

FILE

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

DE-OHIO EXHIBIT 14

2008 AUG -8 AM 10: 30

BEFORE

PUCO

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of)	
Duke Energy Ohio for an)	Case No. 08-709-EL-AIR
Increase in Electric Distribution Rates)	
)	
In the Matter of the Application of)	
Duke Energy Ohio for Tariff)	Case No. 08-710-EL-ATA
Approval)	
)	
In the Matter of the Application of)	
Duke Energy Ohio for Approval)	Case No. 08-711-EL-AAM
to Change Accounting Methods)	

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

RICHARD G. STEVIE

ON BEHALF OF

DUKE ENERGY OHIO

_____	Management policies, practices, and organization
_____	Operating income
_____	Rate Base
_____	Allocations
_____	Rate of return
_____	Rates and tariffs
<u> X </u>	Other: SmartGrid

August 8, 2008

234990

This is to certify that the images appearing are an
accurate and complete reproduction of a case file
document delivered in the regular course of business
Technician 5 Date Processed 8-8-08

BEFORE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of)	
Duke Energy Ohio for an)	Case No. 08-709-EL-AIR
Increase in Electric Distribution Rates)	
)	
In the Matter of the Application of)	
Duke Energy Ohio for Tariff)	Case No. 08-710-EL-ATA
Approval)	
)	
In the Matter of the Application of)	
Duke Energy Ohio for Approval)	Case No. 08-711-EL-AAM
to Change Accounting Methods)	

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

RICHARD G. STEVIE

ON BEHALF OF

DUKE ENERGY OHIO

INDEX

Testimony addressing the valuation of economic societal benefits from implementation of SmartGrid.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Method For Estimating Economic Benefits.....	4
III. Conclusion	8

Attachments:

- RGS-1: Multipliers that represent the impacts on Final-demand Output
- RGS-2: Four selected multipliers are provided along with the projected amounts of direct investments assigned to each of the four categories.

I. INTRODUCTION

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Richard G. Stevie And my business address is 139 E. Fourth Street,
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.

Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

A. I am employed by the Duke Energy Corporation (Duke Energy) affiliated companies
as Managing Director of Customer Market Analytics.

**Q. PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE YOUR DUTIES AND
RESPONSIBILITIES AS MANAGING DIRECTOR OF THE CUSTOMER
MARKET ANALYTICS DEPARTMENT.**

A. I have responsibility for several functional areas, including load forecasting, load
research, demand side management (DSM) analysis, market research, load
management analytics, and product development analytics. The Customer Market
Analytics Department is responsible for providing functional analytical support
for the Duke Energy affiliates, Duke Energy Ohio (DE-Ohio or Company), Duke
Energy Kentucky, Duke Energy Indiana and Duke Energy Carolinas.

**Q. PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND
AND BUSINESS EXPERIENCE.**

A. I received a Bachelor's degree in Economics from Thomas More College in May
1971. In June 1973, I was awarded a Master of Arts degree in Economics from
the University of Cincinnati. In August 1977, I received a Ph.D. in Economics
from the University of Cincinnati.

My past employers include the Cincinnati Water Works where I was

1 involved in developing a new rate schedule and forecasting revenues, the United
2 States Environmental Protection Agency's Water Supply Research Division
3 where I was involved in the research and development of a water utility
4 simulation model and analysis of the economic impact of new drinking water
5 standards, and the Economic Research Division of the Public Staff of the North
6 Carolina Utilities Commission where I presented testimony in numerous utility
7 rate cases involving natural gas, electric, telephone, and water and sewer utilities
8 on several issues including rate of return, capital structure, and rate design. In
9 addition, I was involved in the Public Staff's research effort and presentation of
10 testimony regarding electric utility load forecasting. This included the
11 development of electric load forecasts for the major electric utilities in North
12 Carolina. I was also involved in research concerning cost curve estimation for
13 electricity generation, rate setting, and separation procedures in the telephone
14 industry, and the implications of financial theory for capital structures, bond
15 ratings, and dividend policy. In July 1981, I became the Director of the Economic
16 Research Division of the Public Staff with the responsibility for the development
17 and presentation of all testimony of the Division.

