BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio	:	
Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric	:	Case No. 14-1297-EL-SSO
Illuminating Company and The Toledo	:	
Edison Company for Authority to Provide	:	
for a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to	:	
R.C. 4928.143, in the Form of an Electric	:	
Security Plan.	:	

PREFILED TESTIMONY OF TAMARA S. TURKENTON Regulatory Services division rates & analysis department Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

Staff Exhibit _____

September 18, 2015

1	1.	Q.	Please state your name and your business address.
2		A.	My name is Tamara S. Turkenton. My business address is 180 East Broad
3			Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.
4			
5	2.	Q.	By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
6		A.	I am employed by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio as Chief of the
7			Regulatory Services Division of the Rates and Analysis Department.
8			
9	3.	Q.	Please briefly summarize your educational background and work experi-
10			ence.
11		A.	I received a Bachelor of Business Administration in Finance and Business
12			Pre-Law (BBA) from Ohio University. I also received a Master of Busi-
13			ness Administration (MBA) degree from Capital University and a Master of
14			Tax Laws (MT) degree from Capital Law School.
15			
16			I have been employed by the Commission since June 1994 and involved in
17			the Electric Fuel Component (EFC) section, the Telecommunications sec-
18			tion, the Competitive Retail Electric Service (CRES) section working on
19			electric deregulation and SB 3, and the Rates & Tariffs section working on
20			electric utility rates, tariffs, and rules. In April 2009, I was assigned to the
21			Accounting and Electricity Division working on many aspects of SB 221. I

1			currently serve as the Chief of the Regulatory Services Division of the
2			Rates and Analysis Department.
3			
4	4.	Q.	Have you testified in prior proceedings before the Commission?
5		A.	Yes.
6			
7	5.	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?
8		A.	On August 4, 2014, Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illum-
9			inating Company and The Toledo Edison Company (Companies) filed an
10			application for an Electric Security Plan (ESP) in accordance with Section
11			4928.143, of the Ohio Revised Code.
12			
13			My testimony addresses Staff's support of the Companies' use of an Elec-
14			tric Security Plan, rather than a Market Rate Offer (MRO). In support of
15			this position, Staff has compared the terms and conditions of the Com-
16			panies' ESP to determine if they are more favorable to customers in the
17			aggregate than the expected results that would otherwise apply under an
18			MRO.
19			
20			Additionally, my testimony discusses the proposed Pilot Program included
21			in the Companies' Supplemental Stipulation, filed on May 28, 2015, which

1	provides certain customers the ability to opt out of the Non-Market Based
2	Services Rider (Rider NMB).

3		Com	parison between the ESP and the MRO
4	6.	Q.	Do you believe the proposed ESP is more favorable in the aggregate than
5			an MRO?
6		A.	Yes, when all provisions of the ESP application are considered along with
7			Staff recommendations filed in this case, I believe the ESP application is
8			more favorable in the aggregate than an MRO application would be.
9			
10	7.	Q.	Please describe what you have considered in regard to the ESP verses MRO
11			test for this application.
12		A.	Generation rates for 100% of the standard service offer (SSO) load are
13			based on market based auction prices and as a result, there should be no dif-
14			ference between market based generation rates under an MRO filing or an
15			ESP filing. However, the Companies proposed in their original application,
16			filed on August 4, 2014, to provide \$3.0 million of shareholder funds for
17			economic development over the term of the proposed ESP. Staff considers
18			the Companies' \$3.0 million commitment to be a quantitative benefit of the
19			proposed ESP. In addition, the Stipulation filed by various parties on
20			December 22, 2014 includes an additional \$7.2 million of shareholder

1			funded commitments to assist at-risk populations, promote energy effi-
2			ciency and promote the retail competitive markets. If these terms are
3			approved by the Commission, the additional \$7.2 million should be
4			included in the quantitative benefits.
5			
6	8.	Q.	Please describe the qualitative benefits you considered in your conclusion.
7		A.	In particular, the Staff believes that an ESP filing provides the most flexi-
8			bility in order to achieve outcomes that are advantageous for all of the par-
9			ties involved. For example, as discussed in the application, the proposed
10			ESP commits to the continuation of the current Delivery Capital Recovery
11			Rider (DCR). This DCR is similar to distribution investment riders
12			approved by the Commission for other utilities in Ohio. The structure of
13			the DCR provides an economical and efficient process which enables the
14			Companies to make investments in their distribution system, which
15			improves both the safety and reliability of the distribution system. Further
16			details of Staff's recommendations in regard to the DCR are discussed in
17			the Direct Testimony of Staff witness McCarter.
18			
19	9.	Q.	What else have you considered in making your recommendation?
20		A.	I have also considered the qualitative benefits associated with the Com-
21			panies' proposal to implement a supplier web portal as well as making
22			other changes to the Companies' Electric Service Regulations and Supplier

tariffs that enhance the retail market and help mitigate potential barriers to
competition. Further details of Staff's recommendations in regard to supplier web portal and retail enhancements are discussed in the Direct Testimony of Staff witness Schaefer.

