

**FILE**

14

**BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Annual Application of :  
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for an Adjustment : Case No. 10-2788-GA-RDR  
to Rider AMRP Rates To Recover Costs :  
Incurred in 2010. :

In the Matter of the Application of Duke : Case No. 10-2789-GA-ATA  
Energy Ohio, Inc. for Tariff Approval. :

PUCO

2011 MAR 28 PM 2:30

RECEIVED-BOOKING DIV

**COMMENTS  
AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS  
SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE STAFF OF  
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

March 28, 2011

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   A   Date Processed MAR 28 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
BACKGROUND.....	2
SCOPE OF STAFF'S INVESTIGATION.....	5
AMRP PROGRESS .....	6
APPLICANT'S PROPOSED RECOVERY .....	6
STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS .....	8
PROOF OF SERVICE .....	12

**BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Annual Application of :  
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for an Adjustment : Case No. 10-2788-GA-RDR  
to Rider AMRP Rates To Recover Costs :  
Incurred in 2010. :

In the Matter of the Application of Duke : Case No. 10-2789-GA-ATA  
Energy Ohio Inc. for Tariff Approval. :

---

**COMMENTS  
AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

**INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with the Stipulation adopted in Case No. 07-589-GA-AIR, the Staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (Staff) has conducted its investigation in the above-referenced matter and hereby submits its findings in these comments to the Commission.

These comments were prepared by the Commission's Utilities Department in conjunction with the Service Monitoring and Enforcement Department. Included are financial reviews of additions to plant-in-service and to the Applicant's proposed revenue requirement and other matters.

In accordance with past practice in other AMRP cases, copies of these comments have been filed with the Commission's Docketing Division.

These comments contain the results of the Staff's investigation, and do not purport to reflect the views of the Commission, nor is the Commission bound in any manner by the representations and/or recommendations set forth herein.

## **BACKGROUND**

Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. (Duke, Company, or Applicant) was incorporated in Ohio on April 3, 1897, as Cincinnati Gas, Light and Coke Company. It was renamed Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company (CG&E) in 1901 and its present name Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. was adopted in 2006. Growth, acquisitions, and mergers throughout the years have resulted in the present operation in which the Applicant renders electric or gas service, or both, in ten counties in Ohio. The Applicant is a public utility engaged in the business of distribution and sale of natural gas to approximately 425,000 customers in eight southwestern Ohio counties.

On October 24, 1994, CG&E merged with PSI Resources, Inc. to form Cinergy Corporation. Prior to the merger, PSI Resources, Inc. was the parent company of PSI Energy, Inc., an electric utility serving Indiana. Following the merger, Cinergy Corporation was the parent company to both CG&E and PSI Energy, Inc.

On June 1, 2005, Cinergy Corporation and Deer Holding Corporation filed an application with the Commission requesting authorization to merge Cinergy Corporation and Duke Energy Corporation. The Commission approved the merger and the Applicant was renamed Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. effective April 3, 2006.

On May 30, 2002, the Commission approved a Stipulation resolving all outstanding issues associated with CG&E Case Nos. 01-1228-GA-AIR, 01-1478-GA-ALT, and 01-1539-GA-AAM including the establishment of the Accelerated Main Replacement Program (AMRP) rider. Under this rider, rates were established for each year and for each class of service through 2007, with rates established in 2007 to continue until the effective date of the rates set in the Applicant's next base rate case. The purpose of the rider was to recover expenditures associated with the Company's ten-year replacement of all twelve inch and smaller cast iron and bare steel gas mains in its distribution system. Under the Stipulation, the Company agreed to file annual applications supporting proposed adjustments to its rates and the Staff was directed to review and report on the viability the proposed rates.

On July 18, 2007 the Applicant filed applications to increase its gas distribution rates, for authority to implement an alternative rate plan for its gas distribution services, and for approval to change accounting methods. On February 28, 2008, the parties to these cases filed a joint stipulation (2008 Stipulation) resolving all issues raised in the applications except for the issue of residential rate design. As part of the 2008 Stipulation, the parties agreed that the Applicant would file actual data to support a Rider AMRP adjustment for the last nine months of 2007 (the months not included in the test year for the base rate case) and that the revenue requirement for 2008 rates would be modified to include deferred curb-to-meter and riser expenses, net of maintenance savings, for calendar year 2007. The parties further agreed and recommended that the Applicant be allowed to recover the deferred expense in any annual AMRP filing, provided that the

recovery does not exceed the cumulative residential rate caps that, for 2009, 2010 and 2011 rates, respectively, were set at \$2.60, \$3.90 and \$5.20. In addition, the parties agreed to a procedure for review of Company applications by Staff and other interested parties similar to that created in Case No. 01-1228-GA-AIR, *et al.*, and used for prior AMRP filings. The Applicant will file a pre-filing notice each November containing nine months of actual AMRP data and three months of projected data and establishing a date certain of December 31. By February 28 of the following year, the Applicant will file an application with updates to a full year of actual data. The Staff will conduct an investigation and, unless the Staff finds the application to be unjust or unreasonable or if any other party files an objection that is not resolved by the Applicant, the Staff will recommend Commission approval of the application. The Commission approved the 2008 Stipulation in Case Nos. 07-589-GA-AIR, *et al.*, on May 28, 2008.

On November 30, 2010, the Applicant filed a notice of intent to file an application to increase existing AMRP rider rates, along with a request to establish a test period of twelve months ending December 31, 2010 and a date certain of December 31, 2010. The Applicant also provided Schedules 1 through 26 containing nine months of actual data through September 2010 and three months of projected data covering October through December 2010 in support of its notice. On February 28, 2011, the Applicant filed its application to increase its AMRP rates and provided updated schedules with actual data through December 31, 2010.

## **SCOPE OF STAFF'S INVESTIGATION**

The Staff investigated the Company's application to evaluate the reasonableness of the revenue requirement proposed by the Company and the resulting proposed increase to the AMRP rider rate. These comments summarize the Staff's review, identify exceptions to the Applicant's rate filing, and provide explanations and recommendations to address the exceptions.

The Staff performed an overview of the Applicant's progress towards implementing its AMRP and Riser Replacement Program (RRP). The Staff also reviewed and analyzed the documentation filed by the Applicant by tracing it to supporting work papers and source data. As part of the review, the Staff issued data requests, conducted investigative interviews, and performed independent analyses when necessary.

To investigate the proposed rate base, the Staff reviewed aspects of the Applicant's plant accounting system to ascertain if the information on mains and services assets contained in the Applicant's plant ledgers and supporting continuing property records represented a reliable source of original cost data. The Staff also examined the computation of the Allowance for Funds Used During Construction (AFUDC) and verified the existence and the used and useful nature of plant additions through physical inspections. The Staff selected a sample of transactions for detailed review and Gas Pipeline Safety Staff conducted on-site inspections. In addition, the Staff reviewed post in-service carrying costs and its deferred income tax effect as well as deferred taxes on liberalized depreciation. To examine the Applicant's proposed operating expenses, the Staff reviewed expenses associated with depreciation, amortization of post in-service

carrying charges, meter relocations, property taxes, amortization of the deferred curb-to-meter expense, and maintenance savings.

### **AMRP PROGRESS**

The Applicant reports that prior to commencing the AMRP in 2001 it had approximately 1,200 miles of cast iron and bare steel mains in service and that, at the end of 2010, it had replaced approximately 866 miles (approximately 72%) of these mains. The Applicant replaced 70 miles of cast iron and bare steel mains in 2010. The Applicant estimates that it has approximately 303 miles of mains left to replace. In addition, the Applicant reports that it has replaced approximately 82,480 main-to-curb service lines. The Applicant maintains that accelerated replacement of the cast iron and bare steel mains has resulted in substantially fewer leaks on its distribution system which has enhanced safety and lowered maintenance costs. In addition, the Applicant claims that it has avoided frequent rate cases and that its assumption of ownership of curb-to-meter service lines allows a more consistent determination of when such lines should be replaced.

### **APPLICANT'S PROPOSED RECOVERY**

For collection beginning with the first billing cycle in May 2011, the Applicant proposes a revenue requirement of \$33,703,214.33 for the AMRP and \$4,187,812.58 for the RRP for a total revenue requirement of \$37,891,026.91. Using the allocation percentages and billing determinants for the AMRP and RRP established in the 2008 Stipulation, approved by the Commission in Case No. 07-589-GA-AIR, the Applicant



proposes that Rider AMRP rate be set at \$4.81 for residential customers, \$36.81 for general service and firm transportation customers, and \$0.15/Mcf for interruptible transportation customers.

The Applicant presented the calculation of its proposed 2010 revenue requirement for the AMRP on Schedule 1 of the Application and for the RRP on Schedule 2. These schedules are supported by more detailed schedules contained in the Application. The Applicant's calculation of the proposed revenue requirements for the AMRP and RRP include the following:

For AMRP:

- The original cost and accumulated depreciation reserve for AMRP property used and useful on December 31, 2007 (the date certain for Case No. 07-589-GA-AIR) as adjusted for 2010 additions to the plant-in-service that was used and useful by December 31, 2010 and retirement of existing assets;
- Calculation of Post in Service Carrying Charges (PISCC) on net plant additions and related deferred taxes calculated from the date that the applicable assets are used and useful until the next effective date of AMRP rider;
- Calculation of deferred taxes on liberalized depreciation;
- Gross-up of 11.67% for rate of return (approved in Case No. 07-589-GA-AIR) assigned to the recovery of all AMRP net capital expenditures;
- Calculation of the annualized depreciation expense for 2010 additions and retirements;
- Meter relocation expense;
- Annualized property tax expense associated with the plant additions and retirements from the date certain in Case No. 07-589-GA-AIR through 2010; and
- Annualized amortization of the PISCC accrued from the date certain from Case No. 07-789-GA-AIR (December 31, 2007) through 2010.

For the RRP:

- The original cost of 2010 riser additions to plant-in-service as adjusted for depreciation;
- Calculation of Post in Service Carrying Charges (PISCC) on net plant additions and related deferred taxes calculated from the date that the applicable assets are used and useful until the next effective date of AMRP rider and recorded in unique sub-accounts of Account 182.3 ("Other Regulatory Assets");
- Calculation of deferred taxes on liberalized depreciation;
- Gross-up of 11.67% rate of return (approved in Case No. 07-589-GA-AIR) assigned to the recovery of certain riser net capital expenditures;
- Calculation of the annualized depreciation expense for 2010 additions and retirements;
- Annualized property tax expense associated with the plant additions and retirements from the date certain in Case No. 07-589-GA-AIR through 2010, and
- Annualized amortization of the PISCC accrued from the date certain from Case No. 07-789-GA-AIR (December 31, 2007) through 2010.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

While, based upon its review, the Staff believes that the Company has supported its filing with adequate data and information, the Staff makes the following recommendations to ensure that the AMRP revenue requirement is just and reasonable:

1. On Schedule 21, the Company calculated "Gas Maintenance Account Savings" by totaling its 2010 expenses in Accounts 885000 (Maintenance Supervision/Engineering), 887000 (Maintenance of Mains), and 892000 (Maintenance of Services) and comparing the result to the baseline for these accounts presently included in base rates established in Case No. 07-589-

GA-AIR, *et.al.* Schedule 21 shows savings of \$318,883.95 in 2010 composite expenses over the baseline expense levels.

In the 2009 AMRP case, Duke and parties entered into a Stipulation which, among other things, included a schedule of minimum maintenance savings for years 2010 through 2016 of AMRP. For year 2010, Duke and parties agreed to apply as savings the greater of the actual maintenance savings as described above, or a minimum savings of \$387,624. For purposes of calculating the AMRP revenue requirement in this case, Staff recommends use of the stipulated \$387,624 savings amount as it was applied by Duke in the filing on February 28, 2011.

2. In the Direct Testimony of Company Witness Hebbeler, Duke requests Commission approval to include in the AMRP replacement of certain large diameter cast iron and bare steel pipe and associated metallic services that were not contemplated under the original AMRP plans. Duke has discovered differences between system pipeline maps and plant records that may indicate that there is less 12-inch and smaller cast iron and bare steel pipe to be replaced than was planned under AMRP. The difference is an under run of approximately 48 miles of twelve inch and smaller diameter pipe. Duke would like to substitute replacement of larger than 12-inch diameter cast iron and bare steel pipe in the remaining years of AMRP. Duke believes there are 33 miles of such larger diameter pipe in need of replacement.

Staff recommends that Duke complete an audit of the remaining map mileage of 12-inch and smaller diameter cast iron and bare steel pipe before any decision is made regarding replacement of larger than 12-inch diameter cast iron and bare steel pipe in the remaining years of AMRP. Replacement of the larger diameter pipe should be decided in a future AMRP proceeding. Duke should report the results the audit to Staff as soon as it is completed.

Subject to the Staff's recommendations, the Staff supports a Commission finding that the Applicant's proposed revenue requirements and rate class allocations are just and reasonable. Staff recommends a revenue requirement of \$33,703,214.33 for the AMRP and \$4,187,812.58 for the Riser Replacement Program for a total revenue requirement of \$37,891,026.91. The resulting AMRP rates are as follows:


Residential	\$4.81 per month
General Service and Firm Transportation	\$36.81 per month
Interruptible Transportation	\$0.15 per Mcf

With adoption of the Staff's recommendations as noted above, the Staff recommends approval of Duke's Application in this case.

Respectfully submitted


**Michael DeWine**  
Ohio Attorney General

**William L. Wright**, Section Chief

  
**Steven L. Beeler**  
Assistant Attorney General  
Public Utilities Section  
180 East Broad Street, 6th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215-3793  
614.466.4397  
614.644.8764 (fax)  
[steven.beeler@puc.state.oh.us](mailto:steven.beeler@puc.state.oh.us)

## **PROOF OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing **Comments** submitted on behalf of the Staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, was served by electronic mail, facsimile, or hand-delivered, upon the following parties of record, this 28th day of March, 2011.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Steven L. Beeler**  
Assistant Attorney General

### **Parties of Record:**

Elizabeth H. Watts  
Associate General Counsel  
Duke Energy Ohio  
155 East Broad Street  
Suite 2100  
Columbus, OH 43215  
Elizabeth.Watts@duke-energy.com

Larry Sauer  
Assistant Consumers' Counsel  
Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel  
10 West Broad Street  
Suite 1800  
Columbus, OH 43215  
sauer@occ.state.oh.us