## BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Columbus

Southern Power Company and Ohio Power

Company for Authority to Establish a

Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section

4928.143, Ohio Revised Code, in the Form of

an Electric Security Plan.

Case Nos. 11-346-EL-SSO

11-348-EL-SSO

In the Matter of the Application of Columbus:

Southern Power Company and Ohio Power

Company for Approval of Certain

Accounting Authority

Case Nos. 11-349-EL-AAM

11-350-EL-AAM

# PREFILED TESTIMONY OF AM M CHOUFIKI PHD

HISHAM M. CHOUEIKI, PH.D., P.E MARKET ANALYSIS & PLANNING DIVISION ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

ZOIZMAY -9 PM 5: 0:

STAFF EX.

May 9, 2012

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a case file document delivered in the regular course of business.

Tachnician Date Processed MAY 0 9 2012

1			I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE
2	<u>EMI</u>	LOYE	<u>R</u>
3	1.	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
4		A.	My name is Hisham M. Choueiki. I am employed by the Public Utilities
5			Commission of Ohio (PUCO or Commission) as a Senior Energy
6			Specialist. My business address is 180 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio
7			43215.
8			
9	<u>ACA</u>	DEMI	C BACKGROUND AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
10	2.	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND
11			PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.
12		A.	I am a Registered Professional Engineer in Ohio. I hold a Bachelor of
13			Science, a Master of Science, and a Philosophy Doctorate in Industrial and
14			Systems Engineering, all from The Ohio State University (OSU).
15			
16			I currently serve as a Senior Energy Specialist in the Planning and Market
17			Analysis Division in the Energy and Environment Department at the Public
18			Utilities Commission of Ohio.
19			
20			I started my career in government regulation as a Graduate Researcher at
21			the National Regulatory Research Institute while attending graduate school
22			at OSU. My tenure at the PUCO commenced when I joined the Forecasting

Division as a Senior Utility Rate Analyst. I was later promoted to a Utility Rate Analyst Manager, an Energy Specialist, and finally to my current position. Between 1996 and 1998, I was on sabbatical from the PUCO, and was a Visiting Assistant Professor in the College of Engineering and Petroleum at Kuwait University where I taught operations research, design of experiments, and forecast modeling, and was also an energy consultant for the Kuwaiti government.

At the PUCO, I have contributed to numerous rule-making proceedings in gas, electric, and telephone, co-authored several energy forecasting and telecommunications reports, lectured at the PUCO and at national and international technical conferences in the areas of forecast modeling, design of experiments, and artificial neural networks, and have published in peer-reviewed engineering journals.

- 3. Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE SOME OF YOUR PRESENT RESPONSIBILITIES AT THE PUCO.
- A. I am a technical/policy advisor to PUCO Commissioners and Senior Staff.

  I have several other major responsibilities; including a) the development of
  empirically valid, and logically consistent, short-term and long-term
  analytical forecasting models for assessing and characterizing the behavior
  of energy and economic systems in utility service areas in Ohio, and in the

1			United States, and b) the review of the long-term forecast reports of		
2	electric distribution utilities in Ohio. I currently serve as a member of the				
3	Staff Steering Committee in the Organization of PJM States, Inc. (OPSI),				
4	and the co-chair of the Staff Modeling Work Group in the Eastern				
5			Interconnect States Planning Council (EISPC). I also serve as a reviewer		
6			for several engineering journals; including IEEE Transactions on Power		
7			Systems and IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks.		
8					
9	4.	Q.	HAVE YOU TESTIFIED IN PREVIOUS CASES AT THE PUCO?		
10		A.	Yes, I have testified in long-term forecast hearings, telecommunications		
11			alternative regulation hearings, telecommunications merger hearings, and,		
12			more recently, in 10-388-EL-SSO.		
13					
14	SCOI	PE OF	<u>restimony</u>		
15	5.	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF FILING THIS TESTIMONY?		
16		A.	Two issues will be addressed in my testimony:		
17			1. I will be deriving Reliability Pricing Model-based (RPM-based)		
18			capacity component charges that staff witness Johnson will use in		
19			developing his retail Market Rate Offer (MRO) for the PJM delivery		

years 2012/2013, 2013/2014, and 2014/2015.

1			2. If the Commission finds in Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC that the
2			prevailing RPM capacity rates during the June 1, 2012 - May 31,
3			2015 period are non-compensatory, I will derive alternate capacity
4			component charges that the Commission may wish to consider when
5			evaluating the MRO price test results.
6	6.	Q.	WHAT SUMMARY TABLES WILL YOU BE SPONSORING IN YOUR
7			TESTIMONY?
8		A.	HMC-1 and HMC-2.
9			II. RPM-BASED CAPACITY COMPONENT CHARGES
10	7.	Q.	HOW DID AEP-OHIO PROPOSE TO ESTIMATE THE CAPACITY
11			COMPONENT CHARGE IN ITS MRO?
12		A.	In her retail MRO development, AEP-Ohio witness Thomas states that the
13			capacity component charge would be established based on the rate
14			supported by AEP-Ohio in Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC; namely a fully
15			embedded cost of \$343.98/MW-day¹ (or \$355.72/MW-day after losses have
16			been included).
17			
18	8.	Q.	IN YOUR OPINION, IS THE CAPACITY CHARGE PROPOSED IN
19			CASE NO. 10-2929-EL-UNC A MARKET-BASED RATE?

Direct Testimony of Laura J. Thomas Testimony, page 15.

1		A.	No, it is not. The capacity charge derived in the development of Ms.
2			Thomas's Competitive Benchmark Prices is cost-based.
3			
4	9.	Q.	IN YOUR OPINION, IS IT REASONABLE TO USE A COST-BASED
5			CAPACITY COMPONENT CHARGE IN A RETAIL MRO
6			DEVELOPMENT?
7		A.	In general, it is not <sup>2</sup> . To the extent there is a transparent forward capacity
8			price available in the market, that price should be used in the derivation of a
9			capacity component charge that would then be included in a proposed retail
10			MRO. This logic is no different than the use of the Simple Swap proposed
11			by Ms. Thomas in the determination of an energy component charge in
12			AEP-Ohio's proposed retail MRO <sup>3</sup> .
13			
14	10.	Q.	FOR THE PERIOD OF INTEREST IN THIS CASE (JUNE 1, 2012 –
15			MAY 31, 2015), ARE THERE TRANSPARENT FORWARD CAPACITY
16			PRICES AVAILABLE IN THE PJM FOOTPRINT?
17		A.	Yes, there are4. AEP-Ohio belongs to a region that is often referred to in
18			the PJM footprint as the "unconstrained" region or "RTO" region. The

Two exceptions to this response are: a Commission Finding that RPM-based capacity charges are not compensatory for AEP-Ohio or a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Order in Docket No. ER-11-2183 (the 205 filing) or Docket No. EL-11-32 (the 206 filing) approving a cost-based capacity charge for AEP-Ohio.

Direct Testimony of Laura J. Thomas Testimony, page 12.

http://www.pjm.com/markets-and-operations/rpm/rpm-auction-user-info.aspx#Item08.

2 and 2014/2015 delivery years 5 are \$16.73/MW-Day, \$27.86/MW-Day6, 3 and \$125.99/MW-day7, respectively. 4 5 11. Q. HAVE YOU DERIVED A CAPACITY COMPONENT CHARGE FOR 6 EVERY DELIVERY YEAR TO BE USED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF 7 THE RETAIL MRO IN STAFF WITNESS JOHNSON'S TESTIMONY? 8 A. Yes, I have. The derivations of all capacity component charges are 9 summarized in HMC-1. A capacity component charge for the 2012/2013 10 delivery year that would be billed with every MW-hour of energy, for 11 example, is computed by dividing the RPM capacity clearing price 12 (\$16.73/MW-day) by the product of 24 (24 hours in a day) and an estimate of AEP-Ohio's load factor8. The net result is a capacity component charge 13 14 of \$1.08/MW-hour9. Using the same arithmetic, the capacity component 15 charges for the 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 delivery years are \$1.80/MW-16 hour and \$8.13/MW-hour, respectively.

capacity clearing prices in the RTO region for the 2012/2013, 2013/2014,

A delivery year commences on June 1<sup>st</sup> and concludes on May 31<sup>st</sup> of the following year. For example, the 2012/2013 delivery year commences on June 1, 2012 and concludes on May 31, 2013.

This is preliminary as only the first incremental auction has occurred for the 2013/2014 delivery year.

This is preliminary as none of the three incremental auctions have occurred yet for the 2014/2015 delivery year.

AEP-Ohio's load factor is estimated at 64.54% (See HMC-2 for derivation).

<sup>9</sup> \$1.08/MW-hour = (\$16.73/MW-day)/(24 hours/day x 0.6454).

