

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	
Energy Ohio for Authority to Establish a)	
Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section)	
4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of)	Case No. 14-841-EL-SSO
an Electric Security Plan, Accounting)	
Modifications and Tariffs for Generation)	
Service.)	

In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	
Energy Ohio for Authority to Amend its)	Case No. 14-842-EL-ATA
Certified Supplier Tariff, P.U.C.O. No. 20.)	

DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS OF STEVE W. CHRISS

ON BEHALF OF

WAL-MART STORES EAST, LP, AND SAM'S EAST, INC.

Dated: September 26, 2014

1 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS, AND OCCUPATION.**

2 A. My name is Steve W. Chriss. My business address is 2001 SE 10th St.,
3 Bentonville, AR 72716-0550. I am employed by Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. as Senior
4 Manager, Energy Regulatory Analysis.

5 **Q. ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU TESTIFYING IN THIS DOCKET?**

6 A. I am testifying on behalf of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP and Sam's East, Inc.
7 ("Walmart").

8 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE.**

9 A. In 2001, I completed a Master of Science in Agricultural Economics at Louisiana State
10 University. From 2001 to 2003, I was an Analyst and later a Senior Analyst at the
11 Houston office of Econ One Research, Inc., a Los Angeles-based consulting firm. My
12 duties included research and analysis on domestic and international energy and
13 regulatory issues. From 2003 to 2007, I was an Economist and later a Senior Utility
14 Analyst at the Public Utility Commission of Oregon in Salem, Oregon. My duties
15 included appearing as a witness for PUC Staff in electric, natural gas, and
16 telecommunications dockets. I joined the energy department at Walmart in July
17 2007 as Manager, State Rate Proceedings, and was promoted to my current position
18 in June 2011. My Witness Qualifications Statement is included herein as Exhibit
19 SWC-1.

1 **Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED TESTIMONY BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES**
2 **COMMISSION OF OHIO (“THE COMMISSION”)?**

3 A. Yes. I testified in Case Nos. 10-2586-EL-SSO, 11-346-EL-SSO, 12-426-EL-SSO, and 13-
4 2385-EL-SSO.

5 **Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED TESTIMONY BEFORE OTHER STATE**
6 **REGULATORY COMMISSIONS?**

7 A. Yes. I have submitted testimony in over 100 proceedings before 33 other utility
8 regulatory commissions and before the Missouri House Committee on Utilities, the
9 Missouri Senate Veterans' Affairs, Emerging Issues, Pensions, and Urban Affairs
10 Committee, and the Kansas House Standing Committee on Utilities and
11 Telecommunications. My testimony has addressed topics including, but not limited
12 to, cost of service and rate design, ratemaking policy, qualifying facility rates,
13 telecommunications deregulation, resource certification, energy efficiency/demand
14 side management, fuel cost adjustment mechanisms, decoupling, and the collection
15 of cash earnings on construction work in progress.

16 **Q. ARE YOU SPONSORING ANY EXHIBITS WITH YOUR TESTIMONY?**

17 A. Yes. I am sponsoring Exhibit SWC-1, consisting of eleven pages.

18 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?**

19 A. The purpose of my testimony is to address issues related to the standard service
20 offer (“SSO”) through an electric security plan (“ESP”) proposed in the application of
21 Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. (“DEO” or “the Company”).

1 **Q. PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WALMART'S OPERATIONS IN OHIO.**

2 A. Walmart operates 174 retail units and employs 47,985 associates in Ohio. In fiscal
3 year ending 2014, Walmart purchased \$13.4 billion worth of goods and services
4 from Ohio-based suppliers, supporting 94,519 supplier jobs.¹

5 **Q. PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WALMART'S OPERATIONS WITHIN DEO'S SERVICE**
6 **TERRITORY.**

7 A. Walmart has approximately 22 stores and related facilities that take electric
8 distribution service from DEO, primarily on the Distribution Secondary ("DS") rate
9 schedule.

10 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMMISSION.**

11 A. My recommendations to the Commission are as follows:

12 1) The Commission should consider ways to simplify the rate structure,
13 including requiring DEO to file a base rate case. This would allow the
14 Commission to examine the inclusion of multiple costs currently recovered
15 by numerous riders into the Company's base rates.

16 2) If the Commission approves the Company's proposed Distribution Capital
17 Investment Rider ("DCI"), it should also require a base rate case to be filed no
18 later than the conclusion of the proposed ESP term.

19 3) The Commission should reject the proposed Price Stabilization Rider ("PSR").
20 If the Commission approves a PSR, the rider should be bypassable by
21 customers who take competitive supply service.

¹ <http://corporate.walmart.com/our-story/locations/united-states#/united-states/ohio>

1 The fact that an issue is not addressed herein or in related filings should not be
2 construed as an endorsement of any filed position.

3 **Q. WHAT IS YOUR GENERAL UNDERSTANDING OF DEO'S ESP PROPOSAL?**

4 A. My general understanding of DEO's ESP proposal is that from June 1, 2015, through
5 May 31, 2018, for customers who do not take supply from competitive suppliers, the
6 Company's SSO, or the generation portion of rates, will be based on the proposals in
7 the Company's filing pursuant to §§ 4928.141 and 4928.143 of the Ohio Revised
8 Code. While I am not an attorney, my understanding is that § 4928.143 provides for
9 a broad array of utility costs to be considered as part of an ESP proposal.

