

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company for Authority to Merge and Related Approvals)))	Case No. 10-2376-EL-UNC
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 §4928.143, Ohio Rev. Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan.))))	Case No. 11-346-EL-SSO Case No. 11-348-EL-SSO
In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company for Approval of Certain Accounting Authority)))	Case No. 11-349-EL-AAM Case No. 11-350-EL-AAM
In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company to Amend its Emergency Curtailment Service Riders)))	Case No. 10-343-EL-ATA
In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to Amend its Emergency Curtailment Service Riders)))	Case No. 10-344-EL-ATA
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
acc	urace	Case No. 11-4920-EL-RDR to certify that the images appearing are an and complete reproduction of a case file delivered in the regular course of business and pate Processed 9-30-11
Mg + *	1	

In the Matter of the Application of)	
Ohio Power Company for Approval)	
of a Mechanism to Recover)	Case No. 11-4921-EL-RDR
Deferred Fuel Costs Ordered Under)	
Ohio Revised Code 4928.144)	

FIRSTENERGY SOLUTIONS CORP.'S NOTICE OF FILING DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT

FirstEnergy Solutions Corp. ("FES"), pursuant to O.A.C. 4901-1-21, hereby provides notice to all parties that it is filing the following deposition transcripts:

• Exhibit A- Stephen J. Baron

Dated: September 30, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

Mark A. Hayden (0081077)

FIRSTENERGY SERVICE COMPANY

76 South Main Street Akron, OH 44308 (330) 761-7735

(330) 384-3875 (fax)

haydenm@firstenergycorp.com

James F. Lang (0059668)

Laura C. McBride (0080059)

N. Trevor Alexander (0080713)

CALFEE, HALTER & GRISWOLD LLP

1400 KeyBank Center

800 Superior Ave.

Cleveland, OH 44114

(216) 622-8200

(216) 241-0816 (fax)

jlang@calfee.com

lmcbride@calfee.com

talexander@calfee.com

David A. Kutik (0006418)

JONES DAY

901 Lakeside Avenue

Cleveland, OH 44114

(216) 586-3939

(216) 579-0212 (fax)

dakutik@jonesday.com

Allison E. Haedt (0082243)

JONES DAY

P.O. Box 165017

Columbus, OH 43216-5017

(614) 469-3939

(614) 461-4198 (fax)

aehaedt@jonesday.com

Attorneys for FirstEnergy Solutions Corp.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing FirstEnergy Solutions Corp.'s Notice of

Filing Deposition Transcript was served this 30th day of September, 2011, via e-mail upon the

parties below.

One of the Attorneys for FirstEnergy Solutions Corp.

Steven T. Nourse
Matthew J. Satterwhite
Anne M. Vogel
American Electric Power Corp.
1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
stnourse@aep.com
mjsatterwhite@aep.com
amvogel@aep.com

Daniel R. Conway
Porter Wright Morris & Arthur
41 South High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

dconway@porterwright.com

Cynthia Fonner Brady
David I. Fein
550 W. Washington Street, Suite 300
Chicago, IL 60661
cynthia.a.fonner@constellation.com
david.fein@constellation.com

Richard L. Sites Ohio Hospital Association 155 East Broad Street, 15th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215-3620 ricks@ohanet.org

Shannon Fisk 2 North Riverside Plaza, Suite 2250 Chicago, IL 60606 Dorothy K. Corbett
Amy Spiller
Duke Energy Retail Sales
139 East Fourth Street
1303-Main
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
dorothy.corbett@duke-energy.com
amy.spiller@duke-energy.com

David F. Boehm Michael L. Kurtz Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry 36 East Seventh Street. Suite 1510 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 dboehm@bkllawfirm.com mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com

Terry L. Etter
Maureen R. Grady
Jeffrey L. Small
Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485
etter@occ.state.oh.us
grady@occ.state.oh.us
small@occ.state.oh.us

Thomas J. O'Brien Bricker & Eckler 100 South Third Street Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291 tobrien@bricker.com

Jay E. Jadwin American Electric Power Service Corporation 1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor

sfisk@nrdc.org

John W. Bentine
Mark S. Yurick
Zachary D. Kravitz
Chester Willcox & Saxbe, LLP
65 East State Street, Suite 1000
Columbus, Ohio 43215
jbentine@cwslaw.com
myurick@cwslaw.com
zkravitz@cwslaw.com

Terrence O'Donnell Christopher Montgomery Bricker & Eckler LLP 100 South Third Street Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291 todonnell@bricker.com cmontgomery@bricker.com

Jesse A. Rodriguez
Exelon Generation Company, LLC
300 Exelon Way
Kennett Square, Pennsylvania 19348
jesse.rodriguez@exeloncorp.com

Glen Thomas 1060 First Avenue, Ste. 400 King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406 gthomas@gtpowergroup.com

Henry W. Eckhart 2100 Chambers Road, Suite 106 Columbus, Ohio 43212 henryeckhart@aol.com

Christopher L. Miller
Gregory H. Dunn
Asim Z. Haque
Stephen J. Smith
Schottenstein Zox & Dunn Co., LPA
250 West Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
cmiller@szd.com
ahaque@szd.com
ssmith@szd.com
gdunn@szd.com

Columbus, Ohio 43215
jejadwin@aep.com
Michael R. Smalz
Joseph V. Maskovyak
Ohio Poverty Law Center
555 Buttles Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43215
msmalz@ohiopovertylaw.org
jmaskovyak@ohiopovertylaw.org

Lisa G. McAlister
Matthew W. Warnock
Bricker & Eckler LLP
100 South Third Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291
lmcalister@bricker.com
mwarnock@bricker.com

William L. Massey Covington & Burling, LLP 1201 Pennsylvania Ave., NW Washington, DC 20004 wmassey@cov.com

Laura Chappelle 4218 Jacob Meadows Okemos, Michigan 48864 laurac@chappelleconsulting.net

Pamela A. Fox Law Director The City of Hilliard, Ohio pfox@hilliardohio.gov

M. Howard Petricoff
Stephen M. Howard
Michael J. Settineri
Lija Kaleps-Clark; Benita Kahn
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP
52 E. Gay Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
mhpetricoff@vorys.com
smhoward@vorys.com
mjsettineri@vorys.com
lkalepsclark@vorys.com
bakahn@vorys.com

{01272405.DOC;1 }

Sandy Grace
Exelon Business Services Company
101 Constitution Avenue N.W., Suite 400 East
Washington, DC 20001
sandy.grace@exeloncorp.com

