

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio)
Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric)
Illuminating Company, and The Toledo)
Edison Company For Authority to) Case No. 10-388-EL-SSO
Establish a Standard Service Offer)
Pursuant to R.C. § 4928.143 in the Form)
Of an Electric Security Plan.)

**DIRECT TESTIMONY
OF
JONATHAN WALLACH
Resource Insight, Inc.**

**ON BEHALF OF
THE OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, Ohio 43215**

JULY 27, 2010

1 ***Q1: PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, OCCUPATION, AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.***

2 ***A1:*** My name is Jonathan F. Wallach. I am Vice President of Resource Insight, Inc., 5
3 Water Street, Arlington, Massachusetts.

4

5 ***Q2: HAVE YOU TESTIFIED IN OHIO RECENTLY?***

6 ***A2:*** Yes. I testified in December 2009 in Case No. 09-906-EL-SSO, a case filed in
7 October 2009 by the Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating
8 Company, and The Toledo Edison Company (“FirstEnergy Ohio” or “the
9 Companies”) for approval of a proposed auction process (“competitive bid
10 process” or “CBP”) for procuring wholesale supply for Standard Service Offer
11 (“SSO”) retail generation service starting on June 1, 2011. I refer to that case as
12 the “MRO Case,” a reference to the words “Market Rate Offer” in the caption of
13 the Companies’ application.

14

15 ***Q3: PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND***
16 ***EXPERIENCE.***

17 ***A3:*** As stated in my written, pre-filed testimony in the MRO Case, I have worked as a
18 consultant to the electric-power industry since 1981. From 1981 to 1986, I was a
19 research associate at Energy Systems Research Group. In 1987 and 1988, I was
20 an independent consultant. From 1989 to 1990, I was a senior analyst at
21 Komanoff Energy Associates. I have been in my current position at Resource
22 Insight since September of 1990.

23

1 Over the last twenty-nine years, I have advised clients and testified on a wide
2 range of economic, planning, and policy issues including: electric-utility
3 restructuring; wholesale-power market design and operations; transmission
4 pricing and policy; market valuation of generating assets and purchase contracts;
5 power-procurement strategies; integrated resource planning; cost allocation and
6 rate design; and energy-efficiency program design and planning.

7

8 My resume is attached as Attachment JFW-1.

9

10 ***Q4: PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR EXPERIENCE WITH REGARD TO THE***
11 ***COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT OF WHOLESALE SUPPLY FOR***
12 ***STANDARD SERVICE RETAIL LOAD.***

13 ***A4:*** I participated in the MRO Case, testifying on behalf of the Office of the Ohio
14 Consumers' Counsel ("OCC") regarding the CBP proposed by FirstEnergy Ohio.
15 I proposed modifications to that proposal.

16

17 For more than ten years, I have participated on behalf of the Maryland Office of
18 People's Counsel in the process of designing, implementing, and monitoring the
19 Standard Offer Service procurement mechanism for the four Maryland investor-
20 owned utilities. I participated in the negotiations that established Maryland's
21 procurement approach, and designed the mechanism for screening price offers
22 against a benchmark market price. Since then, I have monitored every round of
23 bidding, and assisted the Office of People's Counsel in the annual stakeholder
24 process regarding modifications to the procurement mechanism. Finally, I have

1 testified on the People's Counsel's behalf in every investigation by the Maryland
2 Public Service Commission of alternative procurement approaches, and was lead
3 investigator for a major study of expected costs and risks associated with
4 alternative procurement approaches.

5
6 Similarly, in Connecticut, I participated in the Standard Service procurement
7 process for the two investor-owned utilities. On behalf of the Connecticut Office
8 of Consumer Counsel, I have participated in the development of requests for
9 proposals, independently evaluated price offers on bid day, participated in the
10 selection of winning bids, and appeared at hearings by the Connecticut
11 Department of Public Utility Control regarding the selection of winning bids. In
12 addition, I am currently involved in a collaborative effort to procure medium- and
13 long-term contracts for Standard Service supply.

14
15 Finally, since 2003, I assisted the Cape Light Compact in the solicitation and
16 acquisition of retail supply to serve the aggregated load of 21 towns on Cape Cod
17 and Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts.

18

19 ***Q5: ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU TESTIFYING?***

20 ***A5:*** I am testifying on behalf of the OCC.

21

22 ***Q6: WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?***

23 ***A6:*** The principal subject matter of my testimony in the MRO Case – the CBP for the
24 Companies' SSO power supply that will begin in June 2011– remains unresolved.

1 The procurement process proposed by FirstEnergy Ohio in the MRO Case
2 involved, among other matters, a June 2010 auction that did not take place. The
3 Companies' proposed CBP has changed, and I address those changes in the
4 context of my previous testimony in the MRO Case.