18 In November 1982, I joined the Load Forecast Section of The Cincinnati
19 Gas & Electric Company (CG&E). My primary responsibility involved directing
20 the development of CG&E's Electric and Gas Load Forecasts. I also participated
21 in the economic evaluation of alternate load management plans and was involved
22 in the development of CG&E's Integrated Resource Plan (IRP), which integrated
23 the load forecast with generation options and demand-side options.

1 With the reorganization after the merger of CG&E and PSI Resources,
2 Inc. in late 1994, I became Manager of Retail Market Analysis in the Corporate
3 Planning Department of Cinergy Services, Inc. and subsequently General
4 Manager of Market Analysis with responsibility for the load forecasting, load
5 research, DSM impact evaluation, and market research functions of the combined
6 Cinergy company. After the merger of Cinergy Corp. and Duke Energy in 2006, I
7 became the General Manager of the Market Analysis Department with
8 responsibility for several areas, including load forecasting, load research, market
9 research, DSM strategy and analysis, load management development, and
10 business development analytics. Since then, I have become the Managing
11 Director of the Customer Market Analytics Department.

12 Since 1990, I have chaired the Economic Advisory Committee for the
13 Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce. I have been a part-time faculty
14 member of Thomas More College located in Northern Kentucky and the
15 University of Cincinnati teaching undergraduate courses in economics. In
16 addition, I am an outside adviser to the Applied Economics Research Institute in
17 the Department of Economics at the University of Cincinnati as well as a member
18 of an advisory committee to the Economics Department at Northern Kentucky
19 University.

20 **Q. ARE YOU A MEMBER OF ANY PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS?**

21 **A.** Yes, I am a member of the American Economic Association, the National
22 Association of Business Economists, and the Association of Energy Services
23 Professionals.

1 **Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY PROVIDED TESTIMONY BEFORE ANY**
2 **OTHER REGULATORY AGENCIES?**

3 A. Yes. I have presented testimony on several occasions before the North Carolina
4 Utilities Commission, the South Carolina Public Service Commission, the Indiana
5 Utility Regulatory Commission, the Kentucky Public Service Commission, and
6 the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.

7 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS**
8 **PROCEEDING?**

9 A. My testimony provides estimates of the broader economic benefits from the
10 installation of smart metering systems. These are often referred to as the
11 macroeconomic benefits or multiplier effects that arise from investments. My
12 testimony will provide background on the method used to estimate the broader
13 economic benefits and then apply the method to the Company's proposed
14 investments in smart meter installations.

15 **II. METHOD FOR ESTIMATING ECONOMIC BENEFITS**

16 **Q. WHAT METHOD IS USED TO ESTIMATE THE ECONOMIC BENEFITS**
17 **FROM INVESTMENTS?**

18 A. In general, investments made for a project have direct and indirect induced types
19 of impact. The direct impacts are measured by the installation phase of the
20 project as well as on-going operational expenditures. The installation phase
21 represents the capital equipment and the labor dollars to complete the construction
22 phase of the project. Beyond the initial completion of the construction phase,
23 there is the direct spending from on-going operations.

1 The indirect economic impacts arise in the form of increased income
2 generated due to the increase in economic activity from the direct spending. In
3 other words, the direct spending creates a "ripple" effect or induced impact above
4 and beyond the direct spending. The total economic impact will be some multiple
5 of the direct spending.

6 One way to look at this is if a business spends an additional dollar on a
7 project, that dollar is spent, in part, again by the person or business that received
8 it. This process repeats itself again and again until the cycle of spending is
9 exhausted. The total economic impact can sometimes be many multiples of the
10 initial dollar spent.

11 The general method for conducting this analysis involves the use of Input-
12 Output multipliers to estimate the total economic impact of increases in final
13 demand for goods and services. Input-Output analysis was developed by Wassily
14 Leontief in the late 1930's and early 1940's as a way to model the
15 interrelationships among the components of the economy. Through an Input-
16 Output, one can gain an understanding of the impact of a change in the level of
17 activity in one industry on other supporting industries. Input-Output model
18 coefficients provide the estimates of the impacts from these interrelationships.
19 The approach has been used since the 1970's by the Bureau of Economic
20 Analysis, Department of Commerce, to provide a structure for conducting
21 estimates of the economic benefits from projects.

