BEFORE THE OHIO POWER SITING BOARD

In the Matter of the Application of	:	
Ohio Power Company for Administration	:	
of the Significantly Excessive Earnings	:	Case No. 18-0989-EL-UNC
Test Pursuant to R.C. 4928.143(F) and	:	
Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-35-10.	:	

PREFILED TESTIMONY OF Joseph P. Buckley

RATES AND ANALYSIS DEPARTMENT FORECASTING, MARKETS, AND CORPORATE OVERSIGHT DIVISION PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

Staff Exhibit ____

May 8, 2019

1	1.	Q.	Please state your name and your business address.
2		A.	My name is Joseph P. Buckley. My business address is 180 East Broad
3			Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.
4			
5	2.	Q.	By whom are you employed?
6		A.	I am employed by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (PUCO or
7			Commission).
8			
9	3.	Q.	Please briefly describe your academic background.
10		A.	I received a Bachelor of Science in Economics from The Ohio State
11			University and a Master in Business Administration Degree from the
12			University of Dayton.
13			
14	4.	Q.	Please describe your work experience and professional training.
15		A.	I have been employed by the PUCO since 1987. Since that time, I have
16			progressed through various positions and was promoted in 2000 to my
17			current position of Utility Specialist 3. In addition, I have worked on
18			several joint Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and NARUC
19			projects and audits, and served on the Midwest Independent System
20			Operator's (now Midcontinent System Operator, Inc.) Finance Committee
21			as Vice-Chairman and Chairman. Also, in 2011, I was awarded the
22			professional designation Certified Rate of Return Analyst (CRRA) by the

1			Society of Utility and Regulatory Financial Analysts. This designation is
2			awarded based upon experience and successful completion of a written
3			examination.
4			
5			In 2000, I earned the Certified in Financial Management (CFM)
6			designation, awarded by the Institute of Management Accountants. Also, I
7			attended The Annual Regulatory Studies Program sponsored by The
8			National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC) and
9			The Training for Utility Management Analyst also sponsored by NARUC.
10			
11	5.	Q.	Have you testified in previous cases at the PUCO?
12		A.	Yes, I have testified in numerous cases before the PUCO.
13			
14	6.	Q.	What is your involvement in this proceeding?
15		A.	I am responsible for determining if Ohio Power exceeded the common
16			equity threshold to be used in its Significantly Excessive Earnings Test
17			(SEET). Based on Staff's review of the information provided in Ohio
18			Power's application, Staff believes that Ohio Power fell well below the
19			SEET threshold in 2017.
20			
21	7.	Q.	What is Staff's recommendation to the Commission in this proceeding?

1		A.	Staff recommends that the Commission find Ohio Power did not exceed the
2			common equity threshold in 2017, and that no refunds are warranted.
3			
4	8.	Q.	Has Staff reviewed Ohio Power's earnings calculations?
5		A.	Yes, Staff has reviewed Ohio Power's calculations and supporting
6			information. While Staff does not necessarily agree or disagree with the
7			method Ohio Power used to represent 2017 SEET earnings, it does not
8			believe the Company exceeded the SEET threshold, based on Staff's
9			methodology described in testimony below.
10			
11	9.	Q.	What methodology did Staff employ to determine significant excessive
12			earnings?
12 13		A.	earnings? Staff used the companies that comprise the SPDR Select Sector Fund –
		A.	
13		A.	Staff used the companies that comprise the SPDR Select Sector Fund –
13 14		A.	Staff used the companies that comprise the SPDR Select Sector Fund – Utility (XLU) as its comparable group (Comparable Group). The Staff then
13 14 15		A.	Staff used the companies that comprise the SPDR Select Sector Fund – Utility (XLU) as its comparable group (Comparable Group). The Staff then totaled the net income earned by the Comparable Group and divided it by
13 14 15 16		Α.	Staff used the companies that comprise the SPDR Select Sector Fund – Utility (XLU) as its comparable group (Comparable Group). The Staff then totaled the net income earned by the Comparable Group and divided it by the aggregate total common equity of the Comparable Group as detailed in
13 14 15 16 17		Α.	Staff used the companies that comprise the SPDR Select Sector Fund – Utility (XLU) as its comparable group (Comparable Group). The Staff then totaled the net income earned by the Comparable Group and divided it by the aggregate total common equity of the Comparable Group as detailed in
 13 14 15 16 17 18 		A.	Staff used the companies that comprise the SPDR Select Sector Fund – Utility (XLU) as its comparable group (Comparable Group). The Staff then totaled the net income earned by the Comparable Group and divided it by the aggregate total common equity of the Comparable Group as detailed in Attachment 1.
 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 		A.	Staff used the companies that comprise the SPDR Select Sector Fund – Utility (XLU) as its comparable group (Comparable Group). The Staff then totaled the net income earned by the Comparable Group and divided it by the aggregate total common equity of the Comparable Group as detailed in Attachment 1. This produced an average return on equity (ROE) of approximately 8.73
 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 		A.	Staff used the companies that comprise the SPDR Select Sector Fund – Utility (XLU) as its comparable group (Comparable Group). The Staff then totaled the net income earned by the Comparable Group and divided it by the aggregate total common equity of the Comparable Group as detailed in Attachment 1. This produced an average return on equity (ROE) of approximately 8.73 percent in 2017. Staff then applied an adder in 2017 of 21.55 percent,

1			sum of the average ROE of the Comparable Group when combined with the
2			adder results in an earnings threshold of 30.28 percent, as shown in
3			Attachment 1A.
4			
5			However, Staff believes a few of the companies in the Comparable Group
6			had earnings that injected too much volatility into the average and caused
7			the standard deviation in 2017 earnings to be too great. These companies
8			were AES, FirstEnergy, NRG Energy and SCANA. Once Staff removed
9			these companies from the calculation, the ROE became 9.89 percent, and
10			the earnings threshold became 17.22 percent. Staff believes that the
11			adjusted earnings threshold of 17.22 percent is a more reliable number to
12			use to determine excess earnings in 2017.
13			
14	10.	Q.	Why did Staff use the components of XLU as its comparable group?
14 15	10.	Q. A.	Why did Staff use the components of XLU as its comparable group? XLU is the most widely traded utility electronically traded fund (ETF), and
	10.	_	
15	10.	_	XLU is the most widely traded utility electronically traded fund (ETF), and
15 16	10.	_	XLU is the most widely traded utility electronically traded fund (ETF), and the components are selected by an independent third party that is not
15 16 17	10.	_	XLU is the most widely traded utility electronically traded fund (ETF), and the components are selected by an independent third party that is not involved in this proceeding. This independence removes any bias in
15 16 17 18	10.	_	XLU is the most widely traded utility electronically traded fund (ETF), and the components are selected by an independent third party that is not involved in this proceeding. This independence removes any bias in selecting the comparable group. That is one reason Staff would advocate
15 16 17 18 19	10.	_	XLU is the most widely traded utility electronically traded fund (ETF), and the components are selected by an independent third party that is not involved in this proceeding. This independence removes any bias in selecting the comparable group. That is one reason Staff would advocate

1			and transparent process that produces consistent reasonable results. Having
2			more parties understand the process will allow greater participation in the
3			review. Finally, the Commission used this approach in multiple previous
4			SEET cases to determine the comparable ROE.
5			
6	11.	Q.	If Staff's goal is to remove any bias from selecting a comparable group,
7			why did it remove AES, FirstEnergy, NRG, and SCANA Energy from
8			the calculation?
9		A.	Staff was very reluctant to remove any companies from the Comparable
10			Group. However, Staff believes that those data points created a skewed
11			distribution that produced an unreliable result.
12			
13			Why did Staff adopt the standard deviation approach in establishing
	12.	Q.	why did Stari adopt the standard deviation approach in establishing
14	12.	Q.	the adder to the ROE?
14 15	12.	Q. A.	
	12.		the adder to the ROE?
15	12.		the adder to the ROE? In previous SEET cases (11-4571-EL-UNC and 11-4572-EL-UNC), the
15 16	12.		the adder to the ROE? In previous SEET cases (11-4571-EL-UNC and 11-4572-EL-UNC), the Commission used this approach ¹ in establishing the adder to the XLU
15 16 17	12. 13.		the adder to the ROE? In previous SEET cases (11-4571-EL-UNC and 11-4572-EL-UNC), the Commission used this approach ¹ in establishing the adder to the XLU
15 16 17 18		A.	the adder to the ROE? In previous SEET cases (11-4571-EL-UNC and 11-4572-EL-UNC), the Commission used this approach ¹ in establishing the adder to the XLU comparable group ROE.

¹ 11-4571-EL-UNC and 11-4572-EL-UNC Opinion and Order page 27.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing Prefiled Testimony of Joseph P.

Buckley 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 8th day of May,

2019.

15/ Thomas W. McNamee

Thomas W. McNamee Assistant Attorney General

Parties of Record:

Debra J. Bingham Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel 65 East State Street, 7th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215-4203 Phone: 614.466.1311 Fax: 614.466.9475 Email: debra.bingham@occ.ohio.gov Steven T. Nourse American Electric Power Service Corporation 1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215 Phone: 614.716.1608 Fax: 614.716.2950 Email: stnourse@aep.com

Attachment 1

Symbol	Company Name	Net Income	Equity 2016	Equity 2017	Average Common Equity	ROACE
NEE	NextEra Energy Inc	\$5,320,000	\$24,341,000	\$29,498,000	\$26,919,500	19.76%
DUK	Duke Energy Corp	\$3,064,000	\$41,033,000	\$41,737,000	\$41,385,000	7.40%
SO	Southern Co	\$926,000	\$24,758,000	\$25,528,000	\$25,143,000	3.68%
D	Dominion Resources Inc	\$3,120,000	\$14,605,000	\$19,370,000	\$16,987,500	18.37%
PCG	PG&E Corporation	\$1,660,000	\$17,940,000	\$19,472,000	\$18,706,000	8.87%
AEP	American Electric Power	\$1,928,900	\$17,397,000	\$18,313,600	\$17,855,300	10.80%
EXC	Exelon Corp	\$3,849,000	\$25,837,000	\$32,132,000	\$28,984,500	13.28%
SRE	Sempra Energy	\$351,000	\$12,951,000	\$13,847,000	\$13,399,000	2.62%
EIX	Edison Intl	\$668,000	\$11,996,000	\$13,866,000	\$12,931,000	5.17%
PPL	PPL Corp	\$1,128,000	\$9,899,000	\$10,761,000	\$10,330,000	10.92%
ED	Consolidated Edison Inc	\$1,525,000	\$11,829,000	\$15,425,000	\$13,627,000	11.19%
PEG	Public Service Enterprise Grp	\$1,574,000	\$13,130,000	\$13,847,000	\$13,488,500	11.67%
XEL	Xcel Energy Inc	\$1,148,000	\$11,020,849	\$11,455,000	\$11,237,925	10.22%
WEC	WEC Energy Group Inc	\$940,200	\$8,929,800	\$8,929,800	\$8,929,800	10.53%
ES	Eversource Energy	\$99,551	\$10,711,734	\$11,086,242	\$10,898,988	0.91%
DTE	DTE Energy Co	\$1,112,000	\$5,995,000	\$9,990,000	\$7,992,500	13.91%
AWK	American Water Works Co Inc	\$426,000	\$5,218,000	\$5,385,000	\$5,301,500	8.04%
ETR	Entergy Corp	\$425,353	\$8,081,809	\$7,992,515	\$8,037,162	5.29%
AEE	Ameren Corp	\$529,000	\$7,103,000	\$7,326,000	\$7,214,500	7.33%
CMS	CMS Energy Corp	\$462,000	\$4,253,000	\$4,478,000	\$4,365,500	10.58%
PNW	Pinnacle West Capital (AZ)	\$507,000	\$4,803,622	\$5,135,730	\$4,969,676	10.20%
LNT	Alliant Energy Corp	\$467,500	\$3,862,000	\$4,382,200	\$4,122,100	11.34%
NI	Nisource Inc	\$128,500	\$4,071,200	\$4,320,100	\$4,195,650	3.06%
		\$31,359,004			\$317,021,601	9.89%
					9.89%	
						4.47%
						1.64
						7.33%
						17.22%
	Source -SNL Financial					
	NRG, FE, SCANA and AES were	e removed becaus	se they wre consi	dered outliners		

