1	BEFORE
. 2	THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO
3	E
4	Consolidated Duke Energy) Case Nos.
5	Ohio, Inc. Rate) 03-93-EL-ATA
6	Stabilization Plan Remand) 03-2079-EL-AN 3
7	and Rider Adjustment) 03-2080-EL-ATA
8	Cases.) 03-2081-EL-AAM
9	05-724-EL-UNC
10	05-725-EL-UNC
11	06-1068-EL-UNC
12	06-1069-EL-UNC
13	06-1085-EL-UNC
14	
15	Deposition of Michael P. Haugh, a
16	witness herein, called by Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.
17	for cross-examination under the statute, taken
18	before me, Valerie J. Grubaugh, Registered Merit
19	Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter, and Notary
20	Public in and for the State of Ohio, pursuant to
21	notice and stipulations of counsel hereinafter set
22	forth, at the offices of Ohio Consumers' Counsel,
23	10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800, Columbus, Ohio,
24	on Tuesday, April 3, 2007, beginning at 10:00
25	o'clock a.m. and concluding on the same day.

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	ON BEHALF OF DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC.:
4	Rocco O. D'Ascenzo, Esq.
5	Counsel
6	Duke Energy Shared Services, Inc.
7	Duke Energy Corporation
8	139 East Fourth Street
9	Post Office Box 960
10	Room 2500, Atrium II
11	Cincinnati, Ohio 45201-0960
12	(513) 287-4326 Fax (513) 287-3810
13	Rocco.d'ascenzo@duke-energy.com
14	
15	Paul A. Colbert, Esq.
16	Associate General Counsel
17	Duke Energy Ohio
18	Duke Energy Corporation
19	155 East Broad Street - 21st Floor
20	Columbus, Ohio 43215
21	(614) 221-7551 Fax (614) 221-7556
22	<pre>paul.colbert@duke-energy.com</pre>
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES (continued):
2	
3	ON BEHALF OF THE RESIDENTIAL CONSUMERS OF DUKE
4	ENERGY OHIO, INC.:
5	Janine Migden-Ostrander, Esq.
6	Ohio Consumers' Counsel
7	BY: Larry S. Sauer, Esq.
8	Ann M. Hotz, Esq.
9	Assistant Consumers' Counsel
10	10 West Broad Street - Suite 1800
11	Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485
12	(614) 466-8574 Fax (614) 466-9475
13	sauer@occ.state.oh.us
14	hotz@occ.state.oh.us
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	STIPULATIONS
2	
3	It is stipulated by and among counsel for
4	the respective parties herein that the deposition
5	of Michael P. Haugh, a witness herein, called by
6	Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for cross-examination under
7	the statute, may be taken at this time and reduced
8	to writing in stenotype by the Notary, whose notes
9	may thereafter be transcribed out of the presence
10	of the witness; that proof of the official
11	character and qualification of the Notary is
12	waived; that the witness may sign the transcript
13	of his deposition before a Notary other than the
14	Notary taking his deposition; said deposition to
15	have the same force and effect as though the
16	witness had signed the transcript of his
17	deposition before the Notary taking it.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

25

1	I N D E X	
2	-	
3	WITNESS	PAGE
4	Michael P. Haugh	
5	Cross-examination by Mr. D'Ascenzo	6
6		
7	 -	
8	EXHIBITS	MARKED
9	Duke Energy Ohio Exhibit No. 1 -	32
10	Supplemental Testimony of	
11	L'Nard E. Tufts	
12	Duke Energy Ohio Exhibit No. 2 -	48
13	Supreme Court of Ohio	
14	Opinion and Order	
15	Duke Energy Ohio Exhibit No. 3 -	75
16	"Argus Air Daily" articles	
17	Duke Energy Ohio Exhibit No. 4 -	100
18	The Boeing Company Annual Report	
19	Duke Energy Ohio Exhibit No. 5 -	104
20	Eli Lilly Annual Report	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

- 1 MICHAEL P. HAUGH
- 2 of lawful age, being by me first duly placed under
- 3 oath, as prescribed by law, was examined and
- 4 testified as follows:
- 5 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 6 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 7 Q. Okay. Good morning, Mr. Haugh. I'm
- 8 Rocco D'Ascenzo. I represent Duke Energy, Ohio in
- 9 the consolidated case numbers 03-93, et al.
- This portion of the proceeding involves
- 11 several of our Riders that make up our market
- 12 price, and I'm here to take your deposition about
- 13 prepared testimony that you filed roughly around
- 14 March 9th of this year.
- I assume you've had your deposition taken
- 16 before?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. So let me just remind you of sort of the
- 19 ground rules. If you don't understand a question
- 20 that I've asked, just let me know and I will
- 21 attempt to rephrase it the best way that I can.
- 22 If you can respond in a "yes" or "no",
- 23 that can speed things along and we can try to get
- 24 out of here sooner.
- So I guess to start things off, do you

- 1 have any questions?
- 2 A. None.
- 3 Q. Okay. Would you please state your name
- 4 for the record, please?
- 5 A. Michael Haugh, H-a-u-g-h.
- 6 Q. And your business address?
- 7 A. 10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800,
- 8 Columbus, Ohio 43215.
- 9 Q. Okay. I want to get into a little bit of
- 10 your background and your education. This
- 11 hopefully won't take too long.
- 12 What degrees do you have?
- 13 A. I have a Bachelor's of Science in
- 14 Business Administration from Ohio State, and that
- 15 is my only degree.
- 16 Q. And when did you graduate from OSU?
- 17 A. 1994.
- 18 Q. Okay. What was your concentration in?
- 19 A. Finance.
- Q. What sorts of classes did you take as
- 21 part of that degree?
- 22 A. Accounting -- A variety of business
- 23 classes: Accounting, finance, operations
- 24 management, economics. That would just be a
- 25 sampling of the cases I took.

- 1 Q. Okay. And what other training
- 2 postgraduate have you had?
- 3 A. Any of a number of conferences.
- 4 Different training seminars with previous
- 5 employers. And I attended the NERUC regulatory
- 6 studies class, I guess you would say, up at
- 7 Michigan State.
- Q. Okay. In your prepared testimony filed
- 9 on March 9th, you describe being employed with
- 10 Enron Energy Services as a Natural Gas Trading
- 11 Analyst; is that correct?
- 12 A. That is correct, yes.
- 13 Q. What time period were you with Enron?
- 14 A. 1996 through 1998.
- 15 Q. Were you a Natural Gas Trading Analyst
- 16 for that entire period?
- A. Would have held the same position. The
- 18 name may have changed at some point, but I held
- 19 the same position for that full time.
- Q. What were your primary responsibilities
- 21 as a trading analyst?
- 22 A. We were a retail -- We did retail natural
- 23 gas marketing, and I would do price quotes for
- 24 the -- sales reps would go out, get customers, and
- 25 I would do price quotes, load forecasting, and

- 1 then hedge the commodity with financial products.
- 2 Q. So your basic function was more along
- 3 analysis supporting the actual sales folks that
- 4 would go out there; is that a correct
- 5 characterization?
- A. I guess it would be a good generalization
- 7 of what I did.
- 8 Q. Did you, yourself, do any sales?
- 9 A. I had limited direct contact with
- 10 customers.
- 11 Q. Okay.
- 12 A. Occasionally -- Let me preface that by
- 13 saying occasionally I did. When discussing
- 14 specifics, I would talk with the customers and
- 15 describe -- answer any questions that they had.
- 16 Q. Did you purchase financial hedges?
- 17 A. I would -- We were a small retail shop
- 18 underneath the larger headquarters in Houston. We
- 19 were here in Dublin, Ohio, and we would -- I would
- 20 actually do some financial hedging by calling the
- 21 trading desk in Houston, and essentially they had
- 22 a large book of business and they would hedge our
- 23 book using theirs, if that makes sense.
- They had a much larger book. Our sole
- 25 counter party in the financial hedges was the

- 1 trading desk in Houston.
- Q. Did you do any actual trading? You,
- 3 personally?
- 4 A. I would purchase physical commodity. You
- 5 could call it -- I was doing financial trading,
- 6 but it was -- at that time it was only with the
- 7 office in Houston.
- 8 Q. What would make those trades or purchases
- 9 profitable?
- 10 A. Well, the sort of problem that I have
- 11 with your question is that we -- our trades
- 12 weren't necessarily made for profit. We were
- 13 hedging the sales --
- 14 Q. Okay.
- 15 A. -- that we were -- we were primarily
- 16 hedging the sales, and that was our goal -- that
- 17 was our function.
- 18 Q. As part of your analysis, did you review
- 19 publications for the price of commodities or the
- 20 financial hedges?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 O. What were those?
- A. That was a long time ago, and I'm trying
- 24 to recall the specific publications. And for that
- 25 particular position, I can't recall exactly what I

- 1 was -- what we were viewing at that time, what the
- 2 names of the publications were.
- 3 Q. But they were published indices in the
- 4 industry?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. What level of risk were you trying to
- 7 achieve with the hedges that you were purchasing?
- 8 A. At that time?
- 9 Q. Uh-huh.
- 10 A. Zero risk.
- 11 Q. Is there a -- In your opinion, is there a
- 12 common level of risk that companies would try to
- 13 achieve in the market?
- 14 THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the
- 15 question, please?
- 16 (Record read back as requested.)
- 17 THE WITNESS: Could you describe what you
- 18 mean by "common level of risk"?
- 19 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- Q. Well, let me see if I can do this as a
- 21 hypothetical.
- 22 Assume a company is actively trading or
- 23 active in a market, and is purchasing hedges such
- 24 as what you were.
- In your opinion, would there be a certain

- 1 amount of risk that a company would be trying to
- 2 mitigate or avoid?
- 3 A. You mean each company?
- 4 Q. Generally speaking.
- 5 A. I would --
- 6 MR. SAUER: I'd like to object. Are you
- 7 asking him what level of risk Enron was trying to
- 8 assume while they were involved in this market,
- 9 or --
- MR. D'ASCENZO: I was speaking more in
- 11 general, given his background and his experience
- 12 and his opinion, whether companies who are active
- in a market would be trying to mitigate some form
- 14 of risk.
- 15 THE WITNESS: Well, I would say that in a
- 16 trading environment, or in a retail marketing
- 17 environment, companies would be -- would be
- 18 attempting to mitigate some risk.
- 19 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- Q. And there may be some level of risk that
- 21 a company would be willing to accept given a
- 22 certain position in a market; would you agree with
- 23 that?
- 24 A. It would depend on the company.
- Q. Would you agree that some companies such

- 1 as Enron are completely risk adverse?
- 2 A. Did you say some companies -- companies
- 3 such as Enron are risk adverse?
- 4 O. Yes.
- 5 A. Well, there's not much going on at Enron
- 6 right now.
- 7 Q. Well, Enron, during your tenure there.
- 8 A. I can't recall the exact risk policies
- 9 while I was at Enron. I know for my position, our
- 10 goal was to have zero risk on those specific
- 11 products that I was working on.
- 12 Q. And in your opinion, was that reasonable?
- 13 A. For that particular product, I felt it
- 14 was reasonable.
- 15 Q. Let's move a little forward in time here.
- 16 After you left Enron, according to your testimony,
- 17 you were with AEP Energy Services; is that
- 18 correct?
- 19 A. Yes. There were a variety of names that
- 20 we worked under, but that was -- I believe that's
- 21 what it was when I left.
- Q. Okay. Approximately when did you start
- 23 with -- I'll just say AEP?
- 24 A. The -- I started immediately after
- 25 leaving Enron; 1998.

- 1 Q. And what was the principle business of
- 2 AEP Energy Services, or the organization of AEP
- 3 while you were there?
- 4 A. We were a wholesale trading group.
- 5 Q. What did you specifically -- What was
- 6 your job title while you were there?
- 7 A. Might be easier for me to describe the
- 8 different positions I held.
- 9 Q. Okay.
- 10 A. There are actually periods of time where
- 11 I'm not sure what my actual title was.
- 12 Q. I know what that's like.
- 13 A. It might be easier to go through and
- 14 explain what I did.
- 15 O. Sure.
- 16 A. I started off doing risk management for
- 17 the natural gas, electric, liquids and coal
- 18 trading groups. Following that, I spent a brief
- 19 time trading natural gas. Following that, I did
- 20 asset optimization on the power plants.
- Q. While you were trading natural gas, what
- 22 were your job responsibilities or typical duties?
- 23 A. With that, we would -- there were traders
- 24 that held long-term positions and, essentially, I
- 25 would flatten those out on a daily basis, on a

- 1 physical -- in a physical sense.
- 2 Q. How did you flatten them out?
- 3 A. Just trading with counter parties in the
- 4 market.
- 5 Q. Were you purchasing hedges as part of
- 6 that?
- 7 A. In that position, no.
- 8 Q. What level of risk was acceptable at AEP
- 9 while you were a natural gas trader?
- 10 A. Can I confer with my counsel briefly?
- 11 O. Yes.
- MR. D'ASCENZO: Go off the record.
- 13 (Discussion held off the record.)
- MR. D'ASCENZO: Go back on the record.
- 15 THE WITNESS: I don't feel comfortable
- 16 discussing the risk that was acceptable while I
- 17 was working at AEP due to that it may be
- 18 considered proprietary.
- MR. D'ASCENZO: Okay. Could we go off
- 20 the record?
- 21 (Discussion held off the record.)
- 22 THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the
- 23 question, please?
- 24 (Record read back as requested.)
- MR. SAUER: I object to this question.