10 **Q. DOES DEO'S PROPOSED ESP COVER A BROAD ARRAY OF UTILITY COSTS?**

11 A. Yes. An examination of the Company's ESP filing demonstrates the breadth of the
12 array. DEO proposes no change to the following riders:

- 13 • Supplier Cost Reconciliation Rider (SCR);
- 14 • Base Transmission Rider (BTR);
- 15 • Alternative Energy Recovery Rider (AER-R);
- 16 • Distribution Decoupling Rider (DDR);
- 17 • Uncollectible Expense Riders (UE-GEN, UE-D);
- 18 • Smart Grid Rider (DR-IM); and
- 19 • Regional Transmission Organization Rider (RTO).

20 DEO proposes changes to the following riders:

- 21 • Retail Capacity Rider (RC);

- Retail Energy Rider (RE); and
- Net Energy Metering Rider (NEM).

DEO has proposed the following new riders:

- Distribution Capital Investment Rider (DCI);
- Distribution Storm Rider (DSR); and
- Price Stabilization Rider (PSR).

DEO has proposed the following riders to replace existing mechanisms:

- Electric Security and Stabilization Rider (ESSC);
- Load Factor Adjustment Rider (LFA);
- Save-A-Watt Rider (SAW);
- Save-A-Watt Rider Rate (SAW-R);
- Economic Competitiveness Fund Rider (ECF);
- Emergency Electrical Procedures for Long Term Fuel Shortages (EEPF);
- PIPP Customer Discount (PIPP); and
- Energy Efficiency Revolving Load Program (EER). See Attachment JEZ-4, page 1 to page 2.

Q. DO YOU HAVE A GENERAL COMMENT ABOUT THE COMPANY'S ESP PROPOSAL?

A. Yes. The ESP proposal increases the complexity of an already extraordinarily complex set of rates. For instance, a bill analysis for a commercial shopping customer, under the ESP proposal, requires examination of up to 11 riders in addition to the Company's base rates, and a number of those riders have rates that

1 change quarterly. A commercial SSO customer would add four riders to that total.
2 *Id.*, page 3. The Commission should consider ways to simplify the rate structure,
3 including requiring DEO to file a base rate case. This would allow the Commission to
4 examine the inclusion of multiple costs currently recovered by numerous riders into
5 the Company's base rates.

6 **Q. WHAT IS YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED DCI RIDER?**

7 A. My understanding is that the Company proposes the DCI to recover a return on
8 incremental capital investment related to all distribution upgrades, with the
9 exception of those included in the Company's Smart Grid deployment. See Direct
10 Testimony of Peggy A. Laub, page 2, line 21, to page 3, line 4. The rider revenue
11 requirement and rates are proposed to be calculated and set quarterly. *Id.*, page 5,
12 line 21 to page 6, line 2.

13 **Q. WOULD THE PROPOSED DCI PROVIDE A REDUCTION IN REGULATORY LAG FOR**
14 **DEO?**

15 A. Yes, as the increases would occur without a base rate case and rates would be
16 calculated and set quarterly. As such, the revenues recovered through the proposed
17 DCI, which would ostensibly otherwise be collected through base rates, are
18 protected from the regulatory lag that occurs between cost incurrence and a
19 subsequent base rate case.

1 **Q. DOES THE COMPANY PROVIDE AN ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE OF THE CALCULATION**
2 **OF DCI REVENUE REQUIREMENT AND RATES IN THEIR FILING?**

3 A. Yes. The Company's illustrative example of the calculation of DCI revenue
4 requirement and rates, which only uses incremental distribution costs incurred
5 through December 13, 2013, results in a DCI revenue requirement of approximately
6 \$18.8 million. This would result in the collection of approximately 7.2 percent of the
7 Company's distribution revenue requirement through the DCI. See Attachment PAL-
8 1, page 1. By May, 2015, when the proposed rider would go into effect per the
9 proposed ESP effective date, the DCI revenue requirement could potentially recover
10 a more substantial portion of DEO's distribution revenue requirement.

11 **Q. WHY IS THIS A CONCERN?**

12 A. The reduction of risk from regulatory lag, particularly as the revenue requirement
13 included in the DCI grows, should implicate the Company's approved return on
14 equity. However, the ESP process does not necessarily provide an avenue to fully
15 determine the impact of the reduction in regulatory lag on the Company's return on
16 equity.

17 **Q. WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMISSION?**

18 A. If the Commission approves the Company's proposed DCI, it should also require a
19 base rate case to be filed no later than the conclusion of the proposed ESP term.

20 **Q. WHAT IS YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED PSR?**

21 A. My understanding is that the Company proposes the PSR as a non-bypassable
22 mechanism to charge or credit all DEO distribution customers for the "economic

value" of DEO's share of the Ohio Valley Electric Cooperative's ("OVEC") generating assets. See Direct Testimony of William Don Wathen Jr., page 11, line 19 to line 21.