5

6 ***Q7: PLEASE DESCRIBE FIRSTENERGY OHIO'S ORIGINAL PROPOSAL FOR***
7 ***THE DESIGN OF THE COMPETITIVE BID PROCESS.***

8 ***A7:*** Starting in June of 2010, the Companies proposed to conduct two descending-
9 price clock auctions per year (in June and October) to purchase wholesale supply
10 to serve SSO retail load. In the first two auctions, in June and October of 2010,
11 the Companies would solicit offers for 12-, 24-, and 36-month contracts for
12 delivery starting in June of 2011. In subsequent annual cycles, with auctions in
13 June and October of each year, the Companies would solicit solely 36-month
14 contracts with delivery starting in June of the following year.

15

16 In each auction, FirstEnergy Ohio's SSO load would be divided into "tranches"
17 representing one percent of total SSO load across service territories and all rate
18 classes. The first two auctions in 2010 would have sought to procure supply
19 offers to meet a total of 34 tranches of SSO load with 12-month contracts, 34
20 tranches with 24-month contracts, and 32 tranches with 36-month contracts. If all
21 of these tranches were successfully filled by the conclusion of the auction in
22 October of 2010, then the Companies would have acquired enough wholesale
23 supply to serve all of SSO load between June of 2011 and May of 2012, two-

1 thirds of SSO load between June of 2012 and May of 2013, and one-third of SSO
2 load between June of 2013 and May of 2014.

3
4 In subsequent annual cycles, FirstEnergy Ohio would solicit offers to meet either
5 32 or 34 tranches of SSO load with 36-month contracts. As a result, at the
6 conclusion of each annual cycle, the Companies would have acquired enough
7 supply to serve all of SSO load for the upcoming delivery year, and about two-
8 thirds and one-third of SSO load for the following two delivery years,
9 respectively.

10

11 ***Q8: DID THE COMPANIES' CBP PROPOSAL CHANGE AFTER THEIR***
12 ***PROPOSAL IN THE MRO CASE?***

13 ***A8:*** Yes. The Companies' filed a Stipulation and Recommendation ("Initial
14 Stipulation") on March 23, 2010 as part of its application in this case (the "ESP
15 Case," referring to the words "Electric Security Plan" in the caption) that
16 contained a modified "ESP CBP Schedule." According to that schedule, the
17 Companies proposed to conduct two descending-price clock auctions in 2010 (in
18 July and October) to purchase wholesale supply to serve SSO retail load. In these
19 first two auctions, the Companies would solicit offers for 12-, 24-, and 36-month
20 contracts for delivery starting in June of 2011, and each auction would contribute
21 half of the power supply solicited in 2010. In each 2010 auction, the Companies
22 would solicit 17 tranches of 12-month contracts, 17 tranches of 24-month
23 contracts, and 16 tranches of 36-month contracts.

24

1 In July 2011, the Companies would (again, according to the Initial Stipulation)
2 solicit 24-month contracts for 34 tranches for delivery starting in June of 2012. In
3 July of 2012, the Companies would solicit 12-month contracts for 34 tranches for
4 delivery starting in June of 2013. The power supply solicited by the entire,
5 proposed process would end on May 31, 2014.

6
7 The modified “ESP CBP Schedule,” which contained a proposal for a July 2010
8 bid, is outdated because the auction did not take place.

9

10 ***Q9: DID THE COMPANIES' PROPOSAL FOR CBP AUCTION DATES CHANGE***
11 ***AFTER THE ONE CONTAINED IN THEIR INITIAL STIPULATION?***

12 ***A9:*** Yes. While a Supplemental Stipulation filed by the Companies in June of 2010
13 and a Second Supplemental Stipulation filed by the Companies in July of 2010
14 did not address a change in the CBP auction dates, a newly modified CBP
15 proposal by FirstEnergy Ohio is contained in the Supplemental Testimony of
16 William R. Ridmann filed on July 23, 2010 in this ESP Case.¹ In this pre-filed
17 testimony, the auction proposed in the Initial Stipulation for July 2010 would be
18 eliminated, and all of the 12-, 24-, and 36-month contracts for delivery beginning
19 in June of 2011 would be solicited in a single auction in October of 2010.
20 Otherwise, the Companies' proposal remains the same as that in the Initial
21 Stipulation, which calls for additional auctions in July of 2011 and July of 2012.

¹ Supplemental Testimony of William R. Ridmann, page 6 (“the competitive bidding process in Attachment A is no longer possible”).

1 ***Q10: DO YOU HAVE ANY CONCERNS WITH REGARD TO THE COMPANIES'***
2 ***CURRENT PROPOSAL FOR THE AUCTION SCHEDULE?***

3 ***A10:*** Yes. I have concerns regarding both the timing and frequency of the auctions
4 under the Companies' most-recent CBP design proposal. Specifically, I am
5 concerned that the Companies propose to conduct only one auction per year, and
6 propose to conduct each annual auction either eight months (for the 2010 auction)
7 or eleven months (for the 2011 and 2012) in advance of the delivery date for the
8 contracts procured in those auctions. Procuring all of the market-priced supply at
9 one time would expose ratepayers to the risk of adverse market-price movements
10 at that time.² Procuring all of the SSO supply eight or eleven months in advance
11 of delivery would expose bidders to substantial load and price uncertainty over
12 that period: bidders would likely reflect such uncertainty in their price bids.

