BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Duke) Energy Ohio, Inc., for an Increase in) Electric Distribution Rates.)	Case No. 12-1682-EL-AIR
In the Matter of the Application of Duke) Energy Ohio, Inc., for Tariff Approval.)	Case No. 12-1683-EL-ATA
In the Matter of the Application of Duke) Energy Ohio, Inc., for Approval to) Change Accounting Methods.)	Case No. 12-1684-EL-AAM

Pre-filed Testimony of John L. Berringer Accounting and Electricity Division Utilities Department

Staff Exhibit _____

March 19, 2013

1 2	1.	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
2 3 4 5 6		A.	My name is John L. Berringer. My business address is 180 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.
0 7 8	2.	Q.	By whom are you employed?
9 10 11 12		A.	I am employed by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (PUCO).
12 13 14	3.	Q.	What is your current position and what are your duties?
15 16 17 18 19 20		А.	I am a Utility Specialist in the Accounting and Electricity Division. My duties include conducting investigations of assigned phases of rate case applications and other financial audits of public utility companies subject to the jurisdiction of the PUCO.
21 22	4.	Q.	Would you briefly state your educational background?
 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 		Α.	I graduated from The Ohio State University in 1991 with a Bachelor of Arts in English. In addition, I earned a post- baccalaureate Certificate of Accounting Concentration at Columbus State Community College in 2012. I also completed a graduate level course in utility regulation at The Ohio State University in 2004.
31 32 33	5.	Q.	Please outline your work experience.
 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 		Α.	I have been with the PUCO since July 2003 and in the Accounting & Electricity Division since April 2009. Prior to working at the PUCO, I held various positions in the insurance, education and health care industries.

1 2	6.	Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?
3		
4		
5		A. The purpose of my testimony is to address an objection from the
6		Applicant relative to an exclusion from the test year of expenses
7		associated with the street light audit program.
8		
9	_	
10	7.	Q. In its Objection #12, the Applicant objects to the Staff's
11		exclusion of the proposed street light audit program. The
12		Applicant states the elimination of the program was not discussed
13		in the Staff report and thus its elimination was arbitrary and
14 15		unreasonable. How do you respond?
15 16		
10		A. While the exclusion was not discussed in the Staff Report, the
18		Staff's decision to eliminate the program was neither arbitrary nor
19		unreasonable.
20		
21		
21 22	8.	Q. Can you explain why Staff's decision was not arbitrary
	8.	Q. Can you explain why Staff's decision was not arbitrary and unreasonable?
22	8.	
22 23	8.	and unreasonable?
22 23 24	8.	and unreasonable?A. Staff's decision was based upon a phone interview with a member
22 23 24 25 26 27	8.	and unreasonable?A. Staff's decision was based upon a phone interview with a member of the Company's staff on September 4, 2012. As a result of the
22 23 24 25 26 27 28	8.	and unreasonable?A. Staff's decision was based upon a phone interview with a member of the Company's staff on September 4, 2012. As a result of the conversation, it was determined that the program did not and would
22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29	8.	and unreasonable?A. Staff's decision was based upon a phone interview with a member of the Company's staff on September 4, 2012. As a result of the conversation, it was determined that the program did not and would not occur at any time during the calendar year 2012, which is the
22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	8.	and unreasonable?A. Staff's decision was based upon a phone interview with a member of the Company's staff on September 4, 2012. As a result of the conversation, it was determined that the program did not and would not occur at any time during the calendar year 2012, which is the test year for this case. Since the program did not occur within the
22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	8.	A. Staff's decision was based upon a phone interview with a member of the Company's staff on September 4, 2012. As a result of the conversation, it was determined that the program did not and would not occur at any time during the calendar year 2012, which is the test year for this case. Since the program did not occur within the test year, it cannot be considered as being a known and measurable
22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32	8.	A. Staff's decision was based upon a phone interview with a member of the Company's staff on September 4, 2012. As a result of the conversation, it was determined that the program did not and would not occur at any time during the calendar year 2012, which is the test year for this case. Since the program did not occur within the test year, it cannot be considered as being a known and measurable expense. Therefore, Staff excluded the expense in its entirety from
22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33	8.	A. Staff's decision was based upon a phone interview with a member of the Company's staff on September 4, 2012. As a result of the conversation, it was determined that the program did not and would not occur at any time during the calendar year 2012, which is the test year for this case. Since the program did not occur within the test year, it cannot be considered as being a known and measurable
22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34		 and unreasonable? A. Staff's decision was based upon a phone interview with a member of the Company's staff on September 4, 2012. As a result of the conversation, it was determined that the program did not and would not occur at any time during the calendar year 2012, which is the test year for this case. Since the program did not occur within the test year, it cannot be considered as being a known and measurable expense. Therefore, Staff excluded the expense in its entirety from the Applicant's test year.
22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35	8. 9.	A. Staff's decision was based upon a phone interview with a member of the Company's staff on September 4, 2012. As a result of the conversation, it was determined that the program did not and would not occur at any time during the calendar year 2012, which is the test year for this case. Since the program did not occur within the test year, it cannot be considered as being a known and measurable expense. Therefore, Staff excluded the expense in its entirety from
22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34		 and unreasonable? A. Staff's decision was based upon a phone interview with a member of the Company's staff on September 4, 2012. As a result of the conversation, it was determined that the program did not and would not occur at any time during the calendar year 2012, which is the test year for this case. Since the program did not occur within the test year, it cannot be considered as being a known and measurable expense. Therefore, Staff excluded the expense in its entirety from the Applicant's test year.
22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36		 and unreasonable? A. Staff's decision was based upon a phone interview with a member of the Company's staff on September 4, 2012. As a result of the conversation, it was determined that the program did not and would not occur at any time during the calendar year 2012, which is the test year for this case. Since the program did not occur within the test year, it cannot be considered as being a known and measurable expense. Therefore, Staff excluded the expense in its entirety from the Applicant's test year.
22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37		 and unreasonable? A. Staff's decision was based upon a phone interview with a member of the Company's staff on September 4, 2012. As a result of the conversation, it was determined that the program did not and would not occur at any time during the calendar year 2012, which is the test year for this case. Since the program did not occur within the test year, it cannot be considered as being a known and measurable expense. Therefore, Staff excluded the expense in its entirety from the Applicant's test year. Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

PROOF OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing Testimony of John L. Berringer, submitted on behalf of the Staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, was served via electronic mail, upon the parties listed below, this 19th day of March, 2013.

<u>/s/Thomas G. Lindgren</u> **Thomas G. Lindgren** Assistant Attorney General

Parties of Record:

M. Howard Petricoff Vorys Sater Seymour & Pease LLP 52 E. Gay Street P.O. Box 1008 Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008

Deb J. Bingham Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel 10 W. Broad Street, 18th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215

Cathryn N. Loucas The Ohio Environmental Council 1207 Grandview Avenue Columbus, Ohio 43212

Douglas E. Hart 441 Vine Street, Suite 4192 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 Andrew J Sonderman Kegler Brown Hill & Ritter 65 East State Street Suite 1800 Columbus, Ohio 43215

Patti Mallamee Office of the Consumers' Counsel 10 W. Broad Street, Suite 1800 Columbus, Ohio 43215

Lisa A DeMarcus-Eyckmans Duke Energy Ohio 139 E. Fourth Street, 1212 Main Cincinnati, Ohio 45201

Todd M. Williams Williams Allwein & moser, LLC Two Maritime Plaza, 3rd Floor Toledo, Ohio 43604 Colleen L. Mooney OPAE 231 West Lima Street Findlay, Ohio 45840

Teresa Orahood Bricker & Eckler LLP 100 South Third Street Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291

Elizabeth Watts Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. 155 East Broad Street, Suite 2100 Columbus, Ohio 43215

Amy Spiller Duke Energy Ohio 139 E. Fourth Street 1303-Main, P.O. Box 961 Cincinnati, Ohio 45201-0960

Michael L. Kurtz Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry 36 E. Seventh Street, Suite 1510 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Carys Cochern Duke Energy 155 East Broad Street, 21st Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215

Ohio Manufacturers' Association 33 N. High Street Columbus, Ohio 43215 Jennifer L. Lause Direct Energy 21 E. State Street, 19th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215

Gina L. Brigner Ohio Consumers' Counsel 10 W. Broad Street, 18th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215

Kimberly W. Bojko Carpenter Lipps & Leland LLP 280 North High Street, Suite 1300 Columbus, Ohio 43215

Dianne Kuhnell Duke Energy Business Services 139 E. Fourth Street EA025 P.O. Box 960 Cincinnati, Ohio 45201

Larry Sauer Terry Etter Ohio C onsumers' Counsel 10 W. Broad Street, 18th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215

Thomas O'Brien Bricker & Eckler LLP 100 South Third Street Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291

Andrew J. Sonderman Kegler Brown Hill & Ritter 65 East State Street, Suite 1800 Columbus, Ohio 43215

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

3/19/2013 5:01:56 PM

in

Case No(s). 12-1682-EL-AIR, 12-1683-EL-ATA, 12-1684-EL-AAM

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