Q. WHAT IS THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED PSR REVENUE REQUIREMENT METHODOLOGY?

A. The Company proposes to sell its share of OVEC's energy and capacity in to the wholesale market, calculate the difference between the proceeds of those sales and the costs allocated to DEO from OVEC, and credit or charge the difference to all distribution customers. *Id.*, page 11, line 21 to page 12, line 2. The Company states that the PSR is not an offer of generation service, as no capacity or energy provided by OVEC will actually be sold to customers. *Id.*, page 12, line 3 to line 7.

Q. WHY DOES DEO PROPOSE THE PSR?

A. The Company states that the proposed PSR would provide a hedge against market price volatility for customers. *Id.*, page 13, line 16 to line 18.

Q. IS DEO'S OWNERSHIP SHARE OF OVEC A REGULATED ASSET?

A. No. DEO states in their testimony that the Company does not earn a regulated return on its share of OVEC. *Id.*, page 13, line 3 to line 7. As such, it appears that DEO's OVEC share is essentially a market resource, as the Company's earnings on that resource are ostensibly tied to the ability of OVEC's generation assets to perform in the capacity and energy markets.

Q. DOES THE COMPANY'S FILING PROVIDE ILLUSTRATIVE PSR RATES?

A. No. See Attached JEZ-1, page 184.

1 **Q. DO YOU HAVE CONCERNS WITH THE PROPOSED PSR?**

2 A. Yes. First, while the OVEC output is not being offered specifically as generation
3 service to customers, the Company is proposing to charge or credit customers for
4 the costs of a generation-related service, which is the use of the OVEC generation
5 assets as a hedge against generation market price volatility. As such, it is not
6 appropriate to assess the PSR charge or credit to competitive supplied customers,
7 since the price paid to the supplier by such customers already includes the cost of
8 power and the cost of procurement for that power, compliance costs, and other
9 underlying operating costs, such as risk management and hedge costs.

10 **Q. DO YOU HAVE A CONCERN THAT SENATE BILL 221 APPEARS TO IMPLICATE THE**
11 **PROPOSED PSR?**

12 A. Yes. While I am not an attorney, Section 4928.02(H) states:

13 “Ensure effective competition in the provision of retail electric service by
14 avoiding anticompetitive subsidies flowing from a noncompetitive retail
15 electric service to a competitive retail electric service or to a product or
16 service other than retail electric service, and vice versa, including by
17 prohibiting the recovery of any generation-related costs through
18 distribution or transmission rates.”

19 The provision of a market price hedge through the use of the OVEC generation
20 assets as proposed by DEO is a generation-related service and, on its face, would
21 appear to be prohibited by the statute. Walmart reserves the right to more formally
22 brief this issue at the appropriate time in this proceeding.

23 **Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL CONCERNS REGARDING THE PROPOSED PSR?**

24 A. Yes. The proposed PSR is essentially a mechanism that transfers the risk exposure of
25 DEO's ownership share of OVEC to customers. Regardless of prices in the energy or

1 capacity market or the performance, efficiency, or the economics of the OVEC
2 generation assets relative to the broader base of generation in the market, the PSR
3 will provide DEO with revenue assurance for some, if not all, of its cost exposure for
4 its share of OVEC and will provide OVEC's generation assets, which operate in the
5 wholesale market, cost recovery assurance not afforded to all other generators in
6 the market. This concern grows with the potential for environmental regulations
7 increasing the costs related to the OVEC generation assets, which consist of two
8 coal-fired units.

9 **Q. WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMISSION?**

10 A. The Commission should reject the proposed PSR. If the Commission approves a PSR,
11 it should determine that the rider is bypassable by customers who take competitive
12 supply service.

13 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?**

14 A. Yes.

Steve W. Chriss

Senior Manager, Energy Regulatory Analysis

Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.

Business Address: 2001 SE 10th Street, Bentonville, AR, 72716-0550

Business Phone: (479) 204-1594

EXPERIENCE

July 2007 – Present

Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., Bentonville, AR

Senior Manager, Energy Regulatory Analysis (June 2011 – Present)

Manager, State Rate Proceedings (July 2007 – June 2011)

June 2003 – July 2007

Public Utility Commission of Oregon, Salem, OR

Senior Utility Analyst (February 2006 – July 2007)

Economist (June 2003 – February 2006)

January 2003 - May 2003

North Harris College, Houston, TX

Adjunct Instructor, Microeconomics

June 2001 - March 2003

Econ One Research, Inc., Houston, TX

Senior Analyst (October 2002 – March 2003)

Analyst (June 2001 – October 2002)

EDUCATION

2001

Louisiana State University

M.S., Agricultural Economics

1997-1998

University of Florida

Graduate Coursework, Agricultural Education
and Communication

1997

Texas A&M University

B.S., Agricultural Development

B.S., Horticulture

TESTIMONY BEFORE REGULATORY COMMISSIONS

2014

Maryland Case No. 9355: In the Matter of the Application of Baltimore Gas and Electric Company for Authority to Increase Existing Rates and Charges for Electric and Gas Service.

Mississippi Public Service Commission Docket No. 2014-UN-132: In Re: Notice of Intent of Entergy Mississippi, Inc. to Modernize Rates to Support Economic Development, Power Procurement, and Continued Investment.