13
14 ***Q11: HOW SHOULD THE CBP AUCTION DESIGN BE MODIFIED TO***
15 ***ADDRESS THESE CONCERNS?***

16 ***A11:*** I recommend that the Companies conduct two auctions per procurement cycle, in
17 October and January preceding the contract delivery date. Specifically, I
18 recommend that the Companies conduct auctions in:
19 • October 2010 and January 2011 to procure contracts for June 2011 delivery;
20 • October 2011 and January 2012 to procure contracts for June 2012 delivery; and
21 • October 2012 and January 2013 to procure contracts for June 2013 delivery.

² If forward prices were to spike at the time of the auction, such price increases would likely be reflected in bid prices in the auction.

1 This recommended auction schedule balances a number of competing objectives.

2

3 The recommended schedule allows for two auctions rather than one auction per
4 procurement cycle, and allows for a reasonable amount of time between these two
5 auctions, in order to reduce the risk of adverse market timing.³ On the other
6 hand, the recommended auction schedule allows for only two auctions per
7 procurement cycle in order to minimize the lead time between the first auction of
8 the cycle and the delivery date for contracts procured in that auction. Finally, the
9 recommended January date for the second auction of the cycle minimizes the lead
10 time between this auction and contract delivery date, but awards contracts early
11 enough to allow winning bidders to effectively participate in PJM's Auction
12 Revenue Right/Financial Transmission Right ("ARR/FTR") process.⁴

13

14 To conclude, adopting the auction schedule that I recommend would likely reduce
15 risks to bidders and ratepayers, and consequently lead to lower SSO prices than
16 achievable under the CBP proposed by Mr. Ridmann.

³ Even if market prices spiked at the time of one of the two auctions, this would affect the price paid for only half of the SSO supply contracts acquired over the two auctions.

⁴ As Mr. Ridmann notes in his supplemental testimony, if the auction were conducted after the ARR/FTR process, the Companies would have to participate in the ARR/FTR process on behalf of the yet-to-be determined winners of that auction. Supplemental Testimony of William R. Ridmann, page 6. According to Mr. Ridmann, this could increase bidders' congestion risk and, in turn, increase bidders' prices in the auction. *Id.*


1 **Q12: DOES THIS COMPLETE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?**

2 **A12:** Yes. However, I reserve the right to incorporate new information or supplement
3 my testimony with information that may subsequently be made available to OCC.

4

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

It is hereby certified that a true copy of the foregoing the *Direct Testimony of Jonathan Wallach on Behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel* has been served electronically this 27th day of July, 2010.



Jeffrey L. Small
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

SERVICE LIST

burkj@firstenergycorp.com
korkosza@firstenergycorp.com
haydenm@firstenergycorp.com
elmiller@firstenergycorp.com
sam@mwncmh.com
lmcalister@mwncmh.com
jclark@mwncmh.com
david.fein@constellation.com
Cynthia.brady@constellation.com
dboehm@BKLawfirm.com
mkurtz@BKLawfirm.com
RTriozzi@city.cleveland.oh.us
SBeeler@city.cleveland.oh.us
Cmooney2@columbus.rr.com
drinebolt@aol.com
Thomas.mcnamee@puc.state.oh.us
smhoward@vorys.com
mhpetricoff@vssp.com
mwarnock@bricker.com
wis29@yahoo.com
cmiller@szd.com
aporter@szd.com
gdunn@szd.com
robinson@citizenpower.com
mheintz@elpc.org
dsullivan@nrdc.org
swolfe@viridityenergy.com
Ccunningham@Akronohio.Gov

ricks@ohanet.org
tobrien@bricker.com
gkrassen@bricker.com
mwarnock@bricker.com
mkl@bbrslaw.com
gas@bbrslaw.com
ibentine@cwslaw.com
mwhite@cwslaw.com
myurick@cwslaw.com
dmancino@mwe.com
glawrence@mwe.com
lkeiffer@co.lucas.oh.us
nmoser@theOEC.org
will@theOEC.org
trent@theOEC.org
Williams.toddm@gmail.com
Amy.Spiller@duke-energy.com
mdortch@kravitzllc.com
mparke@firstenergycorp.com
beitingm@firstenergycorp.com
Dane.Stinson@BaileyCavalieri.com
henryeckhart@aol.com
jpmessn@lasclev.org
mvincel@lasclev.org
eric.weldele@tuckerellis.com
afreifeld@viridityenergy.com