- 1 To the extent you can answer it, Mike, in a manner
- 2 that you feel comfortable, without breaching any
- 3 prior confidences you had with your prior
- 4 employer, you may answer the question.
- 5 THE WITNESS: There were a variety of
- 6 risk tolerances depending on the specific trading
- 7 book, and the specific commodity, each one having
- 8 its own -- each one being slightly different based
- 9 on where that specific trader and where the head
- 10 of all traders felt was comfortable.
- 11 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 12 Q. Let me see if I can just ask a very
- 13 high-level question to see if you feel comfortable
- 14 answering that.
- Would you agree that while you were at
- 16 AEP, the lower the risk, given the factors that
- 17 you just mentioned, the better the deal, the
- 18 position, or the trade?
- MR. SAUER: Continuing objection to this
- 20 line of questioning. To the extent you understand
- 21 the question, Mike, to the extent you feel
- 22 comfortable answering it, you may.
- 23 THE WITNESS: If I could just clarify
- 24 this. You are stating that the lower the risk,
- 25 the better the trade? Was that what you stated?

- 1 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 2 Q. Basically. The lower the risk, the --
- 3 yes, the better the trade. I guess that's the
- 4 best way to put it.
- 5 A. How would you define "better" in that
- 6 statement?
- 7 Q. More profitable, given the various risk
- 8 tolerances that -- as you described in a couple of
- 9 questions ago, of those factors?
- 10 A. I wouldn't agree with that.
- 11 Q. Okay. I think I have just one more
- 12 question along those lines there. Would you agree
- 13 that AEP had policies to limit risk?
- 14 MR. SAUER: Continuing objection.
- 15 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 16 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 17 Q. Okay. You also mentioned while you were
- 18 with AEP that you were involved in asset
- 19 optimization. Could you just briefly describe
- 20 what that is, and what you did?
- 21 A. Essentially, in -- with our power plants,
- 22 we would determine, based on market conditions, if
- 23 it was better to run the power plant, purchase
- 24 power in the market, things of that nature.
- Q. And in your assessment of running a power

- 1 plant, did you take into consideration certain
- 2 costs of running the asset?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Costs such as maybe fuel, emission
- 5 allowances, those sorts of things?
- A. Yes. Those are a few of the things, yes.
- 7 Q. What about, did you consider costs that
- 8 would make the asset run more efficiently?
- 9 A. What do you mean by that?
- 10 Q. Say, scrubbers.
- 11 A. That was not something that I would
- 12 evaluate.
- 13 Q. Do you know if it was evaluated?
- 14 A. I do not know.
- Q. What about reagents, did you evaluate
- 16 that?
- 17 A. I did not evaluate that.
- 18 Q. Do you know if it was evaluated?
- 19 A. I do not know.
- Q. When did you leave -- Approximately, when
- 21 did you leave AEP?
- 22 A. At the end of 2003.
- Q. And according to your testimony, you then
- 24 went to MidAmerican Energy; is that correct?
- A. Energy Services.

- 1 Q. Energy Services.
- 2 A. Yes. My specific area was -- I was under
- 3 MidAmerican Energy Services. MidAmerican Energy
- 4 was the parent to that company.
- 5 Q. Was MidAmerican Energy Services a service
- 6 company that would perform duties for all of the
- 7 companies under MidAmerican Energy?
- 8 A. I'm not -- I don't believe that is true.
- 9 I'm not positive exactly what -- what all was
- 10 encompassed in MidAmerican Energy Services.
- 11 Q. What is your understanding of what
- 12 MidAmerican Energy Services -- what its function
- 13 was?
- 14 A. What I did while I was there was I
- 15 managed the sales for the gas sales into the State
- 16 of Ohio.
- Q. And according to your testimony, at that
- 18 time your job title was Senior Product Manager; is
- 19 that correct?
- 20 A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. Did MidAmerican Energy Services have
- 22 policies regarding risk tolerance?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. And did those policies vary by product or
- 25 book?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. According to your testimony, you were
- 3 with MidAmerican Energy Services for approximately
- 4 one year; is that correct?
- 5 A. That's correct. January of '04 until I
- 6 joined the OCC in October, so ten months.
- 7 Q. Okay. When you joined the OCC in October
- 8 of 2004, what was your position?
- 9 A. The same position I hold currently;
- 10 Senior Regulatory Analyst.
- 11 Q. Are you aware that in October of 2004,
- 12 Duke Energy Ohio's, then The Cincinnati Gas &
- 13 Electric Company's, market base standard service
- offer case was in progress and before the
- 15 Commission?
- 16 A. Yes, I was.
- And also, it's fine, it's easier for me
- 18 and possibly for you, if we can refer to it as
- 19 Duke Energy, Duke Energy Ohio. That's easier for
- 20 me, if it would be easier for you also. I
- 21 recognize CG&E and Duke Energy are one in the
- 22 same.
- Q. That was going to be my next question.
- 24 They sort of ingrained that in us. We are now
- 25 Duke Energy, Ohio.

- Were you at all involved, or did you
- 2 participate in Duke Energy Ohio's MBSSO in 2004?
- A. I was pulled into a few meetings shortly
- 4 after I started here, and to be honest, I was -- I
- 5 understood very little because it was -- I was
- 6 at -- I was coming in at mile one, and everyone
- 7 else was at mile 26 of the marathon. So I was --
- 8 I had very little understanding what was going on
- 9 at that time.
- 10 Q. Okay. So your involvement was limited,
- 11 at best?
- 12 A. Yes. More of an observer.
- Q. Okay. You didn't perform any sort of
- 14 analysis or anything like that?
- 15 A. No.
- 16 Q. Okay. Today, do you feel that you are
- at, as you put it, mile 26? Are you up to speed
- on Duke Energy Ohio's MBSSO case?
- 19 A. Yes, very much so.
- Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Public
- 21 Utilities Commission of Ohio's entry on rehearing
- 22 on November 23rd, 2004?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Are you familiar with and have you
- 25 reviewed the testimony that was presented in that

- 1 initial case?
- 2 A. Is there any specific testimony?
- 3 Q. Sometime around April, middle of April
- 4 of 2004, Duke Energy Ohio filed its direct
- 5 testimony. We had several witnesses.
- 6 A. That's what I was asking. Any specific
- 7 person's testimony? Some of them.
- 8 Q. John P. Steffen?
- 9 A. I believe I reviewed his, yes.
- 10 O. Judah Rose?
- 11 A. I don't believe I reviewed his.
- 12 Q. Are you generally familiar with the
- 13 appeal of the MBSSO that was brought before the
- Ohio Supreme Court in 2000 -- I think it was
- 15 argued in 2006, sometime in April or May?
- 16 A. I have general knowledge of that.
- 17 Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the Opinion
- 18 and Order from the Ohio Supreme Court that --
- 19 involving the MBS -- Duke Energy Ohio's MBSSO case
- 20 that was published back in November of 2006?
- 21 A. Once again, generally knowledgeable on
- 22 that.
- Q. Okay. Let's start going into your
- 24 testimony here a little further.
- By the way, if you need a break while

- 1 we're going through this, please let me know.
- Beginning on Page 3 of your testimony,
- 3 around Line 16, you essentially make three
- 4 recommendations for the company's AAC filing, the
- 5 Annually Adjusted Component Rider, of its market
- 6 base -- of Duke Energy Ohio's market base standard
- 7 service offer; is that correct?
- 8 A. For the AAC, specifically.
- 9 Q. Yes. We'll deal with the AAC
- 10 specifically, and then the SRT later.
- 11 A. I believe there's only three for the AAC.
- 12 Q. Let me ask this: What is your
- 13 understanding of Duke Energy Ohio's AAC?
- A. If I'm not mistaken, according to Duke,
- 15 it is for costs incurred for environmental
- 16 compliance, tax law changes and homeland security.
- 17 Q. Do you know if the AAC is avoidable?
- A. For residentials -- residential
- 19 customers, I believe it is avoidable for the
- 20 first 25 percent that shop.
- Q. Do you know what it is for
- 22 nonresidential?
- A. I believe it's 50 percent, first 50
- 24 percent that shop, subject to check on both of
- 25 those.

- 1 Q. And for the first 25 percent of
- 2 residential load that switches, the AAC is 100
- 3 percent avoidable; is that correct?
- 4 A. That's my understanding.
- 5 Q. Let's deal with the third recommendation
- 6 that you make with respect to the AAC in your
- 7 testimony. And that has to do with the placement
- 8 of the AAC on Duke Energy Ohio's bill.
- 9 Your recommendation, correct me if I
- 10 misstate this, is that Duke Energy Ohio should
- 11 place the AAC charge in the, quote, generation
- 12 portion of customer bills. Is that a correct
- 13 characterization of your recommendation?
- 14 A. I would say that's a correct
- 15 generalization of what my recommendations are.
- 16 Q. And again, correct me if I
- 17 mischaracterize this, but your recommendation is
- 18 based upon the AAC collecting charges related to
- 19 generation; is that correct?
- 20 A. Yes, the AAC deals with generation costs.
- Q. Are you aware if the Commission has
- 22 approved Duke Energy Ohio's current billing
- 23 format?
- A. I'm not aware of that.
- 25 Q. Do you know if Duke Energy Ohio can

- 1 format its customer bills any way it chooses,
- 2 without Commission approval?
- A. No, I believe there's an approval process
- 4 to that.
- 5 Q. To your knowledge, has anybody -- has any
- 6 customer or consumer filed a complaint that Duke
- 7 Energy Ohio is -- Duke Energy Ohio's bill format
- 8 is -- has not received Commission approval?
- 9 THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the
- 10 question, please?
- 11 (Record read back as requested.)
- 12 THE WITNESS: I don't know of any
- 13 complaint.
- 14 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 15 Q. Are you aware if the Commission has
- 16 received any complaints from consumers regarding
- 17 the location of the AAC charge on Duke Energy
- 18 Ohio's bill?
- 19 A. I'm not aware of that.
- 20 Q. Since January of 2006, has OCC received
- 21 any complaints from residential consumers
- 22 regarding the location of the AAC charge on Duke
- 23 Energy Ohio's bill?
- A. I'm not aware of that.
- Q. If Duke Energy Ohio were to agree to a

- 1 billing format change for the location of the AAC,
- 2 as you recommend, subject to Commission approval,
- 3 would this resolve your criticism of Duke Energy
- 4 Ohio's billing format with respect to the AAC
- 5 charge?
- A. Well, my suggestion is that this should
- 7 be moved to the generation portion of the bill.
- 8 If it is moved to the generation portion of the
- 9 bill, then my -- it sounds as though Duke Energy
- 10 Ohio would be following my recommendation in that
- 11 case, so yes, that would be -- if they follow my
- 12 recommendation, I wouldn't have a problem with
- 13 that.
- 14 Q. Okay. Going back to Page 3, starting on
- 15 Line -- you know what, I have -- this was -- I'm
- 16 referring to your November testimony. Let me see
- 17 if -- they are slightly different. It is Page 3,
- 18 and Line 17 of your March testimony.
- 19 You make the recommendation that the AAC
- 20 should be audited in a manner similar to the
- 21 audits that occur with Duke Energy Ohio's System
- 22 Reliability Tracker and Fuel and Purchase Power
- 23 Rider. Is that a correct characterization of your
- 24 recommendation?
- A. I believe that's a direct quote from my

- 1 testimony.
- 2 Q. Okay. Would you please describe in your
- 3 own words what that audit would entail?
- 4 A. I would -- Similar to the SRT and FPP,
- 5 there would be a financial audit made to verify
- 6 that all -- just like any other audit, all the
- 7 money is going to the correct place and is
- 8 prudently incurred -- all the costs were prudently
- 9 incurred, and with this -- with the AAC, I would
- 10 also expect there to be a physical audit of the --
- 11 to verify that the costs incurred were for the
- 12 environmental compliance, and that it was
- 13 operational.
- 14 Q. So let me see if I can summarize that.
- 15 You are recommending a -- both a
- 16 financial audit and some form of a
- 17 Management/Performance audit.
- 18 A. Yes, that's my understanding of the -- of
- 19 how the SRT and FPP are being audited currently.
- 20 Along with the Management/Performance, I guess
- 21 there would be an inclusion of a physical audit
- 22 with a Management/Performance audit.
- Q. Are you also suggesting that an outside
- 24 auditor be employed to review the AAC?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 O. Do you believe that the Commission staff
- 2 is capable of reviewing the AAC filing and
- 3 performing its own analysis?
- A. I don't know -- I'd have to have more
- 5 details on that to make a judgment on that.
- 6 O. Do you believe that the Commission staff
- 7 is capable of performing any audit?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 O. Do you have a reason to believe that the
- 10 Commission staff would be incapable of auditing
- 11 Duke Energy Ohio's AAC?
- 12 THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the
- 13 question, please?
- 14 (Record read back as requested.)
- MR. SAUER: Are you talking, Rocco, about
- 16 financial audits only, or are you talking about
- 17 physical audits, or are you talking about --
- MR. D'ASCENZO: The audits that Mr. Haugh
- 19 here is recommending, both financial and
- 20 management appraisal.
- 21 THE WITNESS: I don't believe I know the
- 22 specific qualifications of all the members of the
- 23 PUCO staff to be able to answer that question, if
- 24 I feel they are capable or incapable.
- 25 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:

- 1 Q. Do you believe that OCC would be capable
- 2 of reviewing the AAC filing and performing its own
- 3 analysis?
- A. Did you say reviewing the AAC?
- 5 Q. Uh-huh.
- A. I believe we are able to review and do an
- 7 analysis on the AAC.
- Q. If an outside auditor were hired to
- 9 perform a comprehensive audit of the AAC filing,
- 10 should those -- the costs of hiring that auditor
- 11 be passed through, through the AAC charge?
- 12 A. I believe this audit should be treated in
- 13 the same fashion as the SRT and FPP audits.
- Q. And do you know what that is?
- 15 A. I am not positive of the handling of
- 16 that -- of those audits.
- Q. Would you agree that OCC has an
- 18 opportunity to intervene, conduct discovery, and
- 19 potentially litigate DE Ohio's annual AAC filing?
- 20 A. If there is a filing, then yes, the OCC
- 21 has the ability to intervene and conduct
- 22 discovery. That's my knowledge.
- Q. Given that you are recommending that the
- 24 AAC be treated in a manner that is identical to
- 25 the FPP and SRT, are you also recommending that

- 1 there be an annual true-up of the AAC calculation
- 2 for both over- or undercollections?
- 3 A. I don't address that in my testimony.
- 4 Q. What is your opinion with respect to
- 5 truing up the AAC?
- A. At this time, I really don't have an
- 7 opinion on that.
- 8 Q. On Page 6, Line 2 of your testimony --
- 9 A. With this, we're going to be working off
- 10 my March 9 testimony, I assume, at all times?
- 11 Q. Yes. I thought I made that change, but
- 12 if not.
- 13 You state that you believe an audit of
- 14 the AAC is the only way the PUCO would be able to
- 15 determine whether the AAC charge is reasonable and
- 16 calculated as ordered. Is that a correct
- 17 characterization?
- 18 A. I believe that's a direct quote from my
- 19 testimony.
- Q. Would such an audit include a review of
- 21 source documents?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. Accounting records, for instance?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 O. Fixed asset records?