1			
2	12	Q.	ARE THERE RPM-BASED CAPACITY PRICES FOR THE DELIVERY
3			YEAR IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE CONCLUSION OF THE
4			PROPOSED ESP (i.e. THE 2015/2016 DELIVERY YEAR)?
5		A.	Not at this time, but prices will be available on May 18, 2012. The PJM-
6			administered Base Residual Auction (BRA) for the 2015/2016 delivery
7			year commenced on May 7, 2012. The auction will conclude on May 11.
8			The PJM Independent Market Monitor (IMM) will review all results during
9			the week of May 14. The results will be disclosed publicly by PJM on May
0			18 (after market closing).
1			
12			III. CAPACITY CHARGES UNDER THE FRR CONSTRUCT
13	BAC	KGRO	UND ON THE FRR CONSTRUCT
4	13.	Q.	HOW DOES AEP-OHIO MEET PJM'S RESERVE MARGIN
15			REQUIREMENT?
6		A.	For the purpose of satisfying PJM's reserve margin requirement, AEP-Ohio
17			operates under the Fixed Resource Requirement (FRR) construct10. The
8			FRR construct is an alternative (to RPM) available for Load Serving
9			Entities (LSEs) in the PJM footprint for procuring capacity.
20	14.	Q.	IS A COMPETITIVE RETAIL ELECTRIC SERVICE (CRES)
21			PROVIDER IN THE AEP-OHIO SERVICE AREA ABLE TO PROCURE

PJM Reliability Assurance Agreement (RAA), Schedule 8.1.

		ITS CAPACITY OBLIGATION FROM THE RPM MARKET DURING
		THE PERIOD JUNE 1, 2012 TO MAY 31, 2015?
	A.	Unless a CRES provider opted out of FRR in March of 2009, 2010, or
		2011, it will have to procure its capacity obligation during the upcoming
		ESP period from AEP-Ohio. However, it should also be stated that AEP-
		Ohio has committed generation resources to all its standard service offer
		customers and to all CRES providers in its service area that had not opted
		out of the FRR for the entire upcoming ESP period. Therefore, regardless
		what decisions were made in the past three years by either AEP-Ohio or
		CRES providers in AEP-Ohio's service area, the latter are "captive buyers"
		of capacity and the former is a "captive seller11" of capacity.
<u>CAP</u>	ACITY	CHARGES UNDER THE FRR CONSTRUCT
15.	Q.	UNDER THE FRR CONSTRUCT, WHAT CAN AN FRR ENTITY
		CHARGE ITS RETAIL COMPETITORS FOR CAPACITY?
	A.	According to Schedule 8.1, Section D, paragraph 8, of the RAA, a state that
		has implemented retail choice has the ability to set the capacity rate that an
		FRR Entity will charge its retail competitors under a "state compensation
		mechanism". To the extent there is no capacity compensation mechanism
	committe	EP-Ohio power plants that are listed on the PJM website for a specific delivery year have already d to FRR during that particular delivery year. For example, the 2012/2013 delivery year committed to the PJM website at: http://www.pim.com/markets-and-

All AEP-Ohio power plants that are listed on the PJM website for a specific delivery year have already been committed to FRR during that particular delivery year. For example, the 2012/2013 delivery year committed power plants are listed on the PJM website at: <a href="http://www.pjm.com/markets-and-operations/rpm/~/media/markets-ops/rpm/rpm-auction-info/627038-frr-resources-2012-2013.ashx">http://www.pjm.com/markets-and-operations/rpm/~/media/markets-ops/rpm/rpm-auction-info/627038-frr-resources-2012-2013.ashx</a>.

1			available in a particular retail choice state, the default capacity charge is the
2			RPM clearing price in the unconstrained region.
3			
4			Additionally, the FRR entity, as an alternative to the RPM clearing price in
5			the unconstrained region, may apply under Section 205 of the Federal
6			Power Act for permission from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
7			(FERC) to charge a cost-based capacity rate that is found to be just and
8			reasonable12.
9			
10	16.	Q.	IS THERE A STATE COMPENSATION MECHANISM FOR
11			CAPACITY IN PLACE FOR THE AEP-OHIO SERVICE AREA?
12		A.	Yes, there is. In its March 7, 2012 Order in Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC,
13			the Commission set an interim two-tier rate13 for capacity in the AEP-Ohio
14			service area as follows: The 2011/2012 RPM clearing price of
15			\$116.15/MW-day for tier-one customers and \$255/MW-day for tier-two
16			customers. This interim rate, per the March 7th Order, is in effect until
17			May 31, 2012, at which time the rate for capacity will revert on June 1,
18			2012 to the 2012/2013 RPM clearing price14 for all customers.
19			

FERC will make that Finding.

For the details, please see the March 7, 2012 PUCO Order in Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC.

As mentioned earlier in my testimony, the RPM rate effective June 1, 2012 is \$16.73/MW-day.