Gregory.Price@puc.state.oh.us

Attachment JFW-1

Qualifications of
JONATHAN F. WALLACH

Resource Insight, Inc.
5 Water Street
Arlington, Massachusetts 02476

SUMMARY OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

- 1990–Present* **Vice President, Resource Insight, Inc.** Provides research, technical assistance, and expert testimony on electric- and gas-utility planning, economics, regulation, and restructuring. Designs and assesses resource-planning strategies for regulated and competitive markets, including estimation of market prices and utility-plant stranded investment; negotiates restructuring strategies and implementation plans; assists in procurement of retail power supply.
- 1989–90* **Senior Analyst, Komanoff Energy Associates.** Conducted comprehensive cost-benefit assessments of electric-utility power-supply and demand-side conservation resources, economic and financial analyses of independent power facilities, and analyses of utility-system excess capacity and reliability. Provided expert testimony on statistical analysis of U.S. nuclear plant operating costs and performance. Co-wrote *The Power Analyst*, software developed under contract to the New York Energy Research and Development Authority for screening the economic and financial performance of non-utility power projects.
- 1987–88* **Independent Consultant.** Provided consulting services for Komanoff Energy Associates (New York, New York), Schlissel Engineering Associates (Belmont, Massachusetts), and Energy Systems Research Group (Boston, Massachusetts).
- 1981–86* **Research Associate, Energy Systems Research Group.** Performed analyses of electric utility power supply planning scenarios. Involved in analysis and design of electric and water utility conservation programs. Developed statistical analysis of U.S. nuclear plant operating costs and performance.

EDUCATION

BA, Political Science with honors and Phi Beta Kappa, University of California, Berkeley, 1980.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Physics and Political Science, 1976–1979.

PUBLICATIONS

“The Future of Utility Resource Planning: Delivering Energy Efficiency through Distributed Utilities” (with Paul Chernick), *International Association for Energy Economics Seventeenth Annual North American Conference* (460–469). Cleveland, Ohio: USAEE. 1996.

“The Price is Right: Restructuring Gain from Market Valuation of Utility Generating Assets” (with Paul Chernick), *International Association for Energy Economics Seventeenth Annual North American Conference* (345–352). Cleveland, Ohio: USAEE. 1996.

“The Future of Utility Resource Planning: Delivering Energy Efficiency through Distribution Utilities” (with Paul Chernick), *1996 Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings* 7(7.47–7.55). Washington: American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, 1996.

“Retrofit Economics 201: Correcting Common Errors in Demand-Side-Management Cost-Benefit Analysis” (with John Plunkett and Rachael Brailove). In proceedings of “Energy Modeling: Adapting to the New Competitive Operating Environment,” conference sponsored by the Institute for Gas Technology in Atlanta in April of 1995. Des Plaines, Ill.: IGT, 1995.

“The Transfer Loss is All Transfer, No Loss” (with Paul Chernick), *Electricity Journal* 6:6 (July, 1993).

“Benefit-Cost Ratios Ignore Interclass Equity” (with Paul Chernick et al.), *DSM Quarterly*, Spring 1992.

“Consider Plant Heat Rate Fluctuations,” *Independent Energy*, July/August 1991.

“Demand-Side Bidding: A Viable Least-Cost Resource Strategy” (with Paul Chernick and John Plunkett), *Proceedings from the NARUC Biennial Regulatory Information Conference*, September 1990.

“New Tools on the Block: Evaluating Non-Utility Supply Opportunities With *The Power Analyst*, (with John Plunkett), *Proceedings of the Fourth National Conference on Micro-computer Applications in Energy*, April 1990.

REPORTS

“Green Resource Portfolios: Development, Integration, and Evaluation” (with Paul Chernick and Richard Mazzini) report to the Green Energy Coalition presented as evidence in Ontario EB 2007-0707.

“Risk Analysis of Procurement Strategies for Residential Standard Offer Service” (with Paul Chernick, David White, and Rick Hornby) report to Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. 2008. Baltimore: Maryland Office of People’s Counsel.

“Integrated Portfolio Management in a Restructured Supply Market” (with Paul Chernick, William Steinhurst, Tim Woolf, Anna Sommers, and Kenji Takahashi). 2006. Columbus, Ohio: Office of the Ohio Consumers’ Counsel.

“First Year of SOS Procurement.” 2004. Prepared for the Maryland Office of People’s Counsel.

“Energy Plan for the City of New York” (with Paul Chernick, Susan Geller, Brian Tracey, Adam Auster, and Peter Lanzalotta). 2003. New York: New York City Economic Development Corporation.

“Peak-Shaving–Demand-Response Analysis: Load Shifting by Residential Customers” (with Brian Tracey). 2003. Barnstable, Mass.: Cape Light Compact.

“Electricity Market Design: Incentives for Efficient Bidding; Opportunities for Gaming.” 2002. Silver Spring, Maryland: National Association of State Consumer Advocates.

“Best Practices in Market Monitoring: A Survey of Current ISO Activities and Recommendations for Effective Market Monitoring and Mitigation in Wholesale Electricity Markets” (with Paul Peterson, Bruce Biewald, Lucy Johnston, and Etienne Gonin). 2001. Prepared for the Maryland Office of People’s Counsel, Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate, Delaware Division of the Public Advocate, New Jersey Division of the Ratepayer Advocate, Office of the People’s Counsel of the District of Columbia.

“Comments Regarding Retail Electricity Competition.” 2001. Filed by the Maryland Office of People’s Counsel in U.S. FTC Docket No. V010003.

“Final Comments of the City of New York on Con Edison’s Generation Divestiture Plans and Petition.” 1998. Filed by the City of New York in PSC Case No. 96-E-0897.

