

HURT, CROSBIE & MAY PLLC

William C. Hurt, Jr.
Scott A. Crosbie
William H. May, III
Michael D. Kalinyak
Steven Lenarz
Matthew R. Malone
Aaron D. Reedy
James L. Deckard
Jacob K. Michul

THE EQUUS BUILDING
127 WEST MAIN STREET
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY 40507

Telephone - (859) 254-0000
Facsimile - (859) 254-4763

Jennifer S. Scutchfield *

* Of Counsel

RECEIVED

APR 22 2010

**PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION**

April 22, 2010

Via Hand-Delivery

Mr. Jeff Derouen, Executive Director
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard
Frankfort, Kentucky 40602

RE: *Case No. 2009-00548*

Dear Mr. Derouen:

Please find enclosed the original and twelve (12) copies of the Kentucky School Boards Association's direct testimony in this matter. By copy of this letter, all parties listed on the Certificate of Service have been served.

Please place the document of file.

Regards,



Matthew Malone

C: File

**COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

In the matter of: : CASE NO. 2009-00548

THE APPLICATION OF KENTUCKY UTILITIES:
COMPANY FOR A GENERAL ADJUSTMENT :
IN BASE RATES :

**KENTUCKY SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION'S CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
REGARDING DIRECT TESTIMONY OF CHARLES BUECHEL**

Comes the Kentucky School Boards Association, by counsel, and hereby certifies that an original and twelve (12) copies of the attached Direct Testimony was served via hand-delivery upon Jeff Derouen, Executive Director, Public Service Commission, 211 Sower Boulevard, Frankfort, Kentucky 40602-0615; furthermore, it was served by mailing a copy by first class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, on the following, and by electronic mail where available all on this 22 day of April, 2010.

Hon. David C. Brown
Stites & Harbison, PLLC
1800 Providian Center
400 West Market Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40202

Hon. Michael L. Kurtz
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry
36 East Seventh Street
Suite 1510
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Hon. Dennis G. Howard, II
Hon. Lawrence W. Cook
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
Utility and Rate Intervention Division
1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 200
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601-8204

Hon. Iris G. Skidmore
Bates & Skidmore
415 W. Main Street, Suite 2
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Hon. Allyson K. Sturgeon
Senior Corporate Attorney
E.ON U.S. LLC
220 W. Main Street
Louisville, KY 40202

Hon. Lonnie E. Bellar
E.ON U.S. LLC
220 West Main Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40202

Hon. Robert M. Watt, III
Stoll Keenon Ogden, PLLC
300 W Vine Street
Suite 2100
Lexington, KY 40507-1801

Hon. Gardner F. Gillespie
Hogan & Hartson, LLP
555 Thirteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-1109

Hon. Frank F. Chuppe
Wyatt, Tarrant & Combs, LLP
500 W. Jefferson Street
Suite 2800
Louisville, Kentucky 40202

Hon. Kendrick R. Riggs
Stoll Keenon Ogden, PLLC
2000 PNC Plaza
500 W. Jefferson Street
Louisville, KY 40202



Matthew R. Malone
William H. May, II.
Hurt, Crosbie & May PLLC
The Equus Building
127 West Main Street
Lexington, Kentucky 40507
(859) 254-0000 (office)
(859) 254-4763 (facsimile)

Counsel for the Petitioner,
KENTUCKY SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

RECEIVED
APR 22 2010
PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

In re the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF KENTUCKY)
UTILITIES COMPANY FOR AN) CASE NO. 2009-00548
ADJUSTMENT OF ITS ELECTRIC)
BASE RATES)

TESTIMONY OF
CHARLES D. BUECHEL
PRESIDENT
UTILITY and ECONOMIC CONSULTING, INC.

ON BEHALF OF THE
KENTUCKY SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

Filed: April 22, 2010

1 **1. INTRODUCTION**

2 **Q. Please state your name and business address.**

3 A. My name is Charles Buechel and my business address is 116 Carrie Ct.,
4 Lexington, KY 40515.

5 **Q. By whom are you employed?**

6 A. I am the President and sole proprietor of Utility and Economic Consulting,
7 Inc. The firm provides consulting services regarding utility regulatory matters.
8 The firm's consulting services are provided to regulatory commissions, utilities
9 and customers. My resume is attached as Exhibit CDB-1.

