New York brought a lawsuit in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York against Cinergy, American Electric Power Company, Inc., American Electric Power Service Corporation, Southern Company, Tennessee Valley Authority, and Xcel Energy Inc. A similar lawsuit was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York against the same companies by Open Space Institute, Inc., Open Space Conservancy, Inc., and The Audubon Society of New Hampshire. These lawsuits allege that the defendants' emissions of CO₂ from the combustion of fossil fuels at electric generating facilities contribute to global warming and amount to a public nuisance. The complaints also allege that the defendants could generate the same amount of electricity while emitting significantly less CO₂. The plaintiffs were seeking an injunction requiring each defendant to cap its CO₂ emissions and then reduce them by a specified percentage each year for at least a decade. In September 2005, the District Court granted the defendants' motion to dismiss the lawsuit. The plaintiffs appealed this ruling to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals. Oral arguments were held before the Second Circuit Court of Appeals on June 7, 2006. In September 2009, the Court of Appeals issued an opinion reversing the district court and reinstating the lawsuit. Defendants filed a petition for rehearing en banc, which was subsequently denied. Defendants filed a petition for certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court on August 2, 2010. On December 6, 2010, the Supreme Court granted certiorari. Argument on this matter was held on April 19, 2011. On June 20, 2011, the Supreme Court held that the Second Court of Appeals decision should be reversed on the basis that plaintiffs' claims cannot proceed under federal common law, which was displaced by the CAA and actual or potential EPA regulations. The Court's decision did not address plaintiffs' state law claims as those claims had not been presented. On September 2, 2011, plaintiffs notified the Court that they had decided to withdraw their complaints. On December 2, 2011, the District Court dismissed plaintiffs' federal claims and on December 6, 2011, plaintiffs filed notices of dismissal.

Name of Respondent Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.	This Report is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report 2011/Q4
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

Alaskan Global Warming Lawsuit.

On February 26, 2008, plaintiffs, the governing bodies of an Inupiat village in Alaska, filed suit in the U.S. Federal Court for the Northern District of California against Peabody Coal and various oil and power company defendants, including Duke Energy and certain of its subsidiaries. Plaintiffs brought the action on their own behalf and on behalf of the village's 400 residents. The lawsuit alleges that defendants' emissions of CO₂ contributed to global warming and constitute a private and public nuisance. Plaintiffs also allege that certain defendants, including Duke Energy, conspired to mislead the public with respect to global warming. Plaintiffs seek unspecified monetary damages, attorney's fees and expenses. On June 30, 2008, the defendants filed a motion to dismiss on jurisdictional grounds, together with a motion to dismiss the conspiracy claims. On October 15, 2009, the District Court granted defendants motion to dismiss. The plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal and briefing is complete. By order dated February 23, 2011, the Court stayed oral argument in this case pending the Supreme Court's ruling in the CO₂ litigation discussed above. Following the Supreme Court's June 20, 2011 decision the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals held argument in the case on November 28, 2011. It is not possible to predict whether Duke Energy will incur any liability or to estimate the damages, if any, that Duke Energy might incur in connection with this matter.

Price Reporting Cases.

A total of five lawsuits were filed against Duke Energy affiliates and other energy companies and remain pending in a consolidated, single federal court proceeding in Nevada.

In November 2009, the judge granted defendants' motion for reconsideration of the denial of defendants' summary judgment motion in two of the remaining five cases to which Duke Energy affiliates are a party. A hearing on that motion occurred on July 15, 2011, and on July 19, 2011, the judge granted the motion for summary judgment. Plaintiffs have filed a notice of appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. In December 2009, plaintiffs in the consolidated cases filed a motion to amend their complaints in the individual cases to add a claim for treble damages under the Sherman Act, including additional factual allegations regarding fraudulent concealment of defendants' allegedly conspiratorial conduct. Those motions were denied on October 29, 2010.

Each of these cases contains similar claims, that the respective plaintiffs, and the classes they claim to represent, were harmed by the defendants' alleged manipulation of the natural gas markets by various means, including providing false information to natural gas trade publications and entering into unlawful arrangements and agreements in violation of the antitrust laws of the respective states. Plaintiffs seek damages in unspecified amounts. It is not possible to predict whether Duke Energy will incur any liability or to estimate the damages, if any, that Duke Energy might incur in connection with the remaining matters. However, based on Duke Energy's past experiences with similar cases of this nature, it does not believe its exposure under these remaining matters is material.

Name of Respondent	This Report is:	Date of Report	Year/Period of Report
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.	(1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	(Mo, Da, Yr) / /	2011/Q4
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

Duke Energy International Paranapanema Lawsuit.

On July 16, 2008, Duke Energy International Geracao Paranapanema S.A. (DEIGP) filed a lawsuit in the Brazilian federal court challenging transmission fee assessments imposed under two new resolutions promulgated by the Brazilian Electricity Regulatory Agency (ANEEL) (collectively, the Resolutions). The Resolutions purport to impose additional transmission fees (retroactive to July 1, 2004 and effective through June 30, 2009) on generation companies located in the State of São Paulo for utilization of the electric transmission system. The new charges are based upon a flat-fee that fails to take into account the locational usage by each generator. DEIGP's additional assessment under these Resolutions amounts to approximately \$61 million, inclusive of interest, through December 2011. Based on DEIGP's continuing refusal to tender payment of the disputed sums, on April 1, 2009, ANEEL imposed an additional fine against DEIGP in the amount of \$9 million. DEIGP filed a request to enjoin payment of the fine and for an expedited decision on the merits or, alternatively, an order requiring that all disputed sums be deposited in the court's registry in lieu of direct payment to the distribution companies.

On June 30, 2009, the court issued a ruling in which it granted DEIGP's request for injunction regarding the additional fine, but denied DEIGP's request for an expedited decision on the original assessment or payment into the court registry. Under the court's order, DEIGP was required to make installment payments on the original assessment directly to the distribution companies pending resolution on the merits. DEIGP filed an appeal and on August 28, 2009, the order was modified to allow DEIGP to deposit the disputed portion of each installment, which was most of the assessed amount, into an escrow account pending resolution on the merits. In the second quarter of 2009, Duke Energy recorded a pre-tax charge of \$33 million associated with this matter.

Brazil Expansion Lawsuit.

On August 9, 2011, the State of São Paulo filed a lawsuit in Brazilian state court against DEIGP based upon a claim that DEIGP is under a continuing obligation to expand installed generation capacity by 15% pursuant to a stock purchase agreement under which DEIGP purchased generation assets from the state. On August 10, 2011, a judge granted an ex parte injunction ordering DEIGP to present, within 60 days of service, a detailed expansion plan in satisfaction of the 15% obligation or face civil penalties in the amount of approximately \$16,000 per day. Both DEIGP and ANEEL have previously taken a position that the 15% expansion obligation is no longer viable given the changes that have occurred in the electric energy sector since privatization of that sector. After filing various objections, defenses and appeals regarding the referenced order, DEIGP submitted its proposed expansion plan on November 11, 2011. The Court ordered the State of São Paulo to file a response to the proposed plan. That response is outstanding.

Name of Respondent	This Report is:	Date of Report	Year/Period of Report
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.	(1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	(Mo, Da, Yr) / /	2011/Q4
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

Duke Energy Retirement Cash Balance Plan.

A class action lawsuit was filed in federal court in South Carolina against Duke Energy and the Duke Energy Retirement Cash Balance Plan, alleging violations of Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA). These allegations arise out of the conversion of the Duke Energy Company Employees' Retirement Plan into the Duke Energy Retirement Cash Balance Plan. The case also raises some Plan administration issues, alleging errors in the application of Plan provisions (i.e., the calculation of interest rate credits in 1997 and 1998 and the calculation of lump-sum distributions). Six causes of action were alleged, ranging from age discrimination, to various alleged ERISA violations, to allegations of breach of fiduciary duty. Plaintiffs sought a broad array of remedies, including a retroactive reformation of the Duke Energy Retirement Cash Balance Plan and a recalculation of participants'/ beneficiaries' benefits under the revised and reformed plan. Duke Energy filed its answer in March 2006. A portion of this contingent liability was assigned to Spectra Energy Corp (Spectra Energy) in connection with the spin-off in January 2007. A hearing on the plaintiffs' motion to amend the complaint to add an additional age discrimination claim, defendant's motion to dismiss and the respective motions for summary judgment was held in December 2007. On June 2, 2008, the court issued its ruling denying plaintiffs' motion to add the additional claim and dismissing a number of plaintiffs' claims, including the claims for ERISA age discrimination. Subsequently, plaintiffs notified Duke Energy that they were withdrawing their ADEA claim. On September 4, 2009, the court issued its order certifying classes for three of the remaining claims but not certifying their claims as to plaintiffs' fiduciary duty claims. After mediation on September 21, 2010, the parties reached an agreement in principle to settle the lawsuit, subject to execution of a definitive settlement agreement, notice to the class members and approval of the settlement by the Court. In the third quarter of 2010, Duke Energy recorded a provision related to the settlement agreement. At a hearing on May 16, 2011, the court issued its final confirmation order and payments have been made in accordance with the settlement agreement.

Crescent Litigation.

On September 3, 2010, the Crescent Resources Litigation Trust filed suit against Duke Energy along with various affiliates and several individuals, including current and former employees of Duke Energy, in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Western District of Texas. The Crescent Resources Litigation Trust was established in May 2010 pursuant to the plan of reorganization approved in the Crescent bankruptcy proceedings in the same court. The complaint alleges that in 2006 the defendants caused Crescent to borrow approximately \$1.2 billion from a consortium of banks and immediately thereafter distribute most of the loan proceeds to Crescent's parent company without benefit to Crescent. The complaint further alleges that Crescent was rendered insolvent by the transactions, and that the distribution is subject to recovery by the Crescent bankruptcy estate as an alleged fraudulent transfer. The plaintiff requests return of the funds as well as other statutory and equitable relief, punitive damages and attorneys' fees. Duke Energy and its affiliated defendants believe that the referenced 2006 transactions were legitimate and did not violate any state or federal law. Defendants filed a motion to dismiss in December 2010. On March 21, 2011, the plaintiff filed a response to the defendant's motion to dismiss and a motion for leave to file an amended complaint, which was granted. The Defendants filed a second motion to dismiss in response to plaintiffs' amended complaint.

A hearing on the motion was held on August 31, 2011, and the parties are awaiting a ruling. On December 14, 2011, the Plaintiff filed a demand for jury trial and a motion to transfer the case to the federal district court. Defendants responded by filing a motion to strike Plaintiff's jury demand, but consented to the transfer of the case to the District Court. The court's ruling on the jury demand and motion to transfer is pending. No trial date has been set. It is not possible to predict at this time whether Duke Energy will incur any liability or to estimate the damages, if any, that Duke Energy might incur in connection with this lawsuit.

Name of Respondent	This Report is:	Date of Report	Year/Period of Report
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.	(1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	(Mo, Da, Yr) / /	2011/Q4
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

On October 14, 2010, a suit was filed in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, by a group of Duke Energy shareholders alleging breach of duty of loyalty and good faith by certain Duke Energy directors who were directors at the time of the 2006 Crescent transaction. On January 5, 2011, defendants filed a Notice of Designation of this case for the North Carolina Business Court. On July 22, 2011, the court granted the defendants' motion to dismiss the lawsuit and the plaintiffs did not appeal the ruling.

Progress Energy Merger Litigation.

Duke Energy and Diamond Acquisition Corporation, a wholly owned subsidiary of Duke Energy have been named as defendants in 10 purported shareholder actions filed in North Carolina state court and two cases filed in federal court in North Carolina. The actions, which contain similar allegations, were brought by individual shareholders against the following defendants: Progress Energy, Duke Energy, Diamond Acquisition Corporation and Directors of Progress Energy. The lawsuits allege that the individual defendants breached their fiduciary duties to Progress Energy shareholders and that Duke Energy and Diamond Acquisition Corporation, aided and abetted the individual defendants. The plaintiffs seek damages and to enjoin the merger. One of the state court cases was voluntarily dismissed. On July 11, 2011, the parties to the remaining nine state court cases entered into a Memorandum of Understanding for a disclosure-based settlement of the litigation. The court's final order approving the settlement was issued on November 29, 2011. The time period for appeal ended on January 18, 2012.

The plaintiff in one of the federal court lawsuits filed a motion for voluntary withdrawal, leaving one federal case pending. The complaint in the federal action includes allegations that defendants violated federal securities laws in connection with the statements contained in Duke Energy's Registration Statement on Form S-4, as amended, and is now subject to the notice requirements of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act. Plaintiff's counsel in the federal case have sent a total of four derivative demand letters to Progress Energy demanding that Progress Energy's board of directors make certain disclosures, desist from moving forward with the merger and engage in an auction of the company. Progress Energy has indicated that it is evaluating those demands. On August 3, 2011, the Court issued a scheduling order granting the plaintiffs' unopposed motion for preliminary approval of the proposed settlement. On December 8, 2011, the Plaintiff filed a Notice of Voluntary Dismissal terminating the litigation.

Federal Advanced Clean Coal Tax Credits.

