

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

- - -

In the Matter of the :
 Application of Columbus :
 Southern Power Company :
 and Ohio Power Company :
 for Authority to Establish:
 a Standard Service Offer : Case No. 11-346-EL-SSO
 Pursuant to §4928.143, : Case No. 11-348-EL-SSO
 Ohio Rev. Code, In the :
 Form of an Electric :
 Security Plan. :

In the Matter of the :
 Application of Columbus :
 Southern Power Company : Case No. 11-349-EL-AAM
 and Ohio Power Company : Case No. 11-350-EL-AAM
 for Approval of Certain :
 Accounting Authority. :

- - -

PROCEEDINGS

before Ms. Greta See and Mr. Jeffrey R. Jones,
 Attorney Examiners, at the Public Utilities
 Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad Street, Room 11-A,
 Columbus, Ohio, called at 11 a.m. on Wednesday,
 September 7, 2011.

- - -

VOLUME II

- - -

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.
 222 East Town Street, Second Floor
 Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201
 (614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481
 Fax - (614) 224-5724

- - -

APPEARANCES:

American Electric Power
By Mr. Steven T. Nourse
Ms. Anne M. Vogel
Mr. Matthew J. Satterwhite
1 Riverside Plaza
Columbus, Ohio 43215-2373

Porter, Wright, Morris & Arthur, LLP
By Mr. Daniel R. Conway
41 South High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215-6194

On behalf of the Applicants.

FirstEnergy Service Company
By Mr. Mark A. Hayden
76 South Main Street
Akron, Ohio 44308

Calfee, Halter & Griswold, LLP
By Mr. James F. Lang
1400 KeyBank Center
800 Superior Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Calfee, Halter & Griswold, LLP
By Mr. N. Trevor Alexander
1100 Fifth Third Center
21 East State Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4243

Jones Day
By Mr. David A. Kutik
Ms. Allison Haedt
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

On behalf of FirstEnergy Solutions
Corporation.

Thompson Hine, LLP
By Mr. Philip B. Sineneng
41 South High Street, Suite 1700
Columbus, Ohio 43215

On behalf of Duke Energy Retail.

APPEARANCES (Continued)

Bricker & Eckler, LLP
By Ms. Lisa Gatchell McAlister
Mr. Matthew W. Warnock
100 South Third Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291

On behalf of Ohio Manufacturers
Association.

Ohio Poverty Law Center
By Mr. Joseph V. Maskovyak
Mr. Michael Smalz
555 Buttles Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43215

On behalf of Appalachian Peace and
Justice Network.

Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease, LLP
By Ms. Lija Kaleps-Clark
Mr. M. Howard Petricoff
Mr. Michael J. Settineri
Mr. Stephen Howard
P.O. Box 1008
52 East Gay Street
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008

On behalf of Exelon Generation
Company, LLC, Constellation NewEnergy,
Inc., Constellation Energy Commodities
Group, Inc., Retail Energy Supply
Association, The Compete Coalition,
and PJM Power Providers Group.

McNees, Wallace & Nurick, LLC
By Mr. Frank P. Darr
Mr. Samuel C. Randazzo
Mr. Joseph E. Oliker
Fifth Third Center, Suite 1700
21 East State Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4288

On behalf of Industrial Energy Users.

APPEARANCES: (Continued)

Chester, Willcox & Saxbe, LLP
By Mr. Zachary D. Kravitz
Mr. Mark S. Yurick
Mr. John W. Bentine
65 East State Street, Suite 1000
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4213

On behalf of the Kroger Company.

SNR Denton US, LLP
By Ms. Emma F. Hand
Mr. Douglas G. Bonner
1301 K Street NW
Suite 600 East Tower
Washington, D.C. 20005

On behalf of Ormet Primary Aluminum
Corporation.

Eimer, Stahl, Klevorn & Solberg, LLP
By Mr. David M. Stahl
Mr. Arin Aragona
224 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 1100
Chicago, Illinois 60604

On behalf of Exelon Generation Company,
LLC.

