

**ORIGINAL**

*[Handwritten signatures and initials: a large signature, CM, CM, ARW]*

STATE OF INDIANA

INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

PETITION OF DUKE ENERGY INDIANA, INC. )  
 FOR APPROVAL OF (1) A ONE-YEAR )  
 EXTENSION OF DEMAND SIDE MANAGEMENT )  
 AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS )  
 APPROVED IN CAUSE NO. 43955, INCLUDING )  
 COST RECOVERY, LOST REVENUES AND )  
 SHAREHOLDER INCENTIVES; (2) AUTHORITY )  
 TO OFFER ADDITIONAL DEMAND SIDE )  
 MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS WITH COST )  
 RECOVERY, INCLUDING LOST MARGINS AND ) **CAUSE NO. 43955 DSM 1**  
 SHAREHOLDER INCENTIVES; (3) AUTHORITY )  
 TO DEFER COSTS INCURRED UNTIL SUCH ) **APPROVED:**  
 TIME THEY ARE REFLECTED IN RETAIL ) **APR 30 2014**  
 RATES; (4) RECONCILIATION OF DEMAND SIDE )  
 MANAGEMENT AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY )  
 PROGRAM COST RECOVERY THROUGH DUKE )  
 ENERGY INDIANA, INC. STANDARD CONTRACT )  
 RIDER 66A, AND (5) APPROVAL OF START -UP )  
 COSTS INCURRED IN CONJUNCTION WITH )  
 CORE PROGRAMS, AND (6) REVISIONS TO )  
 STANDARD CONTRACT RIDER 66A )

ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

**Presiding Officers:**  
**David E. Ziegner, Commissioner**  
**Jeffery A. Earl, Administrative Law Judge**

On January 15, 2014, the Commission issued a final order in this Cause. On February 4, 2014, Nucor Steel-Indiana, a Division of Nucor Corporation (“Nucor”) filed a Petition for Reconsideration (“Motion”). On February 17, 2014, Duke Energy Indiana, Inc. (“Duke”) filed a Response to the Motion. Nucor filed its Reply on February 24, 2014.

Nucor argues that Duke and the Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor (“OUCC”) failed to submit sufficient evidence to support their Settlement Agreement and that the Commission’s January 15, 2014 Order does not contain probative evidence to support approval of the Settlement Agreement. Specifically, Nucor asks that we reconsider our decision on the following issues:

- The approval of lost revenue recovery over the life of an energy efficiency measure rather than the shorter of three years or the life of the measure that was previously approved in Cause No. 43955.

- The approval of shareholder incentives without independent verification.
- The approval of unsupported evaluation, measurement, and verification calculations.

170 IAC 1-1.1-22(e) allows a party to file a petition for rehearing and reconsideration within twenty days after the entry of a final order. 170 IAC 1-1.1-22(e)(3) lists the possible actions that we may take in deciding a Petition for Reconsideration, including upholding our original order, modifying our original order based on the existing record without further hearing, reopening the evidentiary record, or reversing our original order. The Motion does not seek to reopen the record in this Cause or to introduce new evidence. Rather, Nucor asks us to reconsider the findings and conclusions in the January 15, 2014 Order. Nucor reiterates the same arguments that it made in its case-in-chief, which we already considered in reaching our decision in this Cause. Nucor has not offered any new argument that causes us to change our initial decision.

Having reviewed the Motion and reconsidered our Final Order, we uphold our Final Order in this Cause without further modification. Therefore, we deny the Motion.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED BY THE INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION that:**

1. Nucor's Petition for Reconsideration is denied.

**ATTERHOLT, MAYS, STEPHAN, WEBER, AND ZIEGNER CONCUR:**

**APPROVED:      APR 30 2014**

**I hereby certify that the above is a true  
and correct copy of the Order as approved.**



**Brenda A. Howe**  
**Secretary to the Commission**