BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

Tri- Pyramid Machining, Inc.,)
Complainant,))) CASE No. 09-0443-EL-CSS
v.)
The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company,)
Respondent.)))

DIRECT EXPERT TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM T. BEUTLER, P.E.

FILED ON BEHALF OF THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY

Company Exhibit 1

Ebony L. Miller (077063)

Attorney

FirstEnergy Service Company

76 South Main Street Akron, Ohio 44308

Phone: 330-384-5969

Fax: 330-384-3875

Attorneys for The Cleveland Electric

Illuminating Company

			·
1	O:	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND OCCUPA	TION FOR THE RECORD?

- 2 A: My name is William T. Beutler, and I am an employee of FirstEnergy Service Company.
- 3 Q: HOW LONG HAVE YOU WORKED FOR FIRSTENERGY SERVICE
- 4 COMPANY?
- 5 A: I began my association with FirstEnergy Service Company in 1979.
- 6 Q: WHAT ARE YOUR PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS?
- 7 A: I am a registered Professional Engineer in the state of Ohio. I received a Bachelor of
- 8 Electrical Engineering in 1979 and a Masters of Business Administration in 1985.
- 9 Q: WHAT HAS BEEN THE NATURE OF YOUR EMPLOYMENT WITH
- 10 FIRSTENERGY SERVICE COMPANY? SPECIFICALLY, WHAT POSITIONS
- 11 HAVE YOU HELD AND WHAT DUTIES HAVE YOUR PERFORMED?
- 12 A: The focus of my employment with FirstEnergy Service Company and its affiliate The
- 13 Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company ("CEI") has been as an engineer employed in
- the areas of distribution design, power quality and reliability analysis. I am extremely
- familiar with the manner in which CEI trains its personnel to construct and maintain
- electrical power lines in compliance with the National Electrical Safety Code, which is
- also known as NESC. I am also extremely familiar with PUCO regulations and internal
- company policies and procedures as they relate to the complaint before the PUCO.
- After beginning my employment with FirstEnergy in 1979, I worked for fourteen (14)
- 20 years in the Distribution Engineering Unit as a Design Engineer where my job

responsibilities included designing specifications and standards for fuses, re-closers, transformers and arresters. In 1993, I transitioned to the Power Quality Engineering Unit to become the Supervisor of the Power Quality Unit. I was employed as the Supervisor of the Power Quality Unit from 1993 to 1998, and my job responsibilities included overseeing the work of five engineers and investigating customer power quality complaints. From 1998 to 2007, I was a Senior Engineer in the Energy Delivery-Distribution Operations Section, and my job responsibilities included overseeing reliability data, coding of outages and providing corporate support for NESC and NEC interpretations. In 2007, I assumed the role Manager and then Consultant in 2009 of Reliability Support in the Energy Delivery-Distribution Operations Section, where my job responsibilities include overseeing transmission and distribution reliability data.

)

Q: BASED UPON YOUR EXPERIENCE, WHAT CAN YOU TELL THE COMMISSION ABOUT CEI'S DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM?

CEI constructs, maintains and operates its distribution system in accordance with the National Electrical Safety Code ("NESC") and regulations of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, which is also known as the PUCO. Moreover, CEI also maintains its own engineering and construction standards that meet or exceed the NESC. Pursuant to CEI's internal company policies and procedures, each year the company invests substantial amounts of money to maintain and improve the reliability of the distribution system. The company and its employees are continuously working to anticipate and eliminate potential problems that may affect the distribution system.

A:

43	Q:	WHAT CAN YOU TELL THE COMMISSION ABOUT THE CIRCUIT THAT
44		SERVICES 36250 LAKELAND BLVD., #4, THE COMPLAINANT'S
45		PROPERTY?
46	A:	I have reviewed the history and reliability of that circuit and the particular branch line
47		that services 36250 Lakeland Blvd., #4. Overall, the circuit and the branch line have
48		been very reliable.
49	Q:	NOW, LET ME DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION TO THE EVENTS OCCURRING
50		MAY 4, 2009 TO MAY 9, 2009. YOU ARE AWARE THAT COMPLAINANT
51		SUBMITTED A CLAIM TO CEI ALLEGING LOSS OF WORK ORDERS AND
52		POSSIBLE LONG-TERM MACHINE DAMAGE?
53	A:	Yes.
54	Q:	HAVE YOU FAMILIARIZED YOURSELF WITH COMPLAINANT'S CLAIM?
55	A:	Yes. I have reviewed documents submitted by Complainant describing the incident, CEI
56		trouble records for the period of May 4, 2009 through May 11, 2009, and the customer
57		call notes.
58	Q:	DOES CEI HAVE ANY RECORDS OF THE COMPLAINANT CONTACTING
59		THE COMPANY THE WEEK OF MAY 4, 2009?
60	A:	Yes, CEI responded to five calls from the customer between May 4 and May 11, 2009.
61_	Q:	HOW DID CEI RESPOND?
62	Δ	It is my understanding that CEI responded to each of the calls, which included checking