10 **Q. On whose behalf are you testifying in this case?**

11 A. I am testifying on behalf of the Kentucky School Boards Association
12 (KSBA).

13 **Q. Please describe the KSBA.**

14 A. The KSBA is a nonprofit corporation of school boards from each public
15 school system in the state. The association, founded in 1936, serves school
16 boards and districts in such areas as governmental relations, board member and
17 staff training, insurance and risk management, legal, policy, publications and
18 community relations. It is governed by a 27-member statewide board of
19 directors. With nearly 900 members, KSBA is the largest organization of elected
20 officials in Kentucky.

21 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

1 A. My testimony's purpose is three-fold. First, I will review the changes that
2 KU proposes for its All Electric School - Rate AES tariff. Second, I will discuss
3 the potential impact of KU's proposed tariff and rate changes on the many
4 schools that KU serves. Third, I will discuss the importance of the proposed
5 changes in light of the 2008 legislation passed by the Kentucky Legislature. KRS
6 160.325 - Mandatory Participation in Kentucky Energy Efficiency Program -
7 requires each board to enroll in the Kentucky Energy Efficiency Program at the
8 University of Louisville to obtain information regarding the potential energy
9 savings for every board-owned and board-operated facility.

10

11 2. PROPOSED CHANGES TO AES

12 **Q. Have you reviewed KU's All Electric School - Rate AES tariff and the**
13 **proposed changes?**

14 A. Yes, I have reviewed the proposed changes to KU's AES tariff.

15 **Q. Do you have any concerns with the proposed changes?**

16 A. Yes. There are two proposed changes that are particularly troubling.

17 First, the rate increase proposed for the AES tariff seems disproportionate to the
18 overall increase. Second, KU has proposed language to limit the AES tariff only
19 to customers served on that tariff as of February 6, 2009.

20 **Q. Could you elaborate on your concern regarding the proposed increase**
21 **for AES?**

1 A. Certainly. KU is proposing a 13.9% increase for AES. See Seelye Exhibit 6.
2 This is the largest percentage increase proposed for any of KU's tariffs. The
3 apparent reason that the AES proposed increase is the largest is because the
4 Actual Adjusted Rate of Return for AES is calculated to be 2.19%, which is the
5 lowest rate of return. See Seelye testimony at page 68. This is difficult to
6 understand when one compares the results of the cost of service study in this
7 case to the cost of service study presented just 18 months earlier in Case No.
8 2008-00251. In the earlier case, the Actual Adjusted Rate of Return for AES was
9 6.32% or 274 bases points above the Residential - RS Rate. See Seelye testimony
10 at page 66 in Case No. - 2008-00251.

11 **Q. What has caused such a large change in the AES rate of return in such a**
12 **short period of time?**

13 A. I cannot say for certain because it is difficult to follow all of the
14 machinations involved with performing a cost of service study. However, one of
15 the driving forces in this current case is a significant increase in rate base
16 associated with Trimble County Unit 2. For whatever reason, AES has been
17 allocated a disproportionate amount of the increase in rate base. Total System
18 Adjusted Cost Net Rate Base has increased by 42.4% from \$2,216,908,245 to
19 \$3,157,293,448. In contrast, AES Adjusted Cost Net Rate Base has increased
20 74.7% from \$17,344,685 to \$30,304,385. See Seelye Exhibit 19, page 40-41 of 54 in
21 Case No. 2008-00251 and Seelye Exhibit 20, page 29 of 40 in this case.

22 **Q. What is your recommendation to the Commission regarding this matter?**

1 A. KU needs to provide both the Commission and KSBA a better explanation
2 of why the AES rate has been allocated a disproportionate increase in rate base
3 and as a result a higher percentage rate increase. Without a better explanation,
4 the Commission should not increase rates for AES any more than the overall
5 increase granted in this case. The fact that the results from a cost of service study
6 can vary so much from one rate case to the next should reinforce the
7 Commission's historical approach to implementing cost-based rates in a gradual
8 fashion.