1	17.	Q.	WHAT WOULD THE \$116.15/MW-DAY AND \$255/MW-DAY
2			INTERIM CAPACITY RATES TRANSLATE TO IN TERMS OF \$/MW-
3			HOUR CHARGES FOR THE PURPOSE OF AN MRO PRICE TEST?
4		A.	Using the same methodology and load factor assumption described earlier
5			in my testimony, the \$116.15/MW-day and \$255/MW-day capacity rates
6			translate to capacity component charges of \$7.50/MW-hour and
7			\$16.46/MW-hour, respectively.
8			
9	18.	Q.	DOES THE STAFF HAVE A POSITION ON WHAT AEP-OHIO
10			SHOULD BE CHARGING CRES PROVIDERS FOR CAPACITY
11			DURING THE JUNE 1, 2012 - MAY 31, 2015 PERIOD?
12		A.	In general, Staff's position is to charge CRES providers the prevailing RPM
13			rate in the unconstrained region of PJM15. If the Commission finds in
14			Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC that the prevailing RPM rates during the
15			proposed ESP period are not compensatory, Staff's recommendation would
16			then be for AEP-Ohio to charge CRES providers the capacity rate
17			developed by Staff witness Medine 16 - i.e. \$146.41/MW-day.
18			

Two exceptions to this response are: a Commission Finding that RPM-based capacity charges are not compensatory for AEP-Ohio or a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Order in Docket No.ER-11-2183 (the 205 filing) or Docket No.EL-11-32 (the 206 filing) approving a cost-based capacity charge for AEP-Ohio.

Exhibit ESM-4, Testimony of Emily S. Medine, on behalf of Staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, filed on May 7, 2012.

1	19.	Q.	IF THE COMMISSION FINDS THAT THE PREVAILING RPM RATES
2			ARE NON-COMPENSATORY DURING THE PROPOSED ESP PERIOD
3			AND AGREES WITH STAFF'S CAPACITY RATE ESTIMATION IN
4			CASE NO. 10-2929-EL-UNC, HOW WOULD YOU DERIVE A
5			CAPACITY COMPONENT CHARGE FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE
6			MRO PRICE TEST?
7		A,	The same methodology described earlier in my testimony for deriving the
8			RPM-based capacity component charges may be used to derive a state
9			compensation mechanism-based capacity component charge.
10			
11	20.	Q.	WHAT WOULD A \$146.41/MW-DAY CAPACITY RATE TRANSLATE
11	-0.	٧,	
12	20.	ν.	TO IN TERMS OF A \$/MW-HOUR CAPACITY COMPONENT
	20.	V.	TO IN TERMS OF A \$/MW-HOUR CAPACITY COMPONENT CHARGE?
12		A.	
12 13		-	CHARGE?
12 13 14		-	CHARGE? Using the same arithmetic and load factor assumption described earlier in
12 13 14 15		-	CHARGE? Using the same arithmetic and load factor assumption described earlier in my testimony, the \$146.41/MW-day translates to a capacity component
12 13 14 15 16		-	CHARGE? Using the same arithmetic and load factor assumption described earlier in my testimony, the \$146.41/MW-day translates to a capacity component

<sup>\$9.45/</sup>MW-hour = (\$146.41/MW-day)/(24 hours/day x 0.6454).

1 A. It is my recommendation that RPM-based capacity component charges be 2 derived and, accordingly, used for the purpose of conducting an MRO price 3 test. I recommend the use of the results derived in HMC-1: \$1.08/MW-4 hour for the 2012/2013 delivery year, \$1.80/MW-hour for the 2013/2014 5 delivery year, and \$8.13/MW-hour for the 2014/2015 delivery year. 6 7 To the extent the Commission finds in Case No. 10-2929 EL-UNC that the 8 RPM clearing prices in the unconstrained region are non-compensatory to 9 AEP-Ohio during the June 1, 2012 to May 31, 2015 period, Staff 10 recommends the use of a capacity component charge of \$9.45/MW-hour for 11 the entire three-year ESP period based on the analysis results of Staff 12 witnesses Medine in Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC. 13 14 22. Q. Doe this conclude your testimony? 15 Yes, it does. However, I reserve the right to submit supplemental testi-A. 16 mony as described herein, as new information subsequently becomes avail-

able or in response to positions taken by other parties.

### PROOF OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing Prefiled Testimony of HIisham M. Choueiki submitted on behalf of the Staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, was served via electronic mail, upon the following parties of record, this 9<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2012.

