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ATTACHMENTS

BEH-1 Beth E. Hixon – Testimony Submitted on Public Utility Regulation

# I. INTRODUCTION

Q1. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, ADDRESS AND POSITION.

***A1.*** My name is Beth E. Hixon. My business address is 10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800, Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485. I am employed by the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel (“OCC”) as a Senior Energy Team Leader.

***Q2. WOULD YOU PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND?***

***A2.*** I received a Bachelor of Business Administration degree in accounting from Ohio University in June 1980. For the period June 1980 through April 1982, I was employed as an Examiner in the Field Audits Unit of the Ohio Rehabilitation Services Commission (“ORSC”). In this position, I performed compliance audits of ORSC grants to, and contracts with, various service agencies in Ohio.

In May 1982, I was employed in the position of Researcher by the OCC. In 1984, I was promoted to Utility Rate Analyst Supervisor and held that position until November 1987 when I joined the regulatory consulting firm of Berkshire Consulting Services. In April 1998, I returned to the OCC and have subsequently held positions as Senior Regulatory Analyst, Principal Regulatory Analyst, Assistant Director of Analytical Services and Senior Energy Team Leader.

***Q3. WHAT EXPERIENCE DO YOU HAVE IN THE AREA OF UTILITY REGULATION?***

***A3.*** In my positions with the OCC, and as a consultant with Berkshire Consulting Services, I have performed analysis and research in numerous cases involving utilities’ base rates, fuel, and gas rates and other regulatory issues. I have worked with attorneys, analytical staff, and consultants in preparing for, and litigating, utility proceedings involving Ohio’s electric companies, the major gas companies, and several telephone and water utilities. At the OCC, I also chair the OCC’s internal electric team, participate in and/or direct special regulatory projects regarding energy issues, and provide training on regulatory technical issues.

***Q4. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED TESTIMONY BEFORE REGULATORY COMMISSIONS?***

***A4.*** Yes. I have submitted testimony before the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (“PUCO” or “Commission”) in the cases listed in Attachment BEH-1. As shown on this Attachment, I have also submitted testimony in a case before the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission.

# II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

***Q5. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?***

***A5.*** The purpose of my testimony is to address one of FirstEnergy Electric Distribution Utilities’[[1]](#footnote-1) proposals in this proceeding (“ESP IV”). I address the Utilities request related to a commitment they made in Case No. 10-388-EL-SSO (“ESP II”). In ESP II the FirstEnergy EDUs agreed not to seek recovery through Ohio retail rates (i.e. not to collect from retail customers) $360 million of Legacy PJM[[2]](#footnote-2) Regional Transmission Expansion Plan costs (“Legacy RTEP”).

In this proceeding, the FirstEnergy EDUs request that the PUCO allow them to count MISO[[3]](#footnote-3) Transmission Expansion Plan costs (“Legacy MTEP”) costs toward their commitment not to charge Ohio customers $360 million of Legacy RTEP costs. The Utilities propose to count Legacy MTEP toward that commitment if the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”) determines that Legacy MTEP costs are not permitted in the ATSI[[4]](#footnote-4) formula rate tariff. These are the same Legacy MTEP costs that the FERC has determined are not permitted in the ATSI formula rate tariff***.***

***Q6. WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION REGARDING THE FIRSTENERGY EDUS’ PROPOSAL RELATED TO LEGACY MTEP?***

***A6.*** First, I recommend that it is premature for the PUCO, in this proceeding, to consider the FirstEnergy EDUs’ request related to Legacy MTEP costs. This is because there has been no final FERC ruling on whether the FirstEnergy EDUs may be charged Legacy MTEP costs through the ATSI formula rate tariff. The ruling is not final because of a pending rehearing request before the FERC. If the PUCO decides to consider the FirstEnergy EDUs’ request in this proceeding, contrary to OCC’s recommendation otherwise, then the Commission should not allow the Utilities to count any Legacy MTEP that is not eligible for inclusion in ATSI’s formula rate toward their Legacy RTEP commitment. The Utilities should not be permitted to count FERC-disallowed Legacy MTEP toward the $360 million non-collection commitment for FERC-approved Legacy RTEP.

# III. BACKGROUND

## FirstEnergy EDUs’ Commitment on Legacy RTEP Charges

***Q7. WHAT WAS THE RTEP-RELATED COMMITMENT BY THE UTILITIES THAT WAS APPROVED BY THE puco IN THE esp II cASE?***

***A7.*** In the PUCO-approved Stipulation in the ESP II case, the FirstEnergy EDUs agreed:

“not to seek recovery through retail rates of legacy RTEP costs for the longer of: (1) during the period of June 1, 2011 through May 31, 2016, or (2) when a total of $360 million of legacy RTEP costs have been paid by the Companies and have not been recovered by the Companies through retail rates from Ohio customers (Joint Ex. 3 at 5).”[[5]](#footnote-5)

Absent this “non-collection commitment” for Legacy RTEP, those Legacy RTEP costs charged to the FirstEnergy EDUs could have been charged to their Ohio customers.

***Q8. have the Utilities’ met their legacy rtep “non-Recovery COMMITMENT” TO customers?***

***A8.*** No. According to Utilities’ witness Mikkelsen, the Utilities “have made payments of just over $80 million”[[6]](#footnote-6) for PJM Legacy RTEP for which they have not sought to charge Ohio customers. Therefore, FirstEnergy EDUs are still committed to not collect from customers an additional $280 million of PJM Legacy RTEP charges.

## FirstEnergy EDUs’ Proposed Treatment in ESP IV of Legacy MTEP Costs

***Q9. WHAT is the Firstenergy edus’ proposal in this proceeding related to legacy MTEP?***

***A9.*** Witness Mikkelsen proposes that “if MISO transmission expansion costs are not eligible for inclusion in the ATSI formula rate,”[[7]](#footnote-7) then the PUCO should allow the Companies to count such Legacy MTEP costs toward their $360 million commitment not to collect PJM Legacy RTEP from customers. According to Ms. Mikkelsen, the FirstEnergy EDUs’ Ohio retail customers may not pay MTEP costs if “such costs cannot be included in the ATSI formula rate (billed to the Companies and then passed on to retail customers).”[[8]](#footnote-8)

***Q10.* *WHY COULD MTEP COSTS NOT BE ELIGIBLE FOR INCLUSION IN THE ATSI RATE FORMULA?***

***A10.*** Currently, the issue of whether Legacy MTEP costs may be included in the ATSI rate formula is pending before the FERC. According to the Companies’ response to OCC Interrogatory No. 13:

“ATSI is currently seeking authority from FERC to include MISO transmission expansion costs in its formula rate. In its initial decision, FERC determined that they are unable to approve ATSI’s request without additional support for why ATSI’s request is just and reasonable or a cost-benefit analysis showing that the benefits of ATSI’s request outweigh the costs. ATSI is currently seeking rehearing on FERC’s initial decision. As a result, the inclusion of MISO transmission expansion costs in the ATSI formula rate remains unresolved.”

***Q11. HOW would the ATSI formula rate affect rates charged by the firstenergy EDUs to Ohio retail customers?***

***A11.*** The ATSI rate formula is a part of the PJM Open Access Transmission Tariff (“PJM Tariff”) that is charged to ATSI zone transmission customers. The PJM Tariff, and the underlying ATSI rate formula, is subject to approval by the FERC. If a FERC-approved PJM Tariff’s ATSI rate formula included Legacy MTEP costs then PJM could charge those costs to the FirstEnergy EDUs. Those MTEP costs charged by PJM to the Companies could then be collected from Ohio retail customers through the Utilities’ Non-Market-Based Services Rider (“Rider NMB”).[[9]](#footnote-9)

***Q12. HOW DID ATSI SEEK FERC APPROVAL TO RECOVER LEGACY MTEP COSTS?***

***A12.*** In February 2011, PJM and ATSI filed, before the FERC, proposed revisions to the PJM Tariff, which would have allowed transmission customers in the ATSI zone to be charged for specific costs related to ATSI’s June 2011 exit from MISO and integration into PJM. One of the costs proposed to be added to the PJM Tariff was Legacy MTEP. It is my understanding, as confirmed by counsel, that in May 2011, the FERC denied PJM’s request to include Legacy MTEP costs in the ATSI formula rate.[[10]](#footnote-10) In that May 2011 Order, the FERC found that ATSI had not demonstrated that it was just and reasonable to collect from its wholesale transmission customers costs associated with its decision to switch RTOs. Therefore, the FERC ordered those costs to be removed from the PJM Tariff. The FERC did indicate that ATSI could subsequently file with FERC to seek collection of those costs, if it identified the benefits of ATSI’s RTO switch decision to its wholesale transmission customers and included an analysis showing that the benefits to wholesale transmission customers exceeded the costs of the RTO switch.[[11]](#footnote-11)