Kenneth P. Kreider
David A. Meyer
Keating Muething & Klekamp PLL
One East Fourth Street, Suite 1400
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
kpkreider@kmklaw.com
dmeyer@kmklaw.com

Holly Rachel Smith Holly Rachel Smith, PLLC Hitt Business Center 3803 Rectortown Road Marshall, Virginia 20115 holly@raysmithlaw.com

Gregory J. Poulos EnerNOC, Inc. 101 Federal Street, Suite 1100 Boston, MA 02110 gpoulos@enernoc.com

Philip B. Sineneng
Terrance A. Mebane
Carolyn S. Flahive
Thompson Hine LLP
41 S. High Street, Suite 1700
Columbus, Ohio 43215
philip.sineneng@thompsonhine.com
carolyn.flahive@thompsonhine.com
terrance.mebane@thompsonhine.com

Gary A. Jeffries
Dominion Resources Services, Inc.
501 Martindale Street, Suite 400
Pittsburgh, PA 15212-5817
gary.a.jeffries@aol.com

Steve W. Chriss Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. 2001 SE 10th Street Bentonville, Arkansas 72716 stephen.chriss@wal-mart.com

Barth E. Royer Bell & Royer Co., LPA 33 South Grant Avenue Columbus, Ohio 43215-3927 barthroyer@aol.com

Werner L. Margard III
John H. Jones
William Wright
Thomas Lindgren
Assistant Attorneys General
Public Utilities Section
180 East Broad Street, 6th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
werner.margard@puc.state.oh.us
john.jones@puc.state.oh.us
William.wright@puc.state.oh.us
Thomas.Lindgren@puc.state.oh.us

Emma F. Hand
Douglas G. Bonner
Keith C. Nusbaum
Clinton A. Vince
SNR Denton US LLP
1301 K Street, NW, Suite 600, East Tower
Washington, DC 20005-3364
emma.hand@snrdenton.com
doug.bonner@snrdenton.com
keith.nusbaum@snrdenton.com
Clinton.vince@snrdenton.com

{01272405.DOC;1}

Samuel C. Randazzo
Joseph E. Oliker
Frank P. Darr
McNees Wallace & Nurick
21 East State Street, 17th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
sam@mwncmh.com
joliker@mwncmh.com
fdarr@mwncmh.com

David M. Stahl
Arin C. Aragona
Scott C. Solberg
Eimer Stahl Klevorn & Solberg LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 1100
Chicago, IL 60604
dstahl@eimerstahl.com
aaragona@eimerstahl.com
ssolberg@eimerstahl.com

John N. Estes III
Paul F. Wight
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP
1440 New York Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
jestes@skadden.com
paul.wight@skadden.com

Christopher J. Allwein Williams, Allwein and Moser, LLC 1373 Grandview Avenue, Suite 212 Columbus, Ohio 43212 callwein@williamsandmoser.com

Jay L. Kooper
Katherine Guerry
Hess Corporation
One Hess Plaza
Woodbridge, NJ 07095
jkooper@hess.com
kguerry@hess.com

Robert Korandovich KOREnergy P. O. Box 148 Sunbury, OH 43074 korenergy@insight.rr.com Colleen L. Mooney
David C. Rinebolt
Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy
231 West Lima Street
Findlay, Ohio 45840
cmooney2@columbus.rr.com
drinebolt@ohiopartners.org

E. Camille Yancey
Nolan Moser
Trent A. Dougherty
Ohio Environmental Council
1207 Grandview Avenue, Suite 201
Columbus, Ohio 43212-3449
camille@theoec.org
nolan@theoeg.org
trent@theoeg.org

Joel Malina
Executive Director
COMPLETE Coalition
1317 F Street, NW
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20004
malina@wexlerwalker.com

Tara C. Santarelli Environmental Law & Policy Center 1207 Grandview Avenue, Suite 201 Columbus, Ohio 43212 tsantarelli@elpc.org

Allen Freifeld
Samuel A. Wolfe
Viridity Energy, Inc.
100 West Elm Street, Suite 410
Conshohocken, PA 19428
afreifeld@viridityenergy.com
swolfe@viridityenergy.com

