

RECEIVED-REGULATORY DIV
2009 MAR 30 PM 3:57
PUCO

FILE

BEFORE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

- In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for an Increase in Electric Distribution Rates) Case No. 08-709-EL-AIR
- In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for Tariff Approval) Case No. 08-710-EL-ATA
- In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for Approval to Change Accounting Methods) Case No. 08-710-EL-AAM
- In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for Approval of its Rider BDP, Backup Delivery Point Rider) Case No. 06-718-EL-ATA

Prepared Testimony
of
Joseph F. Buckley
Capital Recovery and Financial Analysis Division
Utilities Department

Staff Exhibit __

March 30, 2009

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 Date Processed 3/30/09

PREPARED TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH F. BUCKLEY

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

1. Q. Please state, for the record, your name, position, and business address?

A. My name is Joseph P. Buckley. I am employed as a Utility Specialist 3 in the Capital Recovery and Financial Analysis Division of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (PUCO), 180 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215

2. Q. Please state your educational and professional backgrounds?

A. I received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Economics from the Ohio State University and a Master's Degree in Business Administration from the University of Dayton. In 2000, I earned the Certified in Financial Management (CFM) designation, awarded by the Institute of Management Accountants. Also I attended, The Annual Regulatory Studies Program sponsored by The National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC) and The Training for Utility Management Analyst also sponsored by NARUC. I have been employed by the PUCO since 1987. Since that time I have progressed through various positions and was promoted to my current position of Utility Specialist 3, in 2000. In addition, I have worked on several joint Federal Communication Commission (FCC) and NARUC projects and audits and currently serve on the Midwest ISO's Finance Committee as Vice-Chairman.

3. Q. What is your involvement in this proceeding?

1 A. I will address Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. (DE-Ohio) objection nine and Ohio
2 Consumers Counsel (OCC) objection four, which relate to Staff's
3 elimination of DE-Ohio's purposed merger savings adjustment. I will also
4 address DE Ohio's objection seven, which relates to the adjustments of
5 certain test year labor expenses. These objections were filed in response to
6 the Staff Report of Investigation in Case No. 08-709-EL-AIR.

7 4. Q. In OCC objection four, OCC stated that it, "Objects to the Staff Report's
8 failure to specify that not only is there no evidence of actual merger
9 savings, there is evidence that expenses have increased since the merger
10 between Cinergy Corp. and Duke Energy Corporation in its discussion of
11 this issue on page 13 of the Staff Report. In this case, Duke is requesting
12 recovery of far more test year expenses than it did in the rate case before
13 the merger."

14 Also Duke Energy's stated in objection nine that the "Company objects to
15 the Staff's recommendation to exclude an adjustment to test year expense
16 related to merger savings." The impact of Staff's proposal is to unfairly
17 provide customers with a larger share of the merger savings than what was
18 agreed to in the Commission-approved Stipulation settling the recent
19 merger case, Case No. 05-732-EL-MER, *et al.* How does Staff respond to
20 these merger saving related objections?

21 A. In response to OCC Request for Production of Documents 04-34, DE-Ohio

1 stated that the Company had not performed any study or analysis
2 addressing the extent to which merger savings forecasted in Case No. 05-
3 07320-EL-MER have actually been achieved¹ This statement coupled with
4 Staff analysis of over all Administrative and General (A&G) Costs from
5 Case No. 05-0059-EL-AIR to the current filing does not provide
6 substantial evidence that projected savings were represented in this filing.
7 As detailed below the total electric A&G expenses decreased in 2008 but
8 the percentage allocated to the distribution company has increased,² and
9 results in an increase in costs for the distribution company, DE-Ohio.
10 However at this time Staff does not believe that there is currently enough
11 evidence to relate all of the cost increases to the merger.

(A)	(Millions \$)				<u>Distribution % TTL Electric</u>	
	(B) TTL	(C) TTL Electric A&G <u>Less: 920 & 926</u>	(D) Distribution A&G	(E) Distribution A&G <u>Less: 920 & 926</u>	(F) (D) /(B) <u>TTL</u> <u>A&G</u>	(G) (E) / (C) <u>Less: 920</u> <u>& 926</u>
<u>Year</u>	<u>A&G</u>		<u>A&G</u>			
2005	\$207.685	\$ 84.197	\$ 64.082	\$28.845	30.86%	33.83%
2006	\$258.179	\$129.811	\$83.559	\$39.879	32.36%	30.72%
2007	\$243.356	\$120.377	\$85.443	\$43.186	35.11%	35.88%
2008	\$212.360	\$105.303	\$88.144	\$42.796	41.51%	40.64%

¹ This statement was re-iterated in the direct testimony of OCC witness David J. Effron, beginning on page 21 line 21.

