BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

)

)

)

In the Matter of the Commission's Review) of Customer Rate Impacts from Ohio **Power Company's Transition to Market Based Rates**

Case No. 13-1530-EL-UNC

AEP OHIO COMMENTS

In adopting the modified Electric Security Plan for Ohio Power Company d/b/a AEP Ohio ("AEP Ohio" or the "Company") in Case Nos. 11-346-EL-SSO et al., the Commission incorporated three energy-only auctions during the ESP term: (1) a 10% energy-only auction initially; (2) a 60% energy-only auction starting in June 2014; and (3) a 100% energy-only auction from January to May 2015. As part of the Opinion and Order in the 11-346 cases, the Commission (at 15-16) directed the attorney examiners "to establish a new docket within 90 days of this opinion and order and issue an entry establishing a procedural schedule to allow Staff and any interested party to consider means to mitigate any potential adverse rate impacts upon rates being set by auction." This passage from the 11-346 decision is the basis for initiation of this docket and it governs the scope and purpose of this inquiry.

The June 27, 2013 Entry initiating this docket uses the potentially broader – but ambiguous – concept of "the shift to market based rates." But the Entry is necessarily limited to the scope of the 11-346 Opinion and Order and must be interpreted and applied in a consistent manner, as it is merely implementing that decision (which is final and being reviewed by the Supreme Court). In a similar vein, it must be understood that the inquiry here can only relate to the current ESP term and cannot relate to the SSO plan that will commence in June of 2015, which itself will establish rates going forward from

that date. No firm presumptions or assumptions can be made about the next SSO rate plan, how the competitive bidding process will work post-June 2015, or the rates to be paid by any particular customer group. Thus, the proper scope of this inquiry relates to the rate impact of rates being set by auction under the 2012-2015 Modified ESP.

In connection with the Modified ESP rates being set by auction, AEP Ohio filed its Application on December 21, 2012 initiating Case No. 12-3254-EL-UNC, following a stakeholder process to gather input regarding the Company's proposals, to propose a competitive bidding process (CBP) for procurement of energy to support its SSO. After the Commission's rehearing decision in 11-346, the Company filed a Supplement to the Application on February 11, 2013 to further address retail rate issues and cost recovery issues related to the energy auctions. As part of the CBP case, the Company has already set forth its rate impact mitigation proposals for the period during this ESP when rates are set by energy auction. The Company's position, as discussed below, covers the four areas raised in the June 27, 2013 Entry in the case at bar: (1) cross subsidies among tariff classes; (2) phase-outs of historic rate design mechanisms; (3) methodologies to transition to market based rates; and (4) potential impacts on high winter usage customers.

In the CBP case, AEP Ohio submitted the testimony of David M. Roush to address rate matters related to the energy-only auctions under the ESP. AEP Ohio witness Roush's direct testimony is attached to these comments as Exhibit A and pertinent excerpts from his cross examination transcripts are attached as Exhibit B. As set forth in Mr. Roush's testimony in the CBP case, AEP Ohio offered three distinct rate

mitigation proposals to address and mitigate the potential impacts of rates being set by auction during the ESP.

First, Mr. Roush pointed out that the overall base generation rate decrease anticipated in January 2015 under the ESP could be in the \$9/MWh range, equating to approximately \$10 savings per month for residential customers using 1,000 kWh of electricity per month. (Ex. A, CBP Roush Direct Test., at 7.) That reduction would be coincident with the period when 100% of SSO energy requirements will be procured through the auction, which itself might otherwise potentially cause the energy portion of customers' electricity bills to increase. As Mr. Roush testified, the combination of these two factors "would be a reasonable transition step towards the expected rates based entirely upon a full requirements auction beginning in June of 2015." (Id.) The same can be said of the larger phase in plan for energy-only auctions adopted by the Commission, since the auction clearing prices (which may be higher than the variable portion of the Company's FAC costs during the same period) would be blended with non-auction energy costs over a period of time in increasing proportions. In other words, this gradualism concept is the natural result of the Commission's decision to incorporate the energy-only auctions in increasing proportions (*i.e.*, 10%, 60% and 100%) over the term of the ESP.

Second, Mr. Roush recommended in the CBP case that the separate OPCo and CSP rate zones be maintained for the FAC through December 2014, leading up to the 100% energy auction in January 2015. (Ex. A, CBP Roush Direct Test., at 9-10.) Specifically, the current differentiation between the rate zones would be maintained during this period, in order to avoid the rate impact of both rate zones being flash-cut to a

uniform auction price. Ex. B, CBP Tr. I, at 111-117.)These first two rate mitigation solutions adequately address the phase-out of historic rate design mechanisms and the elimination of cross subsidies that may exist between the rate classes.

Last but certainly not least, Mr. Roush recommended in the CBP case that the Commission expand the 12% rate cap adopted in the 11-346 decision to include the energy auction rate impacts. (Ex. A, CBP Roush Direct Test., at 11.) To be clear, the 12% rate cap would work the same way it does to the rate impacts currently encompassed: any amounts over the cap would be deferred and collected from all customers, inclusive of carrying charges. (*See* ESP Cases, January 30, 2013 Entry on Rehearing at 40.) As Mr. Roush clarified during cross examination in the CBP case, the mechanics of the proposal are to measure the auction phase-in rider and fixed cost rider relative to the June 2013 FAC rates. (Ex. B, CBP Tr. I, at 160.) Thus, customers would be insulated from significant rate impacts associated not only with the clearing prices for the energy-only auctions, but also from increases in fuel rates during the remainder of the ESP term. It is this third and primary recommendation of AEP Ohio that addresses potential auction rate impacts and provides an adequate transition to market rates during the ESP term.

As Mr. Roush testified, using the 12% rate cap "would further address the concerns raised by the parties with respect to the auction results and is consistent with the Commission's desire to maintain protection for customers from any unforeseen risks that may arise from a developing competitive market, as expressed by the Commission on page 11 of the January 30, 2013 Entry on Rehearing in the Company's ESP." (Ex. A,

CBP Roush Direct Test., at 11.) The passage from the ESP rehearing decision referenced by Mr. Roush's testimony stated as follows:

[C]ustomers still maintain protection from any unforeseen risks that may arise from a developing competitive market by having a reasonably priced SSO plan that caps rate increases at 12 percent. In approving the modified ESP, we struck a balance that guarantees reasonably priced electricity while allowing the markets to develop and customers to see future opportunities to lower their electric costs. The General Assembly has vested the Commission with discretion to make these types of decisions by allowing us to view the entire picture, in the aggregate, as to what the effects of the modified ESP would be, going beyond just the dollars and cents aspect of it.

(*ESP Cases*, January 30, 2013 Entry on Rehearing at 11 (emphasis added).) Thus, as a general matter, the Commission's adoption of the 12% rate cap strikes a balance between transitioning to market rates and ensuring there are no adverse rate impacts. Of course, as it stands now, the FAC is outside the operation of the 12% rate cap. (*Id.* at 40.)

Adopting AEP Ohio's recommendation to incorporate the impacts of setting rates by auction into the existing 12% rate cap is reasonable and logical. In addition to striking a reasonable balance during the transition period, expanding the rate cap to cover auction impacts would implement an auction rate impact solution that is only triggered if necessary. Nobody knows what the clearing prices will be for the energy auctions and designing elaborate solutions in anticipation of certain clearing prices might end up being misguided and unnecessary. Further, if certain customer groups have specific impacts associated with the auction – such as high winter usage customers – they would be protected by the rate cap while other customers that do not need to be protected would not. Exhibit C, attached to these comments, illustrates the rate impact of applying the Company's proposed 12% rate cap using varying auction prices and other stated assumptions. (Ex. C is an excerpt of Attachment 1 to AEP Ohio's response to FES INT-

3-003 in the CBP case, which was IEU Ex. 3 in the CBP case; Ex. C. was served on all parties to the CBP case.)

While other parties may propose more elaborate solutions based on certain assumptions about expected auction clearing prices (all of which are speculative), the simple elegance of the rate cap solution is that it utilizes an existing rate impact threshold determined by the Commission to strike a reasonable balance between moving toward market rates and the long-term benefits to be enjoyed by customers while recognizing the short-term potential need to mitigate rate impacts during the transition period. AEP Ohio recognizes that the clearing prices for the energy auctions may come in higher than the Company's internal variable energy costs, but that contingency should only be mitigated if it creates a significant rate impact. The rate cap solution is only triggered if the rate impact concerns actually materialize and will not operate if the significant rate impacts do not occur. Stated differently, incorporating the impacts of setting rate by auction into the 12% rate cap would rely on the market in the first instance and trigger a regulatory solution only as needed.

Finally in this regard, using the rate cap is practical and efficient. The Company has already developed the systems needed to implement the 12% rate cap and those can be readily adapted to capture the auction rate impacts. By contrast, other rate restructuring solutions may be relatively complex or difficult to administer. Thus, in addition to being simple and effective, the rate cap solution is practical and efficient.

CONCLUSION

As reviewed above in these comments, AEP Ohio has already proposed solutions to address the potential rate impacts of setting rates by auction during the ESP term. If those matters are addressed and decided as part of the CBP case, there is no need to undertake additional remedies in this docket. AEP Ohio reserves the right to file reply comments addressing comments and proposals submitted by Staff and intervenors.

Respectfully submitted,

//s// Steven T. Nourse Steven T. Nourse American Electric Power Service Corporation 1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215 Telephone: (614) 715-1608 Fax: (614) 716-2950 Email: <u>stnourse@aep.com</u>

Counsel for Ohio Power Company

Exhibit A

EXHIBIT NO.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of)	
Ohio Power Company to Establish)	
A Competitive Bidding Process for)	Case No. 12-3254-EL-UNC
Procurement of Energy to Support its)	£
Standard Service Offer)	

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF DAVID M. ROUSH ON BEHALF OF OHIO POWER COMPANY

Filed: June 14, 2013

INDEX TO DIRECT TESTIMONY OF DAVID M. ROUSH

Page No.

1.	Personal Data	.1
2.	Purpose of Testimony	.2
3.	Standard Service Offer	
4.	Base Generation Rates	.5
5.	Auction Phase-In Rider and the Fuel Adjustment Clause	.7
6.	Additional Customer Rate Impact Mitigation	.11

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO DIRECT TESTIMONY OF DAVID M. ROUSH ON BEHALF OF OHIO POWER COMPANY

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS. 1 2 My name is David M. Roush. My business address is 1 Riverside Plaza, Columbus, Ohio Α. 3 43215. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY? 4 **Q**. 5 A. I am employed as Director - Regulated Pricing and Analysis for American Electric Power 6 Service Corporation (AEPSC). a wholly owned subsidiary of American Electric Power Company, Inc. (AEP). AEP is the parent company of Ohio Power Company (OPCo). 7 8 referred to as AEP Ohio or the Company. 9 PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL **Q**. 10 **BACKGROUND?** 11 I graduated from The Ohio State University (OSU) in 1989 with a Bachelor of Science A. 12 degree in mathematics with a computer and information science minor. In 1999, I earned 13 a Master of Business Administration degree from The University of Dayton. I have 14 completed both the EEI Electric Rate Fundamentals and Advanced Courses. In 2003, I 15 completed the AEP/OSU Strategic Leadership Program. 16 In 1989, I joined AEPSC as a Rate Assistant. Since that time I have progressed 17 through various positions and was promoted to my current position of Director -18 Regulated Pricing and Analysis in June 2010. My responsibilities include the oversight

1		of the preparation of cost-of-service and rate design analyses for the AEP System
2		operating companies, and oversight of the preparation of special contracts and pricing for
3		customers.
4	Q.	HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED TESTIMONY IN ANY REGULATORY
5		PROCEEDINGS?
6	А.	Yes. I have submitted testimony before the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
7		(Commission), the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission, the Michigan Public Service
8		Commission, the Public Service Commission of Kentucky and the Public Service
9		Commission of West Virginia regarding cost-of-service. rate design and other rates and
10		tariff related issues.
11		
12	<u>PUR</u>	POSE OF TESTIMONY
13	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
14	А.	The purpose of my testimony is to discuss the Standard Service Offer (SSO) rate issues
15		related to AEP Ohio's energy-only auctions that have been identified as areas of dispute
16		in party comments on the Company's Application and Supplement to Application.
17		Specifically, I address certain issues related to auction pricing and customer retail rates.
18	Q.	WHAT EXHIBITS ARE YOU SPONSORING?
19	A.	I am sponsoring the following exhibit:
20		Exhibit DMR-1 Illustration of a Single Rider Computation
21		

1 STANDARD SERVICE OFFER

2	Q.	PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT BYPASSABLE COMPONENTS OF A
3		STANDARD SERVICE OFFER CUSTOMER'S BILL.
4	А.	Currently, standard service offer customers pay the following bypassable charges to AEP
5		Ohio for service:
6 7 8 9		Fuel Adjustment Clause Rider (FAC) Alternative Energy Rider (AER) Transmission Cost Recovery Rider (TCRR) Base Generation Rates
10		Of these four elements, the three riders - FAC, AER and TCRR - are based upon
11		specific, separately-identifiable costs incurred and recorded by the Company and are
12		tracked and reconciled through the Company's periodic update and true-up filings with
13		the Commission. The fourth element, Base Generation Rates, were initially established
14		through the unbundling process in the Company's 1999 Electric Transition Plan cases
15		and were subsequently adjusted based upon percentage adjustments in several
16		proceedings, including the Company's most recent Electric Security Plan (ESP) case.
17		While those rates may have originally been based upon cost data in the Company's prior
18		rate cases in the early 1990s, it is no longer appropriate to consider those rates as
19		"traditional" cost-of-service based rates because such a context no longer exists in Ohio.
20		For example, there has been no cost-of-service study performed with respect to those
21		rates, no evaluation of interclass subsidies or any other "traditional" analysis associated
22		with establishing rates based upon cost of service.
23	Q.	ARE THE COMPONENTS OF THE COMPANY'S STANDARD SERVICE
24		OFFER RATES SUBDIVIDED IN A MANNER THAT IS COMPARABLE TO

