# BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of The Dayton :

Power and Light Company for Approval of its : Case No. 12-426-EL-SSO

Electric Security Plan.

In the Matter of the Application of The Dayton :

Power and Light Company for Approval of : Case No. 12-427-EL-ATA

Revised Tariffs.

In the Matter of the Application of The Dayton

Power and Light Company for Approval of : Case No. 12-428-EL-AAM

Certain Accounting Authority.

In the Matter of the Application of The Dayton

Power and Light Company for the Waiver of : Case No. 12-429-EL-WVR

Certain Commission Rules.

In the Matter of the Application of The Dayton : Case No. 12-672-EL-RDR

Power and Light Company to Establish Tariff

Riders. :

# PREFILED TESTIMONY OF RAYMOND W. STROM

EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLES DIVISION ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

Staff Exhibit \_\_\_\_\_

1 1. Q. Please state your name and your business address. 2 A. My name is Raymond W. Strom. My business address is 180 East Broad 3 Street, Columbus, Ohio, 43215. 4 2. 5 Q. By whom are you employed and what is your position? 6 A. I am employed by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio as a Public 7 Utilities Administrator 3, in the Efficiency and Renewables Division of the 8 Energy and Environment Department. 9 Please summarize your educational background. 10 3. Q. 11 A. I have earned B.S. and M.S. degrees from Ohio University, both in the biological/environmental sciences. I have also earned a Master of Business 12 Administration degree from Capital University. 13 14 15 4. Please summarize your work experience. Q. Prior to my employment with the PUCO, I was employed as a chemist, a 16 A. 17 laboratory technician, a graduate teaching assistant, a research technician 18 and a quality control coordinator for various organizations. In 1987, I joined the staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio as Supervisor of 19

the Electric Fuel Component Section. In 1992, I was promoted to Public

Administrator 2 in the Facilities, Siting and Environmental Analysis Divi-

Utility Administrator 1. Starting in 1999, I served as a Public Utility

20

21

22

sion. In October of 2009 I was promoted to Chief of the Efficiency and Renewables Division.

3

- 4 5. Q. Have you testified in prior proceedings before the Commission?
- 5 A. Yes. I have testified in several cases before the Commission.

6

- 7 6. Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?
- A. The purpose of my testimony is to present Staff's suggested revisions to the Company's competitive bidding process proposals.

10

- 7. Q. In its comments submitted on April 27, 2012, in this case, Staff presented various concerns that it had about the competitive bidding process that had been submitted in the Company's initial proposal. Have these concerns been addressed by the Company in its revised competitive bidding process proposal, submitted on October 5, 2012?
- A. In general, yes, they have. In its comments, Staff identified concerns it had
  about the lack of a load cap, the ability to change auction managers,
  inclusion of renewable energy requirements in the auction product, and
  clarity of competitive bidding costs to be included in the reconciliation
  rider. In its revised filing, the Company has made revisions to these areas
  that addressed the concerns presented by Staff. Further, Staff had
  recommended that a process for approving potential modifications to the

competitive bidding process should be developed prior to initial implementation of the competitive bidding process plan. Although the Company has indicated that its proposed competitive bidding process can be modified during the term of the ESP, a process for such modifications has not been presented. Also, Staff had noted in its comments that the Company's competitive bidding process website was not yet functional, so it had not been possible to evaluate the quality of the data presented on the website. As of the time of filing this testimony, the website has still not yet become functional, so the inability to evaluate the quality of the data on the website remains.

Additionally, I note that the Company's current proposal appears not to provide for the Commission to make an independent determination about whether or not to accept the results of the auctions held pursuant the competitive bidding process. As described in the Company's plan, the determination is to be limited to the Commission's consideration of three very basic requirements, or as directed by the auction manager and/or the Commission's consultant in their reports to the Commission. I believe that it would be more appropriate for the competitive bidding process plan to indicate that these inputs should be used by the Commission in making its decision on whether or not to accept the auction results, but that the decision ultimately should rest with the Commission.

Q. Does Staff have further modifications to recommend to the competitive
 bidding process recommended by the Company?

Yes. Staff witness Choueiki is recommending that the electric security plan be limited to a three year period. This limitation necessitates modifications to the blending percentages and delivery time periods for the standard service offer supply that is to be obtained pursuant to the competitive bidding process that has been proposed by the Company. In order to accommodate the revised term of the electric security plan, and accomplish the transition to 100% market over the three year term, I recommend the auction schedule presented in Exhibit RWS-1. This revised auction schedule has a benefit of accelerating the move toward market pricing, with higher percentages of market pricing at earlier times during the term of the ESP. This will help assure that SSO ratepayers will receive a greater proportion of the benefits of the lower market pricing earlier in the ESP than under the schedule proposed by the Company.

A.

Additionally, the competitive bidding process proposed by the Company appears to allow DP&L to participate in its own auction. I am concerned that DP&L's participation could have a negative impact on participation of other potential bidders. This is because of the potential perception by other bidders that they would be bidding against subsidized generation resources, because of revenue that DP&L would receive through the Service Stability

1			Rider (SSR). Robust participation is an important factor for the success of
2			the auction. Therefore, I recommend that DP&L not be permitted to
3			participate in the auction while the SSR is in place.
4			
5	9.	Q.	Doe this conclude your testimony?
6		A.	Yes, it does. However, I reserve the right to submit supplemental testi-
7			mony as described herein, as new information subsequently becomes avail-

able or in response to positions taken by other parties.

#### PROOF OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing Prefiled Testimony of Raymond W. Strom, submitted on behalf of the Staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, was served via electronic mail, upon the parties listed below, this 11<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2013.

## /s/ Thomas W. McNamee

### Thomas W. McNamee Assistant Attorney General

#### **Service List:**

cmooney@ohiopartners.org judi.sobecki@dplinc.com sam@mwncmh.com fdarr@mwncmh.com mpritchard@mwncmh.com joliker@mwncmh.com amy.spiller@duke-energy.com jeanne.kingery@duke-energy.com bmcmahon@emh-law.com elizabeth.watts@duke-energy.com rocco.dascenzo@duke-energy.com stephanie.chmi@thompsonhine.com philip.sineneng@thompsonhine.com michael.dillard@thompsonhine.com matt@matthewcoxlaw.com boiko@carpenterlipps.com sechler@carpenterlipps.com bill.wells@wpafb.af.mil chris.thompson.2@tvndall.af.mil gmeyer@consultbai.com cfaruki@ficlaw.com isharkey@ficlaw.com mswhite@igsenergy.com christopher.miller@icemiller.com gregory.dunn@icemiller.com chris.michael@icemiller.com

dboehm@bkllawfirm.com mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com ikyler@bkllawfirm.com myurick@taftlaw.com zkravitz@taftlaw.com whitt@whitt-sturtevant.com campbell@whitt-sturtevant.com mhpetricoff@vorys.com smhoward@vorys.com ssherman@kdlegal.com ihague@kdlegal.com mwarnock@bricker.com tsiwo@bricker.com tony long@ham.honda.com asim haque@ham.honda.com haydenm@firstenergycorp.com ilang@calfee.com lmcbride@calfee.com talexander@calfee.com jejadwin@aep.com gpoulos@enernoc.com ricks@ohanet.org cmooney2@columbus.rr.com tobrien@bricker.com vparisi@igsenergy.com cathy@theoec.org

trent@theoec.org
mchristensen@columbuslaw.org
stnourse@aep.com
ssolberg@eimerstahl.com
stephen.bennett@exeloncorp.com
cynthia.brady@constellation.com

joseph.clark@directenergy.com dakutik@jonesday.com aehaedt@jonesday.com ejacobs@ablelaw.org mjsatterwhite@aep.com

		2013	2014	2015	2016	
		J F M A M J J A S O N I	D J F M A M J J A S O N D	J F M A M J J A S O N D	J F M A M J J A S O N D	
	12 month	14	1			
Auction 1 Apr 2013	24 month		13			
	36 month		13			
Auction 2	12 month		17			
Mar 2014	24 month		17			
Auction 3 Dec 2014	12 month			35		
Auction 4 Mar 2015	12 month			35		

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on** 

3/12/2013 1:51:50 PM

in

Case No(s). 12-0426-EL-SSO, 12-0427-EL-ATA, 12-0428-EL-AAM, 12-0429-EL-WVR, 12-0672-EL-RDR

Summary: Testimony electronically filed by Mrs. Tonnetta Y Scott on behalf of PUCO