{01272405.DOC;1}

APPEARANCES 1	Step	hen J. Baron		September 26, 201:
Title PRINCE OF TITLETES CONTRIBUTED Case No. 10-2376 EL-UNIC				3
In the Matter of the Application of Otic Power Gose No. 10-2376-EL-DNC Southern Power Company for Authority to Norge and Roland Application of Columbus Case No. 11-346-EL-DNC Case No. 10-344-EL-DNC Case No. 10-344-EL-DNC Case No. 10-344-EL-DNC Case No. 10-344-EL-DNC Case No. 10-346-EL-DNC Case No.		BEFORE	1	
Application of Other Power Coopany and Octumbus State of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company for Authority to Nerge Bot. 11-344-EL-850 Case No.	1	THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO	2	
Company and columbus Case No. 11-144-TL-800 Case No. 11-149-TL-AM Case No.	ł		1	
Boothern Flower Company Cor Authority to Marge and Malated Approximation of Columbus Case No. 11-345-BL-880 Application of Columbus Case No. 11-345-BL-ANN Service Offer Pursuant to 1-328-143, Olio Rev. Case No. 11-345-BL-ANN Southern Power Company Case No. 11-345-BL-ANN Southern Power Company to Amend its Bertin Power Company to Amend its Bertin Power Company (Case No. 10-341-BL-ANN Blockhern Rever Company to Amend its Bertin Power Company to Amend its Bertin Power Company (Case No. 10-344-BL-ANA Columbus Service Rivers) 1 in the Malater of the Application of Onlo Power Case No. 10-344-BL-ANA Case No. 10-344-	1] 3	
For Authority to Marge and Related Approvals To the Natter of the Application of Columbus Case No. 31-346-81-890 Seathlaid at Standard National Case No. 31-348-81-890 Seathlaid National Case No. 31-348-81-890 Seathlaid National Case No. 31-348-81-ANN Suits 600, East Tower Case No. 31-348-81-ANN Southern Power Company of Case No. 31-348-81-ANN Southern Power Company of Case No. 31-348-81-ANN Southern Power Company of Case No. 30-343-81-ATA Seathlaid National Case No. 31-348-81-ANN Southern Power Company of Case No. 10-343-81-ATA Seathlaid National Case No. 31-348-81-ANN Southern Power Company of Case No. 10-343-81-ATA Seathlaid National Case No. 34-38-81-ATA Seathlaid National Case No. 34-38-81-ANN Southern Power Company of Case No. 10-344-81-ANN Seathlaid National Case No. 34-38-ANN Seathlaid National Case No. 34-3	ł		۱,	
and Related Approvals In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Othle Power Company and Othle Power Company Seatability in a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to 1921-131, Citis Per and Distriction of Columbus Case No. 11-349-EL-890 and Distriction of Columbus Case No. 11-349-EL-890 and Othle Power Company And Othle Power Company And Othle Power Company Case No. 11-349-EL-ANA Case	1		1 4	
Data Section Columbus Case No. 11-344-EL-850 Southern Power Cooppany Case No. 11-344-EL-850 Southern Power Cooppany Case No. 11-348-EL-850 Southern Power Cooppany Case No. 11-349-EL-AMN Southern Power Cooppany Case No. 10-343-EL-AMN Case No. 10-343-EL-AMN Southern Power Cooppany Case No. 10-344-EL-AMN Southern Power Cooppany Case No. 10-344-EL-AMN Cooppany Case No.	- 1		5	
Application of Columbus Southern Flower Company Southern Flower				Dakutik@jonesday.com
Southern Power Company and Ohlo Power Company Case No. 11-348-81-880 and Ohlo Power Company Case No. 11-348-81-880 and Service Otter Passant Service Otter Passant Service Otter Passant Service Otter Passant Passant Service Otter Passant Passant Service Otter Passant Passant Service Otter Passant Pas			6	
and Ohio Power Company for Authority to of Bateloliah a Standard Savethority to of Bateloliah a Standard Savethority Code, in the Form of an Blectric Security Plan Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company Application of Columbus Southern Power Company Annot dis Bacegoine Annot dis B			l _	On behalf of Ormet Primary Aluminum Corporation:
Service Office Plurament to Code, in the Fore of an Electric Security Plan			1 ′	EMMA E HAND ESO
### Set-dark to 14252-1431			l a	
1			1	
10			9	
Electric Security Plan In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Case No. 11-359-81-AbM and Columbus Case No. 10-343-81-AbA Application of Columbus Case No. 10-343-81-AbA Application of Columbus Case No. 10-343-81-AbA Application of Columbus Case No. 10-344-81-AbA Application of Columbus Case No. 11-4920-81-AbA Application Application of Columbus Case No. 11-4920-81-AbA Application Application of Columbus Case No. 11-4920-81-AbA Application Applicati			l	
In the Matter of Chief Service State No. 11-350-EL-AM Section Prover Company and Chie Power Company for Application of Columbus Southern Power Company to Acend it a Breegancy Curial Service States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Service States (1/1/1) TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF STEPREN J. BARON 2011 In the Matter of the Application of Chief Service States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Application of Chief Service States (1/1/1) TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF STEPREN J. BARON 2012 In the Matter of the Application of Chief Service States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Application of Chief Service States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Application of Chief Service States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Application of Chief Service States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Application of Chief Service States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Application of Chief Service States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Application of Chief Service States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Application of Chief Service States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Application of Chumbus Case No. 10-344-EL-ATA (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Application of Chumbus Case No. 11-4920-EL-RDR Southern Power Company (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Approval of a Mechanism to Recover Deferred Fuel Costs (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Approval of States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Approval of States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Approval of States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Approval of States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Approval of States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Approval of States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Approval of States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Approval of States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Approval of States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Approval of States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Approval of States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Approval of States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Approval of States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Approval of States (1/1/1) In the Matter of the Approval of States (1/1/1) In the Matter of th				
Againteens of Columbus and Other Power Company for Approval of Certain Accounting Authority In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company Curtailment Service Ridere / / / TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF STEPREN J. BARON SEPTEMBER 26, 2011 1:00 P.M. EST 1 In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Commission Review of the Company to Amend its Service Ridere I in the Matter of the Company to Amend its Service Ridere I in the Matter of the Company to Amend its Service Rider I in the Matter of the Company to Amend its Service Rider I in the Matter of the Company to Amend its Service Rider Southern Power Company of Amend its Service Riders I in the Matter of the Company to Amend its Service Riders Southern Power Company of Amend its Service Riders Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company For Approval of a Mechanism to Recover Disformed Fuel Costs Ordered Medic Rider Sufficient of Rider Disformed Fuel Costs Ordered Medic Rider I TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF September 26, 2011 September 26, 2011 Revised Core 4922.144 10 Telephonic Deposition of September 26, 2011 Revised Core 4922.144 11 Telephonic Deposition of September 26, 2011 Revised Core 4922.144 11 Telephonic Deposition of September 26, 2011 Revised Rider	ŀ		11	
Accounting Authority In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Application of Columbus September 26, 2011 In the Matter of the Application of Columbus September 26, 2011 In the Matter of the Application of Columbus September 26, 2011 In the Matter of the Application of Columbus September 26, 2011 In the Matter of the Application of Columbus September 26, 2011 In the Matter of the Application of Columbus September 26, 2011 In the Matter of the Application of Columbus September 26, 2011 In the Matter of the Application of Columbus September 26, 2011 In the Matter of the Company to Amend its Emergency Curtailment Service Ridger In the Matter of the Company to Amend its Emergency Curtailment September 26, 2010 In the Matter of the Company to Amend its Emergency Curtailment September 26, 2010 In the Matter of the Company to Amend its Emergency Curtailment September 26, 2011 In the Matter of the Company to Amend its Emergency Curtailment September 26, 2011 In the Matter of the Company to Amend its Emergency Curtailment September 26, 2011 In the Matter of the Company to Amend its Emergency Curtailment September 26, 2011 In the Matter of the Company to Amend its Emergency Curtailment September 26, 2011 In the Matter of the Company to Amend its Examination by Mr. Kutlik Examination by Mr. Kutlik Examination by Ms. Hand In the Matter of the Company to Amend its Examination by Ms. Hand In the Matter of the Company to Amend its Examination by Ms. Hand In the Matter of the Company to Amend its Examination by Ms. Hand In the Matter of the Company to Amend its Examination by Ms. Hand In the Matter of the Company to Amend its Examination by Ms. Hand In the Matter of the Company to Amend its Examination by Ms. Hand In the Matter of the Company to Amend its Examination by Ms. Hand In the Matter of the Company to Amend its Examination by Ms. Hand In the Matter of the Company to Amend its Examination by Ms. Hand In the Matter of the Company to Amend its Examination by Ms. Hand In the Matter of the Com	1		12	
for Approval of Certain Accounting Authority In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Counters prover Company to Amend its Emergency Cutratalment Service Riders / / / TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF STEPSEN J. BARON 2 In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company bo Amend its Emergency Cutralment 3 Service Riders I in the Matter of the Commission Review of the Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company For Approval of a Mechanism to Recover Deformed Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio Reviewed Code 4828.144 TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION	1			41 South High Street
1	1		13	
In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company to Amend its Emergency Chart all men Service Riders			1 ,,	
Application of Columbus Case No. 10-343-EL-ATA Southern Pewer Company to Anneal size generation of Columbus Case No. 10-343-EL-ATA Southern Pewer Company and Columbus Southern Pewer Case No. 10-344-EL-ATA Company and Columbus Southern Pewer Company and Columbus Southern Pewer Company and Columbus Southern Pewer Company and Columbus Southern Power Company and Columbus Columbus Southern Power Company and Columbus Co				On behalf of Ohio Energy Group:
Southern Power Company to Anend its Emergency Curtailment Service Riders				
Anend Lite Energency Cutrial Inert Service Riders		**	16	KURT J. BOEHM, ESQ.
Cuttailment Service Ridere 7 / / TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF STEPHEN J. BARON 5SEPTEMBER 26, 2011 1:00 P.N. EST 1 In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to American Review of the Commission Review of the Commission Review of the Company to Amplication of Columbus Southern Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company of Application of Columbus Southern Power Company of Oraproval of a Mechanism to Recover 10 Defored Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio 11 Revised Code 4928.144 12				
Tell_Ephonic Deposition		Curtailment Service	17	Suite 1510 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF STEPHEN J. BARON SEPTEMBER 26, 2011 1:00 P.M. EST 1 In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to Amend its Emergency Curtailment Service Riders 1 In the Matter of the Commission Review of the Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC Capacity Charges of Ohio Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Application of Columbus Application of Columbus Case No. 11-4920-EL-RDR Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus In the Matter of the Application by Mr. Kutik Examination by Mr. Kutik Examination by Ms. Hand In the Matter of the In the Matter of t			1 18	513 421 2255
TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF STEPHEN J. BARON 20 21 22 23 24 25 25 26 27 27 27 27 27 27 27		111	1 -	
In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Case No. 10-344-EL-ATA 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF STEPHEN J. BARON		_
1 in the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Case No. 10-344-EL-ATA Company to Amend its Emergency Curdalment Service Ridders In the Matter of the Commission Review of the Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC Company and Columbus Southern Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company for Approval of Mechanism to Recover Deferred Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio Revised Code 4928.144 15 TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF STEPHEN J. BARON 16 STEPHEN J. BARON 17 September 26, 2011 18 1:00 p.m. EST 19 1420 Peachtree Street, NE Suite 800 22 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2				
In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Case No. 10-344-EL-ATA Company to Amend its Emergency Curtailment Service Riders In the Matter of the Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC Capacity Charges of Ohio Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Case No. 11-4920-EL-RDR Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Case No. 11-4920-EL-RDR Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Case No. 11-4920-EL-RDR Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Case No. 11-4920-EL-RDR INDEX TO EXAMINATIONS WITNESS: Stephen J. Baron INDEX TO EXAMINATIONS WITNESS: Stephen J. Baron INDEX TO EXAMINATIONS WITNESS: Stephen J. Baron INDEX TO EXAMINATIONS WITNESS: Stephen J. Baron INDEX TO EXAMINATIONS WITNESS: Stephen J. Baron INDEX TO EXAMINATIONS IND		SEPTEMBER 26, 2011 1:00 P.M. EST		
1				
1 In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Case No. 10-344-EL-ATA 2 Company to Amend its Emergency Curtailment 3 Service Riders 4 In the Matter of the Commission Review of the Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC 5 Capacity Charges of Ohio Power Company and 6 Columbus Southern Power Company 7 In the Matter of the 8 Application of Columbus Case No. 11-4920-EL-RDR Southern Power Company 9 for Approval of a Mechanism to Recover 10 Deferred Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio Revised Code 4928.144 113 12 13 14 15 TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF STEPHEN J. BARON 17 September 26, 2011 18 1:00 p.m. EST 19 1420 Poachtree Street, NE Suite 800 21 Atlanta, Georgia 22 Deborah P. Longoria, CCR B-1557, RPR 243 24 24 25 Deborah P. Longoria, CCR B-1557, RPR 25 WITNESS: Stephen J. BARMINATIONS 2 WITNESS: Stephen J. BARMINATIONS 2 WITNESS: Stephen J. BARMINATIONS 2 WITNESS: Stephen J. Baron 3 WITNESS: Stephen J. Baron 3 WITNESS: Stephen J. Baron 4 Page 5 Examination by Mr. Kutik 5 Examination by Mr. Kutik 5 Examination by Mr. Kutik 6 Examination by Ms. Hand 41			24	
In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Case No. 10-344-EL-ATA Company to Amend its Emergency Curtailment Service Riders In the Matter of the Commission Review of the Capacity Charges of Ohio Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Case No. 11-4920-EL-RDR Southern Power Company For Approval of a Mechanism to Recover Underrated Under Ohio Cordered Under Ohio STEPHEN J. BARON The Revised Code 4928.144 Telephonic Deposition of Stephen J. Baron In the Matter of the Revised Code 4928.144 The Revi			25	
Application of Ohio Power Case No. 10-344-EL-ATA 2 Company to Amend its Emergency Curtailment 3 Service Riclers 4 In the Matter of the Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC 5 Capacity Charges of Ohio Power Company and 6 Columbus Southern Power Company 7 In the Matter of the 8 Application of Columbus Case No. 11-4920-EL-RDR Southern Power Company 9 for Approval of a Mechanism to Recover 10 Deferred Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio 11 Revised Code 4928.144 12	l l	2	1	4
2 Company to Amend its Emergency Curtailment 3 Service Riders 4 In the Matter of the Commission Review of the Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC 5 Capacity Charges of Ohio Power Company and 6 Columbus Southern Power Company 7 In the Matter of the 8 Application of Columbus Southern Power Company 9 for Approval of a Mechanism to Recover Deferred Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio 11 Revised Code 4928.144 12 13 14 15 TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF 16 STEPHEN J. BARON 17 September 26, 2011 18 1:00 p.m. EST 19 1420 Peachtree Street, NE Suite 800 21 Atlanta, Georgia 22 Deborah P. Longoria, CCR B-1557, RPR 23 24 WITNESS: Stephen J. Baron Page Examination by Mr. Kutik 5 Examination by Mr. Kutik 5 (None Marked) 7 (None Marked) 7 (None Marked) 7 10 11 12 13 14 15 15 16 17 17 18 18 1:00 p.m. EST 19 20 1420 Peachtree Street, NE Suite 800 21 22 23 24 24	1		١,	INDEX TO EXAMINATIONS
Emergency Curtalment Service Riders In the Matter of the Commission Review of the Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC Capacity Charges of Ohio Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company for Approval of a Mechanism to Recover Deferred Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio Revised Code 4928.144 TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF STEPHEN J. BARON TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF September 26, 2011 19 120 1420 Peachtree Street, NE Suite 800 21 Atlanta, Georgia Deborah P. Longoria, CCR B-1557, RPR 23 24 Deborah P. Longoria, CCR B-1557, RPR 25 Examination by Mr. Kutik 5 Examination by Ms. Hand 41 (None Marked) (None Marked) (None Marked) TO			1	
Service Riders In the Matter of the Commission Review of the Revised Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Replication of Columbus Case No. 11-4920-EL-RDR Southern Power Company for Approval of a Mechanism to Recover Ordered Under Ohio Revised Code 4928.144 TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF STEPHEN J. BARON TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF STEPHEN J. BARON TO Demore Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio Revised Code 4928.144 TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF STEPHEN J. BARON TO Demore Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio Revised Code 4928.144 TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF STEPHEN J. BARON TO Demore Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio Revised Code 4928.144 TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF STEPHEN J. BARON TO Demore Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio Revised Code 4928.144 TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF STEPHEN J. BARON The Matter of the Examination by Mr. Kutik Examination by Mr	2		2	WITNESS: Stephen J. Baron
In the Matter of the Commission Review of the Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC Capacity Charges of Ohio Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company for Approval of a Mechanism to Recover Deferred Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio Revised Code 4928.144 TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF STEPHEN J. BARON To September 26, 2011 18 1:00 p.m. EST 19 1420 Peachtree Street, NE Suite 800 Atlanta, Georgia Deborah P. Longoria, CCR 8-1557, RPR 23 24 Deborah P. Longoria, CCR 8-1557, RPR 25 Examination by Mr. Kutik Examination by Ms. Hand 41 None Marked (None Marked) None Marked None Marked 10 10 11 12 12 13 14 15 15 16 17 18 10 10 17 18 10 10 17 18 11 18 11 19 10 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	3		3	
Commission Review of the Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC 5 Capacity Charges of Ohio Power Company and 6 Columbus Southern Power Company 7 In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company 9 for Approval of a Mechanism to Recover 10 Deferred Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio Revised Code 4928.144 11 TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF STEPHEN J. BARON 11 September 26, 2011 12 19 1420 Peachtree Street, NE Suite 800 Atlanta, Georgia 12 Deborah P. Longoria, CCR B-1557, RPR 13 Examination by Mr. Kutik 5 6 Examination by Mr. Kutik 6 6 Examination by Mr. Kutik 6 6 Examination by Mr. Kutik 5 6 Examination by Mr. Kutik 6 6 Examination by Mr. Kutik 6 6 Examination by Mr. Kutik 5 6 Examination by Mr. Kutik 6 6 Examination by Mr. Kutik 6 6 Examination by Mr. Kutik 6 6 Examination by Mr. Autical State of Stat			4	Page
Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company Fower Co			=	
6 Columbus Southern Power Company in the Matter of the 8 Application of Columbus Case No. 11-4920-EL-RDR Southern Power Company for Approval of a Mechanism to Recover 10 Deferred Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio 11 Revised Code 4928.144 12 13 14 15 TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF 16 STEPHEN J. BARON 17 September 26, 2011 18 1:00 p.m. EST 19 10 1420 Peachtree Street, NE Suite 800 21 Atlanta, Georgia 22 Deborah P. Longoria, CCR B-1557, RPR 23 24	5		1	
Company in the Matter of the Application of Columbus Case No. 11-4920-EL-RDR Southern Power Company for Approval of a Mechanism to Recover 10 Deferred Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio 11 Revised Code 4928.144 TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF 16 STEPHEN J. BARON 16 STEPHEN J. BARON 17 September 26, 2011 18 1:00 p.m. EST 19 1420 Peachtree Street, NE Suite 800 Atlanta, Georgia 22 Deborah P. Longoria, CCR 8-1557, RPR 23 24 24			6	Examination by Ms. Hand 41
In the Matter of the 8	6		7	
In the Matter of the 8	7	оопрану	8	INDEX TO EXHIBITS
8 Application of Columbus Southern Power Company For Approval of a Mechanism to Recover 10 Deferred Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio 11 Revised Code 4928.144 13 14 15 TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF 16 STEPHEN J. BARON 17 September 26, 2011 18 1:00 p.m. EST 19 19 1420 Peachtree Street, NE Suite 800 21 Atlanta, Georgia 24 Deborah P. Longoria, CCR B-1557, RPR 23 24 24	'	in the Matter of the	1	
Southern Power Company 10 10 Marked 10 Mechanism to Recover 10 Deferred Fuel Costs 11 12 13 14 15 TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF 16 STEPHEN J. BARON 16 STEPHEN J. BARON 17 September 26, 2011 18 1:00 p.m. EST 19 20 1420 Peachtree Street, NE Suite 800 21 Atlanta, Georgia 22 Deborah P. Longoria, CCR B-1557, RPR 23 24 24 24 24 24 24 24	8		"	/61 a.a 8.8 a. d 35
Mechanism to Recover 10 Deferred Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio 11 Revised Code 4928.144 12 13 14 15 TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF 16 STEPHEN J. BARON 17 September 26, 2011 18 1:00 p.m. EST 19 1420 Peachtree Street, NE. Suite 800 21 Atlanta, Georgia 22 Deborah P. Longoria, CCR 8-1557, RPR 23 24		Southern Power Company	1	(None Marked)
10 Deferred Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio 11 Revised Code 4928.144 12 13 14 15 TELEPHONIC DEPOSITION OF 16 STEPHEN J. BARON 17 September 26, 2011 18 1:00 p.m. EST 19 1420 Peachtree Street, NE Suite 800 21 Atlanta, Georgia 22 Deborah P. Longoria, CCR 8-1557, RPR 23 24	9		10	a Caracata and A Cara
10 Deletred Holer Costs 12 13 14 15 15 15 16 17 17 17 17 17 17 18 100 p.m. EST 19 1420 Peachtree Street, NE Suite 800 21 Atlanta, Georgia 22 Deborah P. Longoria, CCR B-1557, RPR 23 24 24 24 24 4 15 17 17 17 17 17 18 17 18 17 18 17 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	1 10		11	
11 Revised Code 4928.144 12	1 10		1	
13 14 15 16 17 18 1:00 p.m. EST 19 20 1420 Peachtree Street, NE Suite 800 Atlanta, Georgia Deborah P. Longoria, CCR 8-1557, RPR 23 24	11		1	
21 Atlanta, Georgia 22			دد ا	
21 Atlanta, Georgia 22	13		14	
21 Atlanta, Georgia 22		TELEBUIANDO DEDOCITION OF	15	
21 Atlanta, Georgia 22			1	7 - S
21 Atlanta, Georgia 22		STEFRENT, DARON	I	
21 Atlanta, Georgia 22	1 *′	September 26, 2011	I	
21 Atlanta, Georgia 22	18		18	Ç. J
21 Atlanta, Georgia 22		1:00 p.m. EST	19	a 5
21 Atlanta, Georgia 22		4400 D 11 01 () T	1	∞ □
21 Atlanta, Georgia 22	20		1	and the second s
22	21		1	
Deborah P. Longoria, CCR B-1557, RPR 23 23 24		Aliana, Georgia	22	
23 24		Deborah P. Longoria, CCR 8-1557, RPR	23	
24		- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	24	
25			1	
	25			



Toll Free: 877,495,0777 Facsimile: 404,495,0766

2700 Centennial Tower 101 Marietta Street Atlanta, GA 30303 www.esquiresolutions.com 1 Telephonic Deposition of Stephen J. Baron 2 September 26, 2011

(Reporter disclosure made pursuant to Article

8.B. of the Rules and Regulations of the Board of 4 5

Court Reporting of the Judicial Council of Georgia.)

6 7

9

11

15

21

22

4

13

18

19

23

24

3

STEPHEN J. BARON,

having been first duly sworn, testifies as follows: 8

EXAMINATION

BY MR. KUTIK: 10

Q. What is your name?

12 Stephen Baron.

Q. Mr. Baron, other than you and the court 13

reporter, is there anyone else in the room with you? 14

A. No.

16 Q. What did you bring with you today for your

17 deposition?

A. I brought my testimony in this case. I 18

19 brought my testimony in a prior -- my direct

20 testimony in this case. When I -- let me clarify.

I brought my testimony in support of the

stipulation. I brought my prior testimony -- direct

testimony in this case. I brought a copy of the 23

stipulation, some work papers from Mr. Roush, a 24

25 couple of testimony from some of the AEP witnesses, Mr. Roush. Did you also bring some work papers

2 relating to your work or work papers that you

generated?

5

A. Yes. I brought the work papers that had 4

5 been previously supplied, I think to Ormet, regarding

a calculation that I did on the load factor 6

7 provision.

8 Q. Can you give me the cite to the Supreme

9 Court decision that you have?

A. Well, a slip opinion -- I think it's slip 10

opinion No. 2011 Ohio 1788. 11

12 O And the name of the case?

A. In re: Application of Columbus Southern 13

Power Company, et al.; Office of the Ohio Consumers 14

Council, et al., Appellants; Public Utilities 15

Commission, et al., appellees. 16

17 Q. Thank you. You've testified in numerous.

forums on numerous subjects relating to the 18

electricity market, correct? 19

A. Yes.

20

24

Q. And you would consider yourself an expert 21

22 on the PJM market?

A. Yes. In certain aspects, yes. 23

Q. And on the rules developed by PJM?

I've certainly reviewed them. I don't --25

copies of interrogatory responses, some work papers.

I brought my iPad that has some electronic files,

3 though it's not open.

Q. Anything else?

A. Well, I've got a copy of the Supreme Court

decision regarding the statute, I guess. I've got a 6

copy of at least one Ormet order of the Commission.

That's pretty much what comes to mind. 8

Okay. With respect to the testimony that

was filed, has your name on it, in July, would it be 10

agreeable with you to call that, for purposes of this 11

12 deposition, your direct testimony?

14 Q. And with respect to the testimony that was

15 filed in your name in September, would it be okay

16 with you if we called that your stipulation

17 testimony?

A. Yes.

Q. You said that you have brought with you

some interrogatory responses. Are those 20

interrogatory responses by OEG to parties' discovery 21

22 propounded on OEG or something else?

A. The former.

Q. When you said that you brought some work

25 papers, you identified some work papers from

I could not cite to you every rule. I have in 1

various proceedings, including this one, reviewed

various provisions of the OATT of PJM, transmission

owner agreements in various forms; certainly 4

throughout my career, various aspects of those types

of documents and other documents, I've reviewed.

Q. So you may be an expert on some of the

rules promulgated by PJM but perhaps not all of the

10 A. Yes. I would say that's -- I mean that's

correct; I certainly am not familiar with all of the 11

12 rules.

16

21

13 Q. Are you familiar with something called a

14 Reliability Assurance Agreement?

15 A. I have reviewed that previously in the

course of my work. I think I may have reviewed it in

17 preparation, or at least some aspects of it, in

18 preparation of my direct testimony in this case. 19 Q. Do you consider yourself an expert on the

20 RAA?

A. To the extent that I understand the

provisions of the RAA, the implications, I would 22

23 consider myself an expert in some -- on some aspects.

24 Again, I cannot cite verbatim every element of the RAA. In general I understand - I have reviewed it.

Toli Free: 877,495,0777

2700 Centennial Tower 101 Marietta Street Atlanta, GA 30303 www.esquiresolutions.com

Facsimile: 404.495.0766



11

12

I don't know -- I can't tell you that I've reviewed 1 every portion of it. 2

But as a general matter, I understand it, 3 at least with respect to issues that I've addressed in various proceedings that I've been involved in.

Q. Would you consider yourself, at least, to

have a working knowledge of what you would consider

to be the salient provisions of the RAA? 8

A. I believe so. In general, like I said, I

haven't reviewed it recently, but I believe I 10

reviewed it at some point in preparation for my 11

direct testimony in this case. And I believe I had 12

13 reviewed some FERC proceedings involving AEP, the AEP

14 issue with regard to the capacity charges that AEP

would charge to CRES providers. 15

16 Q. I'm not sure whether you answered my 17 question. Do you believe you have a working

knowledge of the salient provisions of the RAA? 18

19 A. Yes. As a general matter, yes. Again, I 20 don't have a copy of it with me and I certainly

21 cannot tell you sitting here now that I've reviewed

every aspect of it. And certainly I don't - since I 22

haven't reviewed it recently, I can't tell you 23

specific provisions. But as a general matter, I'm 24

familiar with it.

