BEFORE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application Seeking Approval of Ohio Power Company's Proposal to Enter into an Affiliate Power Purchase Agreement for Inclusion in the Power Purchase Agreement Rider.	)))))	Case No. 14-1693-EL-RDR
In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company for Approval of Certain Accounting Authority.	)))	Case No. 14-1694-EL-AAM

ENTRY

The attorney examiner finds:

(1) Ohio Power Company d/b/a AEP Ohio (AEP Ohio or the Company) is an electric distribution utility as defined in R.C. 4928.01(A)(6) and a public utility as defined in R.C. 4905.02, and, as such, is subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission.

(2) R.C. 4928.141 provides that an electric distribution utility shall provide consumers within its certified territory a standard service offer (SSO) of all competitive retail electric services necessary to maintain essential electric services to customers, including a firm supply of electric generation services. The SSO may be either a market rate offer in accordance with R.C. 4928.142 or an electric security plan (ESP) in accordance with R.C. 4928.143.

(3) In Case No. 13-2385-EL-SSO, et al., the Commission modified and approved AEP Ohio's application for an ESP for the period beginning June 1, 2015, through May 31, 2018, pursuant to R.C. 4928.143. *In re Ohio Power Co.*, Case No. 13-2385-EL-SSO, et al. (*ESP 3 Case*), Opinion and Order (Feb. 25, 2015), Second Entry on Rehearing (May 28, 2015). Among other matters, the Commission concluded that AEP Ohio's proposed power purchase agreement (PPA) rider, which would flow through to customers the net impact of the Company's contractual entitlement associated with the Ohio Valley Electric Corporation (OVEC), satisfies the requirements of R.C. 4928.143(B)(2)(d) and, therefore, is a permissible provision of an ESP. The Commission stated, however, that it was not persuaded, based on the evidence of record, that AEP Ohio's

PPA rider proposal would provide customers with sufficient benefit from the rider's financial hedging mechanism or any other benefit that is commensurate with the rider's potential cost. Noting that a properly conceived PPA rider proposal may provide significant customer benefits, the Commission authorized AEP Ohio to establish a placeholder PPA rider, at an initial rate of zero, for the term of the ESP, with the Company being required to justify any future request for cost recovery. Finally, the Commission determined that all of the implementation details with respect to the placeholder PPA rider would be determined in a future proceeding, following the filing of a proposal by AEP Ohio that addresses a number of specific factors, which the Commission will consider, but not be bound by, in its evaluation of the Company's filing. In addition, the Commission indicated that AEP Ohio's PPA rider proposal must address several other issues specified by the Commission. *ESP 3 Case*, Opinion and Order (Feb. 25, 2015) at 20-22, 25-26.

(4) On October 3, 2014, in the above-captioned proceedings, AEP Ohio filed an application seeking approval of a proposal to enter into a new affiliate PPA with AEP Generation Resources, Inc. (AEPGR).

(5) Following the issuance of the Commission's Opinion and Order in the *ESP 3 Case*, AEP Ohio filed, on May 15, 2015, an amended application and supporting testimony, again seeking approval of a new affiliate PPA with AEPGR and also requesting authority to include the net impacts of both the affiliate PPA and the Company's OVEC contractual entitlement in the placeholder PPA rider approved in the *ESP 3 Case*. AEP Ohio explains that the amended application supersedes and replaces the Company's original application filed on October 3, 2014. AEP Ohio further explains that the primary purposes of the amended application are to include the OVEC contractual entitlement in the pending PPA rider proposal, along with the proposed affiliate PPA with AEPGR; address the factors and requirements set forth by the Commission in the *ESP 3 Case*; and update the Company's supporting testimony to reflect a current analysis of the amended proposal.

(6) In order to assist the Commission in its review of AEP Ohio's amended application, the attorney examiner finds that the following procedural schedule should be established:

(a) Motions to intervene should be filed by August 21, 2015.

(b) Discovery requests, except for notices of deposition, should be served by September 4, 2015.

(c) Testimony on behalf of intervenors should be filed by September 11, 2015.

(d) Testimony on behalf of Staff should be filed by September 18, 2015.

(e) A prehearing conference shall take place on September 22, 2015, at 10:00 a.m., at the offices of the Commission, 180 East Broad Street, 11th Floor, Hearing Room 11-A, Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793.

(f) An evidentiary hearing shall commence on September 28, 2015, at 10:00 a.m., at the offices of the Commission, 180 East Broad Street, 11th Floor, Hearing Room 11-A, Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793.

(7) Discovery requests and replies shall be served by hand delivery, e-mail, or facsimile (unless otherwise agreed by the parties). An attorney serving a discovery request shall attempt to contact the attorney upon whom the discovery request will be served in advance to advise him/her that a request will be forthcoming (unless otherwise agreed by the parties). To the extent that a party has difficulty responding to a particular discovery request, counsel for the parties should discuss the problem and work out a mutually satisfactory solution.

(8) Finally, the attorney examiner notes that, pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-26(A)(3), parties attending the prehearing conference shall be prepared to identify any witness that will testify during the evidentiary hearing, provide the subject matter of any witness testimony, and indicate dates on which the witness is unavailable to testify.

It is, therefore,

ORDERED, That the procedural schedule set forth in finding (6) be adopted. It is, further,

ORDERED, That a copy of this Entry be served upon all parties and other interested persons of record in these cases and all parties of record in Case No. 13-2385-EL-SSO, et al.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

s/Sarah Parrot

By: Sarah J. Parrot
Attorney Examiner

JRJ/sc

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

8/7/2015 8:02:45 AM

in

Case No(s). 14-1693-EL-RDR, 14-1694-EL-AAM

Summary: Attorney Examiner Entry setting a procedural schedule in accordance with Finding (6). - electronically filed by Sandra Coffey on behalf of Sarah Parrot, Attorney Examiner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio