

**BEFORE THE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of)	
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for)	
Approval of a General Exemption of)	Case No. 21-903-GA-EXM
Certain Natural Gas Commodity)	
Sales Services or Ancillary Services)	

In the Matter of the Application of)	
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for Tariff)	Case No. 21-904-GA-ATA
Approval)	

In the Matter of the Application of)	Case No. 21-905-GA-AAM
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for)	
Approval to Change Accounting)	
Methods)	

PREFILED TESTIMONY
OF
TORNAIN MATTHEWS
SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE STAFF OF
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO
RATES AND ANALYSIS DEPARTMENT

STAFF EX. ____

September 7, 2022

1 1. Q. Please state your name and business address.

2 A. My name is Tornain Matthews. My business address is 180 E. Broad Street,
3 Columbus, Ohio 43215.
4

5 2. Q. By whom and in what capacity are you employed?

6 A. I am employed by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (PUCO or
7 Commission) as a Utility Specialist 2 in the Rates and Analysis
8 Department. My duties include audits of assigned portions of rate case
9 applications and riders, audits of the gas cost recovery (GCR) mechanism
10 for small Local Distribution Company's (LDC)s and monitoring the annual
11 natural gas standard choice offer (SCO) auctions and preparation and filing
12 of the post auction staff reports.
13

14 3. Q. Will you describe your educational and professional background?

15 A. My education includes earning an Associate's degree in Computer Science
16 from Columbus State Community College. I also attended the Annual
17 Regulatory Studies Program offered by the Institute of Public Utilities and
18 the Natural Gas Industry Rate School offered by the National Association
19 of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC). I joined the Commission
20 in 2004 as a Customer Service representative in the Utilities Department
21 (now known as the Rates and Analysis Department) and in 2005 I
22 transferred to the Investigation and Audits Division of the Service

1 Monitoring and Enforcement Department's call center where I worked as a
2 Customer Service Representative assisting consumers calling the consumer
3 hotline with questions, issues and complaints involving utility companies.
4 In 2007 I transferred to the Docketing Division as a Customer Service
5 Representative where I assisted callers, in person visitors, and Staff with
6 filing and receiving documents. In 2010 I was promoted to a Utility Auditor
7 in the Accounting and Electric Division of the Utilities Department where I
8 audited the annual infrastructure replacement rider filings made by the
9 LDCs as well as audits of assigned sections of rate case filings. In 2013 I
10 was promoted to Utility Specialist 1 and later promoted to my current
11 position as a Utility Specialist 2 in 2017.

12
13 4. Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

14 A. The purpose of my testimony is to discuss Staff's review and respond to the
15 parts of Duke Energy Ohio's (Duke or Company) application and witness
16 testimony addressing: the transition from a GCR mechanism to Standard
17 Service Offer (SSO) filed in this case, the riders filed in the application, and
18 the SSO auction process, rules and the auction manager.

19
20 5. Q. Has Staff reviewed Duke's application and testimony to support the
21 application?

1 A. Yes, Staff has reviewed the application and testimony as it relates to the
2 technical aspects of the SSO and auction process.

3
4 6. Q. Has Staff reviewed the riders and Standard Service Offer Service rate that
5 Duke proposes to create with the inception of the SSO?

6 A. Yes, Staff has reviewed the Company's proposed Standard Service Offer
7 Rider (Rider SSO), Standard Service Offer Rate Rider (Rider SSOR),
8 Standard Service Offer Cost Reconciliation Rider (Rider SSOCR), the
9 Auction Transition Cost Rider (Rider ATC), and the Standard Service Offer
10 Service Rate (Rate SSOS).

11
12 7. Q. Does Staff have any recommendations, changes, or modifications to any of
13 the riders or Rate SSOS proposed by the Company?

14 A. No, Staff does not have any recommendations, changes, or modifications to
15 any of the riders or Rate SSOS proposed by the Company.

16
17 8. Q. Does Staff recommend approval of the riders and Rate SSOS as filed by
18 Duke?

19 A. Yes, Staff recommends approval of the riders and Rate SSOS as filed
20 because they are reasonable in order for the Company to transition from the
21 GCR to an SSO.

1 9. Q. Has Staff reviewed Duke's Application and testimony regarding the
2 auction, rules, processes and the selected auction manager?

3 A. Yes, Staff reviewed Duke's Application and testimony regarding the
4 auction, rules, processes, and the selected auction manager.
5

6 10. Q. Is Staff familiar with the natural gas auctions for Columbia Gas of Ohio,
7 Dominion Energy Ohio, and CenterPoint Energy Ohio that are conducted
8 annually at the beginning of each year?