1 **Q. HOW IS THE INPUT-OUTPUT METHOD APPLIED TO ESTIMATE**
2 **ECONOMIC IMPACTS?**

3 A. The Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) has developed a set of regional
4 multipliers known as RIMS II (Regional Input-Output Modeling System). The
5 BEA has created multipliers for the impact on final-demand output, final-demand
6 earnings, final-demand value-added, direct-effect earnings, and direct-effect
7 employment. The estimates of multipliers can be obtained for the nation as a
8 whole as well as for specific regions. The BEA has developed a set of multipliers
9 for the Greater Cincinnati region. The Company has obtained the set of
10 multipliers in order to estimate the broader economic impacts from the smart
11 meter project. Attachment RGS-1 provides the multipliers that represent the
12 impacts on Final-demand Output. The values represent the total dollar change in
13 output that occurs across all industries for each dollar of output delivered to final
14 demand by the row industry. These multipliers can be used with the projected
15 level of direct spending to estimate the total economic impact.

16 From the multipliers in Attachment RGS-1, I selected four that are
17 applicable to the installation of a smart meter system. These are Utilities,
18 Computer and Electronic Product Manufacturing, Electrical Equipment and
19 Appliance Manufacturing, and Information and Data Processing Services. The
20 four selected multipliers are provided on Attachment RGS-2 along with the
21 projected amounts of direct investments assigned to each of the four categories.
22 The associated levels of on-going spending are also provided.

1 The present value total direct investment of the project is \$463 million.
2 Using the multipliers, this translates to a total economic impact of \$923 million or
3 an incremental benefit of \$460 million. For on-going operations, the present
4 value total direct spending of the project is \$142 million. Using the multipliers,
5 this translates to a total economic impact of \$283 million or an incremental
6 benefit of \$141 million.

7 From a total perspective, the present value total expenditure of the project
8 is \$606 million. Using the multipliers, this translates to a total economic impact
9 of \$1,206 million or an incremental benefit of \$601 million.

10 **Q. HOW REALISTIC ARE THESE VALUES OF INCREMENTAL**
11 **BENEFIT?**

12 **A.** In general, this translates into a multiplier that is close to 2 times. For
13 manufacturing projects, I usually expect a higher multiplier. The level found here
14 is not unexpected. However, if one wanted to take a more conservative view, one
15 could examine the incremental value estimated using the lowest non-residential
16 multiplier, which is approximately 1.36. Using that multiplier, I find a minimum
17 estimate of incremental economic benefit of \$ 219 million (0.36 times \$606
18 million).

19 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE FINDINGS FROM YOUR ANALYSIS?**

20 **A.** From the application of the Input-Output multipliers to the projected spending on
21 the smart meter system, I estimate that the incremental economic benefits from
22 the project are \$ 601 million. I also find that under a very conservative approach,
23 the value is \$219 million.

III. CONCLUSION

1
2 **Q. WERE ATTACHMENT RGS-1 AND ATTACHMENT RGS-2 PREPARED**
3 **BY YOU OR UNDER YOUR DIRECTION?**

4 **A. Yes.**

5 **Q. DOES THAT CONCLUDE YOUR PRE-FILED TESTIMONY?**

6 **A. Yes.**

Bureau of Economic Analysis RIMS II Multipliers
 Cincinnati Metropolitan Statistical Area