“Response Comments of the City of New York on Vertical Market Power.” 1998. Filed by the City of New York in PSC Case Nos. 96-E-0900, 96-E-0098, 96-E-0099, 96-E-0891, 96-E-0897, 96-E-0909, and 96-E-0898.

“Preliminary Comments of the City of New York on Con Edison’s Generation Divestiture Plan and Petition.” 1998. Filed by the City of New York in PSC Case No. 96-E-0897.

“Maryland Office of People’s Counsel’s Comments in Response to the Applicants’ June 5, 1998 Letter.” 1998. Filed by the Maryland Office of People’s Counsel in PSC Docket No. EC97-46-000.

“Economic Feasibility Analysis and Preliminary Business Plan for a Pennsylvania Consumer’s Energy Cooperative” (with John Plunkett et al.). 1997. 3 vols. Philadelphia, Penn.: Energy Coordinating Agency of Philadelphia.

“Good Money After Bad” (with Charles Komanoff and Rachel Brailove). 1997. White Plains, N.Y.: Pace University School of Law Center for Environmental Studies.

“Maryland Office of People’s Counsel’s Comments on Staff Restructuring Report: Case No. 8738.” 1997. Filed by the Maryland Office of People’s Counsel in PSC Case No. 8738.

“Protest and Request for Hearing of Maryland Office of People’s Counsel.” 1997. Filed by the Maryland Office of People’s Counsel in PSC Docket Nos. EC97-46-000, ER97-4050-000, and ER97-4051-000.

“Restructuring the Electric Utilities of Maryland: Protecting and Advancing Consumer Interests” (with Paul Chernick, Susan Geller, John Plunkett, Roger Colton, Peter Bradford, Bruce Biewald, and David Wise). 1997. Baltimore, Maryland: Maryland Office of People’s Counsel.

“Comments of the New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate on Restructuring New Hampshire’s Electric-Utility Industry” (with Bruce Biewald and Paul Chernick). 1996. Concord, N.H.: NH OCA.

“Estimation of Market Value, Stranded Investment, and Restructuring Gains for Major Massachusetts Utilities” (with Paul Chernick, Susan Geller, Rachel Brailove, and Adam Auster). 1996. On behalf of the Massachusetts Attorney General (Boston).

“Report on Entergy’s 1995 Integrated Resource Plan.” 1996. On behalf of the Alliance for Affordable Energy (New Orleans).

“Preliminary Review of Entergy’s 1995 Integrated Resource Plan.” 1995. On behalf of the Alliance for Affordable Energy (New Orleans).

“Comments on NOPSI and LP&L’s Motion to Modify Certain DSM Programs.” 1995. On behalf of the Alliance for Affordable Energy (New Orleans).

“Demand-Side Management Technical Market Potential Progress Report.” 1993. On behalf of the Legal Environmental Assistance Foundation (Tallahassee)

“Technical Information.” 1993. Appendix to “Energy Efficiency Down to Details: A Response to the Director General of Electricity Supply’s Request for Comments on Energy Efficiency Performance Standards” (UK). On behalf of the Foundation for International Environmental Law and Development and the Conservation Law Foundation (Boston).

“Integrating Demand Management into Utility Resource Planning: An Overview.” 1993. Vol. 1 of “From Here to Efficiency: Securing Demand-Management Resources” (with Paul Chernick and John Plunkett). Harrisburg, Pa.:Pennsylvania Energy Office

“Making Efficient Markets.” 1993. Vol. 2 of “From Here to Efficiency: Securing Demand-Management Resources” (with Paul Chernick and John Plunkett). Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania Energy Office.

“Analysis Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations.” 1992. Vol. 1 of “Correcting the Imbalance of Power: Report on Integrated Resource Planning for Ontario Hydro” (with Paul Chernick and John Plunkett).

“Demand-Management Programs: Targets and Strategies.” 1992. Vol. 1 of “Building Ontario Hydro’s Conservation Power Plant” (with John Plunkett, James Peters, and Blair Hamilton).

“Review of the Elizabethtown Gas Company’s 1992 DSM Plan and the Demand-Side Management Rules” (with Paul Chernick, John Plunkett, James Peters, Susan Geller, Blair Hamilton, and Andrew Shapiro). 1992. Report to the New Jersey Department of Public Advocate.

“Comments of Public Interest Intervenors on the 1993–1994 Annual and Long-Range Demand-Side Management and Integrated Resource Plans of New York Electric Utilities” (with Ken Keating et al.) 1992.

“Review of Jersey Central Power & Light’s 1992 DSM Plan and the Demand-Side Management Rules” (with Paul Chernick et al.). 1992. Report to the New Jersey Department of Public Advocate.

“Review of Rockland Electric Company’s 1992 DSM Plan and the Demand-Side Management Rules” (with Paul Chernick et al.). 1992.

“Initial Review of Ontario Hydro’s Demand-Supply Plan Update” (with David Argue et al.). 1992.

“Comments on the Utility Responses to Commission’s November 27, 1990 Order and Proposed Revisions to the 1991–1992 Annual and Long Range Demand Side Management Plans” (with John Plunkett et al.). 1991.