Werner L. Margard III
Assistant Attorney General

#### Parties of Record:

tsiwo@bricker.com dclark1@aep.com grady@occ.state.oh.us keith.nusbaum@snrdenton.com kpkreider@kmklaw.com mjsatterwhite@aep.com ned.ford@fuse.net pfox@hilliardohio.gov ricks@ohanet.org stnourse@aep.com cathy@theoec.org dsullivan@nrdc.org aehaedt@jonesday.com dakutik@jonesday.com haydenm@firstenergycorp.com dconway@porterwright.cmo ilang@clafee.com

cmiller@szd.com
ahaque@szd.com
gdunn@szd.com
mhpetricoff@vorys.com
lmcbride@calfee.com
talexander@calfee.com

etter@occ.state.oh.us

trent@theoeg.com nolan@theoec.org gpoulos@enernoc.com emma.hand@snrdenton.com

doug.bonner@snrdenton.com clinton.vince@snrdenton.com

sam@mwncmh.com dstahl@eimerstahl.com aaragona@eimerstahl.com ssolberg@eimerstahl.com tsantarelli@elpc.org

<u>callwein@wamenergylaw.com</u> <u>malina@wexlerwalker.com</u>

jkooper@hess.com kguerry@hess.com

afreifeld@viridityenergy.com swolfe@viridityenergy.com korenergy@insight.rr.com

sasloan@aep.com

dane.stinson@baileycavalierie.com

cendsley@ofbp.org

jeanne.kingery@duke-energy.com rsugarman@kegler.brown.com asimhaque@icemiller.com small@occ.state.oh.us cynthia.a.fonner@constellation.com david.fein@constellation.com dorothy.corbett@duke-energy.com amy.spiller@duke-energy.com dboehm@bkllawfirm.com mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com tobrien@bricker.com ibentine@cwslaw.com myurick@cwslaw.com zkravtiz@cwslaw.com <u>jejad</u>win@aep.com msmalz@ohiopovertylaw.org imaskovyak@ohiopovertylaw.org bakahn@vorys.com gary.a.jeffries@dom.com stephen.chriss@wal-mart.com dmeyere@kmklaw.com holly@raysmithlaw.com barthroyer@aol.com philip.sineneng@thompsonhine.com carolyn,flahive@thompsonhine.com terrance.mebane@thompsonhine.com drinebolt@ohioparterns.corg

gregory.dunn@icemiller.com christopher.miller@icemiller.com bpbarger@bcslawyers.com yalami@aep.com todonnell@bricker.com cmontgomery@bricker.com lmalister@bricker.com mwarnock@bricker.com gthomas@gtpowergroup.com wmassey@cov.com henryeckhart@aol.com laurac@chappelleconsulting.net whit@shitt-sturtevant.com thompson@whitt-sturtevant.com sandry.grace@exeloncorp.com joliker@mwncomh.com fdarr@mwncmh.com jestes@skaddenc.om paul.wight@skadden.com smhoward@vorys.com mjsettineri@vorys.cmo lkalepsclark@vorvs.com cmooney2@columbus.rr.com

# HMC-1 Staff's Proposed Capacity Component Charges in AEP's MRO

### PJM RPM BRA

	RTO
	Clearing
	Price
	(\$/MW-
Planning Period	day)
Planning Period June 2012 - May 2013	<b>day)</b> \$16.73
	<del>+</del>

Load Factor	64.54%
P	

Source: HMC-2

Period	Capacity Component Charges		
(delivery year)	(\$/MW-hour)		
Jun 2012 - May 2013	\$1.08		
Jun 2013 - May 2014	\$1.80		
Jun 2014 - May 2015	\$8.13		

HMC-2
Staff's Estimation of AEP-Ohio's Average Load Factor

		Form FE-D1	Form FE-D3	
Year	COMPANY	Net Energy for Load	Non-Coincident Summer Peak	Load Factor (L.F.)
2012	CSP	22,649,576	4260	
2012	OPC	29,094,828	4875	
2012	AEP-Ohio	51,744,404	9,135	64.49%
2013	CSP	22,768,878	4289	
2013	OPC	29,189,425	4895	
2013	AEP-Ohio	51,958,303	9,184	64.58%
2014	CSP	22,728,485	4294	
2014	OPC	29,186,021	4894	
2014	AEP-Ohio	51,914,506	9,188	64.50%
2015	CSP	22,616,751	4260	
2015	OPC	29,148,699	4891	
2015	AEP-Ohio	51,765,450	9,151	64.58%

Avg L.F. (over all four years) = 64.54%

Source: 2011 CSP/OP Long Term Forecast Report to the PUCO