Nevada Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 14-05004: Application of Nevada Power Company d/b/a NV Energy for Authority to Increase its Annual Revenue Requirement for General Rates Charged to All Classes of Electric Customers and for Relief Properly Related Thereto.

Utah Public Service Commission Docket No. 14-035-T02: In the Matter of Rocky Mountain Power's Proposed Electric Service Schedule No. 32, Service From Renewable Energy Facilities.

Florida Public Service Commission Docket No. 140002-EG: In Re: Energy Conservation Cost Recovery Clause.

Wisconsin Docket No. 6690-UR-123: Application of Wisconsin Public Service Corporation for Authority to Adjust Electric and Natural Gas Rates.

Connecticut Docket No. 14-05-06: Application of the Connecticut Light and Power Company to Amend its Rate Schedules.

Virginia Corporation Commission Case No. PUE-2014-00026: Application of Appalachian Power Company for a 2014 Biennial Review for the Provision of Generation, Distribution and Transmission Services Pursuant to § 56-585.1 A of the Code of Virginia.

Virginia Corporation Commission Case No. PUE-2014-00033: Application of Virginia Electric and Power Company to Revise its Fuel Factor Pursuant to Va. Code § 56-249.6.

Arizona Corporation Commission Docket No. E-01345A-11-0224 (Four Corners Phase): In the Matter of Arizona Public Service Company for a Hearing to Determine the Fair Value of Utility Property of the Company for Ratemaking Purposes, to Fix and Just and Reasonable Rate of Return Thereon, to Approve Rate Schedules Designed to Develop Such Return.

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission Docket No. E-002/GR-13-868: In the Matter of the Application of Northern States Power Company, for Authority to Increase Rates for Electric Service in Minnesota.

Utah Public Service Commission Docket No. 13-035-184: In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Authority to Increase its Retail Electric Utility Service Rates in Utah and for Approval of its Proposed Electric Service Schedules and Electric Service Regulations.

Missouri Public Service Commission Case No. EC-2014-0224: In the Matter of Noranda Aluminum, Inc.'s Request for Revisions to Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri's Large Transmission Service Tariff to Decrease its Rate for Electric Service.

Oklahoma Corporation Commission Cause No. PUD 201300217: Application of Public Service Company of Oklahoma to be in Compliance with Order No. 591185 Issued in Cause No. PUD 201100106 Which Requires a Base Rate Case to be Filed by PSO and the Resulting Adjustment in its Rates and Charges and Terms and Conditions of Service for Electric Service in the State of Oklahoma.

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Case No. 13-2386-EL-SSO: In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company for Authority to Establish a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to §4928.143, Ohio Rev. Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan.

2013

Oklahoma Corporation Commission Cause No. PUD 201300201: Application of Public Service Company of Oklahoma for Commission Authorization of a Standby and Supplemental Service Rate Schedule.

Georgia Public Service Commission Docket No. 36989: Georgia Power's 2013 Rate Case.

Florida Public Service Commission Docket No. 130140-El: Petition for Rate Increase by Gulf Power Company.

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UE 267: In the Matter of PACIFICORP, dba PACIFIC POWER, Transition Adjustment, Five-Year Cost of Service Opt-Out.

Illinois Commerce Commission Docket No. 13-0387: Commonwealth Edison Company Tariff Filing to Present the Illinois Commerce Commission with an Opportunity to Consider Revenue Neutral Tariff Changes Related to Rate Design Authorized by Subsection 16-108.5 of the Public Utilities Act.

Iowa Utilities Board Docket No. RPU-2013-0004: In Re: MidAmerican Energy Company.

South Dakota Public Utilities Commission Docket No. EL12-061: In the Matter of the Application of Black Hills Power, Inc. for Authority to Increase its Electric Rates. (filed with confidential stipulation)

Kansas Corporation Commission Docket No. 13-WSEE-629-RTS: In the Matter of the Applications of Westar Energy, Inc. and Kansas Gas and Electric Company for Approval to Make Certain Changes in their Charges for Electric Service.

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UE 263: In the Matter of PACIFICORP, dba PACIFIC POWER, Request for a General Rate Revision.

Arkansas Public Service Commission Docket No. 13-028-U: In the Matter of the Application of Entergy Arkansas, Inc. for Approval of Changes in Rates for Retail Electric Service.

Virginia State Corporation Commission Docket No. PUE-2013-00020: Application of Virginia Electric and Power Company for a 2013 Biennial Review of the Rates, Terms, and Conditions for the Provision of Generation, Distribution, and Transmission Services Pursuant to § 56-585.1 A of the Code of Virginia.

Florida Public Service Commission Docket No. 130040-EI: Petition for Rate Increase by Tampa Electric Company.

South Carolina Public Service Commission Docket No. 2013-59-E: Application of Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC, for Authority to Adjust and Increase Its Electric Rates and Charges.

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UE 262: In the Matter of PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY, Request for a General Rate Revision.