25 WHOLESALE MARKET PRODUCTS?

A. No. The basic elements of the PJM wholesale market are generation capacity, generation
 energy, transmission service and ancillary services. While transmission service is cost of-service based, the remaining components are primarily established through FERC regulated market mechanisms. The PJM construct is significantly different from both
 traditional cost-of-service rates and rates set through an ESP in Ohio that are subject to
 the statutory market rate offer test. For example, the Company's Base Generation Rates
 can be viewed as the result of a simple arithmetic calculation:

Total generation and transmission rates - FAC - AER <u>- TCRR</u> = Base Generation Rates

8

9

10

11

12

13 When viewed from this simple perspective, it is evident that Base Generation Rates 14 conceptually include items such as commercial activity taxes and the cost of 15 uncollectibles associated with costs that are billed in the FAC, AER and TCRR, since 16 those riders are not grossed-up and merely pass through incurred costs. More generally, 17 there is no reasonable basis to conclude that Base Generation Rates reflect energy-related 18 costs or should fluctuate based on the energy auction process, since the Company (as the 19 Fixed Resource Requirements entity through May 2015) is still providing capacity 20 service to SSO customers without change throughout the delivery period of all three 21 energy-only auction periods. It would unfairly take ESP revenues from the Company to 22 reduce Base Generation Rates just to ensure that the energy-only auctions result in rate 23 decreases as has been argued by some commenters. As a related matter, I have been 24advised by counsel that the Commission's ESP decision determined that retail SSO 25 generation service is a bundled generation service that is different from the wholesale

capacity service provided to CRES providers in support of retail shopping. While I am
 not testifying as to the ultimate meaning of the Commission's orders, my testimony
 incorporates the Company's legal positions regarding such matters. Thus, it is erroneous
 to equate Base Generation Rates with generation capacity.

Q. WILL THE RESULTS OF THE ENERGY AUCTIONS BE REFLECTED IN THE STANDARD SERVICE OFFER RATES THAT NON-SHOPPING CUSTOMERS PAY?

8 Yes. Under AEP Ohio's proposal, the energy purchases resulting from the energy-only A. 9 auctions will appropriately displace energy costs that would otherwise be recovered 10 through the Company's Fuel Adjustment Clause, in proportion to the amount of SSO 11 energy being purchased in each of the energy-only auctions. As further explained below, 12 Base Generation Rates will be frozen through the end of 2014, and be adjusted to reflect 13 capacity at \$188.88 /MW-day for the January through May 2015 period. The AER and 14 TCRR would also continue to periodically adjust during the entire period. Next, I will 15 discuss each of these SSO rate components in more detail.

16

17 BASE GENERATION RATES

18 Q. WHEN WILL THE COMPANY ADJUST ITS BASE GENERATION RATES?

19 A. I have been advised by counsel that the Commission's ESP decision determined that the 20 Company's Base Generation Rates should remain fixed at the levels proposed by the 21 Company until January 1, 2015. In this same regard, counsel further advised me that the 22 issue of whether AEP Ohio's frozen Base Generation Rates should be reduced prior to 23 January 1, 2015 to reflect the lower capacity charge adopted in Case No. 10-2929-EL-

1 UNC was already litigated and the Commission decided not to do so as part of adopting 2 the Modified ESP. While I am not testifying as to the ultimate meaning of the 3 Commission's orders, my testimony incorporates the Company's legal positions regarding 4 such matters. As a separate matter distinct from the legal positions. I can attest that the 5 Company's approach is also consistent with the traditional ratemaking treatment of power 6 purchases in the FAC, wherein the total FAC would change to reflect the power purchases 7 but the existing non-energy related component of the FAC and Base Generation Rates 8 would not. Consequently, the Company proposes to continue charging its current Base 9 Generation Rates until January 1, 2015 when those rates will be adjusted to reflect capacity 10 at \$188.88 /MW-day.

11 Q. HOW DOES THE COMPANY PROPOSE TO IMPLEMENT THE 12 ADJUSTMENT TO BASE GENERATION RATES TO REFLECT CAPACITY AT 13 \$188.88 /MW-DAY BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2015?

14 A. During the Company's most recent ESP proceeding, concerns were raised regarding 15 potential impacts of auction rate design on certain classes of customers, such as CSP Rate 16 Zone residential customers with high winter use. While the Company does not believe that 17 implementation of this Base Generation Rate adjustment process on January 1, 2015 is 18 necessarily ripe for review in this case. I can make some simplifying assumptions and offer 19 an illustrative approach without prejudice to the ultimate approach to be subsequently 20 taken on this issue. For purposes of this discussion. I think the most straightforward 21 approach to ensure that all customers benefit from this ESP-required adjustment would be 22 to uniformly reduce the Base Generation Rates for all customers by 40%. This 40% 23 reduction, which was computed by applying the \$188.88 /MW-day directly to Company

1 load information filed in the ESP proceeding, would reduce overall Base Generation Rates 2 from \$22.50/MWh to \$13.50/MWh. This approach would maintain the existing 3 relationships among the Base Generation Rates for all customers. This approach would be 4 a reasonable transition step towards the expected rates based entirely upon a full 5 requirements auction beginning in June of 2015. In fact, this component alone would drive 6 significant customer bill reductions beginning in January 2015. For residential customers 7 using 1,000 kWh of electricity per month, the reduction resulting from reduced Base 8 Generation Rates would be \$10.28 per month for a CSP rate zone customer and \$10.75 per 9 month for an OP rate zone customer.

10

11 AUCTION PHASE-IN RIDER AND THE FUEL ADJUSTMENT CLAUSE

12 Q. WHY IS AEP OHIO PROPOSING TO SEPARATE THE COSTS WITHIN THE 13 FAC INTO TWO COMPONENTS?

14 A. The Company is proposing to separate the costs within the FAC to provide transparency 15 and comparability with the energy-only auction product. However, should the 16 Commission desire to maintain a single rider, these same goals could still be 17 accomplished as long as each of the two components are treated properly as shown in 18 Exhibit DMR-1. Since its initial implementation, the FAC has included a specifically 19 identified set of cost items which include fuel, purchased power costs (a portion of which 20 are fixed demand charges). and other variable production costs such as environmental 21 variable costs. In the ESP decision, the Commission continued the FAC mechanism 22 without modifying the type of costs that have long been recovered under the FAC. 23 including the demand charges associated with purchased power contracts. The cost items

1 that constitute the FAC, as identified in Exhibit F of the Supplement to Application, are 2 well established and have been tracked, reconciled and audited annually in proceedings 3 before this Commission. As part of the Competitive Bid Process, the Company will 4 procure a defined product which is an energy-only product. Therefore, it is necessary to 5 evaluate the FAC and identify those items which are energy (variable) costs and those 6 items which are non-energy (fixed) costs. Since the auction product is an energy product. 7 the costs that the Company is replacing with purchases of that energy product are the energy (variable) costs in the FAC. This approach is consistent with the recovery of non-8 9 energy (fixed) costs that has occurred when the Company has made market purchases to 10 serve its retail customers since the FAC was instituted. Doing otherwise would 11 improperly eliminate recovery of costs approved for continued recovery through the FAC. 12

Q. WHAT TREATMENT HAS THE COMPANY PROPOSED WITH RESPECT TO THE NON-ENERGY (FIXED) COST COMPONENT OF THE CURRENT FAC?

The Company has proposed to separate the non-energy (fixed) costs and include them in 15 Α. a new, bypassable Fixed Cost Rider. These costs have always been bypassable and 16 17 would continue to be avoidable for customers that elect to take service from a 18 Competitive Retail Electric Service (CRES) provider. However, these non-energy costs 19 primarily relate to contractual commitments by the Company to purchase power from 20 Ohio Valley Electric Corporation and AEP Generating Company (Lawrenceburg 21 Generating Plant) which are used to fulfill the Company's obligation to provide a 22 Standard Service Offer to non-shopping customers and should continue to be collected 23 from non-shopping customers. These costs are clearly not part of the Company's Base

1 Generation Rates, have been recognized as prudent costs to be collected from Ohio 2 customers in the FAC, and are actual costs incurred by the Company that are passed 3 through to customers without any return for the Company. To not allow the Company to 4 collect these costs, as suggested in parties' comments, is inconsistent with the ESP 5 decision's authorization to continue the FAC. I have also been advised by counsel that 6 any disallowance of cost recovery for these FERC-approved contracts, which have long 7 been dedicated to support retail SSO service in Ohio, would unlawfully trap costs in 8 violation of federal law. While I am not testifying as to those legal issues, my testimony 9 incorporates the Company's legal positions regarding such matters.

10 Q. WHAT TREATMENT HAS THE COMPANY PROPOSED WITH RESPECT TO 11 THE ENERGY (VARIABLE) COST COMPONENT OF THE CURRENT FAC?

A. The Company has proposed to separate the energy (variable) costs and include them in a
new, bypassable Auction Phase-In Rider. The Auction Phase-In Rider will also include
the costs of the Auction Purchases and as well as the levelized costs associated with
conducting the Competitive Bid Process as detailed in Exhibit H of the Company's
February 11, 2013 Supplement to Application.

17 Q. HOW WILL THE AUCTION PHASE-IN RIDER BE COMPUTED?

A. The revenue requirement will be the sum of the energy (variable) cost component of the FAC for the MWhs of energy that are not auctioned, the auction purchase cost for the MWhs of energy that are auctioned and the levelized cost of performing the auction. This revenue requirement will be divided by total non-shopping MWh and adjusted for losses to determine the rate at each delivery voltage, consistent with how the FAC is determined currently. To mitigate any potential customer bill impact concerns, the

current differentiation of FAC rates between the Columbus Southern Power and Ohio
Power Rate Zones can be maintained in the Auction Phase-In Rider through December
2014. Therefore, there would be no need to conduct separate Competitive Bid Processes
for each rate zone. Once 100% of the energy is auctioned beginning January 1, 2015 and
none of the Auction Phase-In Rider rate is based upon the energy (variable) cost
component of the FAC, such a rate zone differentiation would no longer have a historical
basis or be meaningful.

8 Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE COMPANY'S PROPOSALS WITH REGARD TO 9 THE FIXED COST RIDER AND AUCTION PHASE-IN RIDER.

A. The current FAC would be separated into two components. The non-energy (fixed)
component will become a new Fixed Cost Rider and the energy (variable) component
will become part of a new Auction Phase-In Rider. The following diagram was included
in Exhibit G of the Company's February 11, 2013 Supplement to Application.

	Existing	Proposed			
Rider	Components	Components	Riders		
	Non-Energy (Fixed)	Non-Energy (Fixed)	Fixed Cost Rider		
FAC	Energy (Variable)	Energy (Variable)			
		Auction Purchase	Auction Phase-In Rider		
		Auction Costs			

14 If the Commission prefers to maintain a single rider and achieve the same goals. 15 the Company is also amenable to that approach and I have illustrated that 16 approach in Exhibit DMR-1.

1 ADDITIONAL CUSTOMER RATE IMPACT MITIGATION

2 Q. DOES THE COMPANY HAVE A RECOMMENDATION TO ADDRESS THE 3 CONCERNS RAISED IN PARTIES' COMMENTS REGARDING ANY 4 POTENTIAL ADVERSE IMPACT OF THE ENERGY AUCTIONS ON 5 CUSTOMERS?

6 Yes. In addition to the rate mitigation components of the Company's proposal discussed A. 7 above, the Company recommends that the 12% rate cap instituted by the Commission in 8 the ESP decision be applied to any potential increases resulting from the implementation 9 of the Auction Phase-In Rider and Fixed Cost Rider. This would further address the 10 concerns raised by the parties with respect to the auction results and is consistent with the 11 Commission's desire to maintain protection for customers from any unforeseen risks that 12 may arise from a developing competitive market, as expressed by the Commission on 13 page 11 of the January 30, 2013 Entry on Rehearing in the Company's ESP. From an 14 implementation standpoint, the sum of the Auction Phase-In Rider and the Fixed Cost 15 Rider would be compared to the current FAC rate as of June 2013. An increase, if any, 16 would then be included in the determination of whether the customer's bill has reached 17 the cumulative 12% rate cap and, if so, handled in the same manner already prescribed by 18 the Commission for rate impacts under the ESP rate plan as a whole. Indirectly, this 19 approach would also protect customers from increases in the FAC.

20

21 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

22 A. Yes it does.

Illustration of a Single Rider Computation 60% Auction

			Generation	Illustrative		Compan	ny's Proposal		
		Energy	Level	Costs		Auction	Fixed Cost		Single
Line / Formula	Description	Percentage	Energy (MWh)	<u>(\$ / MWh)</u>	Pł	nase-In Rider	Rider		Rider
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)=Total x (C)	(E)	(Ŧ	F) = (D) x (E)	(G)	(1	H) = (F) + (G)
(1)	FAC Non-Energy (Fixed) Costs	0%	-		\$	-	\$ 8,000,000	<u>:/</u> \$	8,000,000
(2)	FAC Energy (Variable) Costs	40%	800,000	\$ 40	\$	32,000,000		\$	32,000,000
(3)	Auction Purchase Costs	60%	1,200,000	\$ 40	\$	48,000,000		\$	48,000,000
(4)	Auction Costs	0%	-		\$	122,737	1/	\$	122,737
(5)=(1)+(2)+(3)+(4)	Total Revenue Requirement	100%	2,000,000	0	\$	80,122,737	\$ 8,000,000	\$	88,122,737
(6)	Generation Level Energy (MWh)					2,000,000	2,000,000	6	2,000,000
(7) = (5) / (6)	Revenue Requirement (\$/MWh)					40.06	4.00		44.06

1/2 Estimated Costs from Exhibit H of the Company Supplement to Application = \$2,332,000 / 19 months = \$122,737 2/2 Approximate value for recent months

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of Ohio Power Company's Direct Testimony of David M. Roush has been served upon the below-named counsel by electronic mail to all Parties this 14th day of June. 2013.

/s/ Steven T. Nourse Steven T. Nourse

EMAIL SERVICE LIST

dboehm@bkllawfirm.com jkyler@bkllawfirm.com mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com sam@mwncmh.com joliker@mwncmh.com fdarr@mwncmh.com mpritchard@mwncmh.com mhpetricoff@vorys.com smhoward@vorys.com grady@occ.state.oh.us stnourse@aep.com dconway@porterwright.com jlang@calfee.com lmcbride@calfee.com talexander@calfee.com haydenm@firstenergycorp.com This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

6/14/2013 4:48:19 PM

in

Case No(s). 12-3254-EL-UNC

Summary: Testimony -Direct Testimony of David M. Roush electronically filed by Mr. Steven T Nourse on behalf of Ohio Power Company

Exhibit B

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the : Application of Ohio Power : Company to Establish a : Competitive Bidding : Case No. 12-3254-EL-UNC Process for Procurement : of Energy to Support its : Standard Service Offer. :

PROCEEDINGS

before Mr. Jonathan J. Tauber and Ms. Sarah J. Parrot, Hearing Examiners, at the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad Street, Room 11-A, Columbus, Ohio, called at 10:00 a.m. on Monday, June 24, 2013.

VOLUME I

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC. 222 East Town Street, 2nd Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215 (614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481 Fax - (614) 224-5724

2 1 **APPEARANCES:** 2 American Electric Power By Mr. Steven T. Nourse 3 One Riverside Plaza Columbus, Ohio 43215-2373 4 Porter, Wright, Morris & Arthur, LLP 5 By Mr. Daniel R. Conway 41 South High Street 6 Columbus, Ohio 43215-6194 7 On behalf of Ohio Power Company. 8 Mr. Mark A. Hayden FirstEnergy Corporation 9 76 South Main Street Akron, Ohio 44308 10 Calfee, Halter & Griswold, LLP 11 By Mr. N. Trevor Alexander 1100 Fifth Third Center 12 21 East State Street Columbus, Ohio 43215-4243 13 Calfee, Halter & Griswold, LLP 14 By Mr. James Lang The Calfee Building 15 1405 East Sixth Street Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1607 16 On behalf of FirstEnergy Solutions. 17 Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease, LLP 18 By Mr. M. Howard Petricoff 52 East Gay Street 19 Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008 20 On behalf of Constellation NewEnergy, Inc. and Exelon Generation Company, LLC. 21 Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry 2.2 By Mr. Michael Kurtz Ms. Jody Kyler Cohn 23 36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 24 On behalf of the Ohio Energy Group, Inc. 25

		3
1	APPEARANCES (continued):	
2	McNees, Wallace & Nurick, LLC By Mr. Matthew R. Pritchard	
3	Fifth Third Center, Suite 1700 21 East State Street	
4	Columbus, Ohio 43215-4288	
5	On behalf of Industrial Energy Users of Ohio.	
6	Bruce J. Weston, Ohio Consumers' Counsel	
7	Bruce S. Weston, Onio consumers counser By Ms. Maureen R. Grady Assistant Consumers' Counsel	
8	Ten West Broad Street, Suite 1800 Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485	
9	On behalf of the Residential Customers	
10	of Ohio Power Company.	
11	Mike DeWine, Ohio Attorney General William L. Wright, Section Chief	
12	By Mr. Stephen Reilly Assistant Attorney General	
13	Public Utilities Section 180 East Broad Street	
14	Columbus, Ohio 43215	
15	On behalf of the staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.	
16		
17		
18		
19		50
20		
21		
22		140
23		
24		
25		

	ŕ			4
1	INDEX			
2				
3	WITNESSES]	PAGE	
4	CHANTALE LaCASSE, PHD		1.0	
5	Direct Examination by Mr. Conway Cross-Examination by Mr. Kurtz		10 19	
6	Cross-Examination by Ms. Grady Cross-Examination by Mr. Pritchard		32 40	
	Cross-Examination by Mr. Reilly		53	
7	Redirect Examination by Mr. Conway		54	
8	DAVID M. ROUSH Direct Examination by Mr. Nourse		58	
9	Cross-Examination by Mr. Petricoff		59	
10	Cross-Examination by Mr. Alexander Cross-Examination by Mr. Kurtz		86 119	
	Cross-Examination by Ms. Grady		150	
11	Cross-Examination by Mr. Pritchard Cross-Examination by Mr. Reilly		157 174	
12				
13	LANE KOLLEN Direct Examination by Ms. Grady		187	
	Cross-Examination by Mr. Petricoff		189	
14	Cross-Examination by Mr. Alexander Cross-Examination by Mr. Conway		192 193	
15	cross Examinación by ne. conway		т у С	
16				
17	COMPANY EXHIBITS	IDFD	ADMTD	
18	1 - Direct Testimony of Dr. Chantale	11	56	
19	LaCasse			
2.0	2 - Direct Testimony of David M. Roush	58	180	
20				
21				
22	FES EXHIBITS	IDFD	ADMTD	
23	1 - FES Interrogatory 1-01	17	56	
24	2 - FES Interrogatory 2-003	96	181	
25				

		111
1		you know, one of the concepts that I've laid out here
2		in my testimony is that if the auction phase-in rider
3		loses its rate zone differentiation beginning 1/1/15,
4		that that's a big enough step or a big enough
5		progress to take at one point in time, and that by
6		just saying, you know, like I did here for
7		illustration, just reduce all the base generation
8		rates by 40 percent, that ensures that all customers
9		are seeing those reductions and there is no alignment
10		issue, that ultimately the resolution of how capacity
11		type costs should be set in the full requirements
12		auction that's expected to happen beginning in June
13		of '15, figuring we're taking a big step with the
14		auction phase-in rider that it was better to sort
15		this other element out once you got to June of '15.
16		MR. ALEXANDER: Could you repeat just the
17		first word of that response?
18		(Record read.)
19		Q. And the current rate relationship between
20		classes are not market based, correct?
21		A. Correct, as we've been discussing
22		regarding base generation rates kind of as we've gone
23		through all of the discussion today, they're kind of
24		a leftover product, for lack of a better word, so
25		they're not necessarily in alignment with what would
	L	

112 be the results of a full requirements competitive 1 2 bid. 3 And the last cost-of-service study was Ο. conducted in the early-'90s? 4 5 That's correct, the last class Α. 6 cost-of-service studies were done in the '90s for 7 each of the companies' cases. 8 0. And you agree that it would be -- it is 9 important to transition to a market-based rate 10 relationship between classes. 11 A. Yes, it is important to make that 12 transition, and we've been kind of taking baby steps 13 along the way for a lot of years and I think continue 14 to take steps to get there so that hopefully by June 15 of '15 we don't have any transition issues. 16 And I believe you sort of touched on this 0. 17 in one of your previous answers, the reason you're 18 not proposing to transition to a market-based rate 19 relationship between classes in this case is the 20 principle of gradualism, correct? 21 Α. I think that's a fair summary because 22 we're proposing to eliminate particularly the rate 23 zone relationships and the auction phase-in rider come January of '15; that's kind of a big enough step 24 25 not to get too far ahead of ourselves.

113 And right now Ohio Power and Columbus 1 Ο. 2 Southern customers have different size fuel 3 adjustment clauses, correct? 4 Correct. They have different fuel Α. adjustment clause rates as well as different base 5 6 generation rates. 7 Q. Page 5, line 19 of your testimony. You reference a portion of the Commission's ESP 2 8 9 decision. Do you see that? A. Yes, I do. 10 11 And you are not providing an opinion in Ο. 12 this case that the Commission actually made that 13 determination, are you? I'm not. I'm relying on the advice of 14 Α. counsel that read those documents and all the aspects 15 of it and then using that information to develop the 16 17 rest of my testimony. Q. And, similarly, at page 6, line 1 of your 18 19 testimony you reference a portion of the Commission's 20 ESP decision, a separate portion. You are not providing an opinion in this case that the Commission 21 22 actually made that determination, correct? 23 A. I apologize, I missed the reference at 24 the beginning of the question. Q. Page 6, line 1. It's actually a 25

114 carryover from page 7 -- or, excuse me, page 5, line 1 2 21. 3 A. That's correct, I'm not interpreting the order, I'm relying on my advice of counsel based on 4 the orders as a whole. 5 6 You're relying exclusively on how your Ο. 7 counsel has instructed you with regard to those two 8 statements. 9 Α. With regard to those two statements, yes. 10 Now, as you discussed with Mr. Petricoff, Ο. 11 AEP Ohio proposes to implement the auction results 12 through the variable portion of the fuel adjustment 13 clause, correct? 14 Α. I guess technically as part of the 15 auction phase-in rider, but . . . Thank you for the correction. You're 16 0. 17 correct. 18 AEP Ohio plans to allocate the revenue 19 requirement for the auction phase-in rider differently between the Ohio Power and CSP rate 20 21 zones; is that correct? 22 That's correct. If you kind of go to Α. 23 page 9, bottom of page 9, top of page 10 of my 24 testimony, I basically discuss that you can take the, 25 just like we do today currently with the FAC, you've

	115
1	got the bundle of costs but then when you set the
2	rate for each rate zone, you maintain a historical
3	differential between the two prices.
4	I'm suggesting that for the auction
5	phase-in rider you can do the same thing through the
6	end of '14 so you've got one auction, one price from
7	the auction, and then you take those dollars and tilt
8	the rate so that the CSP rate area is rate zone
9	price is a little higher and the OP rate zone price
10	is a little lower, just like the current FAC.
11	Q. Okay. So AEP Ohio is proposing to, in
12	your words, tilt the rate throughout the period
13	through the end of the ESP period.
14	A. Through December of '14. So not quite
15	the end.
16	Q. So let's do a hypothetical here. Suppose
17	that the auction result comes in at 4 cents, all
18	right? If the 4 cents was allocated equally between
19	the two rate zones, proportionally between the two
20	rate zones, then that would have a narrowing effect,
21	it would bring the rate zones closer together. But
22	if that 4 cents is tilted, in your words, then it
23	will keep the respective relationship between the CSP
24	and the Ohio Power rate zone; is that correct?
25	A. I think that's a decent summary. Yeah.

	116
1	The current FAC, for example, the cost is maybe in
2	your example 4 cents, the FAC cost today might be 4
3	cents, but the actual rates for CSP might be 4.2
4	cents and it might be 3.8 for OP, and doing the same
5	kind of thing is what we're proposing to continue
6	through December '14.
7	Q. So the auction would not have any
8	narrowing effect on the difference between the
9	charges for those two rate zones.
10	A. That's correct. And that's why we're
11	saying continue that through December '14, then allow
12	that differential to expire at the end of '14 at the
13	same time you're reducing base generation rates by
14	about 40 percent, so that's a good time to do both
15	things simultaneously so that if there are impacts of
16	getting rid of that differential, they should be
17	mitigated somewhat by the base generation rate
18	reduction.
19	Q. And how are the allocation factors for
20	each rate zone calculated?
21	A. They're based on historical
22	relationships. If you look in each of the companies'
23	quarterly fuel filings, you come up with a total FAC
24	cost and then you assign a certain percentage of the
25	cost to one rate zone and a certain percentage to the
	Annature & Ohen Tree Columbus Ohio (614) 224 9481

1	other and then divide by each rate zone kWh to come
2	up with the rates.
3	Q. AEP Ohio proposes to reconcile the CBP
4	results and the auction costs in the auction phase-in
5	rider on a monthly basis; is that correct?
6	A. Not exactly. The company would
7	obviously, for accounting purposes, have to track
8	over/underrecovery on a monthly basis, but I think we
9	anticipate that we would continue quarterly filings
10	to adjust the rate itself.
11	Q. The other part of the auction phase-in
12	rider are the energy costs which are currently in the
13	fuel adjustment clause, correct?
14	A. I guess just to be clear there are three
15	pieces in the auction phase-in rider; the auction
16	purchase, the auction costs which are like the
17	auction manager, that kind of stuff, and then the
18	energy or variable component which is basically the
19	existing FAC elements excluding the fixed costs.
20	Q. I'll rephrase the question. The existing
21	FAC is currently reconciled on a quarterly basis,
22	correct?
23	A. Correct.
24	Q. Will the auction phase-in rider be
25	audited by the staff in the same manner as the fuel

160

little more clear. 1 2 In addition to the four riders that the Commission identified in the entry on rehearing, the 3 4 company's recommended approach would also be to include two additional riders towards the 12 percent 5 6 rate cap, the fixed cost recovery rider, and the 7 auction phase-in rider with the caveat that the last 8 two riders you'd only be measuring the difference 9 between August 2012 levels to the current levels, 10 correct? Close but not quite correct. It would be 11 Α. measuring the auction phase-in rider and fixed-cost 12 rider relative to the June 2013 FAC, not back to 13 14 August 2012 levels. 15 Thank you for that clarification. Q. MR. PRITCHARD: Your Honor, at this time 16 17 may I have a document mark as IEU-Ohio Exhibit 3? EXAMINER PARROT: You may. 18 19 MR. PRITCHARD: And may I approach, your 20 Honor? 21 EXAMINER PARROT: You may. 22 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) Mr. Roush, do you have in front of you 23 Q. 24 what has been marked as IEU-Ohio Exhibit 3? 25 Α. Yes, I do.

Armstrong & Okey, Inc., Columbus, Ohio (614) 224-9481

Exhibit C

Typical Bill Comparison 10% Auction at \$34 / MWh Columbus Southern Power Rate Zone

<u>Tariff</u>	<u>kWh</u>	KW	Current	Proposed	\$ <u>Difference</u>	Difference
<u>Residential</u>						
RR1 Annual	100		\$19.61	\$19.61	\$0.00	0.0%
	250		\$39.69	\$39.69	\$0.00	0.0%
	500		\$73.24	\$73.24	\$0.00	0.0%
RR Annual	750		\$114.62	\$114.62	\$0.00	0.0%
	1,000		\$142.45	\$142.45	\$0.00	
	1,500		\$194.03	\$194.02	-\$0.01	0.0%
	2,000		\$245.58	\$245.57	-\$0.01	0.0%
GS-1	375	3	\$66.23	\$66.23	\$0.00	0.0%
	1,000	3	\$161.01	\$161.01	\$0.00	
	750	6	\$123.10	\$123.10	\$0.00	
	2,000	6	\$278.83	\$278.82	-\$0.01	0.0%
GS-2	1,500	12	\$269.95	\$269.94	-\$0.01	0.0%
Secondary	4,000	12	\$554.69	\$554.68	-\$0.01	0.0%
	6,000	30	\$910.77	\$910.75	-\$0.02	0.0%
	10,000	30	\$1,365.98	\$1,365.96	-\$0.02	0.0%
	10,000	40	\$1,437.37	\$1,437.35	-\$0.02	
	14,000	40	\$1,892.61	\$1,892.58	-\$0.03	
	12,500	50	\$1,793.26	\$1,793.24	-\$0.02	
	18,000	50	\$2,417.51	\$2,417.47	-\$0.04	
	15,000	- 75	\$2,256.21	\$2,256.18	-\$0.03	
	30,000	150	\$4,490.18	\$4,490.11	-\$0.07	
	60,000	300	\$8,958.16	\$8,958.04	-\$0.12	
	100,000	500	\$14,915.43	\$14,915.22	-\$0.21	0.0%
GS-2						
Primary	100,000	1,000	\$17,144.61	\$17,144.41	-\$0.20	0.0%
GS-3	30,000	75	\$3,398.66	\$3,398.59	-\$0.07	
Secondary	50,000	75	\$4,690.92	\$4,690.82	-\$0.10	
	30,000	100	\$3,877.99	\$3,877.92	-\$0.07	
	36,000	100	\$4,265.66	\$4,265.59	-\$0.07	
	60,000	150	\$6,775.06	\$6,774.94	-\$0.12	2 0.0%
	100,000	150	\$9,359.58	\$9,359.37	-\$0.21	
	90,000	300	\$11,589.54	\$11,589.35	-\$0.19	
	120,000	300	\$13,527.93	\$13,527.68	-\$0.25	
	150,000	300	\$15,466.32	\$15,466.01	-\$0.3	
	200,000	300	\$18,696.95	\$18,696.53	-\$0.42	2 0.0%

Typical Bill Comparison 10% Auction at \$34 / MWh Columbus Southern Power Rate Zone

Oblambus Doutlient i ower Nate Lone							
					\$		
<u>Tariff</u>	<u>kWh</u>	<u>KW</u>	<u>Current</u>	Proposed	Difference	<u>Difference</u>	
GS-3	150,000	500	\$19,301.09	\$19,300.78	-\$0.31	0.0%	
Secondary	180,000	500	\$21,239.46	\$21,239.08	-\$0.38	0.0%	
(continued)	200,000	500	\$22,531.72	\$22,531.30	-\$0.42	0.0%	
. ,	325,000	500	\$30,608.34	\$30,607.65	-\$0.69	0.0%	
GS-3	300,000	1,000	\$36,603.82	\$36,603.22	-\$0.60	0.0%	
Primary	360,000	1,000	\$40,379.90	\$40,379.18	-\$0.72		
	400,000	1,000	\$42,897.28	\$42,896.48	-\$0.80		
	650,000	1,000	\$58,630.94	\$58,629.64	-\$1.30		
	,		,,	. ,			
GS-4							
	1,500,000	5,000	\$144,977.71	\$144,974.71	-\$3.00	0.0%	
	2,500,000	5,000	\$203,018.21	\$203,013.21	-\$5.00	0.0%	
	3,250,000	5,000	\$246,548.60	\$246,542.10	-\$6.50	0.0%	
	3,000,000	10,000	\$265,823.46	\$265,817.46	-\$6.00	0.0%	
	5,000,000	10,000	\$381,904.46	\$381,894.46	-\$10.00	0.0%	
	6,500,000	10,000	\$468,965.21	\$468,952.21	-\$13.00	0.0%	
	6,000,000	20,000	\$507,514.96	\$507,502.96	-\$12.00	0.0%	
	10,000,000	20,000	\$739,676.96	\$739,656.96	-\$20.00	0.0%	
	13,000,000	20,000	\$913,798.46	\$913,772.46	-\$26.00	0.0%	
	15,000,000	50,000	\$1,232,589.46	\$1,232,559.46	-\$30.00	0.0%	
	25,000,000	50,000	\$1,812,994.46	\$1,812,944.46	-\$50.00	0.0%	
	32,500,000	50,000	\$2,248,298.21	\$2,248,233.21	-\$65.00	0.0%	

Typical Bill Comparison 10% Auction at \$34 / MWh Ohio Power Rate Zone

Onio Power Rate Zone							
Tariff	<u>kWh</u>	KW	Current	Proposed	\$ <u>Difference</u>	Difference	
Residential	100 250 500 750 1,000 1,500 2,000		\$18.48 \$38.28 \$71.37 \$104.41 \$134.78 \$194.19 \$253.58	\$18.48 \$38.28 \$71.37 \$104.41 \$134.77 \$194.19 \$253.58	\$0.00 \$0.00 \$0.00 \$0.00 -\$0.01 \$0.00 \$0.00	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	
GS-1 Secondary	375 1,000 750 2,000	3 3 6	\$59.27 \$127.04 \$99.93 \$235.50	\$59.27 \$127.03 \$99.93 \$235.50	\$0.00 -\$0.01 \$0.00 \$0.00	0.0% 0.0%	
GS-2 Secondary	1,500 4,000 6,000 10,000 14,000 12,500 18,000 30,000 36,000 30,000 60,000 90,000 150,000 150,000	$\begin{array}{c} 12\\ 12\\ 30\\ 30\\ 40\\ 40\\ 50\\ 50\\ 75\\ 100\\ 100\\ 150\\ 300\\ 300\\ 500\\ 500\\ 500\\ 500\\ \end{array}$	\$265.02 \$506.43 \$830.99 \$1,216.89 \$1,290.02 \$1,675.91 \$1,604.32 \$2,133.22 \$2,028.30 \$3,649.79 \$4,225.27 \$4,015.40 \$7,989.60 \$10,866.97 \$13,288.52 \$18,084.17 \$20,961.52	\$265.02 \$506.42 \$830.98 \$1,216.87 \$1,290.00 \$1,675.88 \$1,604.30 \$2,133.19 \$2,028.28 \$3,649.73 \$4,225.20 \$4,015.34 \$7,989.49 \$10,866.80 \$13,288.34 \$18,083.90 \$20,961.20	\$0.00 -\$0.01 -\$0.02 -\$0.02 -\$0.02 -\$0.03 -\$0.02 -\$0.03 -\$0.02 -\$0.04 -\$0.07 -\$0.06 -\$0.07 -\$0.06 -\$0.11 -\$0.11 -\$0.12 -\$0.12 -\$0.27 -\$0.32	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	
GS-3 Secondary	$\begin{array}{c} 18,000\\ 30,000\\ 50,000\\ 36,000\\ 30,000\\ 100,000\\ 120,000\\ 120,000\\ 150,000\\ 200,000\\ 180,000\\ 200,000\\ 325,000\end{array}$	50 75 75 100 150 150 300 300 300 500 500	\$2,111.91 \$3,339.31 \$4,619.44 \$4,182.63 \$4,717.21 \$6,637.39 \$9,197.63 \$13,233.58 \$15,153.77 \$18,354.06 \$20,748.37 \$22,028.49 \$30,029.26	\$2,111.88 \$3,339.25 \$4,619.35 \$4,182.56 \$4,717.15 \$6,637.28 \$9,197.45 \$13,233.36 \$15,153.50 \$18,353.70 \$20,748.05 \$22,028.13 \$30,028.67	-\$0.03 -\$0.09 -\$0.09 -\$0.01 -\$0.11 -\$0.21 -\$0.21 -\$0.21 -\$0.31 -\$0.31 -\$0.31 -\$0.31 -\$0.31 -\$0.31 -\$0.31	5 0.0% 9 0.0% 7 0.0% 5 0.0% 1 0.0% 2 0.0% 7 0.0% 6 0.0% 2 0.0% 6 0.0% 6 0.0%	

Typical Bill Comparison 10% Auction at \$34 / MWh Ohio Power Rate Zone

					\$				
<u>Tariff</u>	<u>kWh</u>	KW	<u>Current</u>	Proposed	Difference	Difference			
GS-2	200,000	1,000	\$25,611.91	\$25,611.57	-\$0.34	0.0%			
Primary	300,000	1,000	\$34,992.10	\$34,991.59	-\$0.51	0.0%			
GS-3	360,000	1,000	\$40,218.40	\$40,217.79	-\$0.61	0.0%			
Primary	400,000	1,000	\$42,738.05	\$42,737.37	-\$0.68				
	650,000	1,000	\$58,485.90	\$58,484.79	-\$1.11	0.0%			
	000,000	1,000	<i>\\</i> 00,100.00	Q00,101.70	ψ1.11	0.070			
GS-2									
Subtransmissic	1,500,000	5,000	\$143,303.94	\$143,301.39	-\$2.55	0.0%			
eastanonnoon	.,,	0,000	\$110,000.01	φ110,001.00	42.00	0.070			
GS-3	2,500,000	5,000	\$207,010.29	\$207,006.04	-\$4.25	0.0%			
Subtransmissic	3,250,000	5,000	\$249,702.86	\$249,697.33	-\$5.53	0.0%			
GS-4	3,000,000	10,000	\$284,025.79	\$284,020.69	-\$5.10	0.0%			
Subtransmissic	5,000,000	10,000	\$387,641.79	\$387,633.29	-\$8,50				
Subtratisfilissic	6,500,000	10,000	\$465,353.79	\$465,342.74	-\$11.05				
		,							
	10,000,000	20,000	\$769,981.79	\$769,964.79	-\$17.00				
	13,000,000	20,000	\$925,405.79	\$925,383.69	-\$22.10	0.0%			
GS-4	25,000,000	50,000	\$1,906,904.29	\$1,906,861.79	-\$42.50	0.0%			
Transmission	32,500,000	50,000	\$2,295,135.04	\$2,295,079.79	-\$55.25				
i ano nooron	02,000,000	00,000	\$2,200,100.04	\$2,200,010110	φ00.20	0.070			

Typical Bill Comparison 10% Auction at \$40 / MWh Columbus Southern Power Rate Zone

			_		\$	
<u>Tariff</u>	<u>kWh</u>	<u>KW</u>	Current	Proposed	Difference	<u>Difference</u>
Residential			010.01	.	^ ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	0 404
RR1 Annual	100		\$19.61	\$19.68	\$0.07	0.4%
	250		\$39.69	\$39.87	\$0.18	0.5%
	500		\$73.24	\$73.59	\$0.35	0.5%
RR Annual	750		\$114.62	\$115.15	\$0.53	0.5%
T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T	1,000		\$142.45	\$143.15	\$0.70	
	1,500		['] \$194.03	\$195.07	\$1.04	
	2,000		\$245.58	\$246.97	\$1.39	
	2,000		¢210.00	\$10.01	÷	0.0.0
GS-1	375	3	\$66.23	\$66.49	\$0.26	0.4%
	1,000	3	\$161.01	\$161.71	\$0.70	0.4%
	750	6	\$123.10	\$123.63	\$0.53	0.4%
	2,000	6	\$278.83	\$280.22	\$1.39	0.5%
×						
GS-2	1,500	12	\$269.95	\$270.99	\$1.04	
Secondary	4,000	12	\$554.69	\$557.48	\$2.79	
	6,000	30	\$910.77	\$914.95	\$4.18	
	10,000	30	\$1,365.98	\$1,372.95	\$6.97	
	10,000	40	\$1,437.37	\$1,444.34	\$6.97	
	14,000	40	\$1,892.61	\$1,902.37	\$9.76	
	12,500	50	\$1,793.26	\$1,801.98	\$8.72	
	18,000	50	\$2,417.51	\$2,430.06	\$12.55	
	15,000	75	\$2,256.21	\$2,266.67	\$10.46	
	30,000	150	\$4,490.18	\$4,511.09	\$20.91	
	60,000	300	\$8,958.16	\$8,999.99	\$41.83	
	100,000	500	\$14,915.43	\$14,985.15	\$69.72	0.5%
00.0						
GS-2 Primary	100,000	1,000	\$17,144.61	\$17,211.91	\$67.30	0.4%
Fillindry	100,000	1,000	φ <i>Π</i> ,144.01	φ17,211.31	ψ07.50	0.470
GS-3	30,000	75	\$3,398.66	\$3,419.57	\$20.91	0.6%
Secondary	50,000	75	\$4,690.92	\$4,725.78	\$34.86	0.7%
	30,000	100	\$3,877.99	\$3,898.90	\$20.9 ⁻	0.5%
	36,000	100	\$4,265.66	\$4,290.76	\$25.10	0.6%
	60,000	150	\$6,775.06	\$6,816.89	\$41.83	
	100,000	150	\$9,359.58	\$9,429.30	\$69.72	
	90,000	300	\$11,589.54	\$11,652.29	\$62.75	
	120,000	300	\$13,527.93	\$13,611.60	\$83.67	
	150,000	300	\$15,466.32	\$15,570.90	\$104.58	
	200,000	300	\$18,696.95	\$18,836.39	\$139.44	
			. , -			

Typical Bill Comparison 10% Auction at \$40 / MWh Columbus Southern Power Rate Zone

					\$	
<u>Tariff</u>	<u>kWh</u>	KW	Current	Proposed	Difference	<u>Difference</u>
GS-3	150,000	500	\$19,301.09	\$19,405.67	\$104.58	0.5%
Secondary	180,000	500	\$21,239.46	\$21,364.95	\$125.49	0.6%
(continued)	200,000	500	\$22,531.72	\$22,671.16	\$139.44	0.6%
	325,000	500	\$30,608.34	\$30,834.93	\$226.59	0.7%
GS-3	300,000	1,000	\$36,603.82	\$36,805.72	\$201.90	0.6%
Primary	360,000	1,000	\$40,379.90	\$40,622.18	\$242.28	0.6%
	400,000	1,000	\$42,897.28	\$43,166.48	\$269.20	0.6%
	650,000	1,000	\$58,630.94	\$59,068.39	\$437.45	0.8%
GS-4						
	1,500,000	5,000	\$144,977.71	\$145,967.11	\$989.40	0.7%
	2,500,000	5,000	\$203,018.21	\$204,667.21	\$1,649.00	0.8%
	3,250,000	5,000	\$246,548.60	\$248,692.30	\$2,143.70	0.9%
	3,000,000	10,000	\$265,823.46	\$267,802.26	\$1,978.80	0.7%
	5,000,000	10,000	\$381,904.46	\$385,202.46	\$3,298.00	0.9%
	6,500,000	10,000	\$468,965.21	\$473,252.61	\$4,287.40	0.9%
	6,000,000	20,000	\$507,514.96	\$511,472.56	\$3,957.60	0.8%
	10,000,000	20,000	\$739,676.96	\$746,272.96	\$6,596.00	0.9%
	13,000,000	20,000	\$913,798.46	\$922,373.26	\$8,574.80	0.9%
	15,000,000	50,000	\$1,232,589.46	\$1,242,483.46	\$9,894.00	0.8%
	25,000,000	50,000	\$1,812,994.46	\$1,829,484.46	\$16,490.00	0.9%
	32,500,000	50,000	\$2,248,298.21	\$2,269,735.21	\$21,437.00	1.0%

Typical Bill Comparison 10% Auction at \$40 / MWh Ohio Power Rate Zone

Onio Power Rate Zone						
Tariff	<u>kWh</u>	KW	Current	Proposed	\$ Difference	Difference
		<u></u>				
Residential	100		\$18.48	\$18.53	\$0.05	0.3%
	250		\$38.28	\$38.43	\$0.15	0.4%
	500		\$71.37	\$71.66	\$0.29	0.4%
	750		\$104.41	\$104.86	\$0.45	0.4%
	1,000		\$134.78	\$135.37	\$0.59	0.4%
	1,500		\$194.19	\$195.08	\$0.89	0.5%
	2,000		\$253.58	\$254.77	\$1.19	0.5%
GS-1	375	2	\$59.27	\$59.49	\$0.22	0.4%
	1,000	3 3	\$127.04	\$127.63	\$0.59	0.5%
Secondary	750	6	\$99.93	\$100.38	\$0.45	
	2,000	6	\$235.50	\$236.69	\$0.40 \$1.19	0.5%
	2,000	0	ψ200.00	ψ200.00	ψ1.15	0.070
GS-2	1,500	12	\$265.02	\$265.91	\$0.89	0.3%
Secondary	4,000	12	\$506.43	\$508.81	\$2.38	0.5%
,	6,000	30	\$830.99	\$834.56	\$3.57	0.4%
	10,000	30	\$1,216.89	\$1,222.82	\$5.93	0.5%
	10,000	40	\$1,290.02	\$1,295.95	\$5.93	0.5%
	14,000	40	\$1,675.91	\$1,684.22	\$8.31	0.5%
	12,500	50	\$1,604.32	\$1,611.75	\$7.43	0.5%
	18,000	50	\$2,133.22	\$2,143.91	\$10.69	0.5%
	15,000	75	\$2,028.30	\$2,037.21	\$8.91	0.4%
	30,000	100	\$3,649.79	\$3,667.60	\$17.81	0.5%
	36,000	100	\$4,225.27	\$4,246.64	\$21.37	0.5%
	30,000	150	\$4,015.40	\$4,033.21	\$17.81	0.4%
	60,000	300	\$7,989.60	\$8,025.22	\$35.62	0.5%
	90,000	300	\$10,866.97	\$10,920.40	\$53.43	0.5%
	100,000	500	\$13,288.52	\$13,347.89	\$59.37	0.5%
	150,000	500	\$18,084.17	\$18,173.22	\$89.05	0.5%
	180,000	500	\$20,961.52	\$21,068.39	\$106.87	0.5%
GS-3	18,000	50	\$2,111.91	\$2,122.60	\$10.69	
Secondary	30,000	75	\$3,339.31	\$3,357.12	\$17.81	
	50,000	75	\$4,619.44	\$4,649.12	\$29.68	
	36,000	100	\$4,182.63	\$4,204.00	\$21.37	
	30,000	150	\$4,717.21	\$4,735.02	\$17.8 ⁻	
	60,000	150	\$6,637.39	\$6,673.01	\$35.62	
	100,000	150	\$9,197.63	\$9,257.00	\$59.3	
	120,000	300	\$13,233.58	\$13,304.82	\$71.24	
	150,000	300	\$15,153.77	\$15,242.82	\$89.0	
	200,000	300	\$18,354.06	\$18,472.80	\$118.7	
	180,000	500	\$20,748.37	\$20,855.24	\$106.8	
	200,000	500	\$22,028.49	\$22,147.23	\$118.7	
	325,000	500	\$30,029.26	\$30,222.21	\$192.9	5 0.6%

Typical Bill Comparison 10% Auction at \$40 / MWh Ohio Power Rate Zone

	officit officit rate Eofic								
					\$				
Tariff	<u>kWh</u>	<u>KW</u>	<u>Current</u>	Proposed	<u>Difference</u>	<u>Difference</u>			
GS-2 Primary	200,000 300,000	1,000 1,000	\$25,611.91 \$34,992.10	\$25,726.53 \$35,164.03	\$114.62 \$171.93				
Filliary	300,000	1,000	φ 34,992.10	\$55,104.05	φ171.95	0.076			
GS-3	360,000	1,000	\$40,218.40	\$40,424.72	\$206.32	0.5%			
Primary	400,000	1,000	\$42,738.05	\$42,967.29	\$229.24	0.5%			
	650,000	1,000	\$58,485.90	\$58,858.41	\$372.51	0.6%			
GS-2									
Subtransmissic	1,500,000	5,000	\$143,303.94	\$144,146.49	\$842.55	0.6%			
GS-3	2,500,000	5,000	\$207,010.29	\$208,414.54	\$1,404.25	0.7%			
Subtransmissic	3,250,000	5,000	\$249,702.86	\$251,528.38	\$1,825.52	0.7%			
GS-4	3,000,000	10,000	\$284,025.79	\$285,710.89	\$1,685.10	0.6%			
Subtransmissic	5,000,000	10,000	\$387,641.79	\$390,450.29	\$2,808.50				
oubliansmissic	6,500,000	10,000	\$465,353.79	\$469.004.84	\$3,651.05				
	10,000,000	20,000	\$769,981.79	\$775,598.79	\$5,617.00				
	13,000,000	20,000	\$925,405.79	\$932,707.89	\$7,302.10				
	.0,000,000	_0,000	φ υ 20, 100.1 σ	<i></i>	41,002.10	0.070			
GS-4	25,000,000	50,000	\$1,906,904.29	\$1,920,946.79	\$14,042.50	0.7%			
Transmission	32,500,000	50,000	\$2,295,135.04	\$2,313,390.29	\$18,255.25				

Typical Bill Comparison 60% Auction at \$34 / MWh Columbus Southern Power Rate Zone

Columbus Southern Power Rate Zone							
Tariff	<u>kWh</u>	KW	<u>Current</u>	<u>Proposed</u>	\$ Difference	Difference	
Residential							
RR1 Annual	100		\$19.61	\$19.56	-\$0.05	-0.3%	
	250		\$39.69	\$39.56	-\$0.13	-0.3%	
	500		\$73.24	\$72.98	-\$0.26	-0.4%	
RR Annual	750		\$114.62	\$114.23	-\$0.39	-0.3%	
	1,000		\$142.45	\$141.92	-\$0.53	-0.4%	
	1,500		\$194.03	\$193.23	-\$0.80	-0.4%	
	2,000		\$245.58	\$244.52	-\$1.06	-0.4%	
GS-1	375	3	\$66.23	\$66.03	-\$0.20	-0.3%	
	1,000	3	\$161.01	\$160.48	-\$0.53		
	750	6	\$123.10	\$122.71	-\$0.39		
	2,000	6	\$278.83	\$277.77	-\$1.06	-0.4%	
GS-2	1,500	12	\$269.95	\$269.15	-\$0.80	-0.3%	
Secondary	4,000	12	\$554.69	\$552.56	-\$2.13	-0.4%	
	6,000	30	\$910.77	\$907.58	-\$3.19	-0.4%	
	10,000	30	\$1,365.98	\$1,360.68	-\$5.30		
	10,000	40	\$1,437.37	\$1,432.07	-\$5.30	-0.4%	
	14,000	40	\$1,892.61	\$1,885.18	-\$7.43		
	12,500	50	\$1,793.26	\$1,786.63	-\$6.63		
	18,000	50	\$2,417.51	\$2,407.96	-\$9.55		
	15,000	75	\$2,256.21	\$2,248.26	-\$7.95		
	30,000	150	\$4,490.18	\$4,474.26	-\$15.92		
	60,000	300	\$8,958.16	\$8,926.33	-\$31.83		
	100,000	500	\$14,915.43	\$14,862.38	-\$53.05	-0.4%	
GS-2							
Primary	100,000	1,000	\$17,144.61	\$17,093.40	-\$51.21	-0.3%	
GS-3	30,000	75	\$3,398.66	\$3,382.74	-\$15.92		
Secondary	50,000	75	\$4,690.92	\$4,664.40	-\$26.52		
	30,000	100	\$3,877.99	\$3,862.07	-\$15.92		
	36,000	100	\$4,265.66	\$4,246.56	-\$19.10		
	60,000	150	\$6,775.06	\$6,743.23	-\$31.83		
	100,000	150	\$9,359.58	\$9,306.53	-\$53.05		
	90,000	300	\$11,589.54	\$11,541.79	-\$47.75		
	120,000	300	\$13,527.93	\$13,464.27	-\$63.60		
	150,000	300	\$15,466.32	\$15,386.75	-\$79.5		
	200,000	300	\$18,696.95	\$18,590.85	-\$106.10	0.6%	

Typical Bill Comparison 60% Auction at \$34 / MWh Columbus Southern Power Rate Zone

Tariff	<u>kWh</u>	<u>KW</u>	<u>Current</u>	Proposed	Difference	Difference
GS-3	150,000	500	\$19,301.09	\$19,221.52	-\$79.57	-0.4%
Secondary	180,000	500	\$21,239.46	\$21,143.97	-\$95.49	-0.5%
(continued)	200,000	500	\$22,531.72	\$22,425.62	-\$106.10	-0.5%
	325,000	500	\$30,608.34	\$30,435.92	-\$172.42	-0.6%
GS-3	300,000	1,000	\$36,603.82	\$36,450.19	-\$153.63	-0.4%
Primary	360,000	1,000	\$40,379.90	\$40,195.54	-\$184.36	-0.5%
	400,000	1,000	\$42,897.28	\$42,692.44	-\$204.84	-0.5%
	650,000	1,000	\$58,630.94	\$58,298.08	-\$332.86	-0.6%
GS-4						
	1,500,000	5,000	\$144,977.71	\$144,225.01	-\$752.70	-0.5%
	2,500,000	5,000	\$203,018.21	\$201,763.71	-\$1,254.50	-0.6%
	3,250,000	5,000	\$246,548.60	\$244,917.75	-\$1,630.85	-0.7%
	3,000,000	10,000	\$265,823.46	\$264,318.06	-\$1,505.40	-0.6%
	5,000,000	10,000	\$381,904.46	\$379,395.46	-\$2,509.00	-0.7%
	6,500,000	10,000	\$468,965.21	\$465,703.51	-\$3,261.70	-0.7%
	6,000,000	20,000	\$507,514.96	\$504,504.16	-\$3,010.80	-0.6%
	10,000,000	20,000	\$739,676.96	\$734,658.96	-\$5,018.00	-0.7%
	13,000,000	20,000	\$913,798.46	\$907,275.06	-\$6,523.40	-0.7%
	15,000,000	50,000	\$1,232,589.46	\$1,225,062.46	-\$7,527.00	-0.6%
	25,000,000	50,000	\$1,812,994.46	\$1,800,449.46	-\$12,545.00	-0.7%
	32,500,000	50,000	\$2,248,298.21	\$2,231,989.71	-\$16,308.50	-0.7%

* Typical bills assume 100% Power Factor

\$

Typical Bill Comparison 60% Auction at \$34 / MWh Ohio Power Rate Zone

Unio Power Rate Zone							
Tariff	<u>kWh</u>	KW	Current	Proposed	\$ <u>Difference</u>	Difference	
<u>. 1 ai iii</u>	<u>KVVII</u>	INV	Current	<u>Froposed</u>	Difference	Difference	
Residential	100		\$18.48	\$18.43	-\$0.05	-0.3%	
	250		\$38.28	\$38.17	-\$0.11	-0.3%	
	500		\$71.37	\$71.14	-\$0.23	-0.3%	
	750		\$104.41	\$104.07	-\$0.34	-0.3%	
	1,000		\$134.78	\$134.32	-\$0.46		
	1,500		\$194.19	\$193.52	-\$0.67		
	2,000		\$253.58	\$252.68	-\$0.90		
GS-1	375	3	\$59.27	\$59.10	-\$0.17	-0.3%	
Secondary	1,000	3	\$127.04	\$126.58	-\$0.46		
Secondary	750	6	\$99.93	\$99.59	-\$0.34		
	2,000	6	\$235.50	\$234.60	-\$0.90		
	2,000	0	φ200.00	ψ204.00	-40.90	-0.4 /0	
00.0	4.500	10	¢265.02	¢064.25	¢0.67	0.20/	
GS-2	1,500	12	\$265.02	\$264.35	-\$0.67		
Secondary	4,000	12	\$506.43	\$504.62	-\$1.81		
	6,000	30	\$830.99	\$828.28	-\$2.71		
	10,000	30	\$1,216.89	\$1,212.37	-\$4.52		
	10,000	40	\$1,290.02	\$1,285.50	-\$4.52		
	14,000	40	\$1,675.91	\$1,669.58	-\$6.33		
	12,500	50	\$1,604.32	\$1,598.68	-\$5.64		
	18,000	50	\$2,133.22	\$2,125.09	-\$8.13		
	15,000	75	\$2,028.30	\$2,021.53	-\$6.77		
	30,000	100	\$3,649.79	\$3,636.23	-\$13.56		
	36,000	100	\$4,225.27	\$4,209.00	-\$16.27		
	30,000	150	\$4,015.40	\$4,001.84	-\$13.56		
	60,000	300	\$7,989.60	\$7,962.49	-\$27.11		
	90,000	300	\$10,866.97	\$10,826.30	-\$40.67		
	100,000	500	\$13,288.52	\$13,243.34	-\$45.18		
	150,000	500	\$18,084.17	\$18,016.40	-\$67.77		
	180,000	500	\$20,961.52	\$20,880.20	-\$81.32	-0.4%	
GS-3	18,000	50	\$2,111.91	\$2,103.78	-\$8.13	-0.4%	
Secondary	30,000	75	\$3,339.31	\$3,325.75	-\$13.56	5 -0.4% ⁻	
	50,000	75	\$4,619.44	\$4,596.85	-\$22.59	-0.5%	
	36,000	100	\$4,182.63	\$4,166.36	-\$16.27	-0.4%	
	30,000	150	\$4,717.21	\$4,703.65	-\$13.56	-0.3%	
	60,000	150	\$6,637.39	\$6,610.28	-\$27.11	-0.4%	
	100,000	150	\$9,197.63	\$9,152.45	-\$45.18	-0.5%	
	120,000	300	\$13,233.58	\$13,179.36	-\$54.22		
	150,000	300	\$15,153.77	\$15,086.00	-\$67.77	7 -0.5%	
	200,000	300	\$18,354.06	\$18,263.70	-\$90.36	-0.5%	
	180,000	500	\$20,748.37	\$20,667.05	-\$81.32	2 -0.4%	
	200,000	500	\$22,028.49	\$21,938.13	-\$90.36	6 -0.4%	
	325,000	500	\$30,029.26	\$29,882.42	-\$146.84	4 -0.5%	

Typical Bill Comparison 60% Auction at \$34 / MWh Ohio Power Rate Zone

Othor Fonce Fide Eone							
					\$		
Tariff	<u>kWh</u>	<u>KW</u>	Current	<u>Proposed</u>	Difference	<u>Difference</u>	
GS-2	200,000	1,000	\$25,611.91	\$25,524.71	-\$87.20	-0.3%	
Primary	300,000	1,000	\$34,992.10	\$34,861.30	-\$130.80	-0.4%	
						a 484	
GS-3	360,000	1,000	\$40,218.40	\$40,061.44	-\$156.96	-0.4%	
Primary	400,000	1,000	\$42,738.05	\$42,563.65	-\$174.40	-0.4%	
	650,000	1,000	\$58,485.90	\$58,202.50	-\$283.40	-0.5%	
<u></u>							
GS-2					0040.05	0.5%	
Subtransmissic	1,500,000	5,000	\$143,303.94	\$142,662.99	-\$640.95	-0.5%	
GS-3	2,500,000	5,000	\$207,010.29	\$205,942.04	-\$1,068.25	-0.5%	
Subtransmissic	3,250,000	5,000	\$249,702.86	\$248,314.13	-\$1,388.73		
	-121	-,	+- · · , · · - · · · ·				
GS-4	3,000,000	10,000	\$284,025.79	\$282,743.89	-\$1,281.90	-0.5%	
Subtransmissic	5,000,000	10,000	\$387,641.79	\$385,505.29	-\$2,136.50	-0.6%	
	6,500,000	10,000	\$465,353.79	\$462,576.34	-\$2,777.45	-0.6%	
	10,000,000	20,000	\$769,981.79	\$765,708.79	-\$4,273.00	-0.6%	
	13,000,000	20,000	\$925,405.79	\$919,850.89	-\$5,554.90		
		,	• • • • • • • • •		· •		
GS-4	25,000,000	50,000	\$1,906,904.29	\$1,896,221.79	-\$10,682.50		
Transmission	32,500,000	50,000	\$2,295,135.04	\$2,281,247.79	-\$13,887.25	-0.6%	

Typical Bill Comparison 60% Auction at \$40 / MWh Columbus Southern Power Rate Zone

ie N

Tariff	<u>kWh</u>	<u>KW</u>	Current	Proposed	Φ Difference	Difference
<u>Residential</u>						
RR1 Annual	100		\$19.61	\$19.98	\$0.37	1.9%
	250		\$39.69	\$40.61	\$0.92	
	500		\$73.24	\$75.07	\$1.83	
RR Annual	750		\$114.62	\$117.37	\$2.75	2.4%
	1,000		\$142.45	\$146.12	\$3.67	2.6%
	1,500		\$194.03	\$199.52	\$5.49	
	2,000		\$245.58	\$252.91	\$7.33	
GS-1	375	3	\$66.23	\$67.60	\$1.37	2.1%
	1,000	3	\$161.01	\$164.68	\$3.67	
	750	6	\$123.10	\$125.85	\$2.75	
	2,000	6	\$278.83	\$286.16	\$7.33	2.6%
GS-2	1,500	12	\$269.95	\$275.44	\$5.49	2.0%
Secondary	4,000	12	\$554.69	\$569.35	\$14.66	2.6%
-	6,000	30	\$910.77	\$932.75	\$21.98	2.4%
	10,000	30	\$1,365.98	\$1,402.63	\$36.65	2.7%
	10,000	40	\$1,437.37	\$1,474.02	\$36.65	2.6%
	14,000	40	\$1,892.61	\$1,943.92	\$51.31	2.7%
	12,500	50	\$1,793.26	\$1,839.07	\$45.81	2.6%
	18,000	50	\$2,417.51	\$2,483.47	\$65.96	2.7%
	15,000	75	\$2,256.21	\$2,311.19	\$54.98	2.4%
	30,000	150	\$4,490.18	\$4,600.12	\$109.94	2.5%
	60,000	300	\$8,958.16	\$9,178.06	\$219.90	
	100,000	500	\$14,915.43	\$15,281.92	\$366.49	2.5%
GS-2						
Primary	100,000	1,000	\$17,144.61	\$17,498.39	\$353.78	2.1%
GS-3	30,000	75	\$3,398.66	\$3,508.60	\$109.94	3.2%
Secondary	50,000	75	\$4,690.92	\$4,874.17	\$183.25	
	30,000	100	\$3,877.99	[,] \$3,987.93	\$109.94	
	36,000	100	\$4,265.66	\$4,397.60	\$131.94	
	60,000	150	\$6,775.06	\$6,994.96	\$219.90	
	100,000	150	\$9,359.58	\$9,726.07	\$366.49	
	90,000	300	\$11,589.54	\$11,919.38	\$329.84	
	120,000	300	\$13,527.93	\$13,967.72	\$439.79	
	150,000	300	\$15,466.32	\$16,016.06	\$549.74	
	200,000	300	\$18,696.95	\$19,429.93	\$732.98	3.9%

\$

Typical Bill Comparison 60% Auction at \$40 / MWh Columbus Southern Power Rate Zone

\$

Tariff	<u>kWh</u>	<u>KW</u>	Current	Proposed	Difference	Difference
GS-3	150,000	500	\$19,301.09	\$19,850.83	\$549.74	2.9%
Secondary	180,000	500	\$21,239.46	\$21,899.14	\$659.68	3.1%
(continued)	200,000	500	\$22,531.72	\$23,264.70	\$732.98	3.3%
	325,000	500	\$30,608.34	\$31,799.43	\$1,191.09	3.9%
GS-3	300,000	1,000	\$36,603.82	\$37,665.16	\$1,061.34	2.9%
Primary	360,000	1,000	\$40,379.90	\$41,653.51	\$1,273.61	3.2%
	400,000	1,000	\$42,897.28	\$44,312.40	\$1,415.12	3.3%
	650,000	1,000	\$58,630.94	\$60,930.51	\$2,299.57	3.9%
GS-4						
	1,500,000	5,000	\$144,977.71	\$150,178.66	\$5,200.95	3.6%
	2,500,000	5,000	\$203,018.21	\$211,686.46	\$8,668.25	4.3%
	3,250,000	5,000	\$246,548.60	\$257,817.32	\$11,268.72	4.6%
	3,000,000	10,000	\$265,823.46	\$276,225.36	\$10,401.90	3.9%
	5,000,000	10,000	\$381,904.46	\$399,240.96	\$17,336.50	4.5%
	6,500,000	10,000	\$468,965.21	\$491,502.66	\$22,537.45	
	6,000,000	20,000	\$507,514.96	\$528,318.76	\$20,803.80	
	10,000,000	20,000	\$739,676.96	\$774,349.96	\$34,673.00	
	13,000,000	20,000	\$913,798.46	\$958,873.36	\$45,074.90	
	15,000,000	50,000	\$1,232,589.46	\$1,284,598.96	\$52,009.50	
	25,000,000	50,000	\$1,812,994.46	\$1,899,676.96	\$86,682.50	
	32,500,000	50,000	\$2,248,298.21	\$2,360,985.46	\$112,687.25	5.0%

Typical Bill Comparison 60% Auction at \$40 / MWh Ohio Power Rate Zone

Onio Power Rate Zone							
Tariff	<u>kWh</u>	<u>KW</u>	Current	Proposed	\$ <u>Difference</u>	Difference	
Residential	100 250 500 750 1,000 1,500 2,000		\$18.48 \$38.28 \$71.37 \$104.41 \$134.78 \$194.19 \$253.58	\$18.79 \$39.06 \$72.93 \$106.75 \$137.90 \$198.87 \$259.82	\$0.31 \$0.78 \$1.56 \$2.34 \$3.12 \$4.68 \$6.24	1.7% 2.0% 2.2% 2.2% 2.3% 2.4% 2.5%	
GS-1 Secondary	375 1,000 750 2,000	3 3 6 6	\$59.27 \$127.04 \$99.93 \$235.50	\$60.44 \$130.16 \$102.27 \$241.74	\$1.17 \$3.12 \$2.34 \$6.24	2.5% 2.3%	
GS-2 Secondary	1,500 4,000 6,000 10,000 14,000 12,500 18,000 30,000 36,000 30,000 60,000 90,000 100,000 150,000 180,000	12 30 30 40 40 50 50 75 100 100 150 300 300 500 500	\$265.02 \$506.43 \$830.99 \$1,216.89 \$1,290.02 \$1,675.91 \$1,604.32 \$2,133.22 \$2,028.30 \$3,649.79 \$4,225.27 \$4,015.40 \$7,989.60 \$10,866.97 \$13,288.52 \$18,084.17 \$20,961.52	\$269.70 \$518.92 \$849.72 \$1,248.09 \$1,321.22 \$1,719.60 \$1,643.34 \$2,189.40 \$2,075.12 \$3,743.41 \$4,337.62 \$4,109.02 \$8,176.85 \$11,147.85 \$13,600.61 \$18,552.30 \$21,523.28	\$4.68 \$12.49 \$18.73 \$31.20 \$33.69 \$39.02 \$56.18 \$46.82 \$93.62 \$112.35 \$93.62 \$112.35 \$93.62 \$187.25 \$280.88 \$312.09 \$468.13 \$561.76	2.5% 2.3% 2.6% 2.4% 2.6% 2.4% 2.6% 2.3% 2.6% 2.3% 2.3% 2.3% 2.3% 2.3% 2.3% 2.3% 2.3	
GS-3 Secondary	$\begin{array}{c} 18,000\\ 30,000\\ 50,000\\ 36,000\\ 30,000\\ 100,000\\ 120,000\\ 120,000\\ 150,000\\ 200,000\\ 180,000\\ 200,000\\ 325,000\end{array}$	50 75 75 100 150 150 300 300 300 500 500	\$2,111.91 \$3,339.31 \$4,619.44 \$4,182.63 \$4,717.21 \$6,637.39 \$9,197.63 \$13,233.58 \$15,153.77 \$18,354.06 \$20,748.37 \$22,028.49 \$30,029.26	\$2,168.09 \$3,432.93 \$4,775.48 \$4,294.98 \$4,810.83 \$6,824.64 \$9,509.72 \$13,608.09 \$15,621.90 \$18,978.24 \$21,310.13 \$22,652.67 \$31,043.55	\$56.18 \$93.62 \$156.04 \$112.35 \$93.62 \$187.25 \$312.09 \$374.57 \$468.13 \$624.18 \$561.70 \$624.18 \$561.70 \$624.18	2 2.8% 4 3.4% 5 2.7% 2 2.0% 5 2.8% 9 3.4% 1 2.8% 3 3.1% 8 3.4% 6 2.7% 8 2.8%	

Typical Bill Comparison 60% Auction at \$40 / MWh Ohio Power Rate Zone

					\$			
Tariff	<u>kWh</u>	<u>KW</u>	Current	Proposed	Difference	Difference		
GS-2	200,000	1,000	\$25,611.91	\$26,214.45	\$602.54	2.4%		
Primary	300,000	1,000	\$34,992.10	\$35,895.91	\$903.81	2.6%		
GS-3	360,000	1,000	\$40,218.40	\$41,302.97	\$1,084.57	2.7%		
Primary	400,000	1,000	\$42,738.05	\$43,943.13	\$1,205.08	2.8%		
	650,000	1,000	\$58,485.90	\$60,444.15	\$1,958.25	3.4%		
GS-2								
Subtransmissic	1,500,000	5,000	\$143,303.94	\$147,732.84	\$4,428.90	3.1%		
GS-3	2,500,000	5,000	\$207,010.29	\$214,391.79	\$7,381.50	3.6%		
Subtransmissic	3,250,000	5,000	\$249,702.86	\$259,298.81				
Subliansmissic	3,250,000	5,000	φ249,702.00	\$209,290.01	\$9,595.95	3.0%		
GS-4	3,000,000	10,000	\$284,025.79	\$292,883.59	\$8,857.80	3.1%		
Subtransmissic	5,000,000	10,000	\$387,641.79	\$402,404.79	\$14,763.00			
	6,500,000	10,000	\$465,353.79	\$484,545.69	\$19,191.90			
	10,000,000	20,000	\$769,981.79	\$799,507.79	\$29,526.00			
	13,000,000	20,000	\$925,405.79	\$963,789.59	\$38,383.80			
	,,	,	<i>t</i> ,	÷•••;••••••	+00,000.00			
GS-4	25,000,000	50,000	\$1,906,904.29	\$1,980,719.29	\$73,815.00	3.9%		
Transmission	32,500,000	50,000	\$2,295,135.04	\$2,391,094.54	\$95,959.50			
	• • •	1. C		, , ,	. ,			

Typical Bill Comparison 100% Auction at \$34 / MWh Columbus Southern Power Rate Zone

Columbus Southern Power Rate Zone							
			•		\$	B.177	
Tariff	<u>kWh</u>	KW	<u>Current</u>	Proposed	<u>Difference</u>	<u>Difference</u>	
Residential	100		¢40.04	¢40.00	00.10	7 4 0/	
RR1 Annual	100		\$19.61	\$18.22	-\$1.39	-7.1%	
	250		\$39.69	\$36.22	-\$3.47	-8.7%	
	500		\$73.24	\$66.29	-\$6.95	-9.5%	
RR Annual	750		\$114.62	\$102.06	-\$12.56	-11.0%	
T (V) unidui	1,000		\$142.45	\$127.27	-\$15.18	-10.7%	
	1,500		\$194.03	\$174.42	-\$19.61	-10.1%	
	2,000		\$245.58	\$221.54	-\$24.03	-9.8%	
	2,000		ψ2 10.00	<i>Q<i>LL</i> 1.0 1</i>	+=	0.0.0	
GS-1	375	3	\$66.23	\$55.23	ິ -\$11.00	-16.6%	
	1,000	3	\$161.01	\$131.67	-\$29.34	-18.2%	
	750	6	\$123.10	\$101.10	-\$22.00	-17.9%	
	2,000	6	\$278.83	\$233.68	-\$45.15	-16.2%	
GS-2	1,500	12	\$269.95	\$233.73	-\$36.22		
Secondary	4,000	12	\$554.69	\$458.10	-\$96.59		
	6,000	30	\$910.77	\$765.88	-\$144.89		
	10,000	30	\$1,365.98	\$1,124.51	-\$241.47		
	10,000	40	\$1,437.37	\$1,195.90	-\$241.47		
	14,000	40	\$1,892.61	\$1,554.54	-\$338.07		
	12,500	50	\$1,793.26	\$1,491.42	-\$301.84		
	18,000	50	\$2,417.51	\$1,982.84	-\$434.67		
	15,000	75	\$2,256.21	\$1,893.99	-\$362.22		
	30,000	150	\$4,490.18	\$3,765.74	-\$724.44		
	60,000	300	\$8,958.16	\$7,509.28	-\$1,448.88		
	100,000	500	\$14,915.43	\$12,500.64	-\$2,414.79	-16.2%	
GS-2	100.000	1,000	\$17,144.61	\$14,780.75	-\$2,363.86	-13.8%	
Primary	100,000	1,000	φ17,144.01	\$14,700.75	-92,505.60	-15.070	
GS-3	30,000	75	\$3,398.66	\$2,925.66	-\$473.00	-13.9%	
Secondary	50,000	75	\$4,690.92	\$4,119.94	-\$570.98	-12.2%	
····,	30,000	100	\$3,877.99	\$3,296.32	-\$581.67		
	36,000	100	\$4,265.66	\$3,654.60	-\$611.06	5 -14.3%	
	60,000	150	\$6,775.06	\$5,829.07	-\$945.99		
	100,000	150	\$9,359.58	\$8,217.61	-\$1,141.97		
	90,000	300	\$11,589.54	\$9,844.54	-\$1,745.00		
	120,000	300	\$13,527.93	\$11,635.95	-\$1,891.98		
	150,000	300	\$15,466.32	\$13,427.36	-\$2,038.96		
	200,000	300	\$18,696.95	\$16,413.01	-\$2,283.94		
			,	, ,	, _,		

Typical Bill Comparison 100% Auction at \$34 / MWh Columbus Southern Power Rate Zone

					\$	-		
<u>Tariff</u>	<u>kWh</u>	<u>KW</u>	Current	Proposed	<u>Difference</u>	<u>Difference</u>		
GS-3	150,000	500	\$19,301.09	\$16,392.77	-\$2,908.32	-15.1%		
Secondary	180,000	500	\$21,239.46	\$18,184.15	-\$3,055.31	-14.4%		
(continued)	200,000	500	\$22,531.72	\$19,378.42	-\$3,153.30	-14.0%		
	325,000	500	\$30,608.34	\$26,842.60	-\$3,765.74	-12.3%		
GS-3	300,000	1,000	\$36,603.82	\$30,971.13	-\$5,632.69	-15.4%		
Primary	360,000	1,000	\$40,379.90	\$34,461.55	-\$5,918.35	-14.7%		
	400,000	1,000	\$42,897.28	\$36,788.50	-\$6,108.78			
	650,000	1,000	\$58,630.94	\$51,331.92	-\$7,299.02			
	,	.,	<i> </i>	+, <u>-</u>	+ - 1			
GS-4								
	1,500,000	5,000	\$144,977.71	\$138,024.61	-\$6,953.10	-4.8%		
	2,500,000	5,000	\$203,018.21	\$191,429.71	-\$11,588.50	-5.7%		
	3,250,000	5,000	\$246,548.60	\$231,483.55	-\$15,065.05			
	3,000,000	10,000	\$265,823.46	\$251,917.26	-\$13,906.20			
	5,000,000	10,000	\$381,904.46	\$358,727.46	-\$23,177.00			
	6,500,000	10,000	\$468,965.21	\$438,835.11	-\$30,130.10			
	6,000,000	20,000	\$507,514.96	\$479,702.56	-\$27,812.40			
	10,000,000	20,000	\$739,676.96	\$693,322.96	-\$46,354.00			
	13,000,000	20,000	\$913,798.46	\$853,538.26	-\$60,260.20			
	15,000,000	50,000	\$1,232,589.46	\$1,163,058.46	-\$69,531.00			
		•						
	25,000,000	50,000	\$1,812,994.46	\$1,697,109.46	-\$115,885.00			
	32,500,000	50,000	\$2,248,298.21	\$2,097,647.71	-\$150,650.50	-6.7%		

Typical Bill Comparison 100% Auction at \$34 / MWh Ohio Power Rate Zone

Onio Power Rate Zone								
Tariff	<u>kWh</u>	<u>KW</u>	Current	Proposed	\$ <u>Difference</u>	Difference		
Residential	100 250 500		\$18.48 \$38.28 \$71.37	\$17.54 \$35.95 \$66.69	-\$0.94 -\$2.33 -\$4.68	-5.1% -6.1% -6.6%		
	750		\$104.41	\$97.40	-\$4.00	-6.7%		
	1,000		\$134.78	\$125.79	-\$8.99	-6.7%		
	1,500		\$194.19	\$181.49	-\$12.70	-6.5%		
	2,000		\$253.58	\$237.14	-\$16.44	-6.5%		
GS-1	375	3	\$59.27	\$54.46	-\$4.81	-8.1%		
Secondary	1,000	3	\$127.04	\$114.23	-\$12.81	-10.1%		
	750	6	\$99.93 \$225 50	\$90.34 \$200.00	-\$9.59	-9.6%		
	2,000	6	\$235.50	\$209.90	-\$25.60	-10.9%		
GS-2	1,500	12	\$265.02	\$248.00	-\$17.02	-6.4%		
Secondary	4,000	12	\$506.43	\$461.04	-\$45.39	-9.0%		
	6,000	30	\$830.99	\$762.91	-\$68.08			
	10,000	30	\$1,216.89	\$1,103.40	-\$113.49			
	10,000	40	\$1,290.02	\$1,176.53	-\$113.49			
	14,000	40 50	\$1,675.91 \$1,604,22	\$1,517.03 \$1,462.47	-\$158.88			
	12,500 18,000	50	\$1,604.32 \$2,133.22	\$1,928.95	-\$141.85 -\$204.27			
	15,000	75	\$2,028.30	\$1,858.08	-\$170.22			
	30,000	100	\$3,649.79	\$3,309.33	-\$340.46			
	36,000	100	\$4,225.27	\$3,816.72	-\$408.55			
	30,000	150	\$4,015.40	\$3,674.94	-\$340.46			
	60,000	300	\$7,989.60	\$7,308.69	-\$680.91	-8.5%		
	90,000	300	\$10,866.97	\$9,845.60	-\$1,021.37			
	100,000	500	\$13,288.52	\$12,153.68	-\$1,134.84			
	150,000	500	\$18,084.17	\$16,381.90	-\$1,702.27			
	180,000	500	\$20,961.52	\$18,918.80	-\$2,042.72	-9.8%		
GS-3	18,000	50	\$2,111.91	\$1,935.87	-\$176.04			
Secondary	30,000	75	\$3,339.31	\$3,078.87	-\$260.44			
	50,000	75	\$4,619.44	\$4,383.19	-\$236.25			
	36,000	100	\$4,182.63	\$3,830.55	-\$352.08			
	30,000	150	\$4,717.21	\$4,160.07	-\$557.14			
	60,000	150	\$6,637.39 \$0,107.63	\$6,116.52 \$8,725,12	-\$520.87			
	100,000 120,000	150 300	\$9,197.63 \$13,233.58	\$8,725.13 \$12,191.85	-\$472.50 -\$1,041.73			
	150,000	300	\$15,153.77	\$12,191.05	-\$1,041.73			
	200,000	300	\$18,354.06	\$17,409.05	-\$945.01			
	180,000	500	\$20,748.37	\$18,987.98	-\$1,760.39			
	200,000	500	\$22,028.49	\$20,292.28	-\$1,736.21			
	325,000	500	\$30,029.26	\$28,444.17	-\$1,585.09			

