BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

:		
:	Case Nos.	11-346-EL-SSO
:		11-348-EL-SSO
:		
:		
:		
	~	
:	Case Nos.	11 -349- EL-AAM
:		11-350-EL-AAM
:		
:		
	•	: : : : Case Nos.

PREFILED TESTIMONY OF PETER K. BAKER SERVICE MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT **PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

STAFF EX.

May 9, 2012

This is to certify that the invges appearing one of accurate and complete reproduction of a case rile document delivered in the regular course of business. Date Processed_MAY 0.0 Technician <u>2012</u>

2012 NAY -9 PH 5:08

.....

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

. .

	A.	My name is Peter Baker. My address is 180 E. Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio
		, , , , ,
		43215-3793.
2.	Q.	By whom are you employed?
	A.	I am employed by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.
3.	Q.	What is your present position with the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
		and what are your duties?
	А.	I am a section chief in the Reliability and Service Analysis Division of the
		Service Monitoring and Enforcement Department. My section analyzes
		reliability and service quality performance, and enforces reliability, service
		quality, and consumer protection rules for electric, gas, and water utilities.
		This includes analyzing and assessing the electric reliability and maintenance
		performance of electric distribution utilities. In addition, my section audits
		expenditures for cost recovery through electric smart grid riders, and also
		audits Ohio Power Company (OPC) ¹ vegetation maintenance costs for
		recovery through its Enhanced Service Reliability (ESR) Rider. Finally, my
		A. 3. Q.

¹ Effective January, 2012, Columbus Southern Power and Ohio Power Company were merged, and the surviving entity was named Ohio Power Company. Throughout this testimony, the newly-merged entity will be designated as OPC while the previously separate entities will be designated as CSP and OP.

1	section has also collected and analyzed data concerning the vegetation
2	management performance of Ohio's seven investor-owned electric utilities.

3

4. 4 O. Would you briefly state your educational background and work history? 5 I have bachelor's degrees in Psychology (1967) and Philosophy (1971) from A. 6 the University of Oklahoma, and a 1987 bachelor's degree in Business 7 Administration (with major in Accounting) from Franklin University. From 8 1972 to 1986, I was employed by Dowell Division of Dow Chemical Company 9 (an oil field service operation later called Dowell Schlumberger) where I 10 functioned as clerk/dispatcher and administrative assistant. In 1987, I joined 11 the PUCO, where I worked as an analyst and coordinator in the Performance Analysis Division of the Utilities Department. In December of 1994, I was 12 13 promoted to Administrator in the Consumer Services Department (now 14 called the Service Monitoring and Enforcement Department), and assigned to 15 the Compliance Division (now the Facilities and Operations Field Division). 16 In that organization, I enforced electric, gas, and telephone service quality, 17 customer service, and consumer protection rules. In 1997, I was transferred 18 to the Service Quality and Analysis Division (now called the Reliability and 19 Service Analysis Division), and in 2000, I was promoted to my current 20 position and duties.

1	5.	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony is this case?
2		A.	My testimony has three objectives. The first is to recommend whether the
3			Commission should find that OPC's reliability expectations are aligned with
4			those of its customers. The second is to recommend enhancements to the
5			proposed DIR Rider. The third objective is to make recommendations
6			concerning the continuation and funding of the ESR Rider.
7			
8	RE	LIAB	ILITY EXPECTATIONS
9	6.	Q.	Please describe your working knowledge of what ORC Sec. 4928.143 (B)(2)(h)
10			requires.
11		A.	This statute requires that, before approving an electric utility's distribution
12			infrastructure or modernization incentive as part of its Electric Security Plan,
13			the Commission must examine the reliability of the utility's distribution
14			system to ensure that customers' and the utility's reliability expectations are
15			aligned.
16			
17	7.	Q.	How does the Staff perform such an examination?
18		A.	Administrative Code Rule 4901:1-10-10-(B)(2) requires each electric utility in
19			the state to file with the Commission an application to establish company-
20			specific minimum reliability performance standards. As part of that

•

1			application, electric utilities are to include supporting justification for the
2			proposed methodology and each resulting performance standard. The
3			performance standards should reflect historical system performance, system
4			design, technological advancements, service area geography, customer
5			perception surveys, and other relevant factors.
6			
7			Staff's review mainly involves two steps. The first step is to work with the
8			company and other interested parties in establishing Commission-approved
9			reliability standards that incorporate consideration of historical performance,
10			customer survey results, and input from customer groups. Once performance
11			standards are set, the second step is to monitor the utility's performance
12			against its reliability standards to ensure that the standards are met.
13			
14	8.	Q.	Please describe the historical data that was used to set OPC's reliability
15			standards.
16		A.	OP's original application included six years of reliability data, but only the
17			more recent years were used for setting the standards, because performance
18			in these years better reflects the current operating conditions of the system
19			and results in standards that enforce better reliability.
20			

- •

1	9.	Q.	Please describe OPC's customer survey results that were considered in the
2			standard setting process.
3		A.	The survey results indicated that a high percentage of OPC customers, both
4			residential and commercial were satisfied overall with the service reliability
5			provided by OPC.
6			
7	10.	Q.	Please describe how consumer groups were involved in the standard-setting
8			process.
9		A.	The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel participated in the standards
10			proceeding by filing comments (and replies), and also signed the joint
11			stipulation recommending reliability standards for each of the two OPC
12			territories. The Commission approved that stipulation on September 8, 2010.
13			
14	12.	Q.	How did OPC's 2011 reliability performance compare with that for the
15			previous year?
16		A.	Most of OPC's reliability measures showed worse performance in 2011. The
17			table below analyzes OPC's 2010 and 2011 performance by territory.
18			
19			
20			

				OP	C Reliabilit	y Perfor	mance -	2010 vs. 20)11		
					(Lower is better)						
				Measure	Territory	2010	2011	Change	% Change		
				CATEL	CSP	1.21	1.39	0.18	15%		
				SAIFI ²	OP	0.98	1.06	0.08	8%		
				CATDLA	CSP	123.40	139.42	16.02	13%		
				CAIDI 3	OP	157.51	154.09	-3.42	-2%		
2					es that for			•			
3			perior	mance wo	rsened in 2	.011; and	i SAIFI	got worse	e for the C		
4			while	CAIDI imj	proved.						
5											
6	13.	Q,	Has O	PC met its	reliability	standar	ds?				
7		A.	Althou	ugh both C	PC territo	ries met	all of th	eir standa	ards in 20		
8			territo	ry missed	one of its r	eliabilit	y standa	rds in 201	11. The t		
9			preser	nts an anal	ysis of OPC	C's 2011	perform	nance.			
10											
11											
12											
13											

² SAIFI, or the System Average Interruption Frequency Index, represents the average number of interruptions per customer. SAIFI is calculated by dividing the total number of customer interruptions by the total number of customers served.

³ CAIDI, or the Customer Average Interruption Duration Index, represents the average interruption duration or average time to restore service per interrupted customer. CAIDI is calculated by dividing the sum of customer interruption durations by the total number of customers interrupted.

			OPC Reliability Performance vs. Standards						
				(Lower is better)					
			Territory	Measure	Performance		Variance	%	}
					Standar		0.45	Variance	-
				SAIFI	Performance	1.39	-0.15	-10%	4
			CSP		Standard	1.54	4.05	<u></u>	4
				CAIDI	Performance Standard	139.42	4.25	3%	-
					Performance	135.17 1.06	-0.13	-11%	-
				SAIFI	Standard	1.00	-0.15	-11 /0	-
			OP		Performance	154.09	-15.13	-9%	-
				CAIDI	Standard	169.22	-10.10	-770	-
1			·	1	Statuturu	107,222			1
2			As indicated	by the sha	aded portion o	of the tab	ole, the CSI	e territory i	missed its
3			CAIDI stand	and by 1 2	E minutos or 2	norconi			
5				.atu Dy 4.2.	5 minutes or 3	percen	•		
4									
5	14.	Q.	Does this mi	ss constitu	te a rule viola	tion?			
6		A.	No, it does not. A reliability standard must be missed in two consecutive						
7			years to constitute a rule violation. Staff will continue to monitor OPC's						
			5						
8			reliability pe	rformance	and take actio	on in the	e future if n	ecessary.	
9									
-									
10	15.	Q.	Based on you	ur analysis	, do you belie	ve that (OPC's relia	bility expe	ctations are
11			in alignment	with thos	e of its custom	ers?			
12		A.	No, I do not.	Based on	its 2011 perfo	ormance	, missing o	ne of its re	liability
13			standards, S	taff recom	mends the Cor	nmissio	n find that	OPC's reli	ability
14			expectations	are not cu	rrently in alig	nment v	vith those c	of its custor	ners.