² Information gathered from FERC form 1

1 6. Q. In Company objection seven, DE-Ohio objects to the Staff's proposed
2 adjustment to test year labor expense. The Objection states that the "Staff
3 made a number of errors in developing its labor expense adjustment that
4 negatively impact the Company. The errors include:

5 7(a) Excluding all costs for Human Resources,
6 Governance, and Shared Services in the test year labor
7 amount. This adjustment excludes costs incurred for Legal
8 services, Information Technology, Company executives
9 including, but not limited to the utility President, Corporate
10 Chief Executive Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Controller,
11 Chief Legal Officer and other business functions shared
12 throughout the Duke Energy Corporate structure and which
13 are properly allocable to DE-Ohio. Staff's recommendation to
14 exclude *all* of this cost is not only arbitrary but is patently
15 unfair.

16 (b) Including expenses for incentive compensation,
17 bonuses, and severance in its calculation of test year labor
18 expense.

19 7. Q. How does Staff respond to this Objection?

20 A. As detailed above, the Staff reviewed the overall A&G expenses being
21 charged to distribution customers since the last rate agreement (05-0059-
22 EL-AIR), which was a stipulated agreement between multiple parties. Staff
23 believes that these agreed upon values are a reasonable starting place for
24 the evaluation of overall A&G expenses. Staff believes the overall
25 increase to those values is excessive but does not believe that there is
26 currently enough evidence to relate all of the increases to the merger.

27 8. Q. To summarize The Staff Report recommends \$48.4 million for O&M labor
28 expense. Has the Staff changed its labor expense recommendation?

1 A. No. The Staff believes that this is a reasonable allowance based on the
2 level of labor expense adopted in the Applicant's most recent electric rate
3 filing and in view of the overall level of distribution operating expenses
4 sought by Applicant in this proceeding.

5 9. Q. The Applicant objected to the Staff's test year and benefits expense. Has
6 the Staff changed its recommendation?

7 A. No. Both the Applicant and Staff applied the same pension and benefits
8 loading rate to test year labor expense to compute the pension and benefits
9 expense. Since the Staff hasn't changed its recommended labor expense,
10 the recommended pension and benefits expense has not changed either.

11 10. Q. Has there been any changes in how shared services companies are position
12 with in the Duke Corporate/Cinergy Corporate structure?

13 A. According to the Company's response to Staff DR. 41, "The legacy
14 Cinergy Service Company referred to as Duke Energy Shared Services was
15 merged into the legacy Duke Service Company, Duke Energy Business
16 Services (DEBS) effective 7/08. A large portion of the costs are 900
17 accounts. However, other accounts and direct charges to business unit
18 accounts do occur that are different from the 900 series accounts."

19 11. Q. Does Staff believe that this issue needs to be examined in more detail?

20 A. Yes. In the Staff Report the Staff recommended that an audit document,
21 examine and test all the allocation methods and factors that are used to
22 assign costs to PUCO regulated operations. The Staff believes that due to


1 the increase in cost from the last stipulated rate agreement that these costs
2 need to be examined in greater detail, especially after the DEBS cross over
3 has been completed for a significant amount of time, which will allow for
4 meaningful data collection.

5 12. Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

6 A. Yes, it does.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing Testimony of Joseph F. Buckley was served via electronic mail and/or regular U.S. mail, postage prepaid upon the following parties of record this 30th day of March, 2009.


Stephen A. Reilly
Assistant Attorney General

Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.
Elizabeth H. Watts
2500 Atrium II, 139 East Fourth Street
P.O. Box 960
Cincinnati, Ohio 45201-0960
Elizabeth.watts@duke.energy.com

Ohio Consumers' Counsel
Ann M. Hotz, Counsel of Record
10 W. Broad Street
Suite 1800
Columbus, OH 43215-3420
hotz@occ.state.oh.us

Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry
David Boehm/Michael Kurtz
36 East 7th Street
URS Building
Suite 1510
Cincinnati, OH 45202-4454
dboehm@BKLawfirm.com

Chester, Willcox & Saxbe LLP
John W. Bentine/Mark Yurick
65 E. State Street
Suite 1000
Columbus, OH 43215-4216
myurick@cwslaw.com

TW Telecom of Ohio LLC
Pamela Sherwood
4625 W. 8th Street, Suite 500
Indianapolis, IN 46268
Pamela.sherwood@telecom.com

Greater Cincinnati Health Council
Douglas E. Hart
441 Vine Street
Suite 4192
Cincinnati, OH 45202-2852
dhart@douglasshart.com

Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease
Steven M. Howard
52 E. Gay Street
P.O. Box 1008
Columbus, OH 43215-3108
smhoward@vorys.com

People Working Cooperatively, Inc.
Mary W. Christensen, Esq.
100 E. Campus View Blvd.
Columbus, OH 43235-4679
mchristensen@columbuslaw.org

Bricker & Eckler, LLP
Sally Bloomfield/Thomas O'Brien
100 S. Third Street
Columbus, OH 43215-4236
tobrien@bricker.com

Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy
David Rinebolt/Colleen Mooney
231 West Lima Street
Findaly, OH 45840-3033
drinebolt@aol.com
cmooney2@columbus.rr.com

Albert Lane
7200 Fair Oaks Dr.
Cincinnati, OH 45237
AELMICTEN@aol.com