RECEIVED CASE MANAGEMENT

JAN 28 2019

BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES TRENTON, NJ

PHIL MURPHY Governor

SHEILA OLIVER Lt. Governor



TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625

RECEIVED
MAIL ROOM

JAN 28 2019

BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES
TRENTON, NJ

STEFANIE A. BRAND Director

January 28, 2019

Via Hand Delivery and Electronic Mail

Honorable Aida Camacho-Welch, Secretary New Jersey Board of Public Utilities 44 South Clinton Avenue, 3rd Floor, Suite 314 P.O. Box 350 Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0350

Re: I/M/O the Verified Petition of Jersey Central Power and Light Company Seeking Review and Approval of the Veterans' Organization Service Application and Tariff BPU Docket No. ER19010013

Dear Secretary Camacho-Welch:

Please accept this letter (original and 10 copies) setting forth the position of the Division of the Rate Counsel ("Rate Counsel") in the above-referenced matter. Jersey Central Power and Light Company ("JCP&L" or "the Company") seeks review and approval of its proposed tariff in accord with the requirements of N.J.S.A. 48:2-21.41 (also referred to as P.L. 2018, c.77), which requires public utilities to charge residential rates for service provided at property where veterans' organizations operate, as long as the residential rate is lower than the commercial rate which was applied to the property prior to enactment of the statute.

amg list copeed

The Governor and Legislature recognized the sacrifice and service of the members of the United States Armed Forces and tried to provide benefits to Veteran's Organizations by enacting this statute. However, the cost of any program that provides credits to one particular group of customers could ultimately be passed on to the remaining ratepayers of the affected utilities. Low and moderate income residential customers, other non-profits, and businesses that may be struggling economically will all have the additional burden of paying for the Veteran's Organizations' tariff. Utility ratepayers that are having difficulties paying their own bills will have to shoulder these additional burdens, although they may not directly serve them or their community. Therefore Rate Counsel believes that the economic impact of the Veteran's Organization credit should be kept at a minimum while still fulfilling the intent of the statute.

The statute requires electric and gas public utilities that provide services to facilities where Veteran's Organizations operate to charge the residential rate, if the residential rate is lower than the commercial rate that the veteran's groups are currently under. The Company's petition seeks approval for tariff changes that outline an application process and reflect the requirements of the statute. However, the Company is also requesting: 1) deferred accounting and full recovery of its direct administrative costs in its next base rate case; 2) recovery of the carrying charges of those expenses at its current weighted cost of capital, as approved in the company's last base rate case; 3) and, also recovery of any loss of distribution revenues as a result of providing the residential rate on Veterans Organizations' accounts. (Company Petition, para. 8-11). Rate Counsel does not have any objection to the Company's proposed tariff changes at this time. Our concerns regarding cost recovery are detailed below.

Direct Deferred Costs

The Company, in its petition seeks approval to "hire one additional employee at the cost of \$40,000" and possibly additional costs to process applications and review annually the eligible customers' bills to determine the appropriate credits that may be due the Veterans Organizations. (Petition, para. 7). The Company is also requesting to defer incurred administrative, or what is referenced as "direct" costs which it states are "associated with the implementation of the requirements" of the statute. (Petition, para. 8). Rate Counsel notes that not all utilities have estimated a dollar amount of administrative costs associated with implementing the veteran's organization tariff and some state that the direct costs may be minimal¹. At present, it is unknown how many Veterans' Organizations will participate in the program and the dollar value of any potential savings. Therefore, any analysis of the prudency of the cost of one utility's program compared to another will be difficult to determine. Additionally, the credit given to the Veteran's Organization may be negligible in comparison to the \$40,000 for a single full-time employee who may not even be needed to implement the statute. Therefore, Rate Counsel questions the prudency of the proposed estimated direct costs of the Company especially considering that the calculation will be conducted on an annual basis.

-

¹ See In the Matter of South Jersey Gas Company's Request for Deferred Accounting Authority for Costs and Lost Revenue Related to Veterans' Organizations Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 48:2-21.41 and Associated Tariff Changes, BPU Docket No. GR19010018; In the Matter of Elizabethtown Gas Company's Request for Deferred Accounting Authority for Costs and Lost Revenue Related to Veterans' Organizations Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 48:2-21.41 and Associated Tariff Changes, BPU Docket No: GR19010017; In the Matter of New Jersey Natural Gas Company's Request for Deferred Accounting Authority for Costs and Lost Revenue Related to Veteran's Organizations Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 48:2-21.41 and Associated Tariff Changes, BPU Docket No. GR19010016; In the Matter of Rockland Electric Company's Request for Deferred Accounting Authority for Costs and Lost Revenue Related to the Veterans Organizations Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 48:2-21.41 and Associated Tariff Changes, BPU Docket No. ER19010046; In the Matter of a Request by Atlantic City Electric Company for Approval of Tariff Pages Related to the Implementation of Veterans' Organizations Rates Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 48:2-21.41 and Deferred Accounting Authority for Cost and Lost Revenue Related Thereto, BPU Docket No. ER19010062.

