

BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY

ATTORNEYS AT LAW 36 EAST SEVENITH STREET SUITE 1510 CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202 TELEPHONE (513) 421-2255

TELECOPIER (513) 421-2764

Via Telefax Transmission and Overnight Mail

February 7, 2011

2011 FEB -8 AM 11: 04 PUCO

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio PUCO Docketing 180 E. Broad Street, 10th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215

In re: Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC

Dear Sir/Madam:

Please find enclosed the original and twenty (20) copies of the REPLY COMMENTS OF THE OHIO ENERGY GROUP fax-filed today in the above-referenced matter.

Please place this document of file. Copies have been served on all parties listed on the attached Certificate of Service.

Respectfully yours,

David F. Boehm, Esq. Michael L. Kurtz, Esq. BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY

MLKkew Encl. Cc: Certificate of Service

> This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a case file document delivered in the regular course of basiness. Technician ______ Date Processed FFR 0.8 2011

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that true copy of the foregoing was served by electronic mail (when available) or ordinary mail, unless otherwise noted, this 7th day of February, 2011 to the following:

David F. Boehm, Esq. Michael L. Kurtz, Esq. Kurt J. Boehm, Esq.

*RINEBOLT, DAVID C MR. OHIO PARTNERS FOR AFFORDABLE ENERGY 231 W LIMA ST PO BOX 1793 FINDLAY OH 45840-1793

GRACE, SANDY I-RU EXELON BUSINESS SERVICES COMPANY, LLC 101 CONSTITUTION AVENUE, NW SUITE 400 EAST WASHINGTON DC 20001 WIGHT, PAUL F. SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP 1440 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTO, DC 20005

*PETRICOFF, M HOWARD VORYS SATER SEYMOUR AND PEASE LLP 52 E. GAY STREET P.O. BOX 1008 COLUMBUS OH 43216-1008

*PETRICOFF, M HOWARD VORYS SATER SEYMOUR AND PEASE LLP 52 E. GAY STREET P.O. BOX 1008 COLUMBUS OH 43216-1008

RODRIGUEZ, JESSE A ATTORNEY 300 EXELON WAY KENNETT SQUARE PA 19348

OLIKER, JOSEPH E ATTORNEY MCNEE WALLACE & NURICK LLC 21 EAST STATE STREET, 17TH FLOOR COLUMBUS OHIO 43215

O'BRIEN , THOMAS BRICKER & ECKLER LLP 100 SOUTH THIRD STREET COLUMBUS OH 43215-4291

FIRSTENERGY SOLUTIONS COLLETTE APPOLITO 341 WHITE POND DR BLDG B-3 AKRON OH 44320 *ALVAREZ, MARIANNE M MS.

EXELON CORPORATION 101 CONSTITUTION AVE, NW SUITE 400 EAST WASHINGTON DC 20001

KYLER, JODY M OHIO CONSUMERS COUNSEL 10 WEST BROAD STREET SUITE 1800 COLUMBUS OH 43215

CONSTELLATION NEWENERGY INC 100 CONSTELLATION WAY STE 600C BALTIMORE MD 21202

DIRECT ENERGY SERVICES LLC 1001 LIBERTY AVENUE 12TH FLOOR PITTSBURGH PA 15222

EXLON GENERATION COMPANY, LLC 101 CONSTITUTION AVE N.W., SUITE 400 EAST WASHINGTON DC 20001

INDUSTRIAL ENERGY USERS OF OHIO SAMUEL C. RANDAZZO, GENER 21 E. STATE STREET, 17TH FLOOR COLUMBUS OH 43215

OHIO HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION RICHARD L. SITES 155 E. BROAD STREET 15TH FLOOR COLUMBUS OH 43215-3620

OHIO HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION

RICHARD L. SITES 155 E. BROAD STREET 15TH FLOOR COLUMBUS OH 43215-3620

OHIO MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION 33 N HIGH STREET COLUMBUS OH 43215

ESTES III, JOHN N 1440 NEW YORK AVE N.W. WASHINGTON D.C 20005 AMERICAN ELECTRIC POWER 1 RIVERSIDE PLAZA COLUMBUS OH 43215

MCALISTER, LISA G BRICKER & ECKLER 100 SOUTH THIRD STREET COLUMBUS OH 43215-4291

WIGHT, PAUL F. SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP 1440 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C., 20005

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OHIO

:

In The Matter Of The Commission Review of the Capacity Charges of Ohio Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company

: Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC

REPLY COMMENTS OF THE OHIO ENERGY GROUP

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

Comes now, the Ohio Energy Group ("OEG") and submits these Comments in Reply to the Comments of Ohio Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company (collectively "AEP-Ohio"). OEG recommends that the Commission reject AEP-Ohio's proposal concerning its capacity charges and deny AEP-Ohio's motion to establish a procedural schedule for a hearing.

IL ARGUMENT

1. <u>The FERC's Order Rejecting AEP's Proposed Recovery Of Additional Capacity</u> Costs Renders AEP's Proposal In This Docket Moot.

On November 24, 2010 AEP-Ohio submitted an Application at the FERC proposing to change the basis for compensation for capacity costs to a cost-based mechanism and a proposed formula rate template under which AEP-Ohio would calculate their capacity costs under the Reliability Assurance Agreement. AEP-Ohio alleged that this proposed change is necessary because there is no available state compensation mechanism for the recovery of these costs.¹

Prior to the filing of AEP-Ohio's Application at the FERC, the PUCO approved retail rates for AEP-Ohio that included the recovery of capacity costs through provider-of-last-resort ("POLR") charges to certain retail shopping customers, based upon the continuation of the current capacity charges established by the three-year capacity auction conducted by PJM under the current fixed resource requirement mechanism.² In an Order dated December 8, 2010, the PUCO clarified that it has adopted as the state capacity compensation mechanism for retail load that shops for competitive generation the capacity charge established by the three-year auction conducted by PJM in conjunction with the recovery by AEP-Ohio of capacity costs through the POLR charges.³

In Comments filed in this proceeding on January 6, 2011, OEG and other parties argued that the Commission's December 8, 2010 Order renders moot AEP-Ohio's FERC Application. On January 20, 2011, the FERC agreed holding that given PUCO's December 8, 2010 Order "the Ohio Commission has adopted... a state mechanism" for allocating capacity costs to retail load serving entities, "and we therefore reject the AEP Ohio Companies' filing."⁴

The FERC rejected AEP-Ohio's proposal to recover capacity revenues beyond what it is already recovering. For this reason, and the reasons set forth in OEG's initial Comments, the Commission should deny the relief sought by AEP-Ohio in this Docket and this matter should be closed.

¹ See PUCO Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC, Order (December 8, 2010), p. 1.

² See PUCO Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC, Order (December 8, 2010), pp. 1-2.

³ PUCO Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC, Order (December 8, 2010), p. 2.

⁴ FERC Docket No. ER11-2183-000; Order (January 20, 2011), p. 4, paragraph 8.

2. <u>The Commission Should Deny AEP-Ohio's Request For A Hearing.</u>

On January 20, 2011, AEP-Ohio filed a Motion requesting, among other things, that the Commission establish a procedural schedule for a hearing at the PUCO. AEP-Ohio explains that the FERC's rejection of AEP's Application to change the basis for compensation for capacity costs to a cost-based mechanism "provides good cause to... establish an evidentiary hearing process to properly develop a full record for Commission consideration..."⁵

AEP-Ohio's requests for a hearing process at the PUCO should be denied. The PUCO's December 8, 2010 Order and the FERC's January 20, 2011 Order considered all of AEP-Ohio's arguments concerning its requests for additional compensation and denied those requests. AEP has offered no additional evidence that demonstrates that it is entitled to increased State or federal rates. There is no compelling reason for further consideration of this matter. OEG recommends that the Commission deny AEP-Ohio's request for a hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

PPKo

David F. Boehm, Esq. Michael L. Kurtz, Esq. Kurt J. Boehm, Esq. **BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY** 36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 Ph: (513) 421-2255 Fax: (513) 421-2764 E-Mail: <u>dboehm@BKLlawfirm.com</u> <u>mkurtz@BKLlawfirm.com</u> <u>kboehm@BKLlawfirm.com</u>

February 7, 2011

- بە

.

⁵ PUCO Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC, AEP-Ohio Motion (January 20, 2011), pp. 1-2.