5

<u>Pilot Program (Opt-out of Rider NMB)</u>

- Q. The Supplemental Stipulation filed by various parties on May 28, 2015 provides for the creation of a Pilot Program that would allow certain customers
 to opt out of Rider NMB. Does Staff have any comments in regard to the
 proposed Pilot Program?
- 10 A. Yes, Staff is concerned about the possible impacts to other non-participating ratepayers if the Pilot Program is approved. It is Staff's understanding 11 12 that there are a number of customers that represent a significant portion of the Companies' peak load that would be eligible for the program. Also, the 13 14 Companies have indicated that they have not performed any studies to estimate potential impacts to non-participating customers. Another concern is 15 16 that the Pilot Program is limited to a certain set of customers associated 17 with Ohio Energy Group and Industrial Energy Users-Ohio, Nucor Steel 18 Marion, Inc., and Material Sciences Corporation. As a result of these con-19 cerns, Staff does not recommend approval of the Pilot Program as pro-20 posed.
- 21

- 1 11. Q. Doe this conclude your testimony?
- 2 A. Yes, it does. However, I reserve the right to submit supplemental testi-
- 3 mony as described herein, as new information subsequently becomes avail-
- 4 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 Tamara**

S. Turkenton submitted on behalf of the Staff of the Public Utilities Commission of

Ohio, was served by regular U.S. mail, postage prepaid, hand-delivered, and/or delivered

via electronic mail, upon the following parties of record, this 18th day of September,

2015.

/s/ Steven L. Beeler

Steven L. Beeler Assistant Attorney General

Parties of Record:

cmooney@ohiopartners.org drinebolt@ohiopartners.org tdougherty@theoec.org joseph.clark@directenergy.com ghull@eckertseamans.com sam@mwncmh.com fdarr@mwncmh.com mpritchard@mwncmh.com kboehm@blklawfirm.com jkylercohn@bkllawfirm.com larry.sauer@occ.ohio.gov michael.schuler@occ.ohio.gov joliker@igsenergy.com mswhite@igsenergy.com myurick@taftlaw.com schmidt@sppgrp.com ricks@ohanet.org tobrien@bricker.com stnourse@aep.com misatterwhite@aep.com valami@aep.com callwein@wamenergylaw.com ifinnigan@edf.org

christopher.miller@icemiller.com gregory.dunn@icemiller.com jeremy.grayem@icemiller.com athompson@taftlaw.com marilyn@wflawfirm.com blanghenry@city.cleveland.oh.us hmadorsky@city.cleveland.oh.us kryan@city.cleveland.oh.us mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com ccunningham@akronohio.gov boiko@carpenterlipps.com allison@carpenterlipps.com hussey@carpenterlipps.com gkrassen@bricker.com dborchers@bricker.com asonderman@keglerbrown.com mfleisher@elpc.org jscheaf@mcdonaldhopkins.com mitch.dutton@fpl.com matt@matthewcoxlaw.com todonnell@dickinson-wright.com dwolff@crowell.com sechler@carpenterlipps.com

wttpmlc@aol.com mkl@bbrslaw.com rlehfeldt@crowell.com jeffrey.mayes@monitoringanalytics.com toddm@wamenergylaw.com toddm@wamenergylaw.com lhawrot@spilmanlaw.com dwilliamson@spilmanlaw.com meissnerjoseph@yahoo.com trhayslaw@gmail.com lesliekovacik@toledo.oh.gov cynthia.brady@exeloncorp.com david.fein@exeloncorp.com dakutik@jonesday.com gas@bbrslaw.com gpoulos@enernoc.com mhpetricoff@vorys.com ojk@bbrslaw.com sfisk@earthjustice.org msoules@earthjustice.org tony.mendoza@sierraclub.org lael.campbell@exeloncorp.com dstinson@bricker.com jlang@calfee.com talexander@calfee.com burkj@firstenergycorp.com This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

9/18/2015 11:31:49 AM

in

Case No(s). 14-1297-EL-SSO

Summary: Testimony Prefiled Testimony of Tamara S. Turkenton submitted by Assistant Attorney General Steven Beeler on behalf of the Staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio. electronically filed by Kimberly L Keeton on behalf of Public Utilities Commission of Ohio