- 1 A. That, I'm not sure.
- Q. How about estimates of expenditures?
- 3 A. I would assume that would be part of the
- 4 audit.
- 5 Q. And an on-site inspection to verify the
- 6 physical existence of plant items?
- 7 A. That sounds reasonable.
- Q. Should there be a review of monthly
- 9 financial statements and trial balances by FERC
- 10 account?
- 11 A. That also sounds reasonable.
- 12 Q. Have you reviewed the supplemental
- 13 testimony of L'Nard Tufts file on March 9, 2007 in
- 14 this case?
- 15 A. Yes, I looked at it.
- 16 Q. Would you agree that Mr. Tufts, on behalf
- of the Commission staff, reviewed the company's
- 18 proposed AAC calculation for 2007?
- 19 A. Not having Mr. Tufts' testimony, I can't
- 20 remember the specifics.
- Q. I am handing you a copy of L'Nard's
- 22 testimony that was filed in this case.
- 23 - -
- Thereupon, Duke Energy Ohio's Exhibit
- No. 1 was marked for purposes of

- 1 identification.
- 2 - -
- 3 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 4 Q. Beginning on page -- there isn't a page
- 5 number at the bottom, but it is page one of his
- 6 testimony, Line 1 -- actually, Line 2, Mr. Tufts
- 7 states that he will update his previously filed
- 8 testimony and discuss the staff's investigation
- 9 regarding the applicant's filing. Did I
- 10 correctly --
- 11 A. I think you quoted it directly.
- 12 Q. Okay. And in the next question he begins
- 13 to discuss the company's AAC. Is that correct?
- 14 A. He describes what costs are eligible
- 15 through the AAC.
- 16 Q. And you can take a moment, if you need
- to, to review the testimony. It's only
- 18 approximately five pages in total.
- But would you agree that in this
- 20 testimony, Mr. Tufts describes staff's
- 21 investigation of the various cost components and
- 22 pricing components of the AAC?
- A. I'm sorry. You said cost components and?
- Q. Cost pricing components.
- 25 Interchangeable.

- 1 A. Yes, at different times Mr. Tufts does
- 2 describe the cost components in the AAC.
- 3 Q. So going back to a previous question,
- 4 having reviewed Mr. Tufts' testimony, would you
- 5 agree that Mr. Tufts, on behalf of the Commission
- 6 staff, reviewed the company's proposed AAC
- 7 calculation for 2007?
- 8 A. I'd have to look a little deeper. Your
- 9 previous question was did he look -- did he
- 10 describe the costs. And you're a little bit --
- 11 your question was a little more specific in his
- 12 analysis of -- you asked did he perform an
- 13 analysis of the cost.
- 14 Q. I was referring to a question that I had
- 15 asked prior to handing out this.
- 16 A. Okay.
- 17 Q. You stated you could not recall the
- 18 details of Mr. Tufts' testimony.
- 19 A. Okay. And the pending question is did
- 20 Mr. Tufts do an analysis of the costs?
- Q. Did he review the company's proposed AAC
- 22 calculation?
- A. Yes, it appears as though he did review
- 24 the company's AAC calculation.
- 25 Q. Thank you.

- Do you have any criticism regarding
- 2 Mr. Tufts' review of the company's 2007 AAC
- 3 calculation?
- 4 A. Any criticism of his analysis of the --
- 5 Q. Uh-huh.
- 6 MR. SAUER: Can you reread the question?
- 7 (Record read back as requested.)
- 8 THE WITNESS: Some of my -- I disagree
- 9 with some of his calculations, that there are
- 10 differences between my -- in my testimony and what
- 11 he states in his.
- 12 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- Q. Okay. In what way?
- 14 A. The primary difference is that he -- he
- includes the CWIP portion in the calculation, and
- 16 my testimony suggests removing the CWIP.
- 17 Q. Ignoring the CWIP issue for a moment,
- 18 we'll get to that later, do you have any other
- 19 criticisms of Mr. Tufts' review of the AAC
- 20 calculation?
- 21 A. There are some -- some things I don't
- 22 have an opinion on based on the fact that I don't
- 23 have the -- I do not have the information that --
- 24 or some of the information that Mr. Tufts had, it
- 25 appears, some of the detailed -- some of the

- 1 detailed analysis it appears as though he did.
- 2 Q. Do you know if OCC conducted discovery
- 3 with respect to the company's 2007 AAC
- 4 calculation?
- 5 A. Yes, we did.
- Q. On Page 4, beginning on Line -- well,
- 7 beginning on Line 6 of Mr. Tufts' testimony,
- 8 Mr. Tufts describes a staff adjustment to "O&O"
- 9 costs, and I believe that's a typo, I believe it
- should be O&M costs, from roughly \$38,000
- 11 to \$34,000. Do you have an opinion with respect
- 12 to that adjustment?
- 13 A. No opinion.
- 14 Q. Similarly, in the next question,
- 15 beginning on Line 13, Mr. Tufts describes a
- 16 reduction in homeland security property tax from
- approximately \$1,187 to \$504. Do you have any
- 18 opinion on that?
- 19 A. No opinion.
- Q. On Page 5 of Mr. Tufts' testimony,
- 21 beginning with his answer on Line 3, he describes
- 22 another correction that he made in his prepared
- 23 testimony that was filed, I believe, back in
- November of 2004.
- This is with respect to a tax reduction

- 1 amount of \$4,389,290. He makes a correction that
- 2 it should be \$5,477,473. Do you have an opinion
- 3 with respect to that adjustment?
- 4 A. No opinion.
- Q. Mr. Tufts' review of the company's 2007
- 6 AAC proposal resulted in an increase of the total
- 7 revenue requirement; is that correct?
- 8 A. His attachments are not with this -- or
- 9 not on the testimony that you gave me.
- 10 Q. You are right, they are not.
- 11 A. Subject to check, I would agree that they
- 12 are an increase.
- 13 Q. Okay. Subject to check. I apologize for
- 14 that. I printed it off the docket this morning.
- 15 Apparently there was a subsequent filing that I
- 16 forgot.
- Have you personally performed any sort of
- 18 audit of the company's proposed AAC calculation
- 19 for 2007?
- A. Would you define "audit"?
- 21 Q. Have you reviewed any of the company's
- 22 financial documents, source documents, to
- 23 determine the accuracy of the company's proposal?
- A. What do you mean by "financial" and
- 25 "source documents"?

- 1 Q. The documents that we discussed earlier,
- 2 such as accounting records.
- 3 A. No specific accounting records.
- 4 Q. What documents did you review in making
- 5 your recommendation for the -- for your proposed
- 6 AAC charge?
- 7 A. A variety of documents that I reviewed,
- 8 including the application, the discovery, the
- 9 other -- the filings in the case, the testimony of
- 10 the Duke witnesses.
- 11 Q. And again, excluding the issue of CWIP,
- 12 do you dispute the accuracy of Mr. Tufts'
- adjustments to the company's AAC filing?
- 14 A. I did not have the same information that
- Mr. Tufts did, so I don't have any opinions to his
- 16 specifics.
- 17 Q. Do you know what information Mr. Tufts
- 18 had that you did not have access to?
- 19 A. I do not. I don't know where he obtained
- 20 some of the numbers that he uses in his testimony.
- Q. Do you have any reason to believe that
- 22 Mr. Tufts has not performed a thorough review and
- 23 analysis of Duke Energy Ohio's 2007 AAC proposed
- 24 calculation?
- A. I have no opinion.

- 1 Q. Do you believe Mr. Tufts' proposed
- 2 adjustments are reasonable?
- 3 A. I have no opinion as to that.
- 4 Q. In your opinion, what would make a charge
- 5 reasonable? A charge similar to the AAC, let me
- 6 specify.
- 7 A. What do you mean by "reasonable"?
- Q. In your testimony you are essentially
- 9 saying that Duke Energy Ohio's AAC proposal is not
- 10 a reasonable charge.
- I guess what I'm getting at is, other
- 12 than the issue surrounding CWIP, are there any
- 13 other components that you are disputing?
- 14 A. I feel that an audit would answer if
- 15 there are any others.
- 16 Q. But you don't know at this point?
- 17 A. No.
- 18 (Discussion held off the record.)
- 19 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- Q. Is there any information that you or OCC
- 21 requested from Duke Energy Ohio that we did not
- 22 provide with respect to the AAC?
- 23 A. I am not positive we received everything
- 24 that we requested.
- 25 Q. Okay.

1	MR. D'ASCENZO: I think that's all I have
2	for right now. We can take a break and come back
3	after lunch.
4	(Luncheon recess taken.)
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	————————————————————————————————————
3	Tuesday, April 3rd, 2007
4	Afternoon Session
5	-
6	BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
7	Q. Mr. Haugh, going back to Page 3 of your
8	prefiled testimony. Your What you have here as
9	your second recommendation is that a return on
L 0	CWIP should be excluded from the revenue that
1	DE-Ohio seeks to obtain through the AAC.
L2	Did I correctly characterize your
L3	recommendation there?
4	A. That is a direct quote from my testimony.
L5	Q. What is your understanding of the
- 6	construction expenditures component of the
7	company's market price formula?
. 8	A. Well, my understanding is that they are
.9	looking to obtain a return on the environmental
20	construction that is going on currently.
21	Q. What is CWIP, I guess, is a better
22	question?
23	A. It's work that is currently in progress
24	but not completed. It's an account that
5	designates that

- 1 Q. Are you familiar with the book
- 2 "Principles of Public Utility Rates" by James C.
- 3 Bondbright?
- 4 A. I am not.
- 5 Q. Okay. Are you familiar with James C.
- 6 Bondbright's work?
- 7 A. I am not.
- Q. Just to clarify your understanding of the
- 9 company's AAC calculation, is it your
- 10 understanding that the company is seeking a return
- 11 on the investment in plant, or a return of the
- 12 investment in plant?
- 13 A. This CWIP portion, I believe it's a
- 14 return on.
- 15 Q. You are recommending that the company
- 16 exclude all of its construction-related
- 17 expenditures, or some fraction thereof?
- 18 A. I'm not saying that they -- just the
- 19 fraction that is -- the portion that is included
- in CWIP should be included for this proceeding.
- 21 Q. Let me try to clarify.
- In your direct testimony on Line -- on
- 23 Page 6, in the middle of the page there around
- 24 Line 14, I believe it starts, you make reference
- 25 to a 75 percent completion for CWIP to be included

- under a -- under Ohio's previously regulated
- 2 scheme.
- 3 Is that what you are advocating in your
- 4 testimony, or are you saying no CWIP?
- 5 A. I'm saying no CWIP at all. That's stated
- 6 in my Page 8, Line 7 -- actually, Line 9. I
- 7 recommend the CWIP portion be removed from the
- 8 return on environmental plant calculation.
- 9 Q. Okay. And the inclusion of CWIP is the
- 10 only adjustment that you are recommending to the
- 11 AAC price calculation?
- 12 A. That is the only portion that I remove
- 13 from the calculation of Witness Wathen.
- 14 Q. And just to clarify, you are not then
- 15 disputing any of the other cost estimates included
- in the company's 2007 AAC calculation; is that
- 17 correct?
- 18 A. For the cost calculation, I am only
- 19 disputing the CWIP portion.
- 20 Q. Okay. On Page 6, Line 13 of your
- 21 testimony, you state that the company's charges
- 22 are not appropriate for a -- for a deregulated
- 23 generation environment. Is that a correct
- 24 characterization?
- 25 A. That is a direct quote.

- Q. What types of charges, in your opinion,
- 2 are appropriate?
- A. Might be easier for me just to state that
- 4 of the company's charges that they applied for,
- 5 the CWIP portion is what I find -- is one that I
- 6 find inappropriate.
- 7 Q. So when you -- In your statement that the
- 8 company's charges are not appropriate, you're only
- 9 referring to the inclusion of CWIP; is that
- 10 correct?
- A. At this time, yes.
- 12 Q. Do you agree with the statement that
- 13 DE-Ohio's market base standard service offer,
- 14 MBSSO, is a market price?
- 15 A. If you could define "market price", that
- 16 would be helpful.
- 17 Q. Are you aware that Duke Energy --
- 18 utilities are required to provide a market base
- 19 standard service offer?
- A. Are you talking about the provisions of
- 21 Senate Bill 3?
- 22 O. Yes.
- 23 A. Subject to check of the details of that,
- 24 yes, I agree. Differences of terminology, yes, I
- 25 agree that there are requirements in Senate

- 1 Bill 3.
- 2 Q. Are you generally familiar with Senate
- 3 Bill 3?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. What is your understanding of Senate
- 6 Bill 3?
- 7 A. Basically, that the generation portion
- 8 of -- the plan was -- without going into details
- 9 of it, the overall idea was that the generation
- 10 portion of customer's bills would be deregulated
- 11 and provided for by alternative suppliers -- could
- 12 be provided by alternative suppliers. Once again,
- 13 very high level.
- Q. Do utilities provide generation service
- 15 that is deregulated in Ohio?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Do you know if they are required to
- 18 provide a market price for generation?
- MR. SAUER: Objection. Calls for a legal
- 20 conclusion.
- MR. D'ASCENZO: Can he answer?
- MR. SAUER: To the extent you can
- 23 answer --
- 24 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the
- 25 question, please?

- 1 (Record read back as requested.)
- 2 MR. D'ASCENZO: And I'm just asking for
- 3 your understanding, not any sort of legal opinion.
- 4 THE WITNESS: I don't know.
- 5 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- Q. Do you know if the Commission has
- 7 determined if Duke Energy Ohio is providing any
- 8 market price for generation?
- 9 MR. SAUER: Same objection. You can
- 10 answer if you know.
- 11 THE WITNESS: I'm not positive exactly
- 12 what the Commission ordered.
- 13 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- Q. Do you know if OCC, in its appeal of Duke
- 15 Energy Ohio's market base standard service offer,
- 16 made any sort of challenge with respect to whether
- or not Duke Energy Ohio was providing a market
- 18 price?
- 19 A. I believe there were some arguments
- 20 relating to that.
- Q. Do you know if the Supreme Court of Ohio
- 22 made a finding with respect to those arguments?
- MR. SAUER: Objection. Calls for a legal
- 24 conclusion. You can answer if you know.
- THE WITNESS: I do not know.

- 1 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 2 Q. Do you know -- and again, understanding
- 3 you're not an attorney. Do you know whether
- 4 traditional regulatory ratemaking provisions apply
- 5 to generation?
- 6 A. Currently?
- 7 Q. Currently.
- 8 MR. SAUER: Could I have the question
- 9 reread, please?
- 10 (Record read back as requested.)
- 11 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 12 Q. And let me clarify. I'm referring to
- 13 Ohio.
- 14 A. That's a difficult question, because
- 15 there are some aspects that are, and some aspects
- 16 that are not.
- Q. What is your understanding of those that
- 18 are?
- 19 A. That do fall under -- That are regulated?
- Well, the different EDUs around the state
- 21 have different aspects to their generation
- 22 charges, some that may be regulated, some that are
- 23 not.
- Q. When you use the word "regulated", what
- 25 exactly do you mean by that?

1	A. Recovery of costs that are generation
2	related.
3	Q. Are you referring specifically to
4	Commission oversight?
5	A. There's Commission oversight and cost
6	recovery for generation-related components.
7	Q. So is it your opinion that cost recovery
8	equals regulation?
9	A. No, not necessarily.
L O	Q. Do you know and again, understanding
11	you are not an attorney whether the Supreme
L2	Court of Ohio ruled, in its opinion regarding
L3	OCC's appeal of Duke Energy Ohio's market base
L 4	standard service offer, do you know if the court
15	ruled that Duke Energy Ohio's standard service
L 6	offer was market based?
L7	MR. SAUER: Objection. Calls for a legal
l 8	conclusion. You can answer if you know.
L 9	THE WITNESS: I believe I already
20	answered that question. I didn't know.
21	
22	Thereupon, Duke Energy Ohio's Exhibit
23	No. 2 was marked for purposes of
24	identification.

25

- 1 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 2 Q. I'm handing you a copy of the Ohio
- 3 Supreme Court's opinion dated November 22nd, 2006,
- 4 Case No. 11 Ohio State 3d 300, and I will
- 5 represent to you that this is a copy of the
- 6 court's opinion in the OCC's appeal of Duke Energy
- 7 Ohio's MBSSO.
- If you would please turn to -- it's
- 9 Paragraph 44 of this opinion. It looks like it's
- 10 on Page 6.
- 11 A. I'm there.
- 12 Q. And do you see that first sentence there?
- 13 It states:
- 14 "We hold that the commission's finding
- that CG&E's standard service offer was market
- based is supported by sufficient probative
- 17 evidence."
- Did I read that correctly?
- 19 A. I believe that's a direct quote.
- Q. Okay. So you would agree, then, that
- 21 based on that sentence, the Supreme Court of
- 22 Ohio --
- MR. SAUER: Again, I object. This calls
- 24 for a legal conclusion. You quoted one sentence
- 25 out of a 13-page document and asked him if that's

- 1 what the Supreme Court said.
- I don't know if the four of us around
- 3 this table would agree that's what the Supreme
- 4 Court said. You read a passage out and he
- 5 answered it. I don't want him to make a legal
- 6 interpretation as to what the Supreme Court said
- 7 in this case.
- MR. D'ASCENZO: Okay. I will move on.
- 9 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 10 Q. Would you agree that the AAC is a
- 11 component of Duke Energy Ohio's MBSSO price?
- MR. SAUER: Can you read the question
- 13 back, please?
- 14 (Record read back as requested.)
- MR. D'ASCENZO: I'll rephrase the
- 16 question.
- 17 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 18 Q. Do you agree that the AAC is a component
- of Duke Energy Ohio's total market base standard
- 20 service offer price?
- 21 A. I know that Duke has described it as a
- 22 portion of its MBSSO.
- Q. Do you agree that as a component of Duke
- 24 Energy's MBSSO, the AAC is a market price?
- MR. SAUER: I'll object. I think this is

- 1 outside the scope of his testimony. I think
- Witness Talbot spoke to whether or not these
- 3 components were market based or not.
- 4 Mr. Haugh was strictly testifying to the
- 5 components of the -- the individual components
- 6 themselves, and what was included within those
- 7 components. He made no statements as to whether
- 8 or not they are market based.
- 9 MR. D'ASCENZO: Well, Mr. Haugh is
- 10 questioning the formulation of this particular
- 11 charge which Duke Energy Ohio is maintaining is a
- 12 component of its total price.
- 13 I'm only trying to ascertain whether or
- 14 not Mr. Haugh has an opinion as to whether or not
- 15 it matters what components really are ultimately
- 16 included if the company is charging a market
- 17 price. And that's the line of questioning that
- 18 I'm going down.
- MR. SAUER: Okay. Can you repeat the
- 20 question?
- 21 (Record read back as requested.)
- MR. SAUER: Again, I'll object. It's
- 23 outside the scope of his testimony. But if you
- 24 have an opinion, you can answer.
- THE WITNESS: No, I don't.

- 1 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 2 Q. Do you believe the AAC is a regulated
- 3 rate?
- 4 A. It appears as though Duke is using
- 5 traditional regulatory formulas, I guess you could
- 6 say, to calculate the AAC.
- 7 Q. In formulating a market price, do you
- 8 believe it's reasonable to consider -- take into
- 9 consideration costs that a company incurs?
- 10 A. Did you say in developing a market price?
- 11 O. Uh-huh.
- 12 A. I would think a company develops a market
- 13 price.
- Q. Well, certainly a company has to
- 15 determine a price that it can sell its product or
- 16 service; would you agree?
- 17 A. Yes, I agree that a company would do
- 18 that.
- 19 Q. And that price would have to be -- would
- 20 have to take into consideration many factors,
- 21 including what consumers might be willing to pay,
- 22 as well as costs the company would incur in
- 23 producing the product or service, correct?
- A. Those would be some of the aspects to be
- 25 considered.

- 1 Q. So I guess I'm trying to understand your
- 2 statement that you do not believe a company
- 3 determines a market price.
- A. In itself, the name "market price" means
- 5 that the price is set by the market. So I don't
- 6 see how a company could set a market price.
- 7 Q. Well, the company would have to set the
- 8 price that it's willing to sell into the market,
- 9 correct?
- 10 A. A company would have to determine the
- 11 price that it would need to sell a product.
- 12 Q. In determining a price that the company
- is willing to sell into the market, a company must
- 14 take into consideration its costs; would you
- 15 agree?
- 16 A. I don't think it has to.
- 17 Q. If a company were to sell at a price that
- is, say, below its costs, do you believe the
- 19 company could stay in business?
- MR. SAUER: I'll object. This is getting
- 21 pretty far afield of his testimony. To the extent
- 22 you know, you may answer.
- THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the
- 24 question?
- MR. SAUER: I would appreciate you tying

- 1 it closer to his testimony.
- 2 (Record read back as requested.)
- 3 THE WITNESS: It's possible.
- 4 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 5 Q. How is it possible?
- A. It could sell it below cost for a period
- 7 of time, and then -- in hopes of entry into the
- 8 market, then eventually slowly raise prices.
- 9 Q. But it couldn't sustain selling a price
- 10 below cost for any long period of time and still
- 11 be a viable company; would you agree?
- 12 A. It's -- You're making too general of a
- 13 statement for me to agree to that. There are
- 14 possibilities that companies could.
- 15 Q. If a company cannot recover its costs,
- 16 can it stay in business?
- MR. SAUER: Object. Outside the scope of
- 18 his testimony. You're asking him to speculate as
- 19 to what a company can or cannot do. This is,
- 20 again, outside the scope of his testimony, and I
- 21 don't see where it's relevant.
- MR. D'ASCENZO: Well, we are dealing with
- 23 Duke Energy Ohio's market price here that the AAC
- 24 is one component of it, and it -- the AAC is
- 25 designed to recover certain costs that the company

- 1 does incur as it's doing business in a market.
- 2 Mr. Haugh has financial background. He
- 3 has experience in a market. He's testified to his
- 4 experience and his background with respect to
- 5 trading and analysis.
- 6 He's making some recommendations
- 7 regarding whether or not Duke Energy Ohio can
- 8 recover certain costs that it incurs in doing
- 9 business.
- 10 I think this is very relevant -- a very
- 11 relevant discussion in trying to determine how
- 12 he's come to his opinion that certain costs should
- 13 being excluded.
- MR. SAUER: To the extent that
- 15 Mr. Haugh's recommending certain cost exclusions,
- 16 that's an appropriate line of questioning as far
- 17 as specific costs that he's addressed in his
- 18 testimony.
- 19 But the hypotheticals are very general in
- 20 nature and not following exactly the detail he's
- 21 got in his testimony.
- MR. D'ASCENZO: Well, certainly Mr. Haugh
- 23 is an expert that OCC is providing here in terms
- 24 of what costs Duke Energy Ohio can recover, and I
- 25 am just, through hypotheticals, trying to

- 1 determine what is the basis and his reasoning for
- 2 his analysis. That being said, I will try to
- 3 narrow my questions a little more.
- 4 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 5 Q. Mr. Haugh, are you familiar with the term
- 6 "variable cost"?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. What is a variable cost?
- 9 A. It's a cost that's incurred based on the
- 10 different number of factors, for example, based on
- 11 the output from a plant or the amount of -- the
- 12 amount of a certain product that's being produced.
- 13 Q. Is a variable cost short-term or
- 14 long-term in nature?
- 15 A. Could be both.
- 16 Q. Are you familiar with the term "fixed
- 17 cost"?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Would you consider scrubbing technologies
- 20 a fixed or variable cost?
- 21 A. Could be aspects of both in that.
- Q. What about the construction of scrubbing
- 23 technologies?
- A. I'd say just the construction of the
- 25 scrubbers would be a fixed cost.

- 1 Q. Speaking in a hypothetical, do you
- 2 believe that in setting a -- in determining a
- 3 market price, that a company should consider both
- 4 fixed and variable costs?
- 5 A. I don't believe the companies set market
- 6 prices.
- 7 Q. In determining the price that they are
- 8 willing to sell in the market, do you believe it's
- 9 reasonable for a company to consider both its
- 10 fixed and variable costs?
- 11 A. They -- They very well, depending on the
- 12 company, could consider them.
- 13 Q. I want to go back for a minute to
- 14 something you said a few moments ago, and that was
- 15 with respect to the company's calculation of its
- 16 AAC.
- You indicated that the company is using
- 18 some traditional ratemaking formula. You said
- 19 something to that effect. Do you remember that?
- 20 A. I recall that, yes.
- Q. And I just -- I want to know what exactly
- 22 you are referring to.
- A. It would be based on Witness Wathen's
- 24 testimony in his -- describing his revenue
- 25 requirement, and including such things as

- 1 construction work in progress in there, in the
- 2 calculation for the amount to be recovered through
- 3 the AAC.
- 4 Q. In your opinion, and under the
- 5 understanding that you are not an attorney, do you
- 6 know if there is any prohibition for including
- 7 construction work in progress in -- as a cost
- 8 component of a market price?
- 9 MR. SAUER: Prohibition by who, and in
- 10 what circumstances?
- 11 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 12 O. In Ohio.
- 13 A. Meaning is there a rule, regulation,
- 14 prohibiting it?
- 15 Q. Exactly.
- 16 A. I know of no laws that prohibit that.
- On Page 7 of your testimony, beginning
- 18 around -- on Line 1 there, you make a statement
- 19 that in today's deregulated generation
- 20 environment, the future is too uncertain to
- 21 guarantee, I believe you state, this claimed
- 22 benefit would ever be realized by the consumers
- 23 who would pay the 2007 AAC, and then you go on to
- 24 state, "...because it is unknown which customers
- 25 will receive service from DE-Ohio's generating

- 1 units in the future".
- 2 My question is: With respect to claimed
- 3 benefit, what are you referring to?
- 4 A. The benefits of the construction for the
- 5 environmental plant.
- 6 Q. Do you know of any pricing principle that
- 7 would prohibit the inclusion of CWIP in a market
- 8 price?
- 9 A. What do you mean by "pricing principle"?
- 10 Q. Anything other than a statute, rule,
- 11 anything along those lines that would prohibit a
- 12 company from including or considering CWIP as a
- 13 cost to recover in its market price.
- 14 A. Your definition of pricing principle is
- very broad in that you say it's anything but.
- 16 Based on the broadness, I don't know.
- Q. On Page 6 of your testimony, Line 21, you
- 18 state that the company might propose allowing a
- 19 return on CWIP that customers would pay up front
- 20 during plant construction. And you go on to say,
- 21 "...with a claim that the return on CWIP would
- 22 provide lower capital costs for customers at a
- 23 future when the plant is in service".
- To the best of your knowledge, has Duke
- 25 Energy Ohio made any kind of claim like that in

- 1 this proceeding?
- 2 A. My testimony -- in my testimony I state
- 3 that under traditional regulatory paradigm is
- 4 where this would -- is where this would occur,
- 5 where a company would receive a return on CWIP
- 6 prior to it actually going into service.
- 7 Q. In the initial MBSSO proceeding in 2004,
- 8 do you know if OCC made a similar argument
- 9 regarding the inclusion of CWIP as a component of
- 10 the revenue requirement for its POLR charge -- or
- 11 Duke Energy Ohio's POLR charge?
- 12 A. I believe there was a similar argument.
- Q. Do you know if, in approving Duke Energy
- 14 Ohio's market base standard service offer --
- 15 again, understanding you're not an attorney -- do
- 16 you know if the Commission excluded the
- 17 inclusion -- excluded CWIP from Duke Energy Ohio's
- 18 market base standard service offer?
- 19 A. I don't know.
- 20 Q. In your opinion, do consumers receive any
- 21 benefit from Duke Energy Ohio's market base
- 22 standard service offer price?
- MR. SAUER: Will you reread the question,
- 24 please?
- 25 (Record read back as requested.)