. .

1

. .

DISTRIBUTION INVESTMENT RIDER (DIR)

2	16.	Q.	Will your testimony address all aspects of the OPC's proposed DIR?
3		A.	No. My testimony will only address the DIR as it relates to capital projects
4			and programs that affect reliability. Other aspects of the DIR will be
5			addressed by Staff witnesses McCarter.
6			
7	17.	Q.	Do you have any issues with the DIR?
8		A.	Yes, I am concerned that the DIR is not sufficiently defined. On page 18 of his
9			testimony for OPC's Revised Electric Security Plan (ESP), Company witness
10			Kirkpatrick states that the primary focus of incremental ESP investment
11			would be the replacement of assets that are in danger of failure. His
12			testimony also states (on page 15) that distribution substation circuit breakers,
13			regulators, switches, and power cable systems, as well as feeder exit cables
14			and underground residential cable systems are asset classes that can affect
15			large numbers of customers upon failure. His testimony does not, however,
16			specify the quantity of these assets OPC plans to install during each of the
17			years of the ESP, the planned cost for each asset class, the incremental amount
18			of cost above previous levels, and the quantified improvement in reliability
19			performance estimated to result from the incremental expenditures.
20			

20

1	18.	Q.	Are there any enhancements that you recommend that the Commission
2			should make to the proposed DIR?
3		A.	Yes. If the Commission was to find that OPC's reliability expectations are in
4			alignment with those of its customers, then the Commission should require
5			OPC to work with Staff to develop a plan to evaluate and identify proactive
6			distribution maintenance that focuses capital spending where it will have the
7			greatest impact on maintaining and improving electric reliability
8			performance. That plan should then be filed in a separate docket for the
9			Commission's consideration.
10			
11	ESR	R RID	ER
12	19.	Q.	What is the objective of the ESR Rider (ESRR)?
13		A.	The ESRR enables OPC to recover the incremental costs associated with
14			transitioning to a cyclical-based vegetation management program. Under this
15			program, OPC would trim the trees on all of its distribution circuits at least
16			once every four years.
17			
18	20.	Q.	Does Staff have any issues with the ESRR?
19		A.	Yes, the Staff has issues with the continuation and funding levels of the ESRR.

· ·

1	21.	Q.	What is Staff's issue concerning the ESRR's continuation?
2		A.	Although Staff does support the ESRR's continuation through 2014, it also
3			believes the ESRR should not recover costs incurred after the end of 2014.
4			
5	22.	Q,	Why does Staff oppose ESRR recovery of post-2014 vegetation management
6			costs?
7		A,	During 2014, OPC will complete its transition and begin regular maintenance
8			on a four-year cycle vegetation management program. Although this
9			transition is a special project meriting accelerated cost recovery, the four-year
10			cycle vegetation program constitutes a return to normal operations, the cost
11			of which should be recovered through base rates. Staff therefore
12			recommends that the Commission not allow ESRR recovery of vegetation
13			management costs OPC incurs after the year 2014.
14			
15	23.	Q.	What is Staff's issue with ESRR finding levels?
16		A.	Staff believes OPC has overstated the incremental cost of the ESRR for the
17			years 2012 through 2014 due to its failure to recognize the higher ESRR
18			baseline that results from the recent distribution base rate case.
19			
20	24.	Q.	How was the ESRR baseline increased in the recent rate case?

. .

1		Α.	In Case Nos. 11-351-EL-AIR and 11-352-EL-AIR, Staff recommend that the
2			Commission grant OPC an additional \$17.8 million in annual O&M Expense
3			to support its planned four-year cycle vegetation management program. As a
4			result of this adjustment, the O&M portion of the ESRR baseline was
5			increased from \$20.6 million to \$38.4 million.
6			
7	25.	Q.	What does Staff recommend to correct the OPC's overstatement of ESRR
8			incremental costs?
9		A.	Staff recommends an adjustment to remove \$17.8 million from OPC's
10			requested ESRR O&M amounts for each of years 2012 through 2014. This
11			adjustment is highlighted in the table below.
12			