“Comments on the 1991–1992 Annual and Long Range Demand-Side-Management Plans of the Major Electric Utilities” (with John Plunkett et al.). Filed in NY PSC Case No. 28223 in re New York utilities’ DSM plans. 1990.

“Profitability Assessment of Packaged Cogeneration Systems in the New York City Area.” 1989. Principal investigator.

“Statistical Analysis of U.S. Nuclear Plant Capacity Factors, Operation and Maintenance Costs, and Capital Additions.” 1989.

“The Economics of Completing and Operating the Vogtle Generating Facility.” 1985. ESRG Study No. 85-51A.

“Generating Plant Operating Performance Standards Report No. 2: Review of Nuclear Plant Capacity Factor Performance and Projections for the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Facility.” 1985. ESRG Study No. 85-22/2.

“Cost-Benefit Analysis of the Cancellation of Commonwealth Edison Company’s Braidwood Nuclear Generating Station.” 1984. ESRG Study No. 83-87.

“The Economics of Seabrook 1 from the Perspective of the Three Maine Co-owners.” 1984. ESRG Study No. 84-38.

“An Evaluation of the Testimony and Exhibit (RCB-2) of Dr. Robert C. Bushnell Concerning the Capital Cost of Fermi 2.” 1984. ESRG Study No. 84-30.

“Electric Rate Consequences of Cancellation of the Midland Nuclear Power Plant.” 1984. ESRG Study No. 83-81.

“Power Planning in Kentucky: Assessing Issues and Choices—Project Summary Report to the Public Service Commission.” 1984. ESRG Study No. 83-51.

“Electric Rate Consequences of Retiring the Robinson 2 Nuclear Plant.” 1984. ESRG Study No. 83-10.

“Power Planning in Kentucky: Assessing Issues and Choices—Conservation as a Planning Option.” 1983. ESRG Study No. 83-51/TR III.

“Electricity and Gas Savings from Expanded Public Service Electric and Gas Company Conservation Programs.” 1983. ESRG Study No. 82-43/2.

“Long Island Without the Shoreham Power Plant: Electricity Cost and System Planning Consequences; Summary of Findings.” 1983. ESRG Study No. 83-14S.

“Long Island Without the Shoreham Power Plant: Electricity Cost and System Planning Consequences; Technical Report B—Shoreham Operations and Costs.” 1983. ESRG Study No. 83-14B.

“Customer Programs to Moderate Demand Growth on the Arizona Public Service Company System: Identifying Additional Cost-Effective Program Options.” 1982. ESRG Study No. 82-14C.

“The Economics of Alternative Space and Water Heating Systems in New Construction in the Jersey Central Power and Light Service Area, A Report to the Public Advocate.” 1982. ESRG Study No. 82-31.

“Review of the Kentucky-American Water Company Capacity Expansion Program, A Report to the Kentucky Public Service Commission.” 1982. ESRG Study No. 82-45.

“Long Range Forecast of Sierra Pacific Power Company Electric Energy Requirements and Peak Demands, A Report to the Public Service Commission of Nevada.” 1982. ESRG Study No. 81-42B.

“Utility Promotion of Residential Customer Conservation, A Report to Massachusetts Public Interest Research Group.” 1981. ESRG Study No. 81-47

PRESENTATIONS

“Office of People’s Counsel Case No. 9117” (with William Fields). Presentation to the Maryland Public Utilities Commission in Case No. 9117, December 2008.

“Electricity Market Design: Incentives for Efficient Bidding, Opportunities for Gaming.” NASUCA Northeast Market Seminar, Albany, N.Y., February 2001.

“Direct Access Implementation: The California Experience.” Presentation to the Maryland Restructuring Technical Implementation Group on behalf of the Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. June 1998.

“Reflecting Market Expectations in Estimates of Stranded Costs,” speaker, and workshop moderator of “Effectively Valuing Assets and Calculating Stranded Costs.” Conference sponsored by International Business Communications, Washington, D.C., June 1997.

EXPERT TESTIMONY

- 1989* **Mass. DPU** on behalf of the Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy Resources. Docket No. 89-100. Joint testimony with Paul Chernick relating to statistical analysis of U.S. nuclear-plant capacity factors, operation and maintenance costs, and capital additions; and to projections of capacity factor, O&M, and capital additions for the Pilgrim nuclear plant.
- 1994* **NY PSC** on behalf of the Pace Energy Project, Natural Resources Defense Council, and Citizen's Advisory Panel. Case No. 93-E-1123. Joint testimony with John Plunkett critiques proposed modifications to Long Island Lighting Company's DSM programs from the perspective of least-cost-planning principles.
- 1994* **Vt. PSB** on behalf of the Vermont Department of Public Service. Docket No. 5270-CV-1 and 5270-CV-3. Testimony and rebuttal testimony discusses rate and bill effects from DSM spending and sponsors load shapes for measure- and program-screening analyses.
- 1996* **New Orleans City Council** on behalf of the Alliance for Affordable Energy. Docket Nos. UD-92-2A, UD-92-2B, and UD-95-1. Rates, charges, and integrated resource planning for Louisiana Power & Lights and New Orleans Public Service, Inc.
- 1996* **New Orleans City Council** Docket Nos. UD-92-2A, UD-92-2B, and UD-95-1. Rates, charges, and integrated resource planning for Louisiana Power & Lights and New Orleans Public Service, Inc.; Alliance for Affordable Energy. April, 1996.
- Prudence of utilities' IRP decisions; costs of utilities' failure to follow City Council directives; possible cost disallowances and penalties; survey of penalties for similar failures in other jurisdictions.
- 1998* **Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy** Docket No. 97-111, Commonwealth Energy proposed restructuring; Cape Cod Light Compact. Joint testimony with Paul Chernick, January, 1998.
- Critique of proposed restructuring plan filed to satisfy requirements of the electric-utility restructuring act of 1997. Failure of the plan to foster competition and promote the public interest.
- Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy** Docket No. 97-120, Western Massachusetts Electric Company proposed restructuring; Massachusetts Attorney General. Joint testimony with Paul Chernick, October, 1998. Joint surrebuttal with Paul Chernick, January, 1999.
- Market value of the three Millstone nuclear units under varying assumptions of plant performance and market prices. Independent forecast of wholesale market prices. Value of Pilgrim and TMI-1 asset sales.