- 1 THE WITNESS: You're asking if they
- 2 receive benefits from the price. That's sort of
- 3 what I'm having trouble with.
- 4 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 5 Q. Let me see if I can rephrase.
- Are you aware that in its initial MBSSO
- 7 filing, Duke Energy Ohio first proposed a
- 8 competitive market option?
- 9 A. Yes, I'm aware that they did.
- 10 Q. Are you familiar with that proposal?
- 11 A. My familiarization is very general.
- 12 Q. Okay. And are you familiar with the
- 13 Commission, in late 2003, early 2004, asking all
- 14 utilities to put forth what the Commission termed
- 15 as a rate stabilization plan?
- 16 A. Yes, I'm aware of that.
- 17 Q. Are you aware of what the Commission
- determined as three goals for a rate stabilization
- 19 plan?
- MR. SAUER: Objection. Calls for a legal
- 21 conclusion. You can answer if you know.
- THE WITNESS: I do recall three goals
- 23 that were -- I believe there were three goals that
- 24 were stated with the RSPs.
- 25 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:

- 1 Q. And again, understanding you are not an
- 2 attorney, do you have any understanding what those
- 3 goals wére?
- 4 A. They seem to have slipped my memory as of
- 5 the moment, but I -- the exact definitions, I
- 6 can't remember exactly.
- 7 Q. And I don't have the exact three goals in
- 8 front of me, but if I were to represent to you
- 9 that one of them was stable prices for consumers,
- 10 subject to check, would you agree that --
- A. Subject to check, that sounds familiar.
- 12 Q. And would you agree that, subject to
- 13 check, that another one of those goals was some
- 14 sort of revenue certainty to a utility?
- 15 A. Yes, subject to check.
- 16 Q. And just to fill it out, the third goal,
- 17 subject to check, was to encourage a competitive
- 18 market?
- 19 A. Yes, subject to check on the precise
- 20 wording.
- 21 Q. Do you know -- and understanding you're
- 22 not an attorney -- whether the Commission made any
- 23 determination whether Duke Energy Ohio's market
- 24 base standard service offer is consistent with
- 25 those goals?

- 1 A. The current --
- 2 Q. The price that the Commission approved.
- 3 A. The current price?
- 4 MR. SAUER: Again, I'll object. It calls
- 5 for a legal conclusion. To the extent you know,
- 6 you may answer.
- 7 THE WITNESS: I'd have to review the
- 8 opinion and order to answer that fully.
- 9 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 10 Q. Okay. Let me try it another way.
- 11 Assume that Duke Energy Ohio's market
- 12 base standard service offer is the only rate
- 13 stabilized price that the company is willing to
- 14 offer, and that's the current price including
- 15 the 2007 AAC filing.
- Now, assume that CWIP is excluded from
- 17 the AAC calculation, and Duke Energy Ohio is then
- 18 unwilling to provide that price, and instead, a
- 19 competitive bidding option similar to what has
- 20 happened in Maryland or Illinois comes into
- 21 effect.
- Do you know what impact would happen --
- 23 what the impact would be to consumers?
- 24 A. No.
- Q. Are you aware of market prices outside of

- 1 Ohio, market prices for generation?
- 2 MR. SAUER: I object. This is outside
- 3 the scope of his testimony. This is precisely
- 4 what Mr. Talbot testified to. He's been on the
- 5 stand and been deposed, and it's outside the scope
- 6 of his testimony.
- 7 MR. D'ASCENZO: Mr. Haugh, in his
- 8 testimony, talks about benefits to consumers and
- 9 whether or not consumers would receive any benefit
- 10 with the inclusion of certain cost components in
- 11 Duke Energy Ohio's market price.
- 12 I'm just trying to determine whether or
- 13 not Mr. Haugh would agree that there are benefits
- 14 to Duke Energy Ohio's market price.
- MR. SAUER: You're asking him to
- 16 speculate as to what a customer perceives is a
- 17 benefit or doesn't perceive is a benefit based on
- 18 the price they are charged. That's a question
- 19 that's put to him. He can answer to the extent
- 20 he's able to answer.
- MR. D'ASCENZO: Well, I did ask him
- 22 previously whether or not consumers received any
- 23 benefit from Duke Energy Ohio's price, and he
- 24 wasn't able to answer that question. So I'm just
- 25 trying to rephrase it and pose hypotheticals for

- 1 him.
- 2 MR. SAUER: Well, you're offering
- 3 hypotheticals and alternatives that aren't
- 4 comprised in his testimony. You're asking him to
- 5 speculate as to what a customer finds beneficial.
- 6 You're asking what happens if the CMO
- 7 comes into fruition. Well, that's not what he's
- 8 testifying to.
- 9 MR. D'ASCENZO: Go off the record.
- 10 (Discussion held off the record.)
- MR. D'ASCENZO: I guess we'll go back on
- 12 the record.
- 13 (Record read back as requested.)
- 14 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 15 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 16 Q. And do you know, generally, are they
- 17 higher than market prices in Ohio?
- 18 A. They vary by region, so some are higher,
- 19 some are lower.
- Q. Do you know whether Ohio -- where Ohio
- 21 falls in that range?
- 22 A. Now, when you say "market prices", are
- 23 you -- could you define what you mean by the
- 24 market price for generation?
- Q. I'm talking about prices that the

- 1 ultimate consumer is paying.
- A. Meaning a retail price?
- 3 Q. A retail price.
- A. Okay. Depends on what region of the
- 5 country. I'm going to go back to my previous
- 6 answer.
- 7 Some are higher. Some are lower. I'm
- 8 having trouble, being that there's 50 states,
- 9 ranking Ohio where it would be exactly.
- 10 Q. I'm only concerned with those states that
- 11 have some form of electric restructuring or
- 12 deregulation.
- 13 A. I'm having trouble recalling the prices
- 14 for each of the states. I'm going to just stick
- 15 with my original answer. Some are higher and some
- 16 are lower. I'm not positive where Ohio falls
- 17 exactly in that mix.
- 18 Q. Do you know the prices in New Jersey?
- 19 A. Specifically, no.
- Q. Are you generally familiar?
- 21 A. Generally, yes.
- Q. Are the prices in New Jersey generally
- 23 higher than in Ohio?
- A. Now, would that be the prices offered by
- 25 the utilities?

- 1 Q. The BGS auction.
- A. BGS? If you can refresh, what is
- 3 the BGS? What does that stand for?
- 4 Q. It's "Basic Generation Service".
- 5 A. I was confusing it with another acronym,
- 6 and that's -- there was another acronym I got
- 7 confused with, which is why I'm glad that that was
- 8 clarified.
- 9 MR. COLBERT: There are many.
- 10 THE WITNESS: I know. Yes, I'm generally
- 11 aware of the auction that was -- that's conducted
- 12 in New Jersey.
- 13 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 14 Q. And have those prices been higher,
- 15 typically, than Ohio?
- 16 A. To my knowledge, I believe they are
- 17 higher. It would have to be subject to check,
- 18 though. They have done a variety of auctions
- 19 there.
- Q. What about Maryland, are the prices in
- 21 Maryland generally higher than in Ohio?
- 22 A. I didn't do a specific study on what the
- 23 final prices were in Maryland. I know there's a
- 24 variety of legislation going on currently in the
- 25 state, so I'm not -- I'm not even sure what the

- 1 ultimate price is that the consumers are paying
- 2 there, and what the outcome of their legislation
- 3 is.
- 4 O. What about Illinois?
- 5 A. I know they are also in the midst of
- 6 legislation. I don't know what their ultimate
- 7 rates are that their consumers are paying, pending
- 8 the outcome of all of this.
- 9 Q. Do you know if the reason -- Do you know
- 10 the reason why there is new legislation in
- 11 Illinois?
- 12 A. Illinois, there was some questions
- 13 that -- I believe regarding the -- the legality of
- 14 the auction, and that there was some -- I know
- 15 there was some questions of impropriety in that
- 16 auction.
- 17 Q. Do you know if there were any issues
- 18 about the prices consumers were paying?
- MR. SAUER: Again, I'm going to object.
- 20 This is getting outside the scope of his
- 21 testimony. To the extent you know, you can
- 22 answer.
- THE WITNESS: That may have been one of
- 24 the issues I recall.
- 25 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:

- 1 Q. Are you familiar with the term "provider
- 2 of last resort" or POLR?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Please explain your understanding of the
- 5 POLR.
- A. It would be the incumbent utility is
- 7 responsible for providing services to the
- 8 customer. That was a very high-level, general
- 9 definition.
- 10 Q. Would you agree that with -- if I were to
- 11 recommend to you that the POLR was a safety net
- 12 for customers who switch to that, that they can
- 13 rely on the incumbent utility to keep their lights
- 14 on if their competitive provider were to up and
- 15 leave --
- 16 MR. SAUER: That's your definition?
- 17 MR. D'ASCENZO: Yes.
- 18 THE WITNESS: I would say that the
- 19 utility would have the responsibility in that
- 20 case.
- 21 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- Q. Do you believe that switched customers
- 23 have a -- Do you believe that consumers receive a
- 24 benefit by having that safety net generation?
- 25 MR. SAUER: Object. Answer if you know.

- 1 THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the
- 2 question?
- 3 (Record read back as requested.)
- 4 THE WITNESS: Yes -- well, there is a
- 5 benefit to having a utility be providing that --
- 6 providing a service of that nature.
- 7 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 8 Q. Given that an incumbent utility has a
- 9 responsibility to serve as a provider of last
- 10 resort, do you believe that it would be reasonable
- 11 for the incumbent utility to invest in its
- 12 generating plants to make them environmentally
- 13 compliant?
- 14 A. I suppose that would be the determination
- 15 of the specific utility, how they want -- the
- 16 investments they want to make in their plants.
- 17 Q. Do you think it's unreasonable for a
- 18 company to invest in its plants?
- 19 A. Really depends on the specific company,
- 20 and what their goals and objectives are as to what
- 21 they want to do with their plants.
- Q. Do you believe consumers benefit from
- 23 having a cleaner or less polluted environment?
- A. I suppose there are benefits to having
- 25 clean air.

- 1 Q. If Duke Energy Ohio did not invest in
- 2 environmental compliance technologies and
- 3 reagents, wouldn't that have the effect of
- 4 maintaining, if not increasing, emission levels of
- 5 its generation -- generating stations?
- 6 A. I don't know the specifics of their
- 7 generation stations to be able to answer that.
- Q. Do you know what a scrubber does?
- 9 A. Generally.
- 10 Q. What is your general understanding?
- 11 A. In a very high level, it helps to reduce
- 12 emissions out of generating facilities, is my
- 13 understanding.
- 14 Q. If Duke Energy Ohio did not have
- 15 scrubbers on its coal-fired generating plants, and
- 16 assuming the company did not compensate for the
- 17 lack of scrubbers by using cleaner fuel, wouldn't
- 18 that maintain, if not increase, the level of
- 19 emissions that the company would be producing?
- MR. SAUER: Object. Assuming facts not
- 21 in evidence.
- MR. D'ASCENZO: He can answer a
- 23 hypothetical.
- 24 THE WITNESS: I am not -- I don't know
- 25 the answer to that.