Incremental Cost of Enhan
O&M (Requested by OPC) 4

Incremental Cost of Enhanced Service Reliability Plan (\$ Millions)						
	2012	2013	2014	3-Year Total		
O&M (Requested by OPC) 4	30.0	34.0	34.0	98.0		
Staff's O&M Adjustment	(17.8)	(17.8)	(17.8)	(53.4)		
O&M (Staff Adjusted)	12.2	16.2	16.2	44.6		
Capital	5.0	5.0	5.0	15.0		
Total Incremental Cost	17.2	21.2	21.2	59.6		

14

13

•

26. Q. Does the Staff have any other recommendations concerning the ESR Rider? 15

⁴ See Chart 2 on Page 8 of Mr. Kirkpatrick's testimony of March 30, 2012

1		Α.	Yes. In order to ensure that OPC will continue to use the additional
2			vegetation management O&M that was included in base rates, Staff
3			recommends that the Commission order OPC to file, before 2014, a revised
4			vegetation management program ⁵ that commits OPC to complete end-to-end
5			trimming on all of its distribution circuits every four years beginning in 2014.
6			
7	27.	Q.	Does this conclude your testimony?
8		A.	Yes, it does.

.

⁵ Rule 4901:1-10-27 (E)(2) and (3) of the Ohio Administrative Code specifies the required procedures for filing proposed maintenance programs for Commission approval.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing Prefiled Testimony of Peter K. Baker submitted on behalf of the Staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, was served via electronic mail, upon the following parties of record, this 9th day of May,

2012.

Werner L. Margard III ~ Assistant Attorney General

Parties of Record:

tsiwo@bricker.com dclark1@aep.com grady@occ.state.oh.us keith.nusbaum@snrdenton.com kpkreider@kmklaw.com mjsatterwhite@aep.com ned.ford@fuse.net pfox@hilliardohio.gov ricks@ohanet.org stnourse@aep.com cathy@theoec.org dsullivan@nrdc.org aehaedt@jonesday.com dakutik@jonesday.com havdenm@firstenergycorp.com dconway@porterwright.cmo jlang@clafee.com cmiller@szd.com ahaque@szd.com gdunn@szd.com mhpetricoff@vorys.com lmcbride@calfee.com talexander@calfee.com etter@occ.state.oh.us

trent@theoeg.com nolan@theoec.org gpoulos@enernoc.com emma.hand@snrdenton.com doug.bonner@snrdenton.com clinton.vince@snrdenton.com sam@mwncmh.com dstahl@eimerstahl.com aaragona@eimerstahl.com ssolberg@eimerstahl.com tsantarelli@elpc.org callwein@wamenergylaw.com malina@wexlerwalker.com jkooper@hess.com kguerry@hess.com afreifeld@viridityenergy.com swolfe@viridityenergy.com korenergy@insight.rr.com sasloan@aep.com dane.stinson@baileycavalierie.com cendsley@ofbp.org jeanne.kingery@duke-energy.com rsugarman@kegler.brown.com asimhaque@icemiller.com

small@occ.state.oh.us cynthia.a.fonner@constellation.com david.fein@constellation.com dorothy.corbett@duke-energy.com amy.spiller@duke-energy.com dboehm@bkllawfirm.com mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com tobrien@bricker.com jbentine@cwslaw.com myurick@cwslaw.com zkravtiz@cwslaw.com jejadwin@aep.com msmalz@ohiopovertylaw.org jmaskovyak@ohiopovertylaw.org bakahn@vorys.com gary.a.jeffries@dom.com stephen.chriss@wal-mart.com dmeyere@kmklaw.com holly@raysmithlaw.com barthroyer@aol.com philip.sineneng@thompsonhine.com carolyn.flahive@thompsonhine.com terrance.mebane@thompsonhine.com drinebolt@ohioparterns.corg

, ,

gregory.dunn@icemiller.com christopher.miller@icemiller.com bpbarger@bcslawyers.com valami@aep.com todonnell@bricker.com cmontgomery@bricker.com lmalister@bricker.com mwarnock@bricker.com gthomas@gtpowergroup.com wmassey@cov.com henryeckhart@aol.com laurac@chappelleconsulting.net whit@shitt-sturtevant.com thompson@whitt-sturtevant.com sandry.grace@exeloncorp.com joliker@mwncomh.com fdarr@mwncmh.com jestes@skaddenc.om paul.wight@skadden.com smhoward@vorys.com mjsettineri@vorys.cmo lkalepsclark@vorys.com cmooney2@columbus.rr.com