New Jersey Board of Public Utilities Docket No. ER12111052: In the Matter of the Verified Petition of Jersey Central Power & Light Company For Review and Approval of Increases in and Other Adjustments to Its Rates and Charges For Electric Service, and For Approval of Other Proposed Tariff Revisions in Connection Therewith; and for Approval of an Accelerated Reliability Enhancement Program ("2012 Base Rate Filing")

North Carolina Utilities Commission Docket No. E-7, Sub 1026: In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC for Adjustment of Rates and Charges Applicable to Electric Service in North Carolina.

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UE 264: PACIFICORP, dba PACIFIC POWER, 2014 Transition Adjustment Mechanism.

Public Utilities Commission of California Docket No. 12-12-002: Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for 2013 Rate Design Window Proceeding.

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Docket Nos. 12-426-EL-SSO, 12-427-EL-ATA, 12-428-EL-AAM, 12-429-EL-WVR, and 12-672-EL-RDR: In the Matter of the Application of the Dayton Power and Light Company Approval of its Market Offer.

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission Docket No. E-002/GR-12-961: In the Matter of the Application of Northern States Power Company for Authority to Increase Rates for Electric Service in Minnesota.

North Carolina Utilities Commission Docket E-2, Sub 1023: In the Matter of Application of Progress Energy Carolinas, Inc. For Adjustment of Rates and Charges Applicable to Electric Service in North Carolina.

2012

Public Utility Commission of Texas Docket No. 40443: Application of Southwestern Electric Power Company for Authority to Change Rates and Reconcile Fuel Costs.

South Carolina Public Service Commission Docket No. 2012-218-E: Application of South Carolina Electric & Gas Company for Increases and Adjustments in Electric Rate Schedules and Tariffs and Request for Mid-Period Reduction in Base Rates for Fuel.

Kansas Corporation Commission Docket No. 12-KCPE-764-RTS: In the Matter of the Application of Kansas City Power & Light Company to Make Certain Changes in its Charges for Electric Service.

Kansas Corporation Commission Docket No. 12-GIMX-337-GIV: In the Matter of a General Investigation of Energy-Efficiency Policies for Utility Sponsored Energy Efficiency Programs.

Florida Public Service Commission Docket No. 120015-EI: In Re: Petition for Rate Increase by Florida Power & Light Company.

California Public Utilities Commission Docket No. A.11-10-002: Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U 902 E) for Authority to Update Marginal Costs, Cost Allocation, and Electric Rate Design.

Utah Public Service Commission Docket No. 11-035-200: In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Authority to Increase its Retail Electric Utility Service Rates in Utah and for Approval of its Proposed Electric Service Schedules and Electric Service Regulations.

Virginia State Corporation Commission Case No. PUE-2012-00051: Application of Appalachian Power Company to Revise its Fuel Factor Pursuant to § 56-249.6 of the Code of Virginia.

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Case Nos. 11-346-EL-SSO, 11-348-EL-SSO, 11-349-EL-AAM, and 11-350-EL-AAM: In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company for Authority to Establish a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form on an Electric Security Plan and In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company for Approval of Certain Accounting Authority.

New Jersey Board of Public Utilities Docket No. ER11080469: In the Matter of the Petition of Atlantic City Electric for Approval of Amendments to Its Tariff to Provide for an Increase in Rates and Charges for Electric Service Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 48:2-21 and N.J.S.A. 48:2-21.1 and For Other Appropriate Relief.

Public Utility Commission of Texas Docket No. 39896: Application of Entergy Texas, Inc. for Authority to Change Rates and Reconcile Fuel Costs.

Missouri Public Service Commission Case No. EO-2012-0009: In the Matter of KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Notice of Intent to File an Application for Authority to Establish a Demand-Side Programs Investment Mechanism.

Colorado Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 11AL-947E: In the Matter of Advice Letter No. 1597-Electric Filed by Public Service Company of Colorado to Revise its Colorado PUC No. 7-Electric Tariff to Implement a General Rate Schedule Adjustment and Other Changes Effective December 23, 2011.

Illinois Commerce Commission Docket No. 11-0721: Commonwealth Edison Company Tariffs and Charges Submitted Pursuant to Section 16-108.5 of the Public Utilities Act.

Public Utility Commission of Texas Docket No. 38951: Application of Entergy Texas, Inc. for Approval of Competitive Generation Service tariff (Issues Severed from Docket No. 37744).

California Public Utilities Commission Docket No. A.11-06-007: Southern California Edison's General Rate Case, Phase 2.

2011

Arizona Corporation Commission Docket No. E-01345A-11-0224: In the Matter of Arizona Public Service Company for a Hearing to Determine the Fair Value of Utility Property of the Company for Ratemaking Purposes, to Fix and Just and Reasonable Rate of Return Thereon, to Approve Rate Schedules Designed to Develop Such Return.

Oklahoma Corporation Commission Cause No. PUD 201100087: In the Matter of the Application of Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company for an Order of the Commission Authorizing Applicant to Modify its Rates, Charges, and Tariffs for Retail Electric Service in Oklahoma.

South Carolina Public Service Commission Docket No. 2011-271-E: Application of Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC for Authority to Adjust and Increase its Electric Rates and Charges.

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Docket No. P-2011-2256365: Petition of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation for Approval to Implement Reconciliation Rider for Default Supply Service.