9 **Q. Do you have any other concerns with proposed changes to the AES**
10 **tariff?**

11 A. Yes. In the Availability of Service section of the AES tariff KU is
12 proposing to restrict service to those customers receiving service on this rate as of
13 February 6, 2009. This is apparently an attempt to clarify some language changes
14 made in the previous case. However, it has come to the KSBA's attention that
15 some schools that qualify for the AES tariff were mistakenly provided service
16 under different tariffs. In this situation, it seems only fair that the school should
17 be allowed to switch service to the AES rate if it chooses to do so. As discussed
18 in Section 4 of my testimony, in response to Kentucky Revised Statute (KRS)
19 160.325 all of the school boards in Kentucky will be assessing the potential for
20 savings from implementing cost-effective energy management programs during
21 the next several years. To initiate this process, all of the schools will be
22 reviewing their current energy usage and rates. Until this review is completed, it

1 seems fair to allow those schools that qualify to be under the AES but were
2 mistakenly placed under a different tariff to change their service to AES.

3 **Q. Do you have any other concerns with KU's proposal to restrict service**
4 **under the AES tariff?**

5 A. Yes. By restricting the availability of the AES tariff to customers receiving
6 service on this rate as of February 6, 2009, KU will discourage new schools from
7 installing energy efficient heating and cooling systems such as geothermal. In
8 some areas of the state, these systems have been rather popular and in fact
9 encouraged by KU in the past. Several school boards are currently looking at
10 installing these or similar systems. Access to the AES tariff would enable the
11 school boards to continue to promote and install these types of energy efficiency
12 systems.

13 **Q. What is your recommendation to the Commission on this matter?**

14 A. My recommendation is to delete the language in the tariff that restricts
15 availability to those customers receiving service on this rate as of February 6,
16 2009. This will allow the school boards to complete their review of their usage
17 and rates and make a determination if they qualify for the AES tariff but have
18 been served under a different tariff. In this event, they should be allowed to
19 approach KU and request that their service be switched to AES.

20

21 **3. IMPACT OF PROPOSED CHANGES**

22 **Q. Have you reviewed other rate and tariff changes that KU has proposed?**

1 A. Yes I have.

2 **Q. What changes are of particular concern?**

3 A. The large increases that KU has proposed for what it now calls the Basic
4 Service Charge are of particular concern. For General Service – Rate GS single-
5 phase service, the charge increases from \$10 per meter per month to \$20 – a 100%
6 increase. For GS three-phase service, the charge increases from \$10 per meter per
7 month to \$35 – a 250% increase. For Power Service Rate PS, the basic service
8 charges for both secondary and primary are proposed to increase from \$75 per
9 meter per month to \$90 – a 20% increase. The basic service charge for Time-of-
10 Day Secondary is proposed to increase from \$90 per meter per month to \$200 – a
11 122% increase. The basic service charge for Time-of-Day Primary is proposed to
12 increase from \$120 per meter per month to \$300 – a 150% increase.

13 **Q. Why are these changes so disconcerting?**

14 A. Historically, the Commission has implemented cost-based rates in a
15 gradual fashion. Although the company witnesses have testified that their
16 implementation approach is gradual, I would disagree. Increases in basic service
17 charges of 20% to 250% are hardly gradual. For low-energy consumers, these
18 increases can be devastating.

19 **Q. Are you suggesting that schools are low-energy users?**

20 A. The answer to that question is not as obvious as one might think. The
21 classroom facilities that the school boards operate are not likely to be low-energy
22 users. However, school boards operate many other facilities. These facilities

1 may include sheds, garages, pumps, athletic spaces, etc. Most of these facilities
2 are metered separately and therefore are served under whichever tariff applies.
3 They would be confronted with the much higher basic service charge regardless
4 of usage. With school budgets already stretched to their limits, any increase is
5 not welcome, but a disproportionate increase is intolerable.

6 **Q. What is your recommendation to the Commission?**

7 A. I recommend that the Commission continue on the course it has followed
8 for several years. Base rates on costs, but implement strict cost-based rates in a
9 gradual manner so as to avoid serious financial disruptions for some customers.
10 I understand the goal of the Company to eliminate inter- and intra-class
11 subsidies but they cannot be eliminated too quickly. The interests of the
12 ratepayers and the impact on them must also be carefully considered. Finally,
13 the Commission needs to be mindful that the Company has an interest in
14 generating as much revenue as it can through basic service charges because it
15 provides a more certain revenue stream.