- the voltage at the customer's property and making adjustments to the system to bring the customer within acceptable voltage limits when necessary.
- 65 Q. HAVE YOU SPOKEN WITH THE DISTRIBUTION DISPATCH OFFICE
 66 CONCERNING THESE CALLS?
- 67 A. Yes.

 $7\overline{2}$

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

- Q: BASED ON DISCUSSION WITH THE DISTRIBUTION DISPATCH OFFICE,
 HAVE YOU ARRIVED AT ANY CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE CAUSE
 OF THE COMPLAINANT'S VOLTAGE ISSUES AND ALLEGED EQUIPMENT
 DAMAGE?
 - The substation serving this customer was not in it's normal configuration. Typically the A: substation is served by two transformers; however, regularly scheduled maintenance was being performed on one of the two transformers, which left the remaining transformer to serve the substation. This process occurs across the system on a regular basis. The configuration of this substation affected over 6000 customers. However, during this time period, the Companies received few complaints. CEI made changes at the substation and on the circuit to bring the voltage back into acceptable limits. commonly accepted that when voltage is outside acceptable ranges, utilization equipment may not operate satisfactorily and customer protective devices operate to protect the Although Complainant did allege that its equipment did not operate equipment. satisfactorily, Complainant did not indicate any protective devices operated. Thus, I believe it is unlikely that there was any equipment damage.

84	Q:	WHAT DOES CEI DO TO MINIMIZE INCIDENTS LIKE YOU HAVE JUST
85		DESCRIBED?
86	A:	CEI performed the maintenance I discussed above to help ensure proper voltage to
87		customers and minimize the probability of a sustained outage. In addition, CEI designs,
88		builds and constructs its distribution system to specific standards of the NESC and PUCO
89		regulations.
90	Q:	EVEN IF CEI DESIGNS, BUILDS AND CONSTRUCTS ITS DISTRIBUTION
91		SYSTEM TO SPECIFIC STANDARDS OF THE NESC AND PUCO
92		REGULATIONS, IS IT STILL POSSIBLE TO HAVE VOLTAGES OUTSIDE
93		THE ACCEPTABLE RANGE?
94	A:	Yes, By placing the system in different configurations during maintenance activities,
95		voltages outside acceptable ranges could occur. Although we properly plan maintenance
96		activities so that service is not disrupted, there are many factors beyond CEI's control
97		such as predicting the effects of customer loads and the weather. When notified voltage is
98	•	outside of the acceptable range, the CEI takes corrective action.
99	Q:	WHAT, IF ANYTHING, HAVE YOU CONCLUDED REGARDING CEI'S
100		EQUIPMENT SERVICING 36250 LAKELAND BLVD., #4 DURING THE
101		PERIOD OF MAY 4, 2009 THROUGH MAY 11, 2009?
102	A:	I have concluded to a reasonable degree of engineering certainty that CEI's equipment
103		was installed properly and that CEI took appropriate actions in responding to
104		Complainant's voltage issues.