North Carolina Utilities Commission Docket No. E-7, Sub 989: In the Matter of Application of Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC for Adjustment of Rates and Charges Applicable to Electric Service in North Carolina.

Florida Public Service Commission Docket No. 110138: In Re: Petition for Increase in Rates by Gulf Power Company.

Public Utilities Commission of Nevada Docket No. 11-06006: In the Matter of the Application of Nevada Power Company, filed pursuant to NRS 704.110(3) for authority to increase its annual revenue requirement for general rates charged to all classes of customers to recover the costs of constructing the Harry Allen Combined Cycle plant and other generating, transmission, and distribution plant additions, to reflect changes in the cost of capital, depreciation rates and cost of service, and for relief properly related thereto.

North Carolina Utilities Commission Docket Nos. E-2, Sub 998 and E-7, Sub 986: In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Corporation and Progress Energy, Inc., to Engage in a Business Combination Transaction and to Address Regulatory Conditions and Codes of Conduct.

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Case Nos. 11-346-EL-SSO, 11-348-EL-SSO, 11-349-EL-AAM, and 11-350-EL-AAM: In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company for Authority to Establish a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form on an Electric Security Plan and In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company for Approval of Certain Accounting Authority.

Virginia State Corporation Commission Case No. PUE-2011-00037: In the Matter of Appalachian Power Company for a 2011 Biennial Review of the Rates, Terms, and Conditions for the Provision of Generation, Distribution, and Transmission Services Pursuant to § 56-585.1 A of the Code of Virginia.

Illinois Commerce Commission Docket No. 11-0279 and 11-0282 (cons.): Ameren Illinois Company Proposed General Increase in Electric Delivery Service and Ameren Illinois Company Proposed General Increase in Gas Delivery Service.

Virginia State Corporation Commission Case No. PUE-2011-00045: Application of Virginia Electric and Power Company to Revise its Fuel Factor Pursuant to § 56-249.6 of the Code of Virginia.

Utah Public Service Commission Docket No. 10-035-124: In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Authority to Increase its Retail Electric Utility Service Rates in Utah and for Approval of its Proposed Electric Service Schedules and Electric Service Regulations.

Maryland Public Utilities Commission Case No. 9249: In the Matter of the Application of Delmarva Power & Light for an Increase in its Retail Rates for the Distribution of Electric Energy.

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission Docket No. E002/GR-10-971: In the Matter of the Application of Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy for Authority to Increase Rates for Electric Service in Minnesota.

Michigan Public Service Commission Case No. U-16472: In the Matter of the Detroit Edison Company for Authority to Increase its Rates, Amend its Rate Schedules and Rules Governing the Distribution and Supply of Electric Energy, and for Miscellaneous Accounting Authority.

2010

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Docket No. 10-2586-EL-SSO: In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio for Approval of a Market Rate Offer to Conduct a Competitive Bidding Process for Standard Service Offer Electric Generation Supply, Accounting Modifications, and Tariffs for Generation Service.

Colorado Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 10A-554EG: In the Matter of the Application of Public Service Company of Colorado for Approval of a Number of Strategic Issues Relating to its DSM Plan, Including Long-Term Electric Energy Savings Goals, and Incentives.

Public Service Commission of West Virginia Case No. 10-0699-E-42T: Appalachian Power Company and Wheeling Power Company Rule 42T Application to Increase Electric Rates.

Oklahoma Corporation Commission Cause No. PUD 201000050: Application of Public Service Company of Oklahoma, an Oklahoma Corporation, for an Adjustment in its Rates and Charges and Terms and Conditions of Service for Electric Service in the State of Oklahoma.

Georgia Public Service Commission Docket No. 31958-U: In Re: Georgia Power Company's 2010 Rate Case.

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission Docket No. 100749: 2010 Pacific Power & Light Company General Rate Case.

Colorado Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 10M-254E: In the Matter of Commission Consideration of Black Hills Energy's Plan in Compliance with House Bill 10-1365, "Clean Air-Clean Jobs Act."

Colorado Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 10M-245E: In the Matter of Commission Consideration of Public Service Company of Colorado Plan in Compliance with House Bill 10-1365, "Clean Air-Clean Jobs Act."

Public Service Commission of Utah Docket No. 09-035-15 *Phase II*: In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Approval of its Proposed Energy Cost Adjustment Mechanism.

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UE 217: In the Matter of PACIFICORP, dba PACIFIC POWER Request for a General Rate Revision.

Mississippi Public Service Commission Docket No. 2010-AD-57: In Re: Proposal of the Mississippi Public Service Commission to Possibly Amend Certain Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission Cause No. 43374: Verified Petition of Duke Energy Indiana, Inc. Requesting the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission to Approve an Alternative Regulatory Plan Pursuant to Ind. Code § 8-1-2.5-1, *ET SEQ.*, for the Offering of Energy Efficiency Conservation, Demand Response, and Demand-Side Management Programs and Associated Rate Treatment Including Incentives Pursuant to a Revised Standard Contract Rider No. 66 in Accordance with Ind. Code §§ 8-1-2.5-1 *ET SEQ.* and 8-1-2-42 (a); Authority to Defer Program Costs Associated with its Energy Efficiency Portfolio of Programs; Authority to Implement New and Enhanced Energy Efficiency Programs, Including the Powershare® Program in its Energy Efficiency Portfolio of Programs; and Approval of a Modification of the Fuel Adjustment Clause Earnings and Expense Tests.