9 A. Yes, Staff is familiar with the natural gas auctions for Columbia Gas of
10 Ohio, Dominion Energy Ohio, and CenterPoint Energy Ohio. The members
11 of Staff who reviewed Duke's Application in this case, also observe the
12 annual natural gas SCO auctions for these LDCs on behalf of the
13 Commission and prepares and files a Staff report on the results of the
14 auctions.
15

16 11. Q. Has Staff reviewed the SSO auction process and auction rules proposed by
17 Duke in its Application?

18 A. Yes, Staff has reviewed Duke's Application and the SSO auction process
19 and rules proposed therein.
20

21 12. Q. Does Staff recommend any modifications or have concerns with the auction
22 process or rules as they have been proposed in Duke's Application?

1 A. No, Staff does not have any modifications or concerns with the auction
2 process or rules proposed in Duke's Application. The rules and auctions
3 processes are similar to those of Columbia Gas of Ohio, Dominion Energy
4 Ohio, and CenterPoint Energy Ohio. Staff has experience observing these
5 LDCs auctions and preparing and filing Staff reports on the results of the
6 auctions.

7
8 13. Q. In its Application, Duke states that it chose Enel X North America, Inc.
9 (Enel X) to be the auction manager for its SSO auctions. Is Staff familiar
10 with Enel X?

11 A. Yes. Enel X also manages the natural gas auctions for Columbia Gas of
12 Ohio, Dominion Energy Ohio, and CenterPoint Energy Ohio.

13
14 14. Q. Does Staff have any concerns with Enel X being selected to manage the
15 auctions?

16 A. No, Staff does not have concerns with Enel X selected to manage the
17 auctions. Duke witness Perry in his testimony discusses the variety of
18 capacities that Enel X operates within Ohio, with its primary service
19 offerings in Ohio including retail and wholesale energy advisory and
20 procurement services. Additionally, he states that Enel X has conducted
21 tens of thousands of retail and wholesale natural gas auctions on its
22 proprietary online descending clock auction events for Dominion Energy

1 Ohio, Columbia Gas of Ohio and CenterPoint Energy Ohio for over ten
2 years.

3
4 15. Q. Is Duke's Application to transition to an SSO, similar to the other LDCs
5 who have been approved by the Commission to do the same?

6 A. Yes. Staff believes Duke's transition is similar to the other LDCs.
7

8 16. Q. Are there any differences with Duke's proposal to the other LDCs?

9 A. Yes, according to Duke's Application it proposes to retain all storage assets
10 to help balance and serve its customers. Additionally, Duke will not change
11 how interruptible transportation customers are balanced.
12

13 17. Q. Does Staff have any concerns with the differences between Duke's
14 proposal and the other LDC's?

15 A. Duke's witness Gould's testimony states the two major differences between
16 Duke's proposal and the other LDCs are: 1) Duke proposes to retain all
17 storage assets in order to balance and serve the Company's customers, and
18 2) in order to minimize the impact to shopping customers, Duke proposes
19 to not to change how the interruptible transportation customers are balanced
20 in moving to the SSO process. Staff reviewed Duke witness Gould's
21 testimony on the two major differences between Duke's proposal and the
22 other LDCs, Staff does not have any concerns with Duke's proposal. Staff's

1 review of Duke witness Gould's testimony determined the rationale of
2 these two major differences is to minimize the impact to the shopping
3 customers.

4
5 18. Q. Does Staff recommend approval of Duke's Application?

6 A. Yes, Staff recommends the approval of Duke's Application subject to any
7 recommendations and modifications include in Staff witness Bossart's
8 testimony.

9
10 19. Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

11 A. Yes. However, I reserve the right to submit supplemental testimony as new
12 information becomes available or in response to positions taken by other
13 parties.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing **Prefilled Testimony of Tornain Matthews**, submitted on behalf of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, was served via electronic mail upon the following parties of record, this 7th day of September, 2022.

/s/ Robert Eubanks

Robert Eubanks

Assistant Attorney General

Parties of Record:

Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.

Rocco.dascenzo@duke-energy.com
Jeanne.kingery@duke-energy.com
Larisa.Vaysman@duke-energy.com
Elyse.Akhbari@duke-energy.com

Interstate Gas Supply, Inc.

michael.nugent@igs.com
evan.betterton@igs.com
stacie.cathcart@igs.com

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

angela.obrien@occ.ohio.gov
william.michael@occ.ohio.gov
connor.semple@occ.ohio.gov

Spire Marketing Inc.

dparram@bricker.com

Retail Energy Supply Association

mjsettineri@vorys.com
glpetrucci@vorys.com

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities
Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

9/7/2022 12:44:10 PM

in

Case No(s). 21-0903-GA-EXM, 21-0904-GA-ATA, 21-0905-GA-AAM

Summary: Testimony Prefiled Testimony Of Tornain Matthews Submitted On Behalf
Of The Staff Of The Public Utilities Commission Of Ohio Rates And Analysis
Department electronically filed by Mrs. Kimberly M. Naeder on behalf of PUCO