EnerNOC, Inc.
By Mr. Gregory J. Poulos
101 Federal Street, Suite 1100
Boston, Massachusetts 02110

On behalf of EnerNOC.

Ohio Hospital Association
By Mr. Richard L. Sites
155 East Broad Street, 15th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Bricker & Eckler, LLP
By Mr. Thomas J. O'Brien
100 South Third Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291

On behalf of Ohio Hospital Association.

APPEARANCES: (Continued)

Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry
By Mr. David Boehm
Mr. Michael L. Kurtz
Mr. Kurt Boehm
36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

On behalf of Ohio Energy Group.

Ohio Environmental Council
By Mr. Nolan Moser
Mr. Trent A. Dougherty
1207 Grandview Avenue, Suite 201
Columbus, Ohio 43212-3449

On behalf of the Ohio Environmental
Council.

Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy
By Ms. Colleen L. Mooney
Mr. David C. Rinebolt
231 West Lima Street
Findlay, Ohio 45840

On behalf of Ohio Partners for Affordable
Energy.

Janine L. Migden-Ostrander
Ohio Consumers' Counsel
By Mr. Terry L. Etter
Ms. Maureen R. Grady
Assistant Consumers' Counsel
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

On behalf of the Residential Ratepayers
of Columbus Southern Power Company and
Ohio Power Company.

Bell & Royer Co., LPA
By Mr. Barth E. Royer
33 South Grant Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43215

On behalf of Dominion Retail, Inc.

APPEARANCES: (Continued)

Mike DeWine, Ohio Attorney General
William Wright, Section Chief
Public Utilities Section
By Mr. Steven L. Beeler
Mr. John H. Jones
Mr. Werner L. Margard, III
Assistant Attorneys General
180 East Broad Street, 6th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793

On behalf of the staff of the Public
Utilities Commission of Ohio.

Covington & Burling
By Mr. William Massey
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20004

On behalf of The Compete Coalition.

Schottenstein, Zox & Dunn Co., LPA
By Mr. Christopher L. Miller
Mr. Greg J. Dunn
Mr. Asim Z. Haque
250 West Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

On behalf of the Association of
Individual Colleges and Universities.

Bricker & Eckler, LLP
By Mr. Christopher L. Montgomery
Mr. Terrence O'Donnell
100 South Third Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

On behalf of Paulding Wind Farm, II, and
The Distributed Wind Energy Association.

Mr. Henry W. Eckhart
1200 Chambers Road, Suite 106
Columbus, Ohio 43212

On behalf of the Sierra Club and Natural
Resources Defense Council.

APPEARANCES: (Continued)

Keating, Muething & Klekamp PLL
By Mr. David A. Meyer
One East Fourth Street, Suite 1400
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Ms. Holly Rachel Smith
HITT Business Center
3803 Rectortown Road
Marshall, VA 20115

On behalf of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP,
and Sam's East, Inc.

- - -

1 Wednesday Morning Session,
2 September 7, 2011.

3 - - -

4 EXAMINER SEE: Scheduled for hearing
5 today at this time before the Public Utilities
6 Commission are Case Nos. 11-346, 11-348, 11-349, and
7 11-350 being entitled in the Matter of the
8 Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and
9 Ohio Power Company for Authority to Establish a
10 Standard Service Offer Pursuant to 49 -- 4928.143,
11 Ohio Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric
12 Security Plan and associated cases.

13 My name is Greta See. On the Bench with
14 me is Jeff Jones. We have been assigned to the case
15 by the Commission.

16 We are reconvening this hearing. We took
17 appearances on August 15. Is there any party present
18 that needs to revise their appearance?

19 MR. HAYDEN: Your Honor, on behalf of
20 FirstEnergy Solutions appearing Mark Hayden, enter
21 the appearance of James Lang and Trevor Alexander
22 from the law firm Calfee, Halter & Griswold and David
23 Kutik and Allison Haedt from the law firm Jones Day.

24 MR. POULIS: Your Honor, Greg Poulos with
25 EnerNOC. I do not believe I was present at that

1 hearing.

2 EXAMINER SEE: Okay. Is there anyone
3 else that needs to revise their appearance?

4 Mr. Nourse.

5 MR. NOURSE: Thank you, your Honor. A
6 few minutes ago the -- there was a Stipulation and
7 Recommendation filed. It involves not only the two
8 cases -- the four cases that you just called but six
9 additional cases as well. This stipulation is
10 supported by, I believe, about 20 parties. And there
11 may be some opposition, I can't speak to that, but we
12 did -- I would also note that we did file a motion
13 yesterday prior to the prior deadline -- or the
14 deadline for the stipulation to be filed and I guess
15 that's pending and we did -- we did meet our goal of
16 filing this stipulation this morning.

17 So I believe I would submit that the --
18 the hearing as it was scheduled should be suspended,
19 and we would like to discuss the process for the
20 Commission's consideration of adopting the joint
21 stipulation.

22 EXAMINER SEE: Okay. It's my
23 understanding all the parties have been provided a
24 stamped copy of the stipulation; is that correct?

25 MR. MARGARD: Your Honor, all the parties

1 present have been provided with a time-stamped copy
2 of the stipulation. We have additional copies being
3 made in order to ensure everyone present in the room
4 has a copy. Some of those copies are still on their
5 way to the hearing room.

6 EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

7 MR. RANDAZZO: We received them just a
8 couple of minutes ago.

9 EXAMINER SEE: I think the next step is
10 for us to discuss a process to proceed in light of
11 the stipulation. I understand that a number of the
12 parties just received it a few minutes ago. It does
13 not appear at this point to be a settlement entered
14 into by all the parties to the proceeding.

15 Mr. Etter, you can't hear me?

16 Okay. It's my understanding that not all
17 the parties have entered into the stipulation. I
18 assume that there are some parties that are opposing
19 or have not yet decided whether they are going to be
20 joining the stipulation.

21 MR. HAYDEN: Yes, your Honor. We have
22 also just received the stipulation. We obviously
23 need some time to evaluate that going forward. We
24 have a proposed schedule on that -- on that idea. So
25 I don't know if now is the appropriate time to talk

1 about that.

2 EXAMINER SEE: Yes, it is.

3 MR. HAYDEN: Again, your Honor, having
4 just received the stipulation, we need some
5 additional time obviously to evaluate it, run the
6 numbers, and so forth. We would propose to conduct
7 discovery, both written and depositions. We would
8 propose a three-day turnaround on discovery with a
9 cut-off date on or about September 26.

10 We would also ask that a technical
11 conference be conducted on an informal basis so that
12 the parties can ask questions, obtain information,
13 and make the process a little bit more efficient. We
14 would ask that intervenor testimony be filed on or
15 about September 29 and that the hearing for the
16 stipulation begin on October 3.

17 MR. RANDAZZO: Your Honor, might I ask a
18 question?

19 Mark, is the schedule you just proposed
20 assuming that all the testimony is supported and
21 settlement is filed on Friday?

22 MR. HAYDEN: I'm sorry, your Honor. That
23 is the assumption on the schedule I just set out. It
24 is also the assumption, your Honor, that the capacity
25 case, 10-2929, docket will be stayed or continued

1 because that caption is included in this stipulation
2 document.

3 MR. ETTER: Your Honor, OCC concurs with
4 the schedule.

5 EXAMINER SEE: I'm sorry. You said OCC
6 will --

7 MR. ETTER: Will concur with the
8 schedule, we agree with the schedule.

9 MR. SMALZ: Your Honor, Appalachian Peace
10 and Justice Network agrees with the schedule.

11 EXAMINER SEE: With the FEC proposed
12 schedule?

13 MR. RANDAZZO: Your Honors, IEU will
14 concur with the schedule subject to the filing of all
15 the testimony in support of the settlement by this
16 Friday. Obviously we've just got the document that's
17 been filed with the Commission so we're trying to do
18 the best we can, I think, with giving you what we
19 think we may be able to do without having fully
20 looked at the document and been able to run numbers
21 and that sort of thing. So subject to those
22 qualifications we would support the schedule as
23 outlined by Mr. Hayden.

24 MS. MOONEY: OPAC, Ohio Partners for
25 Affordable Energy, would also support the schedule

1 outlined by Mr. Hayden.

2 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Margard.

3 MR. MARGARD: Your Honor, on behalf of
4 the Commission staff, and I believe I probably talk
5 on behalf of the signatory parties as well, we
6 believe that a filing deadline for supporting
7 testimony by Friday is probably a little too early
8 for us. We actually would propose the testimony be
9 filed by next Wednesday.

10 We have a number of issues in this case
11 that need to be addressed. We have very disperse
12 interests, and we have been making significant
13 changes in the course of our negotiations as late as
14 late last night. So we believe that Friday would be
15 too soon for us to be able to adequately support the
16 stipulation and would request until next Wednesday to
17 file that testimony.

18 EXAMINER SEE: Supporting -- other
19 parties supporting the stipulation?

20 MR. PETRICOFF: Yes, your Honor.
21 Constellation, Exelon, and the RESA, the Retail
22 Energy Supply group concur.

23 MR. NOURSE: Your Honor, the companies
24 would concur with Mr. Margard's proposal for next --
25 next Wednesday, and it's probably safe to say all the

1 settling parties would support that schedule. They
2 can speak up if they disagree.

3 I would just clarify -- I'm sorry, just
4 clarify that the -- I guess since the FirstEnergy
5 proposal was keyed off, I believe -- or as Sam said
6 was keyed off of the Friday filing, that would
7 probably involve bumping back those other dates a few
8 days under their proposal.

9 But having said that, I'm not sure if
10 the -- if the full two weeks would be needed by the
11 intervenors, actually it would be more than two
12 weeks, I believe, if they revise the proposal to
13 respond to the testimony but.

14 MR. HAYDEN: Your Honor, I would just say
15 again we just received the document 15 minutes ago.
16 I don't know what the testimony is going to say so I
17 would -- I would suggest that we absolutely do need
18 at least two weeks to evaluate that plus some
19 additional time for discovery. The dates that I gave
20 you earlier were premised on the testimony being
21 filed this Friday, so I would have to revise those
22 dates at this point.

23 MR. MARGARD: Your Honor, if I may.

24 EXAMINER SEE: Yes.

25 MR. MARGARD: Inasmuch as the signatory

1 parties have requested an additional five days, I
2 don't believe we have any difficulty with extending
3 the proposed schedule by that same five days. That's
4 probably acceptable to us.

5 MR. NOURSE: Your Honor, could I add one
6 more thing? I'm not sure I heard Mr. Hayden's
7 comment about the 2929 docket, but it is scheduled
8 for October 4 presently, I believe, the hearing.
9 The -- since the 2929 case would be resolved by the
10 stipulation I believe the hearing for the 2929 case
11 would be -- would become a stipulation hearing at
12 this point so it would be part of the same hearing
13 we're talking about this morning, I believe.

14 EXAMINER SEE: If I understood you
15 correctly, you believe the 10-2929 hearing, the
16 capacity case, would be subsumed in this one?

17 MR. NOURSE: It's proposed to be resolved
18 through the stipulation that was filed this morning,
19 your Honor, so just pointing out that I believe the
20 process in that case as the other cases involved here
21 would be subsumed in a stipulation hearing and the
22 associated process as outlined.

23 I don't think companies have a problem
24 with the structure of the proposal as far as having a
25 technical conference and the discovery. I think, you

1 know, three-day turnaround is pretty aggressive. I
2 would request five days -- five calendar days to make
3 that more manageable. That would still allow
4 multiple rounds of discovery which typically on a
5 stipulation is not entertained as being extensive
6 discovery opportunities.

7 EXAMINER SEE: You're otherwise okay with
8 the technical conference, did I hear you say,
9 Mr. Nourse?

10 MR. NOURSE: Yes, yes.

11 MR. RANDAZZO: Do we have a sense for how
12 much testimony is going to be filed in support of the
13 stipulation? Who is going to be the sponsoring
14 parties? That may be of use to the discussion of
15 procedural schedules.

16 EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

17 MR. MARGARD: Your Honor, if I may, that
18 is part of what is still yet to be determined.
19 Certainly the company and staff anticipate filing
20 testimony. We would anticipate that additional
21 signatories will as well. We are endeavoring to do
22 some coordination of that to cover all the bases with
23 a minimal number of witnesses, but we do expect other
24 signatory parties to file testimony as well.

25 MR. KURTZ: Your Honor, Mike Kurtz, Ohio

1 Energy Group. This may be redundant but I would just
2 weigh in by saying Mr. Margard's proposal to give the
3 opposing parties the exact procedural schedule they
4 have asked for but just extend it for five days to
5 allow the parties to file testimony is a reasonable
6 proposal assuming it gives your Honors enough time to
7 get a decision out but that's a reasonable proposal
8 that would essentially only leave the question of the
9 discovery turnaround three or five days.

10 EXAMINER SEE: Thank you, Mr. Kurtz.

11 The Bench is going to take 10 minutes and
12 look at the proposals. We will reconvene at 11:35.

13 (Recess taken.)

14 EXAMINER SEE: Let's go back on the
15 record. The Bench has considered the request -- the
16 request of the parties for a schedule to proceed in
17 this matter. We would also like to note that we are
18 occupying one of the only -- the only hearing room
19 within the Commission that accommodates the number --
20 we have a number of parties that we have involved in
21 this case and there are several other cases for AEP
22 and other electric and gas companies that need this
23 room so that those hearings can proceed.

24 In light of that we have adjusted
25 slightly the process to proceed in this case. We are

1 going to continue to have five calendar days to
 2 respond to discovery requests. Testimony in support
 3 of the stipulation shall be due September 13.
 4 Discovery deadline is September 28. The parties can
 5 schedule a technical conference -- or informal
 6 technical conference as counsel for FES has requested
 7 among themselves. You should, however, advise the
 8 Bench of that date.

9 MR. NOURSE: Okay.

10 EXAMINER SEE: Testimony in opposition to
 11 the stipulation is due September 27, and the hearing
 12 will begin on October 4 at 10 a.m. in this hearing
 13 room.

14 Is there any other matter that needs to
 15 be addressed at this point?

16 MR. HAYDEN: Your Honor, a point of
 17 clarification on motions, those would be carried out
 18 in an expedited manner, I would assume? Motions,
 19 expedited response?

20 EXAMINER SEE: As we have currently,
 21 there is a five-day response period, I believe, in
 22 this case, three-day reply pursuant to the entry that
 23 was issued the end of July in this case, I think.

24 MR. HAYDEN: Okay.

25 MR. POULOS: Your Honor, may we file

1 testimony electronically?

2 EXAMINER SEE: If you have been cleared
3 by the Docketing Department to engage in that
4 process, you can.

5 MR. POULOS: Thank you.

6 MR. NOURSE: Can I ask another question?

7 EXAMINER SEE: Just a second.

8 EXAMINER JONES: The Bench would
9 encourage the parties to transmit testimony among
10 themselves electronically as well to save time on
11 mail.

12 EXAMINER SEE: And also include the
13 Attorney Examiners.

14 MR. NOURSE: I'm sorry. I didn't hear.
15 Did you say electronic filing as well for the
16 testimony?

17 EXAMINER SEE: If you have been approved
18 by the Docketing Division and according to their
19 requirements to file electronically, you may do so.

20 MR. NOURSE: Thank you.

21 MR. ETTER: Yes, your Honors, we were
22 wondering of the effect of this on the 10-2929 case
23 since that case is also to start hearing at that same
24 day, I believe.

25 EXAMINER SEE: Since that case is part of

1 the stipulation filed in this case, we'll have to
2 consider it jointly and should further hearings be
3 necessary in that case, we'll have to reschedule it.

4 MR. ETTER: Also, your Honor, OCC sent an
5 e-mail around yesterday to all parties and to the
6 Attorney Examiners notifying the unavailability or
7 limited availability of Mack Thompson to testify
8 after September 9.

9 EXAMINER SEE: Have you had -- have you
10 had an opportunity to discuss that with the parties?

11 MR. ETTER: No, we haven't, your Honor.

12 EXAMINER SEE: In light of the
13 stipulation are you still planning on?

14 MR. ETTER: Well, since we just got the
15 stipulation about an hour ago, maybe a little less,
16 then, no, we haven't had a chance to -- to review the
17 effect of the stipulation to his testimony.

18 EXAMINER SEE: Okay. When can you advise
19 the Bench whether or not you would need to have
20 Mr. Thompson's testimony?

21 MR. ETTER: When we have a chance to
22 analyze the stipulation, hopefully -- hopefully by
23 the end of the day today.

24 MR. NOURSE: Your Honor, I am not sure.
25 Is OCC suggesting they would file testimony regarding

1 the stipulation by Mr. Thompson? I don't understand.

2 MR. ETTER: Well, you know, we are not
3 sure. That's the point.

4 MR. NOURSE: But the -- okay.

5 EXAMINER JONES: Mr. Etter, is it
6 possible to have someone adopt Mr. Thompson's
7 testimony, or do you need to look at the stipulation
8 in order to determine that?

9 MR. ETTER: Yeah, I think we would need
10 to look at the stipulation.

11 EXAMINER JONES: Then I would think we
12 would like to have you advise the parties and the
13 Bench as soon as possible what you are going to
14 proceed. It may not be possible to get Mr. Thompson
15 here and on the stand this week, so either you'll
16 have to make other arrangements for once the hearing
17 starts in October for him to come here or someone
18 adopt his testimony.

19 MR. ETTER: Okay. Thank you.

20 EXAMINER SEE: And you'll notify us by
21 the end of the day today?

22 MR. ETTER: Yes, we will.

23 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Randazzo.

24 MR. RANDAZZO: Yes, your Honors. Maybe I
25 didn't understand correctly what you intended with

1 the answer to the question about the schedule in the
2 2929 case, otherwise known as the capacity case. The
3 companies have filed testimony at this point in that
4 proceeding. Parties -- intervening parties that wish
5 to file testimony have to file I believe on the 23rd
6 of September as the current schedule proceeds.

7 The request I thought earlier was to stay
8 the procedural schedule in that case pending the
9 disposition of the issues in this case. Maybe I
10 misunderstood the request earlier, but we've got --
11 even though there is an attempt to resolve the issues
12 in the 2929 case it is a separate case with different
13 parties, not all the parties, and so we have got a
14 procedural schedule.

15 Would it be your preference that we file
16 testimony in that case according to the current
17 procedural schedule and then how will that get folded
18 into this case?

19 MR. NOURSE: Your Honor, may I respond?

20 EXAMINER SEE: Sure, Mr. Nourse.

21 MR. NOURSE: I believe, as Mr. Randazzo
22 indicated, the company has already filed their
23 testimony in 2929. I think it would be appropriate
24 for the other parties to go ahead and file their
25 testimony on the schedule to avoid any additional

1 delay should that hearing go forward on a litigated
2 basis, but the hearing itself what I tried to say
3 earlier was because the stipulation proposes
4 resolution of that docket, the 2929 docket, that the
5 hearing itself would become part of this stipulation
6 hearing, the process you just set up for the
7 October 4 hearing in my view would be a hearing in
8 all of these cases that are captioned in the
9 stipulation to -- including 2929 and including the
10 ESP cases. It would be a stipulation hearing
11 considering adoption of the stipulation for all of
12 these cases.

13 MR. RANDAZZO: So if I understand you
14 correctly then, we would be permitted to do
15 cross-examination on the companies' testimony in the
16 2929 case and vice versa?

17 MR. NOURSE: I don't think -- I don't
18 think that would apply, Sam, any more than it would
19 apply to testimony that's been filed in the ESP cases
20 by, you know, dozens of parties in this case. The
21 stipulation hearing, my view, would be limited to the
22 testimony relating to the stipulation so that would
23 be the case for all the hearings. None of the other
24 witnesses that -- would be -- unless you file a --
25 refile testimony as stipulation testimony would be

1 appearing or subject to cross-examination in the
2 hearing.

3 MR. RANDAZZO: I'm sorry. I don't know
4 how that works. I don't know how you have a proposal
5 that's designed to resolve contested issues in a case
6 where parties can't cross-examine on the testimony
7 that's been filed in that case. It seems to me to be
8 a bit of an odd process. But I live and learn.

9 MR. NOURSE: It wouldn't be -- it
10 wouldn't be moved for admission. People wouldn't be
11 appearing, your Honor, to try to adopt that prior
12 testimony. The stipulation testimony, I think, would
13 be what's at issue in the stipulation hearing.

14 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Petricoff.

15 MR. PETRICOFF: Your Honor, maybe the
16 better way to do this procedurally would be to
17 entertain a motion to consolidate all of these cases.
18 At this point I would have to go back and check to
19 make sure that everyone in all of these -- that
20 everyone who is in the 11-346 case is in all of the
21 other -- all of the other cases, in other words, we
22 cover everyone whose intervened.

23 If that's the case, then consolidation
24 makes sense because at that point if, in fact, as the
25 proponents believe this answers the question of what

1 to do with capacity, that's fine. But then it
2 becomes an issue if something is left out that can be
3 argued by any of the intervenors, and at this point
4 the only thing that is left to do and I -- I would
5 make the motion to consolidate now but I think it's
6 important to go back and check the list and make sure
7 that basically there would be no isolated or stranded
8 parties.

9 EXAMINER SEE: Does -- counsel for either
10 of the parties involved in 10-2929, as I recall,
11 intervenor testimony is due September 23 and
12 prehearing conference is scheduled for the 28th; is
13 that correct?

14 MR. NOURSE: That sounds right.

15 EXAMINER SEE: I think that's correct.
16 Okay.

17 Mr. Petricoff, did I take it you were
18 planning to file a motion to consolidate the cases?

19 MR. PETRICOFF: Yes, your Honor, as soon
20 as I check the -- check the intervenors' list to make
21 sure I can make the argument that, in fact, everyone
22 would be covered and that there is judicial economy
23 to be accomplished by consolidating them all. If
24 nothing else, we will make good use of this room.

25 MR. NOURSE: Can I offer a conciliatory

1 suggestion in response to Mr. Randazzo's comment
2 about the testimony?

3 I don't think we would be opposed to, you
4 know, avoiding the intervenor testimony on September
5 I think it was 23rd in the 2929 case and just going
6 forward with the stipulation testimony, your Honor,
7 if that's helpful, if that's -- if that was the
8 concern that was articulated.

9 EXAMINER SEE: So you want -- I'm sorry.
10 Say that again for me, Mr. Nourse.

11 MR. NOURSE: Well, I am just saying what
12 I was saying before I assumed that that process, that
13 schedule that is existing, would go forward but the
14 hearing would -- would become a stipulation hearing
15 based on the stipulation testimony we would then file
16 in all these cases.

17 But to the extent that there is a concern
18 about intervenor testimony in the 2929 docket kind of
19 being a waste of time or something to that end, if we
20 are just going to litigate based on stipulation
21 testimony, then we wouldn't be opposed to staying
22 that testimony deadline until if and when such time
23 it would be needed to be taken up again.

24 Is that any clearer?

25 EXAMINER SEE: Uh-huh.

1 MR. RANDAZZO: No.

2 EXAMINER SEE: No? It's not any clearer
3 to you, or you are saying no?

4 MR. RANDAZZO: It's not any clearer. You
5 have got a situation where the testimony that's filed
6 in the ESP case refers to the 2929 case as a basis
7 for resolving the capacity charge. I take it from
8 Mr. Nourse's earlier comment that he would be opposed
9 to anybody doing cross-examination on the testimony
10 that was filed by the companies of the 2929 case. I
11 don't know how that works. I don't know how you
12 satisfy due process requirements based on that
13 structure.