Typical Bill Comparison 100% Auction at \$34 / MWh Ohio Power Rate Zone

			io i owei itale i	Long		
					\$	
Tariff	<u>kWh</u>	KW	Current	Proposed	<u>Difference</u>	<u>Difference</u>
GS-2	200,000	1,000	\$25,611.91	\$25,953.45	\$341.54	1.3%
Primary	300,000	1,000	\$34,992.10	\$35,504.41	\$512.31	1.5%
GS-3	360,000	1,000	\$40,218.40	\$36,715.65	-\$3,502.75	-8.7%
Primary	400,000	1,000	\$42,738.05	\$39,271.00	-\$3,467.05	-8.1%
	650,000	1,000	\$58,485.90	\$55,241.94	-\$3,243.96	-5.6%
GS-2						
Subtransmissic	1,500,000	5,000	\$143,303.94	\$126,574.14	-\$16,729.80	-11.7%
GS-3	2,500,000	5,000	\$207,010.29	\$190,210.19	-\$16,800.10	-8.1%
Subtransmissic	3,250,000	5,000	\$249,702.86	\$233,436.73	-\$16,266.13	
GS-4	3,000,000	10,000	\$284,025.79	\$247,667.55	-\$36,358.24	-12.8%
Subtransmissic	5,000,000	10,000	\$387,641.79	\$354,191.39	-\$33,450.40	-8.6%
	6,500,000	10,000	\$465,353.79	\$434,084.27	-\$31,269.52	-6.7%
	10,000,000	20,000	\$769,981.79	\$703,080.99	-\$66,900.80	-8.7%
	13,000,000	20,000	\$925,405.79	\$862,866.75	-\$62,539.04	
GS-4	25,000,000	50,000	\$1,906,904.29	\$1,743,691.29	-\$163,213.00	-8.6%
Transmission	32,500,000	50,000	\$2,295,135.04	\$2,142,958.14	-\$152,176.90	-6.6%

Typical Bill Comparison 100% Auction at \$40 / MWh Columbus Southern Power Rate Zone

\$

Tariff	<u>kWh</u>	KW	Current	Proposed	⊅ Difference	<u>Difference</u>
Residential						
RR1 Annual	100		\$19.61	\$18.86	~\$0.75	-3.8%
	250		\$39.69	\$37.81	-\$1.88	-4.7%
	500		\$73.24	\$69.47	-\$3.77	-5.2%
RR Annual	750		\$114.62	\$106.83	-\$7.79	-6.8%
	1,000		\$142.45	\$133.64	-\$8.81	-6.2%
	1,500		\$194.03	\$183.96	-\$10.07	-5.2%
	2,000		\$245.58	\$234.27	-\$11.30	-4.6%
GS-1	375	3	\$66.23	\$57.62	-\$8.61	-13.0%
	1,000	3	\$161.01	\$138.04	-\$22.97	-14.3%
	750	6	\$123.10	\$105.87	-\$17.23	-14.0%
	2,000	6	\$278.83	\$246.41	-\$32.42	-11.6%
GS-2	1,500	12	\$269.95	\$243.27	-\$26.68	-9.9%
Secondary	4,000	12	\$554.69	\$483.56	-\$71.13	-12.8%
,	6,000	30	\$910.77	\$804.07	-\$106.70	
	10,000	30	\$1,365.98	\$1,188.16	-\$177.82	-13.0%
	10,000	40	\$1,437.37	\$1,259.55	-\$177.82	-12.4%
	14,000	40	\$1,892.61	\$1,643.64	-\$248.97	-13.2%
	12,500	50	\$1,793.26	\$1,570.98	-\$222.28	-12.4%
	18,000	50	\$2,417.51	\$2,097.41	-\$320.10	-13.2%
	15,000	75	\$2,256.21	\$1,989.46	-\$266.75	-11.8%
	30,000	150	\$4,490.18	\$3,956.69	-\$533.49	-11.9%
	60,000	300	\$8,958.16	\$7,891.17	-\$1,066.99	
	100,000	500	\$14,915.43	\$13,137.12	-\$1,778.31	-11.9%
GS-2						
Primary	100,000	1,000	\$17,144.61	\$15,395.15	-\$1,749.46	-10.2%
GS-3	30,000	75	\$3,398.66	\$3,116.61	-\$282.05	-8.3%
Secondary	50,000	75	\$4,690.92	\$4,438.18	-\$252.74	-5.4%
•	30,000	100	\$3,877.99	\$3,487.27	-\$390.72	10.1%
	36,000	100	\$4,265.66	\$3,883.73	-\$381.93	-9.0%
	60,000	150	\$6,775.06	\$6,210.96	-\$564.10	-8.3%
	100,000	150	\$9,359.58	\$8,854.09	-\$505.49	-5.4%
	90,000	300	\$11,589.54	\$10,417.38	-\$1,172.16	
	120,000	300	\$13,527.93	\$12,399.73	-\$1,128.20	
	150,000	300	\$15,466.32	\$14,382.08	-\$1,084.24	
	200,000	300	\$18,696.95	\$17,685.97	-\$1,010.98	3 -5.4%

Typical Bill Comparison 100% Auction at \$40 / MWh Columbus Southern Power Rate Zone

Tariff	<u>kWh</u>	<u>KW</u>	Current	Proposed	Difference	Difference
GS-3	150,000	500	\$19,301.09	\$17,347.49	-\$1,953.60	-10.1%
Secondary	180,000	500	\$21,239.46	\$19,329.81	-\$1,909.65	-9.0%
(continued)	200,000	500	\$22,531.72	\$20,651.38	-\$1,880.34	-8.4%
	325,000	500	\$30,608.34	\$28,911.16	-\$1,697.18	-5.5%
GS-3	300,000	1,000	\$36,603.82	\$32,814.33	-\$3,789.49	-10.4%
Primary	360,000	1,000	\$40,379.90	\$36,673.39	-\$3,706.51	-9.2%
	400,000	1,000	\$42,897.28	\$39,246.10	-\$3,651.18	-8.5%
	650,000	1,000	\$58,630.94	\$55,325.52	-\$3,305.42	-5.6%
GS-4						
	1,500,000	5,000	\$144,977.71	\$147,057.01	\$2,079.30	1.4%
	2,500,000	5,000	\$203,018.21	\$206,483.71	\$3,465.50	1.7%
	3,250,000	5,000	\$246,548.60	\$251,053.75	\$4,505.15	1.8%
	3,000,000	10,000	\$265,823.46	\$269,982.06	\$4,158.60	1.6%
	5,000,000	10,000	\$381,904.46	\$388,835.46	*\$6,931.00	1.8%
	6,500,000	10,000	\$468,965.21	\$477,975.51	\$9,010.30	1.9%
	6,000,000	20,000	\$507,514.96	\$515,832.16	\$8,317.20	1.6%
	10,000,000	20,000	\$739,676.96	\$753,538.96	\$13,862.00	1.9%
	13,000,000	20,000	\$913,798.46	\$931,819.06	\$18,020.60	2.0%
	15,000,000	50,000	\$1,232,589.46	\$1,253,382.46	\$20,793.00	
	25,000,000	50,000	\$1,812,994.46	\$1,847,649.46	\$34,655.00	1.9%
	32,500,000	50,000	\$2,248,298.21	\$2,293,349.71	\$45,051.50	2.0%

* Typical bills assume 100% Power Factor

\$

Typical Bill Comparison 100% Auction at \$40 / MWh Ohio Power Rate Zone

Unio Power Rate Zone							
<u>Tariff</u>	<u>kWh</u>	<u>KW</u>	Current	Proposed	\$ <u>Difference</u>	Difference	
Residential	100 250 500 750 1,000		\$18.48 \$38.28 \$71.37 \$104.41 \$134.78	\$18.12 \$37.17 \$68.98 \$100.75 \$130.06	-\$0.36 -\$1.11 -\$2.39 -\$3.66 -\$4.72	-2.0% -2.9% -3.4% -3.5% -3.5%	
	1,500 2,000		\$194.19 \$253.58	\$187.46 \$244.84	-\$6.73 -\$8.74	-3.5% -3.5%	
GS-1 Secondary	375 1,000 750 2,000	3 3 6 6	\$59.27 \$127.04 \$99.93 \$235.50	\$56.85 \$120.60 \$95.11 \$222.45	-\$2.42 -\$6.44 -\$4.82 -\$13.05	-4.8%	
GS-2 Secondary	1,500 4,000 6,000 10,000 14,000 12,500 18,000 30,000 36,000 30,000 60,000 90,000 100,000 150,000 180,000	12 30 30 40 40 50 50 75 100 100 150 300 300 500 500	\$265.02 \$506.43 \$830.99 \$1,216.89 \$1,290.02 \$1,675.91 \$1,604.32 \$2,133.22 \$2,028.30 \$3,649.79 \$4,225.27 \$4,015.40 \$7,989.60 \$10,866.97 \$13,288.52 \$18,084.17 \$20,961.52	\$257.54 \$485.64 \$801.10 \$1,163.25 \$1,240.16 \$1,599.61 \$1,541.74 \$2,034.08 \$1,953.55 \$3,489.45 \$4,024.85 \$3,865.89 \$7,690.58 \$10,381.74 \$12,790.16 \$17,330.10 \$20,007.11	-\$7.48 -\$20.79 -\$29.89 -\$53.64 -\$49.86 -\$76.30 -\$62.59 -\$99.14 -\$74.75 -\$160.34 -\$200.42 -\$149.51 -\$299.02 -\$485.24 -\$498.36 -\$754.07 -\$954.41	-4.1% -3.6% -4.4% -3.9% -4.6% -3.9% -4.7% -3.7% -4.4% -4.7% -3.7% -3.7% -4.5% -3.8% -4.2%	
GS-3 Secondary	$\begin{array}{c} 18,000\\ 30,000\\ 50,000\\ 36,000\\ 30,000\\ 60,000\\ 100,000\\ 120,000\\ 150,000\\ 200,000\\ 200,000\\ \end{array}$	50 75 100 150 150 300 300 300	\$2,111.91 \$3,339.31 \$4,619.44 \$4,182.63 \$4,717.21 \$6,637.39 \$9,197.63 \$13,233.58 \$15,153.77 \$18,354.06	\$2,035.97 \$3,230.51 \$4,551.92 \$4,028.61 \$4,351.02 \$6,417.69 \$9,060.49 \$12,792.09 \$14,774.19 \$18,077.66	-\$75.95 -\$108.80 -\$67.52 -\$154.02 -\$366.19 -\$219.70 -\$137.14 -\$441.49 -\$379.58 -\$276.40	-3.3% -1.5% -3.7% -7.8% -3.3% -1.5% -3.3% -2.5% -1.5%	
	180,000 200,000 325,000	500 500 500	\$20,748.37 \$22,028.49 \$30,029.26	\$19,969.87 \$21,291.28 \$29,550.00	-\$778.49 -\$737.22 -\$479.26	-3.4%	

Typical Bill Comparison 100% Auction at \$40 / MWh Ohio Power Rate Zone

					\$	
Tariff	<u>kWh</u>	KW	Current	Proposed	<u>Difference</u>	Difference
GS-2	200,000	1,000	\$25,611.91	\$27,182.25	\$1,570.34	6.1%
Primary	300,000	1,000	\$34,992.10	\$37,221.52	\$2,229.42	6.4%
GS-3	360,000	1,000	\$40,218.40	\$38,608.72	-\$1,609.68	-4.0%
Primary	400,000	1,000	\$42,738.05	\$41,197.68	-\$1,540.37	-3.6%
	650,000	1,000	\$58,485.90	\$57,378.71	-\$1,107.19	-1.9%
GS-2						
Subtransmissic	1,500,000	5,000	\$143,303.94	\$134,004.80	-\$9,299.13	-6.5%
				• · · · • · · ·		
GS-3	2,500,000	5,000	\$207,010.29	\$198,778.81	-\$8,231.48	-4.0%
Subtransmissic	3,250,000	5,000	\$249,702.86	\$242,427.56	-\$7,275.30	-2.9%
00.4	2 222 222	40.000	\$004 005 7 0	****	¢04 000 70	7 50/
GS-4	3,000,000	10,000	\$284,025.79	\$262,803.07	-\$21,222.72	
Subtransmissic	5,000,000	10,000	\$387,641.79	\$369,438.80	-\$18,202.98	
	6,500,000	10,000	\$465,353.79	\$449,415.61	-\$15,938.18	-3.4%
	10,000,000	20,000	\$769,981.79	\$733,327.64	-\$36,654.14	
	13,000,000	20,000	\$925,405.79	\$893,281.25	-\$32,124.54	-3.5%
004	25 000 000	50.000	¢1 006 004 20	¢1 017 717 00	¢00 407 04	4 70/
GS-4	25,000,000	50,000	\$1,906,904.29 \$2,205,125,04	\$1,817,717.08	-\$89,187.21	-4.7%
Transmission	32,500,000	50,000	\$2,295,135.04	\$2,217,364.02	-\$77,771.01	-3.4%

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing AEP Ohio Comments was served

upon the parties of record by electronic service this 12th day of August 2013.

//s// Steven T. Nourse Steven T. Nourse

EMAIL SERVICE LIST

Werner.margard@puc.state.oh.us, Steven.beeler@puc.state.oh.us, dboehm@BKLlawfirm.com, mkurtz@BKLlawfirm.com jkylercohn@BKLlawfirm.com, berger@occ.state.oh.us, haydenm@firstenergycorp.com, sam@mwncmh.com, joliker@mwncmh.com, fdarr@mwncmh.com, mpritchard@mwncmh.com, vparisi@igsenergy.com, mswhite@igsenergy.com,

AE: Jonathan.Tauber@puc.state.oh.us,

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

8/12/2013 4:55:18 PM

in

Case No(s). 13-1530-EL-UNC

Summary: Comments -AEP Ohio Comments electronically filed by Mr. Steven T Nourse on behalf of Ohio Power Company