- 1999* **Maryland PSC** Case No. 8795, Delmarva Power & Light comprehensive restructuring agreement, Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. July 1999.
- Support of proposed comprehensive restructuring settlement agreement
- Maryland PSC** Case Nos. 8794 and 8808, Baltimore Gas & Electric Company comprehensive restructuring agreement, Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. Initial Testimony July 1999; Reply Testimony August 1999; Surrebuttal Testimony August 1999.
- Support of proposed comprehensive restructuring settlement agreement
- Maryland PSC** Case No. 8797, comprehensive restructuring agreement for Potomac Edison Company, Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. October 1999.
- Support of proposed comprehensive restructuring settlement agreement
- Connecticut DPUC** Docket No. 99-03-35, United Illuminating standard offer, Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. November 1999.
- Reasonableness of proposed revisions to standard-offer-supply energy costs. Implications of revisions for other elements of proposed settlement.
- 2000* **U.S. FERC** Docket No. RT01-02-000, Order No. 2000 compliance filing, Joint Consumer Advocates intervenors. Affidavit, November 2000.
- Evaluation of innovative rate proposal by PJM transmission owners.
- 2001* **Maryland PSC** Case No. 8852, Charges for electricity-supplier services for Potomac Electric Power Company, Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. March 2001.
- Reasonableness of proposed fees for electricity-supplier services.
- Maryland PSC** Case No. 8890, Merger of Potomac Electric Power Company and Delmarva Power and Light Company, Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. September 2001; surrebuttal, October 2001. In support of settlement: Supplemental, December 2001; rejoinder, January 2002.
- Costs and benefits to ratepayers. Assessment of public interest.
- Maryland PSC** Case No. 8796, Potomac Electric Power Company stranded costs and rates, Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. December 2001; surrebuttal, February 2002.
- Allocation of benefits from sale of generation assets and power-purchase contracts.
- 2002* **Maryland PSC** Case No. 8908, Maryland electric utilities’ standard offer and supply procurement, Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. Direct, November 2002; Rebuttal December 2002.

- Benefits of proposed settlement to ratepayers. Standard-offer service. Procurement of supply.
- 2003 **Maryland PSC** Case No. 8980, adequacy of capacity in restructured electricity markets; Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. Direct, December 2003; Reply December 2003.
- Purpose of capacity-adequacy requirements. PJM capacity rules and practices. Implications of various restructuring proposals for system reliability.
- 2004 **Maryland PSC** Case No. 8995, Potomac Electric Power Company recovery of generation-related uncollectibles; Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. Direct, March 2004; Supplemental March 2004, Surrebuttal April 2004.
- Calculation and allocation of costs. Effect on administrative charge pursuant to settlement.
- Maryland PSC** Case No. 8994, Delmarva Power & Light recovery of generation-related uncollectibles; Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. Direct, March 2004; Supplemental April 2004.
- Calculation and allocation of costs. Effect on administrative charge pursuant to settlement.
- Maryland PSC** Case No. 8985, Southern Maryland Electric Coop standard-offer service; Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. Direct, July 2004.
- Reasonableness and risks of resource-procurement plan.
- 2005 **FERC** Docket No. ER05-428-000, revisions to ICAP demand curves; City of New York. Statement, March 2005.
- Net-revenue offset to cost of new capacity. Winter-summer adjustment factor. Market power and in-City ICAP price trends.
- FERC** Docket No. PL05-7-000, capacity markets in PJM; Maryland Office of People’s Counsel. Statement, June 2005.
- Inefficiencies and risks associated with use of administratively determined demand curve. Incompatibility of four-year procurement plan with Maryland standard-offer service.
- FERC** Dockets Nos. ER05-1410-000 & EL05-148-000, proposed market-clearing mechanism for capacity markets in PJM; Coalition of Consumers for Reliability, Affidavit October 2005, Supplemental Affidavit October 2006.
- Inefficiencies and risks associated with use of administratively determined demand curve. Effect of proposed reliability-pricing model on capacity costs.
- 2006 **Maryland PSC** Case No. 9052, Baltimore Gas & Electric rates and market-transition plan; Maryland Office of People’s Counsel, February 2006.

Transition to market-based residential rates. Price volatility, bill complexity, and cost-deferral mechanisms.

Maryland PSC Case No. 9056, default service for commercial and industrial customers; Maryland Office of People's Counsel, April 2006.

Assessment of proposals to modify default service for commercial and industrial customers.

Maryland PSC Case No. 9054, merger of Constellation Energy Group and FPL Group; Maryland Office of People's Counsel, June 2006.

Assessment of effects and risks of proposed merger on ratepayers.

Illinois Commerce Commission Docket No. 06-0411, Commonwealth Edison Company residential rate plan; Citizens Utility Board, Cook County State's Attorney's Office, and City of Chicago, Direct July 2006, Reply August 2006.

Transition to market-based rates. Securitization of power costs. Rate of return on deferred assets.

Maryland PSC Case No. 9064, default service for residential and small commercial customers ; Maryland Office of People's Counsel, Rebuttal Testimony, September 2006.

Procurement of standard-offer power. Structure and format of bidding. Risk and cost recovery.

FERC Dockets Nos. ER05-1410-000 & EL05-148-000, proposed market-clearing mechanism for capacity markets in PJM; Maryland Office of the People's Counsel, Supplemental Affidavit October 2006.

Distorting effects of proposed reliability-pricing model on clearing prices. Economically efficient alternative treatment.

Maryland PSC Case No. 9063, optimal structure of electric industry; Maryland Office of People's Counsel, Direct Testimony, October 2006; Rebuttal November 2006; surrebuttal November 2006.

Procurement of standard-offer power. Risk and gas-price volatility, and their effect on prices and market performance. Alternative procurement strategies.

Maryland PSC Case No. 9073, stranded costs from electric-industry restructuring; Maryland Office of People's Counsel, Direct Testimony, December 2006.

Review of estimates of stranded costs for Baltimore Gas & Electric.

2007 **Maryland PSC** Case No. 9091, rate-stabilization and market-transition plan for the Potomac Edison Company; Maryland Office of People's Counsel, Direct Testimony, March 2007.

Rate-stabilization plan.

Maryland PSC Case No. 9092, rates and rate mechanisms for the Potomac Electric Power Company; Maryland Office of People's Counsel, Direct Testimony, March 2007.

Cost allocation and rate design. Revenue decoupling mechanism.

Maryland PSC Case No. 9093, rates and rate mechanisms for Delmarva Power & Light; Maryland Office of People's Counsel, Direct Testimony, March 2007.

Cost allocation and rate design. Revenue decoupling mechanism.

Maryland PSC Case No. 9099, rate-stabilization plan for Baltimore Gas & Electric; Maryland Office of People's Counsel, Direct, March 2007; Surrebuttal April 2007.

Review of standard-offer-service-procurement plan. Rate stabilization plan.

Connecticut DPUC Docket No. 07-04-24, review of capacity contracts under Energy Independence Act; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel, Joint Direct Testimony June 2007.

Assessment of proposed capacity contracts.

Maryland PSC Case No. 9117, residential and small-commercial standard-offer service; Maryland Office of People's Counsel. Direct and Reply, September 2007; Supplemental Reply, November 2007; Additional Reply, December 2007; presentation, December 2008.

Benefits of long-term planning and procurement. Proposed aggregation of customers.

Maryland PSC Case No. 9117, Phase II, residential and small-commercial standard-offer service; Maryland Office of People's Counsel. Direct, October 2007.

Energy efficiency as part of standard-offer-service planning and procurement. Procurement of generation or long-term contracts to meet reliability needs.

2008 **Connecticut DPUC 08-01-01**, peaking generation projects; Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel. Direct (with Paul Chernick), April 2008.

Assessment of proposed peaking projects. Valuation of peaking capacity. Modeling of energy margin, forward reserves, other project benefits.

Ontario EB-2007-0707, Ontario Power Authority integrated system plan; Green Energy Coalition, Penimba Institute, and Ontario Sustainable Energy Association. Evidence (with Paul Chernick and Richard Mazzini), August 2008.

Critique of integrated system plan. Resource cost and characteristics; finance cost. Development of least-cost green-energy portfolio.

2009 **Maryland PSC** Case No. 9192, Delmarva Power & Lights rates; Maryland Office of People's Counsel. Direct, August 2009; Rebuttal, Surrebuttal, September 2009.

Cost allocation and rate design.

Wisconsin PSB Docket No. 6630-CE-302, Glacier Hills Wind Park certificate, Citizens Utility Board of Wisconsin. Direct and Surrebuttal, October 2009.

Reasonableness of proposed wind facility.

Ohio PUC Case No. 09-906-EL-SSO, Competitive Bidding Process for FirstEnergy Ohio, Ohio Consumers' Counsel. Direct, December 2009.

Assessment of risks associated with migration of FirstEnergy Ohio to PJM. Evaluation of proposed design for auctions to procure Standard Service Offer supply contracts.