Attachment 1A

Symbol	Company Name	Net Income	Equity 2016	Equity 2017	Average Common Equity	ROACE
NEE	NextEra Energy Inc	5,320,000	24,341,000	29,498,000	26,919,500	19.76%
DUK	Duke Energy Corp	3,064,000	41,033,000	41,737,000	41,385,000	7.40%
SO	Southern Co	926,000	24,758,000	25,528,000	25,143,000	3.68%
D	Dominion Resources Inc	3,120,000	14,605,000	19,370,000	16,987,500	18.37%
PCG	PG&E Corporation	1,660,000	17,940,000	19,472,000	18,706,000	8.87%
AEP	American Electric Power	1,928,900	17,397,000	18,313,600	17,855,300	10.80%
EXC	Exelon Corp	3,849,000	25,837,000	32,132,000	28,984,500	13.28%
SRE	Sempra Energy	351,000	12,951,000	13,847,000	13,399,000	2.62%
EIX	Edison Intl	668,000	11,996,000	13,866,000	12,931,000	5.17%
PPL	PPL Corp	1,128,000	9,899,000	10,761,000	10,330,000	10.92%
ED	Consolidated Edison Inc	1,525,000	11,829,000	15,425,000	13,627,000	11.19%
PEG	Public Service Enterprise Grp	1,574,000	13,130,000	13,847,000	13,488,500	11.67%
XEL	Xcel Energy Inc	1,148,000	11,020,849	11,455,000	11,237,925	10.22%
WEC	WEC Energy Group Inc	940,200	8,929,800	8,929,800	8,929,800	10.53%
ES	Eversource Energy	99,551	10,711,734	11,086,242	10,898,988	0.91%
DTE	DTE Energy Co	1,112,000	5,995,000	9,990,000	7,992,500	13.91%
FE	FirstEnergy Corp	(1,724,000)	6,241,000	3,925,000	5,083,000	-33.92%
AWK	American Water Works Co Inc	426,000	5,218,000	5,385,000	5,301,500	8.04%
ETR	Entergy Corp	425,353	8,081,809	7,992,515	8,037,162	5.29%
AEE	Ameren Corp	529,000	7,103,000	7,326,000	7,214,500	7.33%
CMS	CMS Energy Corp	462,000	4,253,000	4,478,000	4,365,500	10.58%
CNP	Centerpoint Energy Inc	1,792,000	3,460,000	4,688,000	4,074,000	43.99%
PNW	Pinnacle West Capital (AZ)	507,000	4,803,622	5,135,730	4,969,676	10.20%
SCG	SCANA Corp	(777,000)	5,725,000	5,255,000	5,490,000	-14.15%
LNT	Alliant Energy Corp	467,500	3,862,000	4,382,200	4,122,100	11.34%
NI	Nisource Inc	128,500	4,071,200	4,320,100	4,195,650	3.06%
AES	AES Corp	(777,000)	2,794,000	4,845,000	3,819,500	-20.34%
NRG	NRG Energy	(237,000)	6,241,000	1,968,000	4,104,500	-5.77%
		29,636,004			339,592,601	8.73%
					8.73%	
						13.14%
						1.64
						21.55%
						30.28%

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

5/8/2019 10:39:14 AM

in

Case No(s). 18-0989-EL-UNC

Summary: Testimony Prefiled Testimony of Joseph P. Buckley with Attachments 1 and 1A electronically filed by Ms. Yvette L Yip on behalf of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio