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# I. OVERVIEW

Q1. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, title, AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

***A1.*** My name is Michael P. Haugh. I am employed as the Assistant Director of Analytical Services for the Office of the Ohio Consumers’ Counsel (“OCC” or “agency”). My business address is 10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

***Q2. Please briefly summarize your education and professional experience.***

***A2.*** I have a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration from the Ohio State University with a major in Finance; I have also attended the Institute of Public Utilities Advanced Regulatory Studies at Michigan State University. I have over 20 years working in the energy industry with experience in wholesale and retail energy trading, risk management, natural gas purchasing and scheduling and regulatory affairs. I started with Enron Energy Services in 1995 as an Energy Trader and then moved on to American Electric Power Energy Services in 1998 where I worked in Risk Management and Wholesale Energy Trading. In January 2004 I went to work for MidAmerican Energy Services as a Senior Product Manager. In October of 2004 I began work as a Senior Regulatory Analyst with the OCC. I left the OCC in September 2007 and joined Integrys Energy Services as a Regulatory Affairs Analyst. I joined Just Energy in 2009 and held the position of Manager of Regulatory Affairs before becoming Manager of Market Relations in 2011. I was re-hired at the OCC in June 2014 in my current position.

***Q3. Have you previously submitted testimony in utility cases before regulatory commissions?***

***A3.*** Yes, I have testified before the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (“PUCO” or “Commission”) and the Michigan Public Service Commission. The complete list of cases in which I have testified is attached as Attachment MPH-1.

# II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

***Q4. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?***

***A4.*** The purpose of my testimony is to make recommandations, to the PUCO, for resolving this case in a manner that includes reasonable protections for residential consumers. These protections will help provide balance for consumers considering that they (consumers) are asked to pay subsidies for economic development under the Joint Stipulation and Recommendation filed on September 21, 2015 (“2015 Stipulation” or “settlement”). Residential consumers are among the customers who pay the subsidies for rate discounts for economic development. My recommendations include proposals for modifications to the settlement between the PUCO Staff and Eramet Marietta, Inc (“Eramet” or “applicant”). These recommendations would move the 2015 Stipulation closer to meeting the PUCO’s three-pronged test for evaluating the reasonableness of a proposed settlement. I do appreciate that Eramet discussed its application with the Ohio Consumers’ Counsel. And I appreciate the improvements that the PUCO staff and the applicant made in the settlement, from the original application, to reduce the amounts consumers would pay for the proposed discounts.

Q5. Please provide an overview of the proceeding.

***A5.*** On June 19, 2009, Eramet, filed an application to establish a reasonable arrangement with AEP-Ohio for its manufacturing facility in Marietta, Ohio. In its application Eramet requested a discounted price over a 10-year term to allow a capital investment of approximately $40,000,000 in the facility. A Stipulation was filed on August 5, 2009 (“2009 Stipulation”) which was signed only by PUCO Staff and Eramet. The 2009 Stipulation allowed for a discounted rate of generation, transmission and distribution (with the discount paid to AEP by other customers to make AEP whole) through 2018. In return for this discount Eramet agreed to: (1) make a capital investment in its manufacturing facility of at least $40,000,000 before December 31, 2014; (2) maintain a minimum average employment level of 200 employees during the term of the reasonable arrangement; and (3) file an annual report with the PUCO documenting its compliance with these commitments. On October 15, 2009, the PUCO approved the 2009 Stipulation. On January 22, 2015 Eramet filed an Application to amend the reasonable arrangement. And then on September 21, 2015, the 2015 Stipulation was filed by Eramet.

Q6. Please provide an overview of the 2015 Stipulation.

***A6.*** In the 2015 Stipulation, Eramet has recommended to be permitted to purchase energy, capacity, market-based services and competitive retail electric service (“CRES”) from a certified CRES provider (“marketer”). The declining discount rates in the 2009 Stipulation shall remain (and will continue to be paid by other customers), but the discounts may include Eramet obtaining CRES services. In addition, Eramet commits to maintain an average of 175 full-time equivalent direct employees at the facility over the term of the arrangement. Eramet commits to submitting an annual report to the PUCO regarding the performance and the impact of the modified arrangement. Eramet requests the ability to further modify this arrangement as may be warranted.

# III. THE 2015 STIPULATION

Q7. What ARE the PUCO’s standards of review for evaluating proposed settlements?

***A7.*** The PUCO uses these criteria for evaluating the reasonableness of a proposed settlement:

1. Is the settlement a product of serious bargaining among capable, knowledgeable parties, where there is diversity of interests among the stipulating parties?

2. Does the settlement package violate any important regulatory principle or practice?

3. Does the settlement, as a package, benefit customers and the public interest?[[1]](#footnote-2)

Q8. Does the settlement meet the first prong of the standard?

***A8.*** The settlement lacks diversity of interests, meaning customers who would pay the discount subsidy are not signatories.

Q9. Does the settlement package violate any important regulatory principle or practice?

***A9.*** Yes. Regulatory principles and practices should be served by including a cap on what consumers would be asked to pay in subsidies. The 2015 Stipulation does not provide for a cap on the total delta revenue which AEP can collect from customers. Also, the applicant should confirm (publicly) that all its past commitments for economic development (that were the rationale for consumers to pay the discount subsidies under the 2009 Stipulation) have been fulfilled. Further, in future annual filings the applicant should confirm (publicly) that commitments for economic development etc. are being fulfilled. And, for transparency, the amounts that consumers pay for economic development should be public information. These points are not made as unique to the applicant, but are appropriate generally for these types of cases.

Q10. Why do you recommend a cap on the delta revenue (SUBSIDY) THAT AEP COULD CHARGE TO CONSUMERS?

***A10.*** A cap is an important protection for consumers who pay the subsidy. In other cases where companies have sought reasonable arrangements from the PUCO, a cap on the total amount collected from customers has been instituted. As an example, the PUCO set caps on a reasonable arrangement with a company.[[2]](#footnote-3) In another instance the PUCO stated: “The Commission agrees with Staff’s position that, generally, unique arrangements must contain a floor, a minimum amount that the party should be required to pay, and a ceiling, a maximum amount of delta revenue which the [customers] should be expected to pay.”[[3]](#footnote-4) Even though the 2015 Stipulation allows for the applicant to shop with a CRES provider (which can—but is not guaranteed to—reduce the subsidy), energy prices could still rise and that would lead to higher delta revenues (subsidy) collected from customers. A cap would protect customers in such a scenario.

Q11. Do you have a proposed cap in mind for this arrangement?

***A11.*** I would suggest an annual cap of $3.6 million and an aggregate cap of $10 million. This would protect customers and maintain PUCO control of subsidies to be paid by customers.

Q12. DO YOU have any other RECOMMENDATIONS FOR caPping amounts billed TO CUSTOMERS through economic development riders?

***A12.*** Yes. As OCC has previously advocated, there should be a limit on the total amount of money paid by all utility customers for all economic development riders resulting from requests to the PUCO for these discounts. There needs to be this protection for what consumers could at most be made to pay to utilities for all applicable reasonable arrangements. Accordingly, I recommend that the subsidies that consumers are asked to pay to electric utilities for all economic development riders not exceed, in total, a certain low percentage of consumers’ electric bills.

Q13. Why should THE PUCO REQUIRE THE APPLICANT TO confirm it completed all requirements of the 2009 STIPULATION?

***A13.*** Customers and the PUCO should know whether economic development commitments that are a basis for consumers being made to fund the discounts and that are intended for benefiting Ohioans with economic development are fulfilled.

Q14. Does the settlement, as a package, benefit CUSTOMERs and the public interest?

***A14.*** To move the settlement closer to meeting this standard, the PUCO should make some improvements in the settlement for the way the applicant may choose a marketer and for the filing of an annual report that should be done publicly.

Q15. What IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION FOR THE PROCESS OF CHOOSING A CRES PROVIDER?

***A15.*** From my experience in the retail electric and gas markets, I believe the best way to obtain a low price for commodity service is through an auction or a request for proposal (“RFP”) process. Lowering the CRES rate paid by the applicant will, in turn, lower the delta revenue (subsidy) paid by customers. In my opinion, conducting an RFP to choose a CRES provider could help in reducing the price paid by the applicant (and thus paid by consumers to AEP for the delta revenue). It is common practice for large industrial companies to issue an RFP to procure energy supply. In fact, there are a number of third-party companies who provide RFP services to large industrial and commercial customers. The process could be as simple as sending out the RFP to CRES providers who are listed as serving large industrial customers or it could involve an auction where CRES providers would actively bid on serving the applicant. In this situation I believe simply issuing an RFP to Ohio-certified CRES providers would help in obtaining a lower CRES supply rate (and in reducing the subsidy that consumers would pay to AEP for the applicants’ discount subsidy).

Q16. Why should the annual report be made available to interested parties?

***A16.*** It serves transparency and thus is in the public interest to disclose to customers what they are paying for economic development subsidies. And it’s in the public interest to know that companies receiving funding for reasonable arrangements are fulfilling their commitments to Ohioans for economic development. For example, the Ohio Attorney General provides a reporting of the compliance of economic development awards given by the Ohio Development Services Agency.[[4]](#footnote-5) This report publicly discloses the amount of grant awards, loan amounts, commitments, performance and actions taken if the commitments are not reached.

# IV. CONCLUSION

Q17. Does this conclude your testimony?

***A17.*** Yes, however I reserve the right to incorporate new information that may subsequently become available, such as after testimony by the stipulating parties is available.
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