105	Q:	DO YOU UNDERSTAND THAT SOME TIME ON OR ABOUT MAY 8, 2009,
106		COMPLAINANT SUBMITTED A CLAIM TO CEI SEEKING
107		REIMBURSEMENT FOR ALLEGED EQUIPMENT DAMAGES?
108	A:	Yes.
109	Q:	DO YOU KNOW HOW CEI RESPONDED TO COMPLAINANT'S CLAIM?
110	A:	Complainant submitted a claim to CEI in May of 2009. CEI investigated his claim and
111		determined that it was not responsible for the loss of production or possible damages. As
112		such, CEI denied the claim.
113	Q:	DID CEI TREAT THE COMPLAINANT DIFFERENT FROM ANY OTHER
114		CUSTOMER?
115	A:	No. CEI does not guarantee, nor is it required to provide continuous service to all
116		customers. CEI is not an insurer for its customers. That is clearly set forth in CEI's tariff
117		PUCO No. 8, which was in effect at the time of the incident and on file with the PUCO. I
118		have regularly dealt with the tariff during my employment and am familiar with its
119		provisions.
120	Q:	CAN YOU DESCRIBE BRIEFLY CEI'S ELECTRIC TARIFF?
121	Á:	CEI's electric tariff contains the rates, rules and regulations under which CEI provides
122		service to its customers. In short, it contains the rules by which the company provides
123		billing information and handles utility services for all its customers.
124	Q:	I AM HANDING YOU WHAT HAS BEEN PRE-MARKED COMPANY'S

125		EXHIBIT 2. CAN YOU PLEASE IDENTIFY COMPANY'S EXHIBIT 2 FOR
126	•	THE RECORD?
127	A:	Yes. Company's Exhibit 2 is a copy of CEI's electric tariff, which was approved by the
128		PUCO.
129	Q:	BASED UPON YOUR EXPERIENCE, WHAT SECTION OR SECTIONS OF THE
130		TARIFF ARE APPLICABLE TO CEI'S DENIAL OF THE COMPLAINANT'S
131		CLAIM?
132	A:	In particular, sections IV. B entitled "Continuity" and section X. B entitled
133		"Limitation of Liability" are applicable. Section IV. B
134		states:
135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147		The Company will endeavor, but does not guarantee, to furnish a continuous supply of electric energy and to maintain voltage and frequency within reasonable limits. The Company shall not be liable for damages which the customer may sustain due to variations in service characteristics or phase reversals. The standard secondary voltages are 120/240 volt three wire single phase, 208Y/120 volt four wire three phase and 480Y/277 volt four wire three phase. The Company designs its system so that under normal operating conditions the sustained service voltage is within a range of plus or minus 5% of the normal voltage level for that service. Whenever voltages shall be known to exist outside of such ranges, the Company will take steps to promptly initiate corrective action to restore the sustained voltage level within said ranges.
148		Further, Section X. B states:
149 150 151 152 153 154 155		The Company shall not be liable for any loss, cost, damage or expense that the customer may sustain by reason of damage to or destruction of any property, including the loss of use thereof arising out of, or in any manner connected with interruptions in service, variations in service characteristics, high or low voltage, phase failure, phase reversal, the use of electrical appliances or the presence of the Company's property on the customer's premises whether such damages are caused by or involve any
156		fault, failure or negligence of the Company or otherwise except such

157 158 159 160 161		damages that are caused by or due to the willful and wanton misconduct of the Company. The Company shall not be liable for damage to any customer or to third persons resulting from the use of the service on the customer's premises or from the presence of the Company's appliance or equipment on the customer's premises.
162163	Q:	HOW DO YOU AND CEI INTERPRET THOSE SECTIONS OF THE TARIFF?
164	A:	That CEI does not guarantee, nor is CEI required to provide continuous service to all
165	A.	customers. CEI is not an insurer for its customers. Moreover, CEI is not responsible for
166		voltage fluctuations or loss of service, nor is CEI responsible for the property damage
167		that was the result of these events.
168	Q:	APPLYING THOSE PROVISIONS TO THE COMPLAINANT'S COMPLAINT
169		BEFORE THE PUCO, HOW DO YOU INTERPRET THAT LANGUAGE IN
170		RELATION TO THE COMPLAINT?
171	A:	That CEI is not responsible for the alleged voltage fluctuation, equipment failure and
172		alleged loss of work orders and possible equipment damage.
173		
174	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?
175	A.	Yes, it does.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing Expert Testimony was served this 24th day of November, 2009, by First Class United States Mail, postage prepaid, and by facsimile upon:

David Patterson 33579 Euclid Avenue Willoughby OH 44094.

Attorney for Defendan

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

11/24/2009 5:07:54 PM

in

Case No(s). 09-0443-EL-CSS

Summary: Testimony DIRECT EXPERT TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM T. BEUTLER, P.E. FILED ON BEHALF OF THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY electronically filed by Ms. Ebony L Miller on behalf of The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company