- 1 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 2 Q. Do you know how a generating station can
- 3 manage its emission levels?
- 4 A. Not exact specifics.
- 5 Q. Are you aware that utilities can purchase
- 6 emission allowances to offset the emissions that
- 7 they produce?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Are you aware that different -- there are
- 10 various types of coal that have higher and lower
- 11 sulfur contents that would produce greater or less
- 12 emissions depending upon the level of sulfur
- 13 content?
- 14 A. Yes, I'm aware of that.
- 15 Q. If a utility -- And again, this is a
- 16 hypothetical.
- 17 If a utility did not invest in scrubbers,
- wouldn't it have to offset its emissions through
- 19 either emission allowances or the use of cleaner
- 20 coal to meet environmental compliance
- 21 requirements?
- MR. SAUER: Can I have that question read
- 23 back, please?
- 24 (Record read back as requested.)
- 25 THE WITNESS: I don't know all the

- 1 environmental compliance requirements and exact
- 2 workings of a power plant, if those are the only
- 3 two things that they can do to lower emissions.
- 4 So I don't know -- I don't know what exactly needs
- 5 to be done to -- or could be done to lower
- 6 emissions.
- 7 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- Q. Would you agree that a reduction in a
- 9 company -- in a generating station's emission
- 10 levels would reduce the amount of expenditures
- 11 necessary for emission allowances?
- 12 A. You say that by reducing the emissions
- 13 would reduce the need for emission allowances?
- 14 Q. Uh-huh.
- 15 A. That would seem logical.
- 16 Q. And conversely, the greater the level of
- emissions, the greater the number of emission
- 18 allowances that are needed; would you agree?
- 19 A. That seems logical.
- Q. Are you at all familiar with the market
- 21 for emission allowances?
- 22 A. I'm familiar with it.
- Q. Would you describe it as being subject to
- 24 price swings?
- 25 A. With the understanding that every market

- 1 has price swings, but I don't know the specific
- 2 levels of the price swings within the emissions
- 3 market.
- Q. Are you familiar with the levels in 2005,
- 5 the market prices?
- 6 A. Not familiar with those.
- 7 Q. 2006?
- 8 A. I'm not familiar with those, either.
- 9 Q. What about the current?
- 10 A. Not familiar with price swings for the
- 11 emission allowance for 2007.
- 12 Q. Are you aware that Duke Energy Ohio
- 13 receives recovery of its emission allowance
- 14 expenditures through its Fuel and Purchased Power
- 15 Rider?
- 16 A. Subject to check, yes.
- 17 Q. In your current position, do you review
- 18 various market indexes for energy-related
- 19 components such as emission allowances?
- MR. SAUER: Objection. Outside the scope
- of his testimony. To the extent you know, you may
- 22 answer.
- 23 THE WITNESS: Emission allowance --
- 24 emission allowances specifically, or --
- 25 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:

- 1 Q. Yes.
- 2 A. No, I do not.
- 3 Q. Are you familiar with the publication
- 4 "Megawatt Daily"?
- 5 A. I'm familiar with it.
- Q. Are you familiar with the publication
- 7 Argus Air Daily?
- 8 A. Not familiar -- It sounds familiar, but I
- 9 don't think I've ever read it.
- 10 Q. But you think you might have heard of it?
- 11 A. It sounds familiar.
- 12 - -
- 13 Thereupon, Duke Energy Ohio's Exhibit
- No. 3 was marked for purposes of
- 15 identification.
- 16 - -
- MR. SAUER: I'll object to the admission
- 18 of this as being outside the scope of his
- 19 testimony.
- 20 (Discussion held off the record.)
- 21 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- Q. If you would look at the document
- 23 entitled "Argus Air Daily". It's volume 12, it
- looks like, 146, dated August 1 of 2005. Do you
- 25 have that in front of you?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. If you look on the left-hand side there
- 3 are several charts there that discuss emission
- 4 allowances, and I'm looking in particular at the
- 5 third one down that says "SO2 Allowances". Do you
- 6 see that?
- 7 A. Under "Daily Market" or "Assessment
- 8 Averages"?
- 9 Q. Assessment Averages. We're just looking
- 10 at the averages. If you look, it shows in that
- 11 chart under 2005, the second line down that says
- 12 "July Average". Do you see that?
- 13 A. Yes, I do.
- 14 Q. And do you see, if you go over -- the
- 15 next column says "Bid", the next column says
- 16 "Ask", and the last column is "Price" -- well, I
- 17 shouldn't say last. The third column there is
- 18 "Price". Do you see that?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. And what is the price there for the July
- 21 average?
- MR. SAUER: Again, I'll object. This is
- 23 outside the scope of his testimony. You can
- 24 answer, if you know.
- 25 THE WITNESS: 812.13.

- 1 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 2 Q. And in the upper right-hand corner of
- 3 that chart it says that's a price per ton. Do you
- 4 see that?
- 5 A. It states dollar per ton.
- 6 Q. Yes.
- 7 And if you would, please, look at
- 8 Volume 13, which should be the next page there in
- 9 the set, dated January 3rd, 2006.
- 10 I'm looking at a similar chart in the
- 11 same approximate location on that page. It says
- 12 "December Average". Do you see that?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And do you see the price?
- 15 A. For December Average?
- 16 Q. Yes.
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And what is that price?
- 19 A. 1,586.55.
- 20 Q. And so just judging from those two
- 21 documents, the average price there from July
- of 2005 to December -- through December of 2005,
- 23 the SO2 allowance price per ton rose
- 24 significantly. Would you agree?
- 25 A. I don't have enough information as to --

- 1 I don't have enough information about these price
- 2 indexes or how they are calculated as to why one
- 3 number is higher than the other. That's what I
- 4 can say.
- 5 Not giving any credence to the underlying
- 6 price, itself, just that I will agree that one
- 7 number is higher than the other.
- Q. And if you would look, please, at the
- 9 third document in the packet, which is dated
- 10 June 1, 2006.
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Do you see where it says "May Average SO2
- 13 Allowances"?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And what is the price there?
- MR. SAUER: Again, object. Outside the
- 17 scope of his testimony. Answer.
- 18 THE WITNESS: Under "Assessment Average",
- 19 May Average is 6.6025.
- 20 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 21 Q. And would you agree that that -- what's
- 22 listed there, according to Argus Air Daily, their
- 23 May average is lower than what they had listed for
- 24 their December 2005 average price?
- 25 A. That number is lower than the other

- 1 number.
- 2 Q. So in -- at least according to this
- 3 index, would you characterize that change in
- 4 roughly a one-year period, a little over a
- 5 one-year period, as being volatile?
- 6 MR. SAUER: Object. I think he asked and
- 7 answered that question.
- 8 THE WITNESS: I have difficulty answering
- 9 that because I don't know the underlying
- 10 methodology for determining these prices. So it's
- 11 difficult for me to assess the volatility of this
- 12 particular index.
- 13 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 14 Q. Assuming that Argus Air Daily, in its
- 15 indexes, are tracking trades of emission
- 16 allowances, and assuming that what they have
- 17 listed as the monthly average, that it is the
- 18 average of all those trades in that given month,
- 19 would you describe the market, as reported by
- 20 Argus Air Daily, as being volatile?
- MR. SAUER: Object. Asked and answered.
- 22 Also, this line of questioning is completely
- 23 irrelevant.
- Mr. Haugh's testimony is on the AAC and
- 25 the SRT. The emission allowances are onto the

- 1 FPP, as you described earlier. This is completely
- 2 irrelevant and outside the scope of his testimony.
- 3 MR. D'ASCENZO: I disagree that it is
- 4 irrelevant. Mr. Haugh's testifying to the
- 5 inclusion of cost components in the AAC related to
- 6 environmental compliance construction.
- 7 If Duke Energy Ohio is not permitted to
- 8 recover costs for its environmental compliance,
- 9 the alternative is through emission allowances or
- 10 cleaner coal. I think it's very relevant to his
- 11 testimony.
- MR. SAUER: Can you reread the question?
- 13 (Record read back as requested.)
- MR. SAUER: Again, that question was
- 15 asked and answered earlier. To the extent you
- 16 know, you can answer.
- 17 THE WITNESS: It's difficult for me to
- 18 assess the volatility with only three points.
- 19 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- Q. I can go through month-by-month, if you
- 21 would like.
- 22 A. If you have every publication of this,
- 23 I'd be able to give a better idea of volatility.
- 24 I'd need all pricing points for this nine,
- 25 ten-month period.

- We could go through them if you like, and
- 2 then I can assess the volatility. I would need
- 3 time to compute the volatility. I mean, this is a
- 4 burdensome task you're asking me to do. It's not
- 5 something I would finish -- I would be able to
- 6 complete this afternoon.
- 7 MR. D'ASCENZO: Could we go off the
- 8 record for just a moment?
- 9 (Discussion held off the record.)
- 10 MR. D'ASCENZO: Back on the record.
- 11 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 12 Q. Mr. Haugh, would you agree that the price
- 13 for emission allowances changes on a monthly
- 14 basis?
- 15 A. Yes, it does. According to these
- 16 reports, the price does change monthly.
- 17 Q. And that's the average price?
- 18 A. According to your description of this,
- 19 what the assessment average -- the publication
- 20 doesn't provide a definition for assessment
- 21 averages.
- Using that, that is the monthly average,
- 23 then yes, that is the monthly price. That was
- 24 your question, correct?
- 25 Q. Right. So the average changes per month.

- 1 And do you know at all how frequent the
- 2 price for emission allowances changes?
- 3 A. It appears as though it changes daily,
- 4 according to this publication.
- 5 Q. Okay. Mr. Haugh, have you done any
- 6 analysis regarding what impact the exclusion of
- 7 CWIP would have on other pricing components of
- 8 Duke Energy Ohio's MBSSO?
- 9 A. What other components are you --
- 10 Q. For instance, if Duke Energy Ohio did not
- 11 invest in scrubbing technologies because it was
- 12 not able to recover costs associated with
- 13 construction work in progress through its AAC, do
- 14 you know if Duke Energy Ohio would then have to
- 15 purchase more emission allowances?
- 16 A. I do not know if the exclusion of CWIP
- 17 directly leads to that.
- 18 Q. Do you know if Duke Energy Ohio did not
- 19 invest in construction work in process as part of
- 20 its environmental compliance plan, whether the
- 21 company would have to purchase lower sulfur
- 22 content coal for its coal-fired generating
- 23 stations?
- A. I don't know if there's a direct
- 25 relationship between those two.

- 1 Q. And you've done no analysis about that?
- 2 A. Of the direct relationships between those
- 3 two aspects?
- 4 O. Yes.
- 5 A. I have not.
- 6 Q. Okay. To the best your knowledge, and
- 7 understanding that you are not an attorney, do you
- 8 know if Duke Energy Ohio's POLR obligation
- 9 expires?
- MR. SAUER: Objection. Calls for a legal
- 11 conclusion. You can answer if you know the
- 12 answer.
- 13 THE WITNESS: I don't know.
- 14 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- Q. As a hypothetical, assuming all else
- 16 being equal, cost of fuel, emission allowances,
- 17 et cetera, would you agree that the more capacity
- 18 that is available in the market, the lower the
- 19 price for that capacity?
- 20 A. Simple economic principle of greater
- 21 supply leads to lower price.
- Q. Are you aware of any new baseload
- 23 generating stations that are being built in Ohio?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. And what is the extent of your knowledge?

- 1 A. The specifics escape me right now, but
- 2 there is a number of wind projects, hydro
- 3 projects.
- 4 Not necessarily baseload, I guess, but
- 5 there is a natural gas-fired plant up in the
- 6 northern part of the state. I'm not sure of the
- 7 timing of them coming on line.
- 8 The exact details of this, this is
- 9 just -- my memory is escaping me on the details of
- 10 these. I know AEP has a proposed facility in
- 11 southeast Ohio. The specifics of the projects
- 12 escape me right now, but there are a few.
- Q. What is your understanding of a baseload
- 14 generating unit?
- 15 A. That's why I -- I was going over all
- 16 generation, then I remembered you asked baseload.
- 17 So excluding the hydro and wind plants, it would
- 18 be a plant that would be dispatched a majority of
- 19 the hours of a day. Once again, just a general
- 20 definition of that.
- Q. AEP has not actually begun construction,
- 22 has it?
- A. No, not construction. That's just a
- 24 proposed plant.
- 25 Q. Do you know how long it takes to

- 1 construct a baseload generating plan?
- 2 MR. SAUER: Objection. Outside the scope
- 3 of his testimony. Answer if you know.
- 4 THE WITNESS: Depending on the size,
- 5 anywhere from two to five years would be my
- 6 general understanding.
- 7 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 8 Q. So it takes several years, though?
- 9 A. It's not going to pop up overnight.
- 10 Q. Okay. Given that it takes several years
- 11 to construct a baseload plant, and that there are
- 12 few baseload plants currently being built or
- 13 considered to be built in Ohio, do you believe it
- 14 would be prudent to keep existing generating
- 15 stations operational?
- MR. SAUER: Objection. Outside the scope
- 17 of his testimony. You can answer if you know.
- 18 THE WITNESS: I'd have to say that's a
- 19 very broad statement that I can neither agree or
- 20 disagree with.
- MR. SAUER: Do you need a break?
- 22 (Discussion held off the record.)
- 23 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- Q. Mr. Haugh, let me pose a hypothetical to
- 25 you.

- 1 Assuming that there is no new baseload
- 2 capacity being constructed and coming on line in
- 3 Ohio in the near future, and if existing plants
- 4 start to cease operation because they are no
- 5 longer able to recover costs related to
- 6 environmental compliance, would you agree that
- 7 available capacity in Ohio would decline?
- 8 A. You're saying that in Ohio nothing new is
- 9 being built, and what is in operation now shuts
- 10 down?
- 11 Q. Uh-huh.
- 12 A. That would definitely result in a decline
- in the amount of generating capacity.
- Q. And under that hypothetical, isn't it
- 15 likely that the price for available capacity, both
- on the wholesale and spot market levels, would
- 17 likely rise?
- 18 A. You're assuming Ohio is a market into
- 19 itself, there are no other factors in this?
- 20 Q. Yes.
- A. Assuming that there was a fence around
- 22 Ohio and no generation could get in, then using
- 23 any previous explanation that an increase in
- 24 supply would decrease the price, the economic
- 25 principle would conversely apply that a decrease

- 1 in supply would increase the price. Did I state
- 2 that correctly?
- 3 THE WITNESS: Can you read back my
- 4 answer, please?
- 5 (Record read back as requested.)
- 6 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 7 Q. Now, assuming the same hypothetical, but
- 8 this time the fence is around MISO.
- 9 A. With both of these hypotheticals -- Well,
- 10 the fence is only changing there, so the economic
- 11 principles don't change.
- 12 Q. Do you know if it's cheaper to construct
- 13 a scrubber versus constructing a baseload
- 14 generating station?
- 15 A. I think there are a number of factors in
- 16 there. There's a number of factors that I
- wouldn't be able to answer that fully.
- 18 Q. Well, like what?
- 19 A. Size of the plant. Type of fuel being
- 20 burned. Any of a number of other costs.
- 21 Transversely, the size of the scrubber, the size
- 22 of the plant that the scrubber is going on to.
- Q. Do you know if the cost of environmental
- 24 compliance effects the cost of capacity?
- A. Meaning in the capacity market?

- 1 O. Yes.
- 2 A. That could be a factor.
- 3 Q. Do you know whether it is a cost driver?
- 4 MR. SAUER: What do you mean by "cost
- 5 driver"?
- 6 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 7 Q. Whether there's a significant impact --
- 8 whether environmental compliance makes a
- 9 significant impact on the cost of capacity in the
- 10 market.
- 11 A. I don't know about significant. I would
- 12 say there is an impact.
- 13 Q. Do you know what are cost drivers for the
- 14 market clearing price for capacity?
- A. Specifically, no.
- Q. Would you assume price of fuel would be?
- 17 A. I would assume that would be one.
- 18 Q. Do you know if fuel would be considered a
- 19 variable cost?
- 20 A. For the cost of general -- for the cost
- 21 of megawatts coming out of a plant?
- 22 Q. Uh-huh.
- A. That would be a variable cost.
- Q. What about emission allowances?
- 25 A. That would also be a variable cost.

