Exh. No. MJV ___ CX Witness: Michael J. Vilbert

Page 1 of 6

UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20549

FORM 10-K

X

ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the fiscal period ended December 31, 2013 or

TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the transition period from

to

file number Offices, and Telephone Number

DUKE
ENERGY:

IRS Employer Identification No.

1-32853

Duke Energy Progress

Commission

DUKE ENERGY CORPORATION

Registrant, State of Incorporation or Organization, Address of Principal Executive

20-2777218

Name of each exchange on

(a Delaware Corporation) 550 South Tryon Street Charlotte, NC 28202-1803

Commission file	Registrant, State of Incorporation or Organization, Address of Principal Executive Offices, and Telephone Number	Commission file number	Registrant, State of Incorporation or Organization, Addres
1-4928	DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC (a North Carolina limited liability company) 526 South Church Street Charlotte, North Carolina 28202-1803 704-382-3853 56-0205520	1-3274	DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, INC. (a Florida corporation) 299 First Avenue North St. Petersburg, Florida 33701 704-382-3853 59-0247770
1-15929	PROGRESS ENERGY, INC. (a North Carolina corporation) 410 South Wilmington Street Raleigh, North Carolina 27601-1748 704-382-3853 56-2155481	1-1232	DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC. (an Ohio corporation) 139 East Fourth Street Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 704-382-3853 31-0240030
1-3382	DUKE ENERGY PROGRESS, INC. (a North Carolina corporation) 410 South Wilmington Street Raleigh, North Carolina 27601-1748 704-382-3853 56-0165465	1-3543	DUKE ENERGY INDIANA, INC. (an Indiana corporation) 1000 East Main Street Plainfield, Indiana 46168 704-382-3853 35-0594457

SECURITIES REGISTERED PURSUANT TO SECTION 12(B) OF THE ACT:

<u>Registrant</u>			Title of each class	which registere	<u>ed</u>
Duke Energy Corporation (Duke Energ	gy)	Co	ommon Stock, \$0.001 par value	New York Stock Excha	nge. Inc.
Duke Energy			125% Junior Subordinated Debentures due nuary 15, 2073	New York Stock Excha	
Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (Duke E	nergy Carolinas	, _	If of the registrant's limited liability company memb nergy.	er interests are directly own	ned by Duke
Progress Energy, Inc. (Progress Energ	gy)	AI	I of the registrant's common stock is directly owned	by Duke Energy	
Duke Energy Progress, Inc. (Duke En	ergy Progress)		I of the registrant's common stock is indirectly owner		
Duke Energy Florida, Inc. (Duke Ene	rgy Florida)	Al	I of the registrant's common stock is indirectly owner	ed by Duke Energy.	
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. (Duke Energy	Ohio)	Al	I of the registrant's common stock is indirectly owner	ed by Duke Energy.	
Duke Energy Indiana, Inc. (Duke Ene	ergy Indiana)	Aļ	If of the registrant's common stock is indirectly owner	ed by Duke Energy.	
	SECURITI	ES REGISTE	ERED PURSUANT TO SECTION 12(G) OF THE ACT	: None	
Indicate by check mark if the registran	t is a well-know	n seasoned	issuer, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act		
Duke Energy	Yes ⊠	No □	Duke Energy Florida	Yes ⊠	No □
Duke Energy Carolinas	Yes ⊠	No □	Duke Energy Ohio	Yes□	No ⊠
Progress Energy	Yes □	No ⊠	Duke Energy Indiana	Yes□	No 🗵

Indicate by check mark if the registrant is not required to file reports to pursuant to Section 13 or Section 15(d) of the Exchange Act. Yes \square No \boxtimes (Response applicable to all registrants.)

No □

Yes ⊠

Indicate by check mark whether the registrants (1) have filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days. Yes 🗵 No 🗆

Indicate by check mark whether the registrants have submitted electronically and posted on their corporate website, if any, every Interactive Data File required to be submitted and posted pursuant to Rule 405 of Regulation S-T (§232.405 of this chapter) during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to submit and post such files). Yes 🗵 No 🗆

Indicate by check mark it	f disclosure of delinquent filers p	ursuant to It	em 405 of Regulation S-K is not contained herein	, and will not be contained,	to the best of
registrant's knowledge, i	n definitive proxy or information	statements	incorporated by reference in Part III of this Form	10-K or any amendment to	this Form 10-K.
Duke Energy	Yes⊠	No 🗆	Duke Energy Florida	Yes ⊠	No □
Duke Energy Carolinas	Yes 🗵	No 🖂	Duke Energy Ohio	Vac 🔯	No 🗆

PART II

ITEM 6. SELECTED FINANCIAL DATA

n millions, except per-share am-	ounts)		2013	2012	201	1	2010	2009
tatement of Operations ^(a)		the fire of California and California			A Gallatatica de L			
otal operating revenues		s 24,	598 \$	19,624	\$ 14,529	\$	14,272	\$ 12,731
perating income		4.	982	3,126	2,77	7	2,461	2,24
ncome from continuing operation	ıs	2	,659	1,746	1,713	3	1,320	1,07
let income		- 2	,676	1,782	1,714	r. i j	1,323	1,08
let income attributable to Duke E	nergy Corporation	2	,665	1,768	1,706	6	1,320	1,07
		s. Asali daka Kasahara at						PAR GARAGO
Basic Diluted let income attributable to Duke E	nergy Corporation com		3.74 s 3.74	3.01 3.01	\$ 3.83		2.99 2.99	\$ 2.4
hareholders ^(b) Basic			3.77 s	3.07	\$ 3.83)	3.00	S 2.4
			3.76	3.07	3.83		3.00	2.49
Diluted								
Diluted ividends declared per share ^(b)			3.09	3.03	2.97	·- 12. 116.	2.91	2.8
			3.09	3.03	2.97			2.8

 ⁽a) Significant transactions reflected in the results above include: (i) 2013 charges related to Crystal River Unit 3 and nuclear development costs (see Note 4 to the Consolidated Financial Statements, "Regulatory Matters"); (ii) the 2012 merger with Progress Energy (see Note 2 to the Consolidated Financial Statements, "Acquisitions, Dispositions and Sales of Other Assets"); (iii) 2012 and 2011 charges related to the Edwardsport Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) project (see Note 4 to the Consolidated Financial Statements); and (iv) 2010 impairment of goodwill and other assets.
 (b) On July 2, 2012, immediately prior to the merger with Progress Energy, Duke Energy executed a one-for-three reverse stock split. All share and earnings per share amounts are presented as if the one-for-three reverse stock split had been effective at the beginning of the earliest period presented.

Exh. No. MJV ___ CX Witness: Michael J. Vilbert Page 3 of 6

PART II

DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA

Introduction

Management's Discussion and Analysis should be read in conjunction with the accompanying Consolidated Financial Statements and Notes for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011.

Basis of Presentation

The results of operations and variance discussion for Duke Energy Florida is presented in a reduced disclosure format in accordance with General Instruction (I)(2)(a) of Form 10-K.

Results of Operations

		Years Ended Decen	nber 31,
(in millions)	201	13 2012	Variance
Operating Revenues	\$ 4,52	.7 \$ 4,689	\$ (162)
Operating Expenses Gains on Sales of Other Asset and Other, net	3,84	4,062 1 2	(222)
Operating Income Other Income and Expense, net	68	8 629 30 39	
Interest Expense	18	255	(75)
Income Before Income Taxes	- 53	8 413	125
Income Tax Expense	21	147	66
Net Income	32	25 -266	59
Preferred Stock Dividend Requirement		2	(2)
Net Income Attributable to Parent	\$ 32	.5 \$ 264	\$ 61

The following table shows the percent changes in GWh sales and average number of customers for Duke Energy Florida. The below percentages for retail customer classes represent billed sales only. Wholesale power sales include both billed and unbilled sales. Total sales includes billed and unbilled retail sales, and wholesale sales to incorporated municipalities and to public and private utilities and power marketers. Amounts are not weather normalized.