16

17 **4. CONSIDERATION OF KRS 160.325**

18 **Q. Could you describe KRS 160.325?**

19 A. Certainly. I have attached a copy of the statute to my testimony as Exhibit
20 CDB-2. Basically, the legislation requires all of the school boards in Kentucky to
21 participate in the Kentucky Energy Efficiency Program offered by the Kentucky
22 Pollution Prevention Center at the University of Louisville. The potential energy

1 savings for every board-owned and operated facility will be assessed. Beginning
2 December 1, 2011 and every year thereafter, the Kentucky Pollution Prevention
3 Center will prepare a report to be filed with the Governor's Office of Energy
4 Policy and the Legislative Research Commission. The report will provide the
5 status of the development of energy management plans by the boards of
6 education and identify the anticipated savings to be obtained from the plans.

7 **Q. How do you expect the boards will proceed with this initiative?**

8 A. My understanding is that one of the first steps will be for each of the
9 school boards to submit information on each of the facilities that it operates and
10 sufficient billing information to determine under which tariff service is provided
11 and the typical usage. This will accomplish two goals. First, it will enable the
12 analysts to determine that the service is being provided under the appropriate
13 tariff. Based on some recent experience, KSBA has discovered that the
14 appropriate tariff has not always been utilized. Second, the usage and billing
15 information will be needed to begin assessing the potential savings from various
16 energy management plans.

17 **Q. Why is it important that the Commission be aware of this initiative in
18 its consideration of this rate case?**

19 A. In its filing, the Company has proposed to eliminate some tariffs and
20 move customers served under those tariffs to new tariffs. Although this may
21 cause some complications and duplication of efforts for the Kentucky Energy
22 Efficiency Program, I am confident they can sort through these changes. The

1 larger concern is the large increases proposed for the basic service charges. This
2 shifting of cost from a variable rate component to a fixed rate component has
3 clear implications for assessing the potential savings of various energy
4 management programs. The school boards will not be able to escape the fixed
5 basic service charge. This will reduce the cost-effectiveness of some energy
6 management programs and also the potential savings from the plans.

7 **Q. What is your recommendation to the Commission regarding this matter?**

8 A. Again, I recommend that the Commission stay the course with its gradual
9 approach to implementing cost-based rates, in particular with regard to the
10 significant increase in basic service charges that the Company has proposed.

11 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

12 A. Yes it does.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF KENTUCKY)
UTILITIES COMPANY FOR AN) CASE NO. 2009-00548
ADJUSTMENT OF ITS ELECTRIC)
BASE RATES)

AFFIDAVIT OF CHARLES BUECHEL

Comes the undersigned, Charles D. Buechel, being duly sworn, deposes and states that he is President of Utility and Economic Consulting, Inc., that he has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the foregoing testimony and exhibits, said testimony was prepared by him and under his direction and supervision, if inquiries were made as to the facts in said testimony he would respond as therein set forth and the answers contained therein are true and correct to the best of his knowledge.

Charles D Buechel
Charles D. Buechel

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)
)
COUNTY OF FAYETTE)

Subscribed and sworn to me this 21st day of April, 2010, by Charles Buechel.

Emily Genovese
Notary Public

My Commission Expires: 11/21/2011

EXHIBIT CDB-1

Chuck Buechel
116 Carrie Ct.
Lexington, KY 40515
859-523-3908 (O)
859-361-0088 (C)

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION

Mr. Buechel has worked on numerous consulting assignments for electric, gas, water, and telephone utilities. The primary focus of many of these assignments has been regulatory matters, however, he has consulted on other matters, including corporate and strategic planning, incentive regulation, least-cost planning, workforce management, and competitive bidding.

Prior to consulting, Mr. Buechel spent over nine years on the Staff of the Kentucky Public Service Commission. During his tenure at the Commission, he was public utility economist, Director of Research Division, and Deputy Executive Director. His assignments at the Commission included: the preparation of an integrated resource planning regulation; coordinating a statewide load management committee to investigate time-of-day rates and other load management issues; directing staff in rate cases and special investigations; writing orders as directed by the Commission; establishing a management audit program; and testifying in selected cases.

SELECTED CONSULTING EXPERIENCE

Lower Colorado River Authority – Senior consultant for an audit of LCRA’s cost allocation methods for assigning costs to various divisions.

Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control – Senior Consultant for a management audit of United Illuminating Company. Reviewed primary planning documents and processes for the development of the documents.

Big Rivers Electric Corporation – Regulatory advisor for the presentation of Big Rivers’ Unwind proposal to Kentucky Public Service Commission.

Kentucky Public Service Commission – Witness before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regarding AEP’s membership in PJM and the KPSC’s role in approving the membership.

Consolidated Edison Company – Senior Consultant on an audit of emergency restoration and outage planning capabilities for the New York PSC. Audit followed a number of large and highly public outages. Major recommendations were made to develop new strategies and programs for addressing reliability and outage response.

Maryland Public Service Commission – Monitored all RFP solicitations for 2007 and 2008 bid years. This amounted to nine solicitations for all four utilities in Maryland. Provided

Resume of Mr. Chuck Buechel

oversight on bid day, reviewed applications, provided confidential analysis and briefings to the Commissioners on results.

North American Stainless – Witness for NAS in Kentucky Utilities Company Case No. 2003-00434 regarding KU's proposed Non-Conforming Load Tariff.

Pacific Gas & Electric Co. – Senior Consultant for affiliated audit for 2001 and 2002 calendar years to verify compliance with California PUC restructuring requirements. Assignment included assessment of company plan and audit of affiliate transactions. Acted as the Lead Consultant on areas that addressed Nondiscrimination Standards, Disclosure and Information Standards, and Competitive Services. Recommendations from these reports addressed means of improving compliance.

Public Service Electric & Gas Company – Retained by the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities to assess compliance with all Affiliate Compliance and Code of Conduct Rules enacted as a result of restructuring.

Delaware Public Service Commission – Monitored all RFP solicitations for 2006 bid year. Provided oversight on bid day, reviewed applications, provided confidential analysis and briefings to the Commissioners and testified on results.

Seattle City Light – Retained by the City Council to perform an audit of the municipally-owned Seattle City Light electric utility. Assigned issue was governance of the municipal utility. The audit yielded recommendations for training the council members to better understand the issues and to add additional resources for oversight of the utility.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission – Senior Consultant for an operational audit of the California Independent System Operator. The audit was performed for FERC. Assigned issues of primary focus were market design, the relationships among the parties and governance of the ISO.

Arizona Corporation Commission – Senior Consultant to provide advice and assistance to the Commission regarding the on-going implementation of its industry restructuring initiative.

Louisville Electric & Gas and Kentucky Utilities – Actively participated in the development of a comprehensive performance-based regulation mechanism and provided support for development of tariff, preparation of testimony, and witness preparation and worked with attorneys to prepare briefs.

Public Service Electric & Gas – Senior Consultant in the evaluation of cost of service studies and unbundling plan for the Restructuring Plan submitted to the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities.

Entergy – Consultant in this financial audit of affiliated transactions between Entergy Corporation, Entergy Services, Inc., and subsidiaries responsible for the review of affiliated

Resume of Mr. Chuck Buechel

transactions, allocation, accounting procedures and control, improper disclosure, and insulation and segregation of regulated and non-regulated affiliates.

California Public Utilities Commission - Regulatory Lead Consultant for an assignment to assist with the evaluation of a two-year experiment to implement performance-based ratemaking for San Diego Electric and Gas Company's gas procurement and generation and dispatch functions.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company - Consultant responsible for this mid-term evaluation of the Company's Base Rates Performance-Based Ratemaking mechanism which included analysis and assessment in the areas of price and corporate performance.

Big Rivers Electric Corporation - Provided support and assisted with the preparation of the Company's regulatory filings before the Kentucky PSC for approval to implement a proposed lease of its generating assets to a subsidiary of LG&E Energy.

Delta Natural Gas - Assisted with the preparation of an application to increase rates and modify rate design. Testified on rate design changes for larger commercial and industrial customers as well as other specific charges.

East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. - Senior Consultant for a project to audit the fuel procurement function at East Kentucky Power Cooperative. The assignment is being performed for the Fuel and Environmental Committee of the Board of Directors.

Louisville Gas and Electric Company/Kentucky Utilities Company - Provided strategic, regulatory and operational advice regarding merger between these two utilities. Assisted with preparation of merger application and provided regulatory strategy regarding synergy savings.

Kentucky Public Service Commission - Engagement Director for a project to prepare a joint response for a consortium of four utilities in Kentucky. The response is to the Kentucky Public Service Commission Administrative Case No. 341, An Investigation into the Feasibility of Implementing Demand-Side Management Cost Recovery and Incentive Mechanisms. The response discusses the advantages and disadvantages of various regulatory incentives with regard to DSM and conservation.

Louisville Gas and Electric Company - Lead Consultant in the preparation of its application to establish a holding company. The application included proposed guidelines to be used in financial dealings between the subsidiary companies, as well as the allocation of costs between the companies.

New England Telephone Company - Consultant for the management audit of its affiliated interests. The audit was performed for the Department of Public Utilities of Massachusetts. Primary responsibilities included providing regulatory advice and consultation to the audit team.

Resume of Mr. Chuck Buechel

Kentucky Utilities Company - Engagement Director for a project to provide advice and consultation with regard to the preparation of an application for a certificate of convenience and necessity to construct additional peaking capacity. The filing was prepared to comply with a comprehensive regulation on integrated resource planning adopted by the Kentucky Public Service Commission. Areas of responsibility included preparing the responses for the sections of the IRP regulation, which were concerned with demand-side management.

Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc. - Consultant for its management and operations audit. The audit was for the Public Utility Commission of Ohio. Areas of responsibility include requirements forecasting and flexible transportation program.

Pennsylvania Gas & Water Company - Consultant for a comprehensive management audit. The audit is being performed for the Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission. Areas of responsibility include requirements forecasting, rates and regulatory relations, and financial management and planning.

West Texas Utilities Company - Consultant for a management and operations audit. The audit was performed for the Public Utility Commission of Texas. Areas of responsibility included financial planning, economic analysis, and system planning.

East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. - Engagement Director for the performance of an audit of evaluation of competitive bids it received for providing generating capacity to meet its needs. The purpose of the audit was to provide assurance to EKPC's management that each of the proposals is provided fair and consistent treatment. The audit was needed because the company had also provided a bid.

Big Rivers Electric Corporation - Engagement Director for an assignment to implement a comprehensive planning process. The process is centered on an annual planning cycle, which incorporates the corporate and strategic plans with the divisional plans and budgets.

Kentucky Public Service Commission - Witness testifying on behalf of GTE Products Corporation in Kentucky Public Service Commission Case No. 10498, a request by Columbia Gas of Kentucky, Inc. to raise its rates. The testimony supported the continuation of a flexible rate for the transportation of natural gas to industrial customers with alternative fuel capability.

Henderson County Water District - Lead Consultant for a comprehensive operations review. The study was sponsored by the district's Board of Directors. Areas of responsibilities included operations planning, organization and staffing, system management, and customer service.

Lexington Fayette Urban County Government - Principal Investigator for a report regarding the feasibility of regulating landfill operations at the Kentucky Public Service Commission.

Kentucky-American Water Company - Lead Consultant for a project to review and comment on drafts of testimony and a consultant's report on the need to expand its water treatment capacity. The testimony and report was the subject of a mock hearing.

Resume of Mr. Chuck Buechel

Kentucky Public Service Commission - Witness testifying on behalf of AT&T Communications in Kentucky Public Service Commission Administrative Case No. 323, an investigation into permitting intraLATA toll competition. The testimony related to the validity of a customer survey submitted by AT&T in the proceeding.

East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. - Engagement Director for a project which reviewed its load research program, made conclusions regarding the statistical validity of its previous efforts, and provided recommendations for future studies.

OTHER BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

President, Utility and Economic Consulting, Inc., February 1989-Present. The company provides utility, regulatory, management, and economic consulting services. The consulting engagements described above were performed since the formation of UEC.

Deputy Executive Director for the Public Service Commission of Kentucky, 1986-January 1989. Primary responsibilities include the following.

- Managing staff, through their directors, to ensure that cases were processed according to operating procedures and in a timely fashion.
- Working directly with the staff to develop regulatory policy positions for presentation to the Commissioners. One of the key policies developed involved a revised regulatory scheme to promote a more competitive environment for the delivery of natural gas.
- Preparation of a proposed comprehensive planning regulation for the Commission. The regulation, which is applicable to the state's electric utilities, specified filing requirements for the reporting of load forecasts and resource information including demand-side management and supply-side options.

Director, Division of Research, for the Public Service Commission of Kentucky, 1983-1986. Primary responsibilities include the following.

- Managing and providing direction for the economic research staff. The staff provided economic advice to the Commission concerning regulatory issues arising in the electric, telephone, gas, and water industries. This included making case assignments, reviewing the economists' work, preparing budgets, as well as other administrative duties.
- Participating in cases before the Commission. This involved working with other staff personnel, reviewing utility filings, preparing data requests and cross-examination of witnesses, advising the Commission, and preparing orders as instructed by the Commission.

Resume of Mr. Chuck Buechel

- Load Management Coordinator. This position required coordinating, leading discussions, and making presentations to two statewide load management committees - a steering and a technical committee. The committees were composed of Commission staff, utility executives, and consumer representatives. The committees met quarterly to discuss and review the implementation of time-of-day rates for large commercial and industrial customers. Various other load management techniques were also reviewed and considered.
- Project Coordinator, Case No. 8666 - An Investigation Into Alternative Load Forecasting Methods and Planning Considerations for the Efficient Provision of Electric Generation and Transmission Facilities. In this docket, the Commission hired the services of a consultant to perform the following tasks: review the forecasting methods of the state's electric utilities; provide alternative forecasts; examine the potential benefits of conservation; evaluate alternative construction scenarios assuming the formation of a statewide power pool; and estimate the financial impact of the alternative scenarios. Primary duties were to be the intermediary between the consultants, Commission, the utilities, and other parties; to conduct review sessions on the consultant's work; and to evaluate the draft and final reports produced by the consultant.
- Project Officer for comprehensive management audits of Kentucky Utilities Company and South Central Bell Telephone Company. The Commission instituted a management audit program, which involved hiring consultants to review the management practices of all the State's major utility companies. The role of the project officer was to ensure satisfactory and timely performance of the proposed work; to attend selected interviews; and to critically review and evaluate analytical results.

Public Utility Economist for the Public Service Commission of Kentucky, 1979-1983. Primary responsibilities included:

- assisting the Commission in implementing procedures and policies to meet the federal mandates of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act (PURPA). This involved performing cost-of-service studies, developing alternative rate design proposals, and testifying on the ratemaking standards in Section 111 of PURPA;
- developing the Commission's regulations pertaining to cogeneration.

Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, for Morehead State University, 1976-1979. Primary teaching responsibilities were investments, introduction to economics, and intermediate macroeconomics. Other teaching responsibilities included managerial economics and computer programming in BASIC. Committee work included membership on the Southern Association Self-Study and the Committee on Student Life.

Resume of Mr. Chuck Buechel

EDUCATION

B.S. in Economics with Honors, University of Kentucky.

M.A. in Economics, University of Kentucky.

Ph.D. Candidate, University of Kentucky

EXHIBIT CDB-2

KRS § 160.325

Baldwin's Kentucky Revised Statutes Annotated Currentness

Title XIII. Education

Chapter 160. School Districts (Refs & Annos)

Boards of Education

➔ **160.325 Mandatory participation in Kentucky Energy Efficiency Program**

- (1) In an effort to reduce the rising energy costs that are straining school budgets, on or before January 1, 2010, each board of education shall enroll in the Kentucky Energy Efficiency Program that is offered by the Kentucky Pollution Prevention Center at the University of Louisville in order to obtain information regarding the potential energy savings for every board-owned and board-operated facility.
- (2) The Kentucky Pollution Prevention Center may prioritize the provision of assistance and development of energy management plans based upon available resources.
- (3) On or before December 1, 2011, and on or before December 1 of each year thereafter, the Kentucky Pollution Prevention Center shall file a report for the preceding fiscal year with the Governor's Office of Energy Policy and the Legislative Research Commission. The report shall include:
 - (a) The number of boards of education enrolled in the Kentucky Energy Efficiency Program;
 - (b) The status of the development of energy management plans by those boards of education and anticipated savings to be obtained by those plans; and
 - (c) The amount and disposition of grants provided by the Governor's Office of Energy Policy and any state appropriations for support of the Kentucky Energy Efficiency Program.

CREDIT(S)

HISTORY: 2008 c 139, § 16, eff. 7-15-08

KRS § 160.325, KY ST § 160.325

Current through end of 2009 legislation

(C) 2010 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.

END OF DOCUMENT

(c) 2010 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. US Gov. Works.