- 1 Q. On a general level, are you aware of
- 2 prices for coal in the market?
- 3 A. Generally, yes.
- 4 Q. Do you know whether lower content coal is
- 5 more or less than expensive than higher content
- 6 coal?
- 7 MR. SAUER: I'll object. Again, this is
- 8 outside the scope of his testimony. You can
- 9 answer if you know.
- 10 THE WITNESS: Content? What do you mean
- 11 by "content"?
- 12 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 13 Q. For instance, are you familiar with the
- 14 term "NYNEX coal"?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. What is your understanding of NYNEX coal?
- 17 A. It's been a while since I've worked with
- 18 the contracts. The specifics of the contract are
- 19 escaping me right now. But it's -- NYNEX coal
- 20 would be a specific quality of coal.
- Q. And do you know -- Strike that.
- 22 Are you aware that one way to control the
- 23 level of emissions for a coal-fired generating
- 24 station is by using coal as fuel that has a lesser
- 25 content of sulfur?

- 1 MR. SAUER: Again, objection. Outside
- 2 the scope. Answer if you can.
- 3 THE WITNESS: Your question was using
- 4 lower-sulfur coal can reduce the amount of what
- 5 type of emission?
- 6 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 7 O. SO2.
- 8 A. Logic would dictate that if there's less
- 9 sulfur in the coal, it would lead to less sulfur
- 10 being emitted from the plant.
- 11 Q. And you are aware that there are various
- 12 types of coal that have varying degrees of sulfur
- in them?
- 14 A. Yes, there are a variety of qualities of
- 15 coal.
- 16 Q. And those qualities have different
- 17 prices, correct?
- MR. SAUER: Continuing objection. You
- 19 can answer.
- 20 THE WITNESS: The price is determined by
- 21 the quality.
- 22 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- Q. And do you know if the lower the content
- of the sulfur has an effect on the price of that
- 25 coal?

- 1 A. Yes.
- O. And what is that?
- 3 A. As the sulfur content decreases, price
- 4 increases as a general way to -- obviously there
- 5 could be instances where that's not true, but as a
- 6 general principle, for the pricing of coal, that
- 7 would be my understanding.
- Q. Okay. Would you agree that to the extent
- 9 a utility is able to use scrubbing technologies on
- 10 its generating -- coal-fired generating stations,
- 11 that a utility would gain more flexibility in
- 12 terms of fuel purchases -- Strike that. Let me
- 13 rephrase.
- 14 Would you agree that to the extent a
- 15 utility is able to use scrubbing technologies on
- 16 its coal-fired generating assets, that the utility
- would then gain more flexibility in its purchase
- of coal and the purchase of emission allowances
- 19 necessary to offset SO2 emissions?
- MR. SAUER: Object. Outside the scope of
- 21 his testimony. If you understand the question,
- 22 you can answer it.
- THE WITNESS: You're stating that -- Your
- 24 hypothetical is that if there is equipment on the
- 25 plant to reduce emissions, then there are a wider

- 1 variety of coal qualities that can be purchased?
- 2 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 3 O. Yes.
- 4 A. I think a company could purchase whatever
- 5 type of coal it desires based on its plants and
- 6 what they can -- what the plants can burn, I
- 7 believe.
- Q. Let me try rephrasing.
- 9 Absent scrubbing technologies on a
- 10 coal-fired plant, doesn't a utility have to rely
- 11 more upon the purchase of emission allowances and
- 12 varying qualities of coal to offset its emissions?
- MR. SAUER: Again, objection. Outside
- 14 the scope of his testimony. You can answer if you
- 15 know.
- THE WITNESS: From a general sense,
- assuming a plant is burning coal, the only way to
- 18 offset the sulfur emissions is through emission
- 19 allowances? Is that what you're stating?
- 20 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- Q. Or the use of cleaner fuels.
- 22 A. So to offset the emissions allowance
- 23 expense, they would purchase lower sulfur coal?
- 24 That would be one way they could reduce their
- 25 emissions, yes.

- 1 Q. If a utility has a scrubber on its
- 2 coal-fired plant, wouldn't it be able to rely less
- 3 on purchasing emission allowances or more
- 4 expensive, lower-sulfur content coal?
- 5 A. I suppose that would be one way that they
- 6 could lower the emission allowances.
- 7 Q. Going back to your testimony on Page 8,
- 8 Line 2. You make a statement that in a truly
- 9 competitive market, CWIP would not be earned at
- 10 all. Is that a correct characterization of your
- 11 testimony?
- 12 A. I believe that's a direct quote.
- Q. What is the basis of your opinion?
- 14 A. I would say my experience in the
- 15 competitive markets.
- 16 Q. And in terms of your experience in
- 17 competitive markets, what are you referring to,
- 18 exactly? As a gas trader?
- 19 A. Gas, electricity, the wholesale markets
- 20 that I've been involved in.
- 21 Q. And the markets that you've been involved
- 22 in, have the companies considered their actual
- 23 costs in determining a price that they are willing
- 24 to sell their product or service?
- A. Have they determined their costs?

- 1 MR. D'ASCENZO: Could you please reread
- 2 the question?
- 3 (Record read back as requested.)
- 4 THE WITNESS: That would be one of the --
- 5 could be one of the aspects that are used.
- 6 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 7 Q. Don't all market prices have some
- 8 consideration of actual cost?
- 9 A. I would say there would be some
- 10 consideration.
- 11 Q. Have you been involved in developing a
- 12 market price for a competitive product?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And what was the basic pricing formula
- 15 that you used to develop that price?
- A. Well, market price is determined by
- offers in the market compared with bids in the
- 18 market. Market price is determined by those two
- 19 factors.
- 20 Q. In terms of a price that -- of a product
- 21 that you were involved in selling, what factors
- 22 were considered in determining the actual price
- 23 that you were willing to sell it at?
- A. In the markets that I operated in, the
- 25 majority of it was were people willing to buy,

- 1 that would often set my price that I was willing
- 2 to offer into the market at.
- 3 Q. Did you ever have a situation where you
- 4 weren't willing to sell at the price that people
- 5 were willing to buy?
- 6 A. Sure.
- 7 O. And what drove that determination that
- 9 you weren't willing to sell?
- 9 A. There's a variety of factors that would
- 10 lead to that, depending on the situation.
- 11 Q. Such as?
- 12 A. Depending on the specific commodity or
- 13 product that I had, as to where, it was -- if I
- was able to move it to another market, it was more
- 15 valuable in another market, how much it cost to
- 16 move it over to that market. If I was able to
- 17 store the product until later at a greater price.
- 18 Things of that nature.
- Q. So one of the factors was cost?
- A. It was one of many, yes.
- Q. And was recovering costs important to
- 22 determining that price that you were willing to
- 23 sell?
- A. Well, I already stated it was a factor in
- 25 determining the selling price.

- 1 Q. Do you know how many competitive retail
- 2 electric service providers are currently certified
- 3 in Ohio?
- 4 A. How many are certified? There's quite a
- 5 few that are certified. I'm not sure of the exact
- 6 number.
- 7 Q. Would you agree that there are more than
- 8 five?
- 9 A. More than five certified in all of Ohio?
- 10 Yes, I would agree to that.
- 11 Q. More than ten?
- 12 A. My problem is I know that there's
- 13 different levels of certification as to what a
- 14 certified -- what a certified supplier can -- who
- 15 they can serve and everything, and the
- 16 all-encompassing list of everything, I think, is
- 17 above -- is greater than ten, yes.
- 18 Q. Okay.
- 19 A. That's subject to check.
- Q. Sure. Of those competitive retail
- 21 electric service providers that are currently
- 22 offering generation to consumers in Ohio, have you
- 23 reviewed any of their pricing structures?
- A. That are currently offering? Now, if we
- 25 could go back to preface my previous answer.

- 1 Those were just people that are certified. I
- 2 don't know how many of those are actually serving
- 3 customers.
- 4 And I am not sure of any offers that are
- 5 currently out there, at least for the residential
- 6 class, if there are any offers currently out there
- 7 now. So given that, there's no analysis for me to
- 8 do in that aspect for residential.
- 9 Q. Have you ever performed an analysis of a
- 10 price that a competitive retail electric service
- 11 provider offered to residential customers?
- 12 A. No, I don't believe I ever have. Not to
- 13 my knowledge.
- 14 Q. So you don't know if competitive retail
- 15 electric service providers, in formulating their
- 16 price, you don't know if they included expenses
- 17 such as CWIP?
- 18 A. I have no idea.
- 19 Q. Have you reviewed pricing formulas for
- 20 competitive retail electric service providers for
- 21 customers other than residential?
- 22 A. Other than residential? No.
- Q. Do you know if CRES providers can
- 24 consider CWIP in formulating their -- the price
- 25 that they are willing to offer to customers?

- 1 A. I don't know.
- Q. Are you familiar with the term "research
- 3 and development"?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. What is your understanding of the term
- 6 research and development?
- 7 A. The term, in itself, is self-explanatory.
- 8 It's research and development of -- I guess I
- 9 think it's self-explanatory, the term in itself.
- 10 Q. Would you agree that it's an expense?
- 11 A. It could be, yes.
- 12 Q. Would you agree that it's an expense
- incurred by a company for some future product or
- 14 service that it's going to offer?
- 15 A. I suppose that's possible.
- 16 Q. Earlier we talked about CWIP and its
- 17 definition. And we stated -- I believe we agreed
- 18 that CWIP is some sort of investment in plant
- 19 construction for some future technology such as a
- 20 scrubber. Is that a fair characterization of the
- 21 discussion we had on CWIP?
- 22 A. You said current investment in a product
- 23 that would be completed at a later date?
- 24 Q. Yes.
- 25 A. That's a general description, yes.

- 1 Q. Isn't CWIP, then, similar to research and
- 2 development in that both are investing in a future
- 3 service or product?
- 4 MR. SAUER: Object. Outside the scope of
- 5 his testimony. Research and development assumes
- 6 facts not in evidence, and to the extent you
- 7 understand the question, you may answer.
- 8 THE WITNESS: Could you read the
- 9 question, please?
- 10 (Record read back as requested.)
- 11 THE WITNESS: I guess they are somewhat
- 12 similar.
- 13 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 14 Q. And would you agree that many industries,
- 15 such as the pharmaceutical industry, or the
- 16 airline and manufacturers, take into consideration
- 17 ongoing research and development costs in their
- 18 current prices?
- 19 A. I don't know that.
- 20 Q. Are you generally familiar with annual
- 21 reports that are filed by corporations?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. Are you aware that publicly owned
- 24 corporations do file annual reports?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. And are you generally familiar with
- 2 income statements?
- A. Yes.
- 4 Q. And income statements show a
- 5 corporation's income as well as expenses; is that
- 6 correct?
- 7 A. Revenues and expenses.
- Q. And are you aware that annual reports
- 9 typically have income statements?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 - -
- 12 Thereupon, Duke Energy Ohio's Exhibit
- No. 4 was marked for purposes of
- 14 identification.
- 15 - -
- MR. SAUER: I object. This is way, way
- 17 outside the scope of his testimony.
- 18 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 19 Q. I am looking at what I've just handed you
- 20 as the Annual Report for 2006 for Boeing, and this
- 21 won't take long, but I'm looking at Page 4.
- On the right-hand corner there's a bold
- 23 text there that says "Facing Reality", and below
- 24 that there's a paragraph followed by, it looks
- 25 like, four bullets there.

- And I'm looking, in particular, at the
- 2 third bullet down which states, "We increased our
- 3 research and development spending for 2006 and '07
- 4 by almost a billion dollars", and it goes on, "to
- 5 reduce risk in our commercial airplane programs".
- 6 Do you see that?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Would you please turn to Page 22?
- 9 A. Okay. I'm there.
- 10 Q. And the top of the page says "Five-Year
- 11 Summary (Unaudited)"?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And do you recognize this as the general
- 14 form of an income statement?
- MR. SAUER: Again, I object. There's
- 16 absolutely no relevance to Mr. Haugh's testimony
- 17 as to whether or not Boeing has written off
- 18 research and development expenses in any years on
- 19 this schedule.
- 20 Airline industries are under a different
- 21 set of regulations, and what costs they are
- 22 allowed and attempt to recover through their
- 23 pricing is irrelevant to whether or not Duke is
- 24 attempting to recover a return on their CWIP.
- MR. D'ASCENZO: Can he answer?

- 1 MR. SAUER: To the extent he knows, he
- 2 may answer.
- 3 THE WITNESS: Would you reread the
- 4 question, please?
- 5 (Record read back as requested.)
- 6 THE WITNESS: There appears to be a lot
- 7 missing. Very high-level summary of this is all
- 8 it appears to be.
- 9 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 10 Q. Well, it does show the company's annual
- 11 revenues, correct?
- 12 A. There's an area that is designated
- 13 revenues. I haven't looked at this entire
- 14 document. I don't know if this is just a specific
- 15 portion or if this -- I don't have all the
- 16 details. I will state that I see an area that is
- 17 designated as revenues.
- 18 Q. And do you see that there is a -- Strike
- 19 that.
- Do you see that below where it says
- 21 "Total Revenues", that there are some discussions
- of expenses?
- MR. SAUER: Continuing objection.
- 24 THE WITNESS: I see two line items with
- 25 expense at the end of them.