Public Utility Commission of Texas Docket No. 37744: Application of Entergy Texas, Inc. for Authority to Change Rates and to Reconcile Fuel Costs.

South Carolina Public Service Commission Docket No. 2009-489-E: Application of South Carolina Electric & Gas Company for Adjustments and Increases in Electric Rate Schedules and Tariffs.

Kentucky Public Service Commission Case No. 2009-00459: In the Matter of General Adjustments in Electric Rates of Kentucky Power Company.

Virginia State Corporation Commission Case No. PUE-2009-00125: For acquisition of natural gas facilities Pursuant to § 56-265.4:5 B of the Virginia Code.

Arkansas Public Service Commission Docket No. 10-010-U: In the Matter of a Notice of Inquiry Into Energy Efficiency.

Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control Docket No. 09-12-05: Application of the Connecticut Light and Power Company to Amend its Rate Schedules.

Arkansas Public Service Commission Docket No. 09-084-U: In the Matter of the Application of Entergy Arkansas, Inc. For Approval of Changes in Rates for Retail Electric Service.

Missouri Public Service Commission Docket No. ER-2010-0036: In the Matter of Union Electric Company d/b/a AmerenUE for Authority to File Tariffs Increasing Rates for Electric Service Provided to Customers in the Company's Missouri Service Area.

Public Service Commission of Delaware Docket No. 09-414: In the Matter of the Application of Delmarva Power & Light Company for an Increase in Electric Base Rates and Miscellaneous Tariff Charges.

2009

Virginia State Corporation Commission Case No. PUE-2009-00030: In the Matter of Appalachian Power Company for a Statutory Review of the Rates, Terms, and Conditions for the Provision of Generation, Distribution, and Transmission Services Pursuant to § 56-585.1 A of the Code of Virginia.

Public Service Commission of Utah Docket No. 09-035-15 *Phase I*: In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Approval of its Proposed Energy Cost Adjustment Mechanism.

Public Service Commission of Utah Docket No. 09-035-23: In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Authority To Increase its Retail Electric Utility Service Rates in Utah and for Approval of Its Proposed Electric Service Schedules and Electric Service Regulations.

Colorado Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 09AL-299E: Re: The Tariff Sheets Filed by Public Service Company of Colorado with Advice Letter No. 1535 – Electric.

Arkansas Public Service Commission Docket No. 09-008-U: In the Matter of the Application of Southwestern Electric Power Company for Approval of a General Change in Rates and Tariffs.

Oklahoma Corporation Commission Docket No. PUD 200800398: In the Matter of the Application of Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company for an Order of the Commission Authorizing Applicant to Modify its Rates, Charges, and Tariffs for Retail Electric Service in Oklahoma.

Public Utilities Commission of Nevada Docket No. 08-12002: In the Matter of the Application by Nevada Power Company d/b/a NV Energy, filed pursuant to NRS §704.110(3) and NRS §704.110(4) for authority to increase its annual revenue requirement for general rates charged to all classes of customers, begin to recover the costs of acquiring the Bighorn Power Plant, constructing the Clark Peak, Environmental Retrofits and other generating, transmission and distribution plant additions, to reflect changes in cost of service and for relief properly related thereto.

New Mexico Public Regulation Commission Case No. 08-00024-UT: In the Matter of a Rulemaking to Revise NMPRC Rule 17.7.2 NMAC to Implement the Efficient Use of Energy Act.

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission Cause No. 43580: Investigation by the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission, of Smart Grid Investments and Smart Grid Information Issues Contained in 111(d) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. § 2621(d)), as Amended by the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007.

Louisiana Public Service Commission Docket No. U-30192 *Phase II (February 2009)*: Ex Parte, Application of Entergy Louisiana, LLC for Approval to Repower Little Gypsy Unit 3 Electric Generating Facility and for Authority to Commence Construction and for Certain Cost Protection and Cost Recovery.

South Carolina Public Service Commission Docket No. 2008-251-E: In the Matter of Progress Energy Carolinas, Inc.'s Application For the Establishment of Procedures to Encourage Investment in Energy

Efficient Technologies; Energy Conservation Programs; And Incentives and Cost Recovery for Such Programs.

2008

Colorado Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 08A-366EG: In the Matter of the Application of Public Service Company of Colorado for approval of its electric and natural gas demand-side management (DSM) plan for calendar years 2009 and 2010 and to change its electric and gas DSM cost adjustment rates effective January 1, 2009, and for related waivers and authorizations.

Public Service Commission of Utah Docket No. 07-035-93: In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Authority to Increase its Retail Electric Utility Service Rates in Utah and for Approval of its Proposed Electric Service Schedules and Electric Service Regulations, Consisting of a General Rate Increase of Approximately \$161.2 Million Per Year, and for Approval of a New Large Load Surcharge.

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission Cause No. 43374: Petition of Duke Energy Indiana, Inc. Requesting the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission Approve an Alternative Regulatory Plan for the Offering of Energy Efficiency, Conservation, Demand Response, and Demand-Side Management.

Public Utilities Commission of Nevada Docket No. 07-12001: In the Matter of the Application of Sierra Pacific Power Company for authority to increase its general rates charged to all classes of electric customers to reflect an increase in annual revenue requirement and for relief properly related thereto.

Louisiana Public Service Commission Docket No. U-30192 *Phase II*: Ex Parte, Application of Entergy Louisiana, LLC for Approval to Repower Little Gypsy Unit 3 Electric Generating Facility and for Authority to Commence Construction and for Certain Cost Protection and Cost Recovery.

Colorado Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 07A-420E: In the Matter of the Application of Public Service Company of Colorado For Authority to Implement and Enhanced Demand Side Management Cost Adjustment Mechanism to Include Current Cost Recovery and Incentives.

2007

Louisiana Public Service Commission Docket No. U-30192: Ex Parte, Application of Entergy Louisiana, LLC for Approval to Repower Little Gypsy Unit 3 Electric Generating Facility and for Authority to Commence Construction and for Certain Cost Protection and Cost Recovery.

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UG 173: In the Matter of PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON Staff Request to Open an Investigation into the Earnings of Cascade Natural Gas.

2006

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UE 180/UE 181/UE 184: In the Matter of PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY Request for a General Rate Revision.

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UE 179: In the Matter of PACIFICORP, dba PACIFIC POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY Request for a general rate increase in the company's Oregon annual revenues.

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UM 1129 *Phase II*: Investigation Related to Electric Utility Purchases From Qualifying Facilities.

2005

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UM 1129 *Phase I Compliance*: Investigation Related to Electric Utility Purchases From Qualifying Facilities.

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UX 29: In the Matter of QWEST CORPORATION Petition to Exempt from Regulation Qwest's Switched Business Services.

2004

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UM 1129 *Phase I*: Investigation Related to Electric Utility Purchases From Qualifying Facilities.

TESTIMONY BEFORE LEGISLATIVE BODIES

2014

Regarding Kansas House Bill 2460: Testimony Before the Kansas House Standing Committee on Utilities and Telecommunications, February 12, 2014.

2012

Regarding Missouri House Bill 1488: Testimony Before the Missouri House Committee on Utilities, February 7, 2012.

2011

Regarding Missouri Senate Bills 50, 321, 359, and 406: Testimony Before the Missouri Senate Veterans' Affairs, Emerging Issues, Pensions, and Urban Affairs Committee, March 9, 2011.

AFFIDAVITS

2011

Colorado Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 11M-951E: In the Matter of the Petition of Public Service Company of Colorado Pursuant to C.R.S. § 40-6-111(1)(d) for Interim Rate Relief Effective on or before January 21, 2012.

ENERGY INDUSTRY PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Mock Trial Expert Witness, The Energy Bar Association State Commission Practice and Regulation Committee and Young Lawyers Committee and Environment, Energy and Natural Resources Section of the D.C. Bar, Mastering Your First (or Next) State Public Utility Commission Hearing, February 13, 2014.

Panelist, Customer Panel, Virginia State Bar 29th National Regulatory Conference, Williamsburg, Virginia, May 19, 2011.

Chriss, S. (2006). "Regulatory Incentives and Natural Gas Purchasing – Lessons from the Oregon Natural Gas Procurement Study." Presented at the 19th Annual Western Conference, Center for Research in Regulated Industries Advanced Workshop in Regulation and Competition, Monterey, California, June 29, 2006.

Chriss, S. (2005). "Public Utility Commission of Oregon Natural Gas Procurement Study." Public Utility Commission of Oregon, Salem, OR. Report published in June, 2005. Presented to the Public Utility Commission of Oregon at a special public meeting on August 1, 2005.

Chriss, S. and M. Radler (2003). "Report from Houston: Conference on Energy Deregulation and Restructuring." USAEE Dialogue, Vol. 11, No. 1, March, 2003.

Chriss, S., M. Dwyer, and B. Pulliam (2002). "Impacts of Lifting the Ban on ANS Exports on West Coast Crude Oil Prices: A Reconsideration of the Evidence." Presented at the 22nd USAEE/IAEE North American Conference, Vancouver, BC, Canada, October 6-8, 2002.

Contributed to chapter on power marketing: "Power System Operations and Electricity Markets," Fred I. Denny and David E. Dismukes, authors. Published by CRC Press, June 2002.

Contributed to "Moving to the Front Lines: The Economic Impact of the Independent Power Plant Development in Louisiana," David E. Dismukes, author. Published by the Louisiana State University Center for Energy Studies, October 2001.

Dismukes, D.E., D.V. Mesyanzhinov, E.A. Downer, S. Chriss, and J.M. Burke (2001). "Alaska Natural Gas In-State Demand Study." Anchorage: Alaska Department of Natural Resources.

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

9/26/2014 1:59:14 PM

in

Case No(s). 14-0841-EL-SSO

Summary: Testimony Steve W. Chriss Direct electronically filed by Mr. Rick D Chamberlain on behalf of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP and Sam's East, Inc.