Increase (decrease) over prior year		2013	2012
Residential sales	1.4.4	% (5.	1) %
General service sales	(0.5) % (1.0	0) %
Industrial sales	1.	i % (2.	5) %
Wholesale power sales	(13.8	% (34.	.2) %
Total sales	(1.2) % (2.	9) %
Average number of customers	1.1	. % 0).8 %

Year Ended December 31, 2013 as Compared to 2012

Operating Revenues. The variance was primarily due to:

A \$387 million decrease in retail fuel revenues primarily due to the impact of lower residential fuel rates and a decrease in GWh retail sales due to weather and lower usage.

Partially offset by:

- . A \$167 million increase in base revenues as allowed by the 2012 Settlement, and
- A \$57 million increase in nuclear cost-recovery clause revenue due to an increase in recovery rates primarily related to the Crystal River Unit 3 uprate project, a prior period true-up and Levy as allowed by the 2012 Settlement.

Operating Expenses. The variance was primarily due to:

- A \$482 million decrease in retail fuel expense primarily due to the application of the NEIL settlement proceeds including amortization associated with the 2012 Settlement, lower system requirements, and the prior year establishment of a regulatory liability for replacement power in accordance with the 2012 Settlement, and
- A \$71 million decrease in operations and maintenance expenses primarily due to the deferral of Crystal River Unit 3-related expenses in accordance with the 2012 Settlement, lower costs associated with the merger with Duke Energy, and the prior year write-off of previously deferred costs related to the vendor not selected for the Crystal River Unit 3 containment repair. These were partially offset by the prior year reversal of accruals in conjunction with the placement of Crystal River Unit 3 into extended cold shutdown in accordance with the 2012 Settlement and higher charges associated with related settlement matters.

Partially offset by:

A \$212 million increase in impairment and other charges. In 2013, Duke Energy Florida recorded impairment and other charges primarily related to Crystal River
Unit 3 and Levy. In 2012, Duke Energy Florida recorded impairment and other charges related to the decision to retire Crystal River Unit 3. See Note 4 to the
Consolidated Financial Statements, "Regulatory Matters," for additional information; and

Exh. No. MJV ___ CX Witness: Michael J. Vilbert Page 4 of 6

PART II

A \$138 million increase in depreciation and amortization primarily due to higher nuclear cost-recovery amortization related to Levy and a decrease in the reduction
of the cost of removal component of amortization expense as allowed under the 2012 Settlement.

Other Income and Expense, net. The variance was primarily due to lower AFUDC equity due primarily to the retirement of Crystal River Unit 3.

Interest Expense. The variance was primarily due to the deferral of debt costs recorded on the retail portion of the retired Crystal River Unit 3 regulatory asset beginning January 1, 2013.

Income Tax Expense. The variance was primarily due to an increase in pretax income. The effective tax rates for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 were 39.6 percent and 35.7 percent, respectively. The increase in the effective tax rate was primarily due to the impact of lower AFUDC equity and lower impairment charges.

Exh. No. MJV ___ CX Witness: Michael J. Vilbert Page 5 of 6

PART II

DUKE ENERGY OHIO

Introduction

Management's Discussion and Analysis should be read in conjunction with the accompanying Consolidated Financial Statements and Notes for the years ended December 31, 2013, 2012, and 2011.

Basis of Presentation

The results of operations and variance discussion for Duke Energy Ohio is presented in a reduced disclosure format in accordance with General Instruction (I)(2)(a) of Form 10-K

Results of Operations

_	Yea	ars Ended December 31,			
(in millions)	2013	2012	Variance		
Operating Revenues	s 3,245	\$ 3,152	93		
Operating Expenses Gains on Sales of Other Assets and Other, net	2,999 -5	2,810 7	189 (2)		
Operating Income Other Income and Expense, net	251 4	349 13	(98) (9)		
Interest Expense	78	89	(11)		
Income Before Income Taxes	177	273	(96)		
Income Tax Expense	75	98	(23)		
Net Income	\$ 102	s 175 s	(73)		

The following table shows the percent changes in Regulated Utilities' GWh sales and average number of customers for Duke Energy Ohio. The below percentages for retail customer classes represent billed sales only. Total sales includes billed and unbilled retail sales, and wholesale sales to incorporated municipalities and to public and private utilities and power marketers. Amounts are not weather normalized.

Increase (decrease) over prior year		2013	2012
Residential sales	vida da e e	1.5 %	(3.3) %
General service sales		0.8 %	(2.6) %
Industrial sales		0.2 %	0.6 %
Wholesale power sales		20.9 %	(35.9) %
Total sales [1997] 中国中国共和国企业的基础的企业的基础的企业。 中国中国企业的企业的主义的企业的企业的企业的企业的企业的企业的企业的企业企业的企业企业企业企业企业企业		0.9 %	(2.3) %
Average number of customers		0.4 %	0.5 %

Year Ended December 31, 2013 as Compared to 2012

Operating Revenues. The variance was primarily driven by:

- A \$68 million increase in net mark-to-market revenue on non-qualifying power and capacity hedge contracts, consisting of mark-to-market gains of \$70 million in 2013 compared to losses of \$2 million in 2012;
- . A \$68 million increase for the gas-fired generation assets driven primarily by higher power prices, partially offset by decreased volumes;
- A \$41 million increase in rate riders and retail pricing primarily due to rate increases in 2013;
- A \$21 million increase for the coal-fired generation assets driven primarily by increased volumes, partially offset by lower realized power prices, including the impact of hedge settlements; and
- A \$13 million increase related to favorable weather conditions.

Partially offset by:

- · An \$85 million decrease in PJM capacity revenue related to lower average cleared capacity auction pricing; and
- A \$41 million decrease in regulated fuel revenues primarily driven by reduced sales volumes, partially offset by higher fuel costs.

Operating Expenses. The variance was primarily driven by:

- A \$109 million increase in fuel expense for the gas-fired generation assets driven by higher natural gas costs, partially offset by decreased natural gas volumes;
- A \$96 million increase in net mark-to-market fuel expense on non-qualifying fuel hedge contracts, consisting of mark-to-market losses of \$99 million in 2013 compared
 to losses of \$3 million in 2012; and
- A \$41 million increase in property and other taxes driven primarily by an Ohio property tax settlement recorded in 2012.

Partially offset by:

. A \$42 million decrease in regulated fuel expense driven primarily by lower purchased power expense and reduced volumes, partially offset by higher fuel costs.

Exh. No. MJV ___ CX Witness: Michael J. Vilbert Page 6 of 6

PART II

Other Income and Expenses, net. The decrease was primarily due to lower AFUDC equity and lower interest income.

Interest Expense. The decrease was primarily due to lower average debt balances in 2013 compared to 2012.

Income Tax Expense. The variance was primarily due to a decrease in pretax income. The effective tax rates for the years ended December 31, 2013 and 2012 were 42.2 percent and 36 percent, respectively. The change in the effective tax rate was primarily due to a decrease in pretax income and a decrease in the manufacturing deduction in 2013.

Matters Impacting Future Duke Energy Ohio Results

On February 17, 2014, Duke Energy Ohio announced that it had initiated a process to exit its nonregulated Midwest generation business. Considering a marketing period of several months and potential regulatory approvals, Duke Energy Ohio expects to dispose of the nonregulated Midwest generation business by early to mid-2015. In the first quarter of 2014, Duke Energy Ohio will reclassify approximately \$3.5 billion carrying value of its Midwest generation business to assets held for sale and expects to record an estimated pretax impairment charge of \$1 billion to \$2 billion to reduce the carrying value to estimated sales proceeds less cost to sell.

In 2013, a FERC Administrative Law Judge issued an initial decision holding that Duke Energy Ohio is responsible for certain MVP costs, a type of MTEP cost, approved by MISO prior to the date of Duke Energy Ohio's withdrawal. The initial decision will be reviewed by FERC. If FERC upholds the initial decision, Duke Energy Ohio intends to file an appeal in federal court. If Duke Energy Ohio ultimately is found to be responsible for these costs, a portion of these costs may not be eligible for recovery, resulting in an adverse impact to its financial position, results of operations and cash flows. See Note 4 to the Consolidated Financial Statements, "Regulatory Matters," for additional information.