Rate Counsel asserts that the Board should not allow the Company, or any utility, to defer direct costs and create a regulatory liability for ratepayers where \$40,000 or more in direct costs could be found to be imprudent. Past precedent set by the Board of Public Utilities is clear in that:

It is a long-standing Board policy that issues of expense which are related to base rate proceedings are not normally subject to review in other than a base rate proceeding. To allow such review outside of a base rate proceeding would result in almost continuous litigation, where one party or another would claim that rates should either increase or decrease depending on spot observations of particular expenses. The Board and courts have wisely found that to review specific cost items would be counterproductive, and that only in the confines of the general base rate case, when all of the Company's expenses are reviewed, should such base rate adjustments be counted. <u>I/M/O the Petition of Atlantic City Electric</u>, BPU Docket No. ER97020105, Initial Decision, (12/23/1997) at p.13.

The Board should not allow deferral of costs associated with the new statute at this time. This review should be undertaken as part of the complete examination of the Company's expenses during its next base rate case as set forth in N.J.S.A. 48:2-21.25. Rate Counsel recommends that as part of the Company's next base rate case, the Board should review the direct costs, the number of participants charged the new rate, the amount of actual charges that were paid by Veteran's Organizations under the new tariff, and any other relevant data to determine the prudency of the Company's expenses. The Board can *only* determine whether the direct costs are prudent and whether the Company is entitled to recovery against the larger backdrop of the Company's full financial picture in its subsequent base rate case. A mandate from the Legislature to charge certain organizations under the residential rate does not exempt the Company from the legal standard of first showing prudency prior to recovery.

Carrying Charges

Rate Counsel opposes the Company's ability to recover the direct costs carrying charges at its present weighted cost of capital. At this time, the estimated costs are speculative and determining that the Company is entitled to recovery of carrying charges would be inappropriate given that the direct costs are still subject to a prudency review.

Distribution "Lost" Revenues

Rate Counsel is opposed to the Company's request for recovery of distribution "lost" revenues associated with complying with the statute since it is not certain at this time whether any of the utilities affected by the statute will in fact lose revenues.

The statute states that the utility will provide services at the residential rate without mention of the utility's ability to recovery any assumed difference in revenue. See N.J.S.A. 48:2-21. First, since this is a new tariff, the utility cannot be certain how many participants will apply and qualify. Second, Rate Counsel characterizes the revenue difference as "assumed" since it is impossible to know if Veteran's Organizations will use more or less energy as a result of approval for the veteran's tariff. Those changes in behavior associated with energy use would make any mathematical calculation of the difference between residential and commercial bills inaccurate since the customers would now have the knowledge that they are in a new rate class. Therefore, just comparing the bills using the residential and commercial tariff is not enough information to capture a potential loss of revenue.

Additionally, the legislation does not contemplate lost revenue to the utilities. Therefore, although the utilities should not be permitted to defer direct costs and any perceived difference in revenue associated with the Veteran's Organization tariff, the

Honorable Aida Camacho-Welch, Secretary

New Jersey Board of Public Utilities

January 28, 2019

Page 6

Board can review any expenses and potential losses as part of the Company's next base

rate case.

Conclusion

Rate Counsel maintains that direct costs associated with complying with the

statute should not be incurred as a regulatory liability. Additionally, we are opposed to

permitting the Company to recover any carrying costs associated with the direct costs

since a prudency review is necessary. If direct costs fall into the test year of the

Company's next base rate case, we reserve the right to perform a prudency review of

those direct costs in light of the number of participants in the Veteran's Organizations'

tariff and other data provided in the Company's next base rate case.

Finally, Rate Counsel is opposed to allowing the Company to defer any "lost"

distribution revenue since customer behavior regarding energy use can be influenced as a

result of approval for the Veteran's Organization tariff therefore making any perceived

difference an unmeasurable variable, and the language of the statute does not include a

mechanism for utility recovery of revenues.

Respectfully submitted,

STEEANIE A. BRAND

DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF RATE COUNSEL

By:

James Glassen, Esq.

Maura Caroselli, Esq.