- 1 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- Q. And in particular, the second line item,
- 3 does that state "Research and Development
- 4 Expense"?
- 5 A. There is a line item that is -- that's
- 6 stated as Research and Development Expense.
- 7 Q. And going across the row there to the
- 8 first column in bold under 2006, the company,
- 9 Boeing, is reporting approximately \$3 billion in
- 10 research and development; is that correct? If you
- 11 look at the very top of the --
- 12 A. That's what I was looking at. Dollars in
- 13 millions --
- 14 MR. SAUER: Continuing objection.
- 15 THE WITNESS: I see that there is --
- 16 appears the information on this states that
- 17 under 2006 there is 3.3 billion in -- what this
- 18 states is research and development expense.
- 19 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- Q. Given that Boeing is including its
- 21 research and development expense on this summary,
- 22 would you agree that Boeing takes research and
- 23 development expenditures into consideration as
- 24 part of its ongoing costs?
- MR. SAUER: Object. Outside the scope of

- 1 his testimony. Assumes facts not in evidence. He
- 2 has no way of knowing what Boeing does in terms of
- 3 pricing their product or trying to recover costs.
- 4 THE WITNESS: It's listed here as an
- 5 expense. Unless they are -- this is unaudited, so
- 6 I don't know if the audited version also had
- 7 research and development expense.
- But according to this unaudited version,
- 9 it states they have an expense titled "Research
- 10 and Development".
- 11 - -
- 12 Thereupon, Duke Energy Ohio's Exhibit
- No. 5 was marked for purposes of
- 14 identification.
- 15 ---
- MR. D'ASCENZO: I'm handing out a copy of
- 17 the 2006 Annual Report for Eli Lilly.
- 18 MR. SAUER: Continuing objection.
- 19 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- Q. And if you would please turn to -- it
- 21 doesn't appear to have a page number on it, but
- 22 it's the third page in the packet, "2006 Financial
- 23 Highlights".
- A. I'm there, yes.
- Q. On the first line Eli Lilly is reporting

- 1 its net sales; is that correct?
- 2 A. There's a line that states "Net Sales".
- 3 Q. And below that --
- 4 MR. SAUER: Objection.
- 5 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 6 Q. -- Eli Lilly is reporting roughly \$3
- 7 billion in research and development, is that
- 8 correct?
- 9 A. It's just a line item that says "Research
- 10 and Development", with \$3.1 billion.
- 11 Q. And below that, there is a line there
- 12 that is entitled "Research and Development As a
- 13 Percent of Net Sales". Do you see that?
- 14 A. It's right below that, yes.
- MR. SAUER: Objection.
- 16 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 17 Q. And Eli Lilly has calculated that it's
- 18 approximately 19.9 percent; is that correct?
- 19 A. That is what that document shows, yes.
- Q. Would you agree that research and
- 21 development is considered a cost factor as an
- 22 ongoing cost of doing business by both Boeing and
- 23 Eli Lilly, given the significant investment that
- 24 they reported?
- 25 MR. SAUER: Can I have that question

- 1 reread?
- 2 (Record read back as requested.)
- MR. SAUER: Object. Outside the scope of
- 4 his testimony. To the extent you know, you may
- 5 answer.
- 6 THE WITNESS: Based on the information
- 7 provided by these, I can deduce that they both
- 8 have expenses listed as research and development.
- 9 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 10 Q. Let's go back to your testimony,
- 11 Mr. Haugh. On Page -- Let me make sure I have the
- 12 correct citation here. I believe it's Page 3,
- 13 Line 20.
- 14 A. Page 3, Line 20?
- 15 Q. Yes.
- 16 A. Yes, I'm there.
- 17 Q. This is in reference to the company's
- 18 System Reliability Tracker, SRT?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. You state you concur with the auditor's
- 21 recommendation that the DENA assets should not be
- 22 collected from customers through the SRT. Is that
- 23 a correct characterization?
- A. I believe that was a direct quote from my
- 25 testimony.

- 1 Q. Is it your opinion that Duke Energy Ohio
- 2 should not purchase capacity from the DENA assets,
- 3 even if that capacity is less expensive than other
- 4 available capacity?
- 5 MR. SAUER: Can you read that question,
- 6 please?
- 7 (Record read back as requested.)
- MR. SAUER: Again, when you're asking
- 9 that question, Rocco, are you again tying it to
- 10 the SRT, purchasing capacity in terms of the
- 11 planning process and the use of the capacity for
- 12 planning purposes under the SRT?
- MR. D'ASCENZO: Yes, I'm referring to the
- 14 SRT.
- 15 THE WITNESS: On Page 15 of my testimony
- 16 I state that:
- 17 "DE-Ohio should only be allowed to
- 18 purchase capacity of DENA assets in the future
- if DE-Ohio demonstrates that the DENA assets
- 20 clearly offer a better price or better product
- for customers than offered in the open
- 22 market."
- 23 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- Q. So you would not oppose the inclusion of
- 25 the DENA assets in the SRT providing the price is

- 1 more beneficial to customers, or the product,
- 2 itself, is more beneficial to customers?
- 3 A. That is what my testimony states, that a
- 4 better price or better product.
- 5 Q. With respect to Duke Energy Ohio's
- 6 day-ahead operational needs, would you also oppose
- 7 the use of the DENA assets?
- 8 A. The same question and answer. It would
- 9 be Line 18 on Page 15.
- "If the circumstances arises where
- 11 DE-Ohio is in an emergency situation and
- 12 unable to meet its capacity needs, then use of
- DENA assets could be appropriate."
- 14 Q. Have you compared the price of the DENA
- 15 capacity to other capacity available in the
- 16 competitive retail electric service market?
- 17 A. No.
- 18 Q. If Duke Energy Ohio is not permitted to
- 19 purchase capacity from its DENA assets, and then
- 20 sells that -- those -- that capacity to nonMBSSO
- 21 customers and earns a profit, do you agree that
- 22 Duke Energy Ohio then has no obligation to pass
- 23 such profits through to MBSSO customers?
- 24 THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the
- 25 question?

- 1 (Record read back as requested.)
- 2 THE WITNESS: I agree with that.
- 3 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 4 Q. On Page 4 of your testimony, Line 1, you
- 5 make a recommendation regarding the SRT charge in
- 6 terms of its location on Duke Energy Ohio's bill.
- 7 And you made the same recommendation with respect
- 8 to the AAC charge, correct?
- 9 A. I paired those two together in my
- 10 testimony.
- 11 Q. And that recommendation is that the SRT,
- 12 along with the AAC, should be relocated to the
- 13 generation portion of DE-Ohio's bill; is that
- 14 correct?
- 15 A. Yes, I believe they both should be to the
- 16 generation charge portion.
- 17 Q. To the best of your knowledge, has the
- 18 Commission received any complaints about the
- 19 location of the SRT charge on customer bills?
- 20 A. Has the Commission? I don't know.
- Q. To the best of your knowledge, has OCC
- 22 received any complaints from consumers regarding
- 23 the S- -- the location of the SRT charge on
- 24 customer bills?
- 25 A. I do not know that.

- 1 Q. If Duke Energy Ohio were to agree to the
- 2 billing format change that you're recommending for
- 3 the SRT, does that end your criticism of Duke
- 4 Energy Ohio's bill with respect to the SRT?
- 5 A. Yeah, basically my only -- it's somewhat
- 6 confusing, separating the two, the two charges,
- 7 but I would -- my recommendation is to move both
- 8 the AAC and SRT from the -- I believe it's called
- 9 the delivery -- from the delivery charges into the
- 10 generation charges portion of the bill.
- 11 That's the gist of my recommendation for
- 12 this. If both of those were to move, then I guess
- 13 you're asking if -- if Duke agreed to my
- 14 recommendation, I would be satisfied, yes.
- 15 Q. I think I just have a few more questions
- 16 for you.
- Going back to your knowledge of Duke
- 18 Energy Ohio's initial MBSSO proceeding, are you
- 19 familiar with the pricing structure that the
- 20 company filed as its initial rate stabilized
- 21 market base standard service offer?
- 22 A. As part of the -- I believe there was a
- 23 stipulation filed in September, maybe, of 2004.
- 24 The price as a result of that?
- Q. I'm asking more about the application

- 1 that the company filed, which would have been in
- 2 January of 2004; late January.
- 3 A. I apologize, because I think I may be --
- 4 I have a general understanding, let's say. I
- 5 think I have a better understanding of the
- 6 stipulation that was filed, but I have a general
- 7 understanding of the 2004 application, the
- 8 January 2004 application.
- 9 Q. Okay. Are you aware that the January
- 10 application was made up of two basic components, a
- 11 price to compare and a POLR charge?
- 12 A. I believe that was the overriding theme
- 13 of the application.
- 14 Q. And do you know what components were in
- 15 that POLR charge?
- A. As of the application, I am not positive.
- 17 Q. Did the company have a component of that
- 18 POLR charge that was similar to the AAC that the
- 19 company currently has?
- 20 A. I believe that -- My problem is the exact
- 21 terminology that was used in the original
- 22 application. If it wasn't the AAC, it was
- 23 something that is currently represented by the
- 24 AAC.
- 25 O. And that's correct.

- 1 A. I believe. I'm not -- Subject to check
- 2 on that.
- 3 Q. And are you aware of what cost components
- 4 were -- Strike that.
- 5 Are you aware of what pricing components
- 6 were included in that, we'll call it an annually
- 7 adjusted component of the POLR charge from that
- 8 January application?
- 9 A. Generally, I'm familiar with what was
- 10 included with that.
- 11 Q. And what were those components, to the
- 12 best of your knowledge?
- 13 A. I believe, once again, subject to check,
- 14 and based on my -- trying to remember exactly what
- 15 was filed in the original application, the
- 16 stipulation and then on the application for
- 17 rehearing.
- I believe at the time of the original
- 19 application, the AAC included the homeland
- 20 security, environmental tax law changes, and also
- 21 what is now known as the SRT. Subject to check on
- 22 that, I believe that's what was included in the
- 23 AAC at that time.
- Q. The AAC component of that POLR charge, do
- 25 you know if it included emission allowances?

- 1 A. I believe at the time it included
- 2 emission allowances, and then during the first FPP
- 3 audit those emission allowances were moved --
- 4 Strike that.
- 5 The original did include emission
- 6 allowances, and then the initial FPP audit moved
- 7 the emission allowances to the generation -- or to
- 8 the FPP. Once again, subject to check as to the
- 9 history behind the emission allowances.
- MR. D'ASCENZO: I'm sorry, would you
- 11 please read that back?
- 12 (Record read back as requested.)
- 13 BY MR. D'ASCENZO:
- 14 Q. The annually adjusted component that was
- 15 initially proposed, do you know if it included a
- 16 reserve margin component?
- 17 A. Honest, it would be very much easier for
- 18 me if I had the application to be able to cite to
- 19 these specific points.
- 20 As I stated before, there were a variety
- 21 of changes that happened throughout the
- 22 proceeding, as to where everything was moved
- 23 around, and I'm not positive as to where the
- 24 reserve margin -- what I call the current SRT,
- 25 where that was during the original application.

- 1 Q. That's fine.
- Do you know what -- Strike that.
- I will represent to you that it did
- 4 include a reserve margin component, subject to
- 5 check.
- 6 Do you know what percentage of load the
- 7 company initially sought for recovery through that
- 8 reserve margin?
- 9 A. I believe -- Subject to check, I believe
- 10 the original was they were looking for 18 percent
- 11 reserve margin.
- 12 Q. And do you know if that was 18 percent of
- 13 total load?
- 14 A. I believe it was of the peak load.
- 15 Q. Do you know if it included a capacity
- 16 commitment other than reserve margin?
- 17 A. That, I'm not aware of.
- 18 Q. And not having the whole history in front
- 19 of me, you agree that -- you would agree that at
- 20 some point emission allowances were removed from
- 21 that annually adjusted component and were placed
- 22 into the Fuel and Purchased Power Rider, correct?
- 23 A. Yeah, as I stated before, I believe it
- 24 was in the first FPP audit that was done, an
- 25 auditor recommendation was to move -- was to

1	include the emission allowances in with the FPP.
2	Q. The Commission didn't order that in
3	the 03-93 case, to the best of your knowledge?
4	A. I'm not positive on that.
5	MR. D'ASCENZO: Could we go off the
6	record for just a moment?
7	(Discussion held off the record.)
8	MR. D'ASCENZO: Back on the record.
9	Mr. Haugh, I have no more questions for you.
10	(Signature not waived.)
11	
12	(Thereupon, the deposition was concluded
13	at 3:32 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, April
14	3rd, 2007.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	AFFIDAVIT
2	
3	STATE OF,)
4) ss:
5	COUNTY OF,)
6	Michael P. Haugh, having been duly placed
7	under oath, deposes and says that:
8	I have read the transcript of my
9	deposition taken on Tuesday, April 3rd, 2007, and
10	made all necessary changes and/or corrections as
11	noted on the attached correction sheet, if any.
12	
13	
14	
15	Michael P. Haugh
16	Placed under oath before me and
17	subscribed in my presence this day of
18	·
19	
20	
21	
22	Notary Public
23	
24	My Commission Expires:
25	

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	State of Ohio,)) SS:
4	County of Fairfield,)
5	
6	I, Valerie J. Grubaugh, Registered Merit
7	Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio, hereby
_	certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate
8	transcript of the deposition testimony, taken under oath on the date hereinbefore set forth, of
9	MICHAEL PHAULM.
	I further certify that I am neither
10	attorney or counsel for, nor related to or
	employed by any of the parties to the action in
11	which the deposition was taken, and further that I
	am not a relative or employee of any attorney or
12	counsel employed in this case, nor am I
	financially interested in the action.
13	
14	$1 \cdot 1 \cdot 2 \cdot $
1 5	Valeir Skulaugh
	Valerie J. Grubaugh, ()
16	Registered Merit 7000 Action
	Reporter, Certified
17	Realtime Reporter and
	Notary Public in and for
18	the State of Ohio
19	My Commission Expires: August 10, 2011
20	
	*** CAUTION ***
21	This certification bears an original signature in
	nonreproducible ink. The foregoing certification
22	of the transcript does not apply to any
	reproduction of the same not bearing the signature
23	of the certifying court reporter. McGinnis &
	Associates, Inc. disclaims responsibility for any
24	alterations which may have been made to the noncertified copies of this transcript.
25	The second contract of the second sec