Duke Energy Carolinas has been awarded \$125 million of federal advanced clean coal tax credits associated with its construction of Cliffside Unit 6 and Duke Energy Indiana has been awarded \$134 million of federal advanced clean coal tax credits associated with its construction of the Edwardsport IGCC plant. In March, 2008, two environmental groups, Appalachian Voices and the Canary Coalition, filed suit against the Federal government challenging the tax credits awarded to incentivize certain clean coal projects. Although Duke Energy was not a party to the case, the allegations center on the tax incentives provided for the Cliffside and Edwardsport projects. The initial complaint alleged a failure to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act. The first amended complaint, filed in August 2008, added an Endangered Species Act claim and also sought declaratory and injunctive relief against the DOE and the U.S. Department of the Treasury. In 2008, the District Court dismissed the case. On September 23, 2009, the District Court issued an order granting plaintiffs' motion to amend their complaint and denying, as moot, the motion for reconsideration. Plaintiffs have filed their second amended complaint. The Federal government has moved to dismiss the second amended complaint; the motion is pending. On July 26, 2010, the District Court denied plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction seeking to halt the issuance of the tax credits.

Name of Respondent Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.	This Report is: (1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Original (2) <input type="checkbox"/> A Resubmission	Date of Report (Mo, Da, Yr) / /	Year/Period of Report 2011/Q4
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (Continued)			

Duke Energy Carolinas

Duke Energy Carolinas Cliffside Unit 6 Permit.

On July 16, 2008, the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, Environmental Defense Fund, National Parks Conservation Association, Natural Resources Defenses Council, and Sierra Club (collectively referred to as Citizen Groups) filed suit in U.S District Court for the Western District of North Carolina alleging that Duke Energy Carolinas violated the CAA when it commenced construction of Cliffside Unit 6 without obtaining a determination that the MATS emission limits will be met for all prospective hazardous air emissions at that plant. The Citizen Groups claim the right to injunctive relief against further construction at the plant as well as civil penalties in the amount of up to \$32,500 per day for each alleged violation. In July 2008, Duke Energy Carolinas voluntarily performed a MATS assessment of air emission controls planned for Cliffside Unit 6 and submitted the results to the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR). On December 2, 2008, the Court granted summary judgment in favor of the Plaintiffs and entered judgment ordering Duke Energy Carolinas to initiate a MATS process before the DAQ. The court did not issue an injunction against further construction, but retained jurisdiction to monitor the MATS proceedings. On December 4, 2008, Duke Energy Carolinas submitted its MATS filing and supporting information to the DAQ specifically seeking DAQ's concurrence as a threshold matter that construction of Cliffside Unit 6 is not a major source subject to section 112 of the CAA and submitting a MATS determination application. Concurrent with the initiation of the MATS process, Duke Energy Carolinas filed a notice of appeal to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals of the Court's December 2, 2008 order to reverse the Court's determination that Duke Energy Carolinas violated the CAA. The DAQ issued the revised permit on March 13, 2009, finding that Cliffside Unit 6 is a minor source of hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) and imposing operating conditions to assure that emissions stay below the major source threshold. Based upon DAQ's minor-source determination, Duke Energy Carolinas filed a motion requesting that the court abstain from further action on the matter and dismiss the plaintiffs' complaint. The court granted Duke Energy Carolinas motion to abstain and dismissed the plaintiffs' complaint without prejudice, but also ordered Duke Energy Carolinas to pay the plaintiffs' attorneys' fees. On August 3, 2009, plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal of the court's order and Duke Energy Carolinas likewise appealed on the grounds, among others, that the dismissal should have been with prejudice and the court should not have ordered payment of attorneys' fees. The appeals have been consolidated. On April 14, 2011, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the district court's ruling awarding fees to defendants. Duke Energy Carolinas filed a request for rehearing, which was denied, on May 10, 2011. A settlement was reached in January 2012. Duke Energy Carolinas has paid the attorneys fees and this matter is resolved.

The revised permits, issued by DAQ on January 29, 2008 and March 13, 2009, were appealed by seven different organizations and the appeals were consolidated in the North Carolina Office of Administrative Hearings. Through rulings on motions to dismiss and motions for summary judgment, the administrative law judge narrowed the issues for hearing and two of the parties appealing were dismissed. A hearing was scheduled in October 2011. On October 5, 2011, petitioners and Duke Energy Carolinas agreed to a settlement in principle. The settlement agreement was executed on January 3, 2012. Pursuant to this agreement and existing requirements in the air permit, Duke Energy Carolinas will retire 1667 MWs of older coal-fired units between May 2011 and December 2020. Petitioners moved to dismiss their petitions on January 17, 2012, and the administrative law judge granted the motion to dismiss on January 18, 2012. This matter is now resolved.

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

4/27/2012 11:19:02 AM

in

Case No(s). 12-0001-EL-RPT

Summary: Annual Report Duke Energy Ohio Form 1 (Part 3 of 11) electronically filed by Ms. Sharon L Hood on behalf of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.