Assistant Deputies Rate Counsel

Service List

c:

I/M/O THE VERIFIED PETITION OF JERSEY CENTRAL POWER & LIGHT COMPANY SEEKING REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE VETERANS' ORGANIZATION SERVICE APPLICATION AND TARIFF

BPU Dkt. No.: ER1910013

Stefanie Brand, Director Division of Rate Counsel 140 E. Front St., 4th floor P O Box 003 Trenton, NJ 08625

Diane Schulze, Esquire Division of Rate Counsel 140 E. Front St., 4th floor P O Box 003 Trenton, NJ 08625

Felicia Thomas Friel, Esquire Division of Rate Counsel 140 E. Front St., 4th floor P O Box 003 Trenton, NJ 08625

Celeste Clark
Division of Rate Counsel
140 E. Front St., 4th floor
P O Box 003
Trenton, NJ 08625

James O'Toole Jersey Central Power & Light Co. 300 Madison Avenue, P O Box 1911 Morristown, NJ 07962

Caroline Vachier, Esquire Division of Law 124 Halsey Street, P O Box 45029 Newark, NJ 07101

Alex Moreau, Esquire Division of Law 124 Halsey Street, P O Box 45029 Newark, NJ 07101

Andrea Reid NJ Bd. of Public Utility 44 So. Clinton Avenue, Ste. 314 P O Box 350 Trenton, NJ 08625

Aida Camacho Welch NJ Bd. of Public Utility 44 So. Clinton Avenue, Stc. 314 P O Box 350 Trenton, NJ 08625 Brian O. Lipman, Esquire Division of Rate Counsel 140 E. Front St., 4th floor P O Box 003 Trenton, NJ 08625

James Glassen, Esquire Division of Rate Counsel 140 E. Front St., 4th floor P O Box 003 Trenton, NJ 08625

Lisa Gurkas
Division of Rate Counsel
140 E. Front St., 4th floor
P O Box 003
Trenton, NJ 08625

Mark Mader Jersey Central Power & Light Co. 300 Madison Avenue Morristown, NJ 07962

Carol Pittavino FirstEnergy Service Company 800 Cabin Hill Drive Greensburg, Pa 15601

Geoffrey Gersten, Esquire Division of Law 124 Halsey Street, P O Box 45029 Newark, NJ 07101

Timothy Oberleiton, Esquire Division of Law 124 Halsey Street, P O Box 45029 Newark, NJ 07101

Brian Hamilton NJ Bd. of Public Utility 44 So. Clinton Avenue, Ste. 314 P O Box 350 Trenton, NJ 08625

Paul Flanagan, Executive Director NJ Bd. of Public Utility 44 So. Clinton Avenue, Ste. 314 P O Box 350 Trenton, NJ 08625 Ami Morita, Esquire Division of Rate Counsel 140 E. Front St., 4th floor P O Box 003 Trenton, NJ 08625

Maura Caroselli, Esquire Division of Rate Counsel 140 E. Front St., 4th floor P O Box 003 Trenton, NJ 08625

Debora Layugan
Division of Rate Counsel
140 E. Front St., 4th floor
P O Box 003
Trenton, NJ 08625

Lauren Lepkoski, Esq. FirstEnergy Service Company 2800 Pottsville Pike Reading, Pa 19612

Patricia Krogman, Esquire Division of Law 124 Halsey Street, P O Box 45029 Newark, NJ 07101

Andrea Hart, Esquire
NJ Bd. of Public Utility
44 So. Clinton Avenue, Ste. 314
P O Box 350
Trenton, NJ 08625

Renee Greenberg, Esquire Division of Law 124 Halsey Street, P O Box 45029 Newark, NJ 07101

Thomas Walker NJ Bd. of Public Utility 44 So. Clinton Avenue, Ste. 314 P O Box 350 Trenton, NJ 08625

Benjamin Witherell NJ Bd. of Public Utility 44 So. Clinton Avenue, Ste. 314 P O Box 350 Trenton, NJ 08625 Stacy Peterson NJ Bd. of Public Utility 44 So. Clinton Avenue, Ste. 314 P O Box 350 Trenton, NJ 08625

Joseph Snow, AAG Division of Law 124 Halsey Street, P O Box 45029 Newark, NJ 07101

Kevin Nedza NJ Bd. of Public Utility 44 So. Clinton Avenue, Ste. 314 P O Box 350 Trenton, NJ 08625

Chance Lykins NJ Bd. of Public Utility 44 So. Clinton Avenue, Ste. 314 P O Box 350 Trenton, NJ 08625 Bethany Rocque Romaine, Esquire NJ Bd. of Public Utility 44 So. Clinton Avenue, Ste. 314 P O Box 350 Trenton, NJ 08625

Stephen Luma NJ Bd. of Public Utility 44 So. Clinton Avenue, Ste. 314 P O Box 350 Trenton, NJ 08625

Megan Lupo NJ Bd. of Public Utility 44 So. Clinton Avenue, Ste. 314 P O Box 350 Trenton, NJ 08625

Cindy Bianco NJ Bd. of Public Utility 44 So. Clinton Avenue, Ste. 314 P O Box 350 Trenton, NJ 08625 Noreen Giblin, Esquire NJ Bd. of Public Utility 44 So. Clinton Avenue, Ste. 314 P O Box 350 Trenton, NJ 08625

Paul Lupo NJ Bd. of Public Utility 44 So. Clinton Avenue, Ste. 314 P O Box 350 Trenton, NJ 08625

Suzanne Patnaude NJ Bd. of Public Utility 44 So. Clinton Avenue, Ste. 314 P O Box 350 Trenton, NJ 08625