Industry Group	Final-demand Output (dollars)
1. Crop and animal production	1.7424
2. Forestry, fishing, and related activities	1.8211
3. Oil and gas extraction	1.0000
4. Mining, except oil and gas	1.8457
5. Support activities for mining	2.0167
6. Utilities*	1.3618
7. Construction	2.1636
8. Wood product manufacturing	1.8244
9. Nonmetallic mineral product manufacturing	2.0004
10. Primary metal manufacturing	1.8650
11. Fabricated metal product manufacturing	2.0455
12. Machinery manufacturing	2.1372
13. Computer and electronic product manufacturing	2.1250
14. Electrical equipment and appliance manufacturing	1.9888
15. Motor vehicle, body, trailer, and parts manufacturing	2.3026
16. Other transportation equipment manufacturing	1.8558
17. Furniture and related product manufacturing	2.0978
18. Miscellaneous manufacturing	2.1575
19. Food, beverage, and tobacco product manufacturing	2.1870
20. Textile and textile product mills	1.9107
21. Apparel, leather, and allied product manufacturing	2.0319
22. Paper manufacturing	2.1961
23. Printing and related support activities	2.2681
24. Petroleum and coal products manufacturing	1.7821
25. Chemical manufacturing	1.9156
26. Plastics and rubber products manufacturing	2.1769
27. Wholesale trade	1.8930
28. Retail trade	1.9925
29. Air transportation	1.8299
30. Rail transportation	1.8676
31. Water transportation	2.0857
32. Truck transportation	2.1608

33. Transit and ground passenger transportation*	2.1503
34. Pipeline transportation	1.6567
35. Other transportation and support activities*	1.9219
36. Warehousing and storage	1.9605
37. Publishing including software	2.0462
38. Motion picture and sound recording industries	1.8378
39. Broadcasting and telecommunications	1.9421
40. Information and data processing services	2.0121
41. Federal Reserve banks, credit intermediation and related services	1.7872
42. Securities, commodity contracts, investments	2.1890
43. Insurance carriers and related activities	2.1716
44. Funds, trusts, and other financial vehicles	2.2393
45. Real estate	1.4594
46. Rental and leasing services and lessors of intangible assets	2.1571
47. Professional, scientific, and technical services	2.0770
48. Management of companies and enterprises	2.0958
49. Administrative and support services	2.0726
50. Waste management and remediation services	2.0315
51. Educational services	2.1465
52. Ambulatory health care services	2.0891
53. Hospitals and nursing and residential care facilities	2.1764
54. Social assistance	2.1150
55. Performing arts, museums, and related activities	2.0897
56. Amusements, gambling, and recreation	1.9719
57. Accommodation	1.9339
58. Food services and drinking places	2.0710
59. Other services*	2.1112
60. Households	1.3257

Economic Impact of Smart Meter Project

Impact of Direct Investment

Input-Output Multipliers		Project Cost		Total		Incremental	
Final-demand Output (dollars) Components		20 Year Present Value		Economic Value		Value	
Computer and electronic product manufacturing	2.1250 Hardware	\$	9,043,988	\$	19,218,475	\$	10,174,487
Electrical equipment and appliance manufacturing	1.9888 Equipment (1)	\$	471,500,339	\$	937,719,875	\$	466,219,535
Information and data processing services	2.0121 Software and IT labor	\$	26,333,978	\$	52,986,597	\$	26,652,619
Total		\$	506,878,305	\$	1,009,924,946	\$	503,046,641

Impact of Operational Direct Spending

Input-Output Multipliers		Project Cost		Total		Incremental	
Final-demand Output (dollars) Components		20 Year Present Value		Economic Value		Value	
Utilities	1.3618 Power usage	\$	6,802,523	\$	9,263,676	\$	2,461,153
Computer and electronic product manufacturing	2.1250 Hardware and support	\$	13,408,336	\$	26,492,711	\$	15,084,377
Electrical equipment and appliance manufacturing	1.9888 Service contracts and maintenance	\$	33,359,642	\$	66,345,656	\$	32,986,014
Information and data processing services	2.0121 Software maintenance	\$	93,219,645	\$	187,567,248	\$	94,347,603
		\$	146,790,145	\$	291,669,292	\$	144,879,146

Total Project Costs, Economic Value and Incremental Value

Project Cost		Total		Incremental	
20 Year Present Value		Economic Value		Value	
Capital	\$	\$	1,009,924,946	\$	503,046,641
Operation and Maintenance	\$	\$	291,669,292	\$	144,879,148
Total	\$	\$	1,301,594,238	\$	647,925,789

(1) Meters, communication equipment, distribution automation equipment, and installation