***Q13. DID ATSI SEEK FERC APPROVAL OF THE RTO SWITCH COSTS IN A SUBSEQUENT FILING, SHOWING THAT THE BENEFTIS TO ITS WHOLESALE TRANSMISSION CUSTOMERS EXCEEDED THE COSTS?***

***A13.*** No. In December 2012, ATSI submitted, for FERC’s consideration, settlements which would have allowed PJM to collect the RTO switch costs, including Legacy MTEP, from ATSI transmission customers. It is my understanding, as confirmed by counsel, that in September 2013 the FERC rejected these settlements, noting that the settlements imposed the same tariff changes as originally proposed, but that ATSI had neither provided the required additional support for why the changes were just and reasonable nor the cost-benefit analysis for the RTO switch costs.[[12]](#footnote-12) Because, in its September 2013 Order, the FERC again did not allow inclusion of Legacy MTEP costs in the ATSI formula rate, PJM, consequently, cannot charge Legacy MTEP costs to ATSI’s wholesale transmission customers. As explained in the FirstEnergy EDUs’ response to OCC Interrogatory No. 13, ATSI requested a rehearing on the September 2013 Order[[13]](#footnote-13) and FERC has not made a decision on that request.[[14]](#footnote-14)

# IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

***Q14. IN THIS PROCEEDING, SHOULD THE PUCO CONSIDER THE FIRSTENERGY EDUS’ REQUEST RELATED TO LEGACY MTEP?***

***A14.*** No, because the premise of the request - that Legacy MTEP costs are not eligible for the ATSI formula rate - remains unresolved as it is currently pending at the FERC and thus the PUCO should not consider it in this proceeding.

However, if, in the alternative, the PUCO decides to consider the request in this proceeding, then the Commission should deny FirstEnergy EDUs’ proposal on Legacy MTEP. FERC’s May 2011 Order and September 2013 Order confirmed that ATSI cannot charge Legacy MTEP costs to its transmission customers. In both Orders, FERC disallowed Legacy MTEP charges because ATSI has not shown that the resulting rates are just and reasonable, and has not shown that the benefits of the RTO switch to its wholesale transmission customers exceed the costs.

If it is assumed that the FERC’s decision stands (which is the premise of the FirstEnergy EDUs’ request), then PJM would not be able to charge the FirstEnergy EDUs for Legacy MTEP costs. And because the FirstEnergy EDUs would not be charged these costs, the FirstEnergy EDUs would not be able to charge Ohio retail customers for Legacy MTEP.[[15]](#footnote-15) Thus, Ohio retail customers would not (as they should not) be responsible for paying the FirstEnergy EDUs for costs the Utilities did not incur, and which were not charged to the Utilities.

Under these circumstances, the Utilities’ request in this proceeding would have the PUCO approve costs disallowed by FERC to satisfy the non-collection commitment for Legacy RTEP from ESP II. This is improper because counting FERC-disallowed Legacy MTEP toward the $360 million non-recovery commitment for FERC-approved Legacy RTEP means that Ohio retail customers would begin paying sooner for, and far more of, Legacy RTEP. Ohio retail customers should receive the benefit of not having to pay $360 million in Legacy RTEP that the FirstEnergy EDUs paid. Using Legacy MTEP costs that the FirstEnergy EDUs did not pay, and are not responsible for, reduces the benefit to Ohio customers of the $360 million non-recovery RTEP commitment from ESP II.

***Q15. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?***

***A15.*** Yes. However, I reserve the right to incorporate new information that may subsequently become available. I also reserve the right to supplement my testimony in the event that the Utilities, the PUCO Staff, or other parties submit new or corrected information in connection with this proceeding.
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