14 MR. POULOS: Your Honor, this is Greg
15 Poulos, EnerNOC. There is a motion to consolidate
16 that is pending.

17 MR. PETRICOFF: There will be.

18 MR. POULOS: No, there has been one.

19 EXAMINER SEE: There was one that was
20 filed quite some time ago.

21 MR. POULIS: I don't know if it has all
22 the cases. I don't know if 10-2929 is on there. I
23 know there are a number of other cases. The
24 emergency curtailment was one that was included in
25 that.

1 EXAMINER SEE: I think as I recall it
2 includes more cases than --

3 MR. NOURSE: Right.

4 EXAMINER SEE: -- are addressed in the
5 stipulation. I think we are talking about the same
6 one that was filed.

7 MR. POULOS: Yes, we are.

8 EXAMINER SEE: Maybe in May?

9 MR. POULOS: Yes. And to your other
10 question I think there is at least one party that's a
11 part of that case, the emergency curtailment service
12 rider case, that's not a party to this case, Core
13 Energy.

14 EXAMINER SEE: Who?

15 MR. POULOS: Core Energy.

16 EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

17 MR. NOURSE: Okay. Your Honor, can I try
18 one more time?

19 EXAMINER SEE: Sure.

20 MR. NOURSE: As to the consolidation, I
21 think we'll table that for the moment, and perhaps
22 the signatory parties can talk about that in filing
23 that request or making that request, but on the issue
24 of the testimony, it's been my experience and
25 understanding in the past when there is a partial

1 stipulation, that there's no precedent for saying
2 that anybody that's filed testimony like the dozens
3 of parties in this case that have filed testimony
4 would somehow be forced to carry through with that
5 testimony, appear on the stand, adopt it, or be
6 subject to cross. It wouldn't be admitted into the
7 record if obviously the witness didn't appear and so
8 sponsor.

9 And so the stipulation hearing becomes
10 about the stipulation testimony and those witnesses
11 that file in support. The stipulation testimony
12 would be obviously appearing and subject to
13 cross-examination. And that's -- that would be the
14 scope of the stipulation hearing.

15 So all I was saying about 2929 was that I
16 don't think we would be opposed to not having the
17 intervenors file their testimony that would otherwise
18 be sort of put on the shelf or put to the side during
19 a stipulation hearing.

20 And so that was my conciliatory
21 suggestion. That's what I was trying to say.

22 MR. HAYDEN: Your Honor, I would agree
23 that to the extent the issues in the case -- in the
24 capacity case are subsumed within this document that
25 I haven't reviewed yet, it would make no sense for

1 the intervening parties to file testimony in the
2 10-2929 case on the 23rd.

3 My assumption, and I think Mr. Nourse
4 would agree, those issues -- all those issues would
5 be dealt with within the context of the hearing on
6 the stipulation.

7 EXAMINER SEE: Okay. In light of the
8 concerns raised by the parties in this case about
9 10-2929, we'll consider that issue along with the
10 motion to consolidate. I'm aware of the fact
11 Mr. Poulos represents there is one more party
12 involved. I would like to have a chance to review
13 the record in that case to make sure.

14 Mr. Petricoff, when do you expect to be
15 able to file?

16 MR. PETRICOFF: Well, I don't think it
17 would take long to put that together. That's
18 something we could do by close of business tomorrow.

19 EXAMINER SEE: Okay. If there is nothing
20 further, this hearing is adjourned until October 4.

21 (Thereupon, the hearing was adjourned at
22 11:57 a.m.)

23 - - -
24
25

CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is
a true and correct transcript of the proceedings
taken by me in this matter on Wednesday, September 7,
2011, and carefully compared with my original
stenographic notes.

Karen Sue Gibson, Registered
Merit Reporter.

(KSG-5408)

- - -

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

9/22/2011 11:07:02 AM

in

Case No(s). 11-0346-EL-SSO, 11-0348-EL-SSO, 11-0349-EL-AAM, 11-0350-EL-AAM

Summary: Transcript Transcript of the Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company hearing held on 09/07/11 electronically filed by Mrs. Jennifer Duffer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Gibson, Karen Sue Mrs.