Q. Would it be fair to say that both of those are statutes? 2

A. Yes.

9

5

15

18

Q. Would it be fair to say that both of those relate to deregulation or partial deregulation of the

electric market in Ohio?

A. Yes.

Q. When was your first involvement in any

9 case that involved the deregulation of the electric

market in Ohio? 10

A. It would have been the cases that 11 12 occurred, I guess, in around the year 2000. I'm

13 looking now at my Exhibit SJB-1 from my direct

14 testimony to see if I can pin that down any more. But basically, the proceedings, the

16 unbundling proceedings that each of the utilities went through in Ohio to implement, I guess, SB3. 17

Q. Were those sometimes known as the ETP --

as in Paul -- cases? 19

A. You know, I don't remember that 20

nomenclature. But I'm sure that that's probably --21

well, if you just give me a moment, let me see if I

can find the specific case. I'm just trying to 23

remember what year that might have been. 24

25 Q. Would you like me to give you a case

Q. Do you consider yourself an expert on the Ohio market for electricity?

A. Some aspects of it. Not every aspect of

it. 4

1

3

5

12

18

20

21

Q. What aspects would you consider yourself

6 an expert on?

A. Understanding the fact that there are CRES

providers that provide retail electric service to В

customers of electric distribution companies who 9

10 choose to shop in lieu of taking standard service

11 offer generation -- or energy and capacity.

Q. Do you consider yourself knowledgeable 13 about how electric distribution companies in Ohio are

14 currently supplying the standard service offer?

15 A. Generally. I am familiar with the

16 FirstEnergy companies, AEP companies, and Duke Energy

17 Ohio.

Q. And I understand that you are familiar

with the provisions of SB221? 19

A. Yes.

Q. And are you familiar with the provisions

of SB3? 22

23 A. At one time I was -- I believe I was quite

24 familiar with those. I haven't reviewed that

25 recently.

number? 1

10

A. Well, I tell you what, if you want to give

me a year, that would probably move it quicker.

Q. One of the cases I want to ask you about,

or companion cases, are 99-1729 and 99-1730. 5

A. Okay. Okay. And I do see the -- I see

one of them -- let's see. I do see the ETP

designation on one of the cases that I was in, which

was a Cincinnati Gas and Electric case.

10 Q. Did you participate in a similar case for either of the two companies that constitute AEP Ohio? 11

12 A. I have a recollection that I did, but I've

13 got to locate it. It's possible that it settled and

I never did present testimony. 14

Q. That was my next question. Do you recall 15

whether there was a stipulation reached in that case?

17 It's my general recollection -- and I do

18 not see offhand any testimony. I know I was involved

in it. I had done some work in it, in the AEP case. 19

But I don't see any testimony. So I suspect that it 20

21 may have been resolved without me putting testimony

22

24

16

23 Q. So is it the best of your recollection

that you believe that the ETP case involving the two

25 AEP Ohio companies was resolved by stipulation?



Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

- A. That's my recollection. But it's -- I
- 2 don't have any I'm willing to accept that and
- generally that's my recollection.
- Q. Do you recall whether, as a result of any
- 5 stipulation in that case or as a result of a
- 6 Commission order in that case, those cases, whether
- 7 there was any limitations on AEP Ohio or the two
- 8 companies that make up AEP Ohio's ability to collect
- transition costs?
- 10 A. I don't have a recollection of that.
- 11 Q. In other words, you don't know one way or
- 12 another?
- 13 A. That's correct.
- 14 Q. Now, you've testified on several occasions
- on behalf of the Ohio Energy Group, correct?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. And it would be fair to say that you are
- 18 familiar with that organization?
- 19 A. Yes.

20

- Q. Does it have any officers?
- 21 A. I don't know.
 - Q. Does it have a board?
- 23 A. I don't know.
- Q. You do know who the members of that group
- 25 are, do you not?
- 1 A. I know who the member -- I'm looking at my
- 2 stipulation testimony. And on Page 1, beginning at
- line 9, there's a list of the OEG members who take
- 4 service from the AEP Ohio companies.
 - Q. So you do know who the members are?
- 6 A. Yes, with respect to the AEP companies.
- 7 And I've -- I have testified on behalf of OEG
- 8 members, OEG and FirstEnergy and in Duke Energy Ohio
- 9 as well. But the I specifically have a list of
- 10 the members of OEG who take service on the AEP
- 11 system, AEP Ohio system.
- 12 Q. Did you participate in the negotiations
- 13 that led up to the stipulation in this case?
- 14 A. No.
- 15 Q. Were you consulted during those
- 16 negotiations?
- 17 A. I had some a couple of conversations
- 18 with counsel during the negotiation.
- 19 Q. Did you have discussions with anyone other
- 20 than counsel about the stipulation? And again, I'm
- 21 not talking about coworkers. I'm talking about
- 22 anybody either outside your firm or outside your
- 23 counsel's firm.
- 24 A. No.
- Q. Would it be fair to say that you did not

- 1 speak with any members of OEG during negotiations of
 - 2 the stipulation?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. Have you spoken with any members of the
 - 5 OEG since the stipulation was signed about the
 - 6 stipulation?
 - 7 A. No.

13

16

22

14

- 8 Q. And that would include the time since the
- 9 filing of your stipulation testimony?
- 10 A. The answer is no.
- 11 Q. In other words, again, you have not spoken
- 12 with any members of OEG about the stip?
 - A. Correct.
- 14 Q. Now, you have stated in your stipulation
- 15 testimony what the views of OEG are, correct?
 - A. Yes. And I've stated some, I think, my
- 17 views and the views of OEG; that's correct.
- 18 Q. And to the extent you've stated the views
- 19 of OEG, would it be fair to say that you informed
- 20 what the views of OEG are at least upon your
- 21 discussions with counsel?
 - A. That's correct.
- 23 Q. You have a general belief about the merits
 - of ESPs versus MROs, do you not?
- 25 A. Yes, I do.
- 1 Q. And would it be fair to say that you
 - 2 believe that ESPs have an inherent advantage and
 - 3 benefit over MROs?
 - 4 A. As a general matter, that's true.
 - 5 Obviously, there can be designs or provisions of ESPs
 - 6 that, from my perspective, would make them less
 - 7 attractive than an MRO. But as a general matter, an
 - 8 ESP would be, in my view, more favorable than an MRO
 - 9 because of the ability of the Ohio Commission to make
 - 10 certain determinations to provide consumer
 - 11 protection.
 - 12 Q. Would you agree that one of the
 - 13 fundamental aspects of SB221 is that customers should
 - 4 be able to choose the lowest prices?
 - 15 A. Yes.

16

- Q. And if there is a market-based price
- 17 that's lower than a cost-based price, a customer
- 18 should be able to opt for service under the lower
- 19 price, correct?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. And certainly, if it was the reverse; if
- 22 the cost-based price was lower than the market-based
- 23 price, then customers should be able to opt for
- 24 service under that lowest price, correct?
- 5 A. As a general matter, yes.



Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

16

2700 Centennial Tower 101 Marietta Street Atlanta, GA 30303 www.esquiresolutions.com Q. Would it be fair to say that an ESP is not required to be cost based?

A. That's correct. There are certain aspects or provisions that would be cost based, such as the recovery of fuel costs, which by definition means

cost based. Environmental costs, if that's being

recovered, is another example. But the basic

8 underlying generation rates are not designed to be

9 cost based.

10 Q. So, for example, what we might call base 11 generation charges are not required to be cost based 12 under an ESP?

13 A. That's correct.

Q. And would it be fair to say that the base generation charge that's proposed in the stipulation is not cost based?

17 A. To the best of my knowledge, that would be 18 true.

Q. And is there any charge for which a number
 has been provided by AEP in this case pursuant to the
 stipulation where there has been a cost-based charge

22 that has been supported by evidence, statements?

A. The only -- are we talking about thestipulation proceed -- Ormet case or the entire case?

Q. Let me back up. I am talking about the

3 whether there was evidence presented in this

supported on a cost basis is the FAC?

A. Yes. And again, I don't actually recall

4 stipulation testimony regarding the FAC. But, of

5 course, my understanding of the FAC is that it would

6 be cost based.

17

There may have been some evidence presented related to the recovery of deferred fuel costs. But I just don't -- I haven't done a review

10 sufficient to answer that.

11 I will agree with, I think your question,
12 that I can't point to anything that I recall that was
13 related to cost based but it doesn't mean that it's

14 not in there.

15

17

20

22

24

13

14

15

18

Q. When companies have provided standard service offer service under an ESP, some companies have procured that load based upon a competitive

18 bidding process, correct?

19 A. Yes.

Q. And particularly the FirstEnergy Ohio

21 utilities have done that?

A. Yes.

Q. Would it be fair to say that when an ESP

is based upon a competitive bidding process, shopping

20

25 can be fairly rigorous in that company's service

1 stipulation.

25

2

5

A. Okay. The stipulation, I think that's correct. I'm just trying to recall whether there may have been some evidence presented as to what the FAC was going to be; there may have been.

But other than that, I think with respect
to generation-related charges, I think that's true
what you said. I would agree that it's not --

9 there's not a focus on cost-based support for the --

10 certainly for the generation rate.

Q. So is it your understanding that other than with respect to the FAC, there is no support for any charge on a cost basis?

A. Well, I don't -- I really can't answer that. In the stipulation itself, I don't recall

seeing any information on that. I have only been
 able to briefly review the testimony filed by AEP, so

18 it's possible that there is information in the

19 testimony that addresses some cost-based aspect of

 $20\,$ $\,$ some provision. But I – so I can't really answer

21 beyond that.

Q. So as you sit here today, based upon whatyou know and don't know and based upon the cursory

24 review that you may have given to AEP-filed

25 information, the only thing you can recollect that is

1 territory?

A. I would think it can be. I haven't

actually reviewed the shopping statistics to know any

specific case, even with regard to the FirstEnergy

5 companies in recent time.

So I would expect that under a competitive bid process the generation -- the standard service offer generation rates would be approximately equal

to the market prices, and so there would be less of a

10 differential. But I haven't done any analysis with

11 regard to how robust the shopping is on, say, the

12 FirstEnergy companies.

Q. You have not reviewed shopping figures within the FirstEnergy company's service territory?

A. Not -- certainly not recently.

Q. So it would be fair to say that you don't even have an impression that shopping within the

18 FirstEnergy company's service territory is higher

19 than anywhere else in the state?

A. Again, I haven't reviewed it so I haven't made that kind of comparison so I can't answer that one way or the other.

Q. I used the word "impression," so that means doesn't necessarily have to be based upon

specific data but based upon an impression.



Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

1 A. I don't. I don't have an impression one

2 way or the other.

3 Q. You're familiar with a rider called Rider

4 MTR that's been proposed in the stipulation?

A. Yes.

5

8

9

11

24

1

2

4

5

16

17

18

19

21

6 Q. And would it be fair to say that Rider MTR

7 is not cost based?

A. That's correct.

Q. Is your understanding that that rider is

10 designed to be revenue neutral, correct?

A. It's designed to be revenue neutral except

12 in 2012.

13 Q. In 2012 it will generate additional

14 revenues for the AEP Ohio companies, correct?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. To the tune of what?

17 A. I think AEP is estimated approximately

18 \$6 million per guarter and that it would be, to the

19 extent that there is a securitization, it would

20 change during 2012. But the estimate is \$6 million

21 per quarter.

Q. And you don't view the MTR rider as a

23 generation-related charge?

A. That's correct.

Q. It's certainly not wires related, is it?

2

A. No. It's a rate-design provision.

Q. And it's a rate-design provision that

adjusts the generation-related charges, does it not?

A. It actually adjusts -- it's a rider that actually adjusts the total bill of the company --

6 that the company imposes on customers.

Q. So it doesn't adjust the generation

8 portion of the bill?

A. It's a rider. And so you could -- you

10 could -- it adjusts the total bill that the customer

11 pays. In other words, the base generation charge is

12 a stated charge. The FAC is a stated charge. And

13 then there's a transition rider, either a credit or a

14 charge. And so it does adjust the total bill that a

15 customer pays.

Q. Well, I guess my question was: Does it adjust the generation portion of the charge?

A. I think I answered that. It adjusts the

total bill. It doesn't change the generation charge.

20 It changes the total bill that the customer pays.

Q. Would it be fair to say that just because

22 something is a rider, it doesn't mean it can't be

23 generation related?

A. I think that's, as a general hypothetical,

25 that's true.

1 Q. For example, one rider is the FAC,

2 correct?

3

10

22

21

A. Yes.

4 Q. That's generation related?

A. Yes. I would agree with that.

6 Q. Now, you're aware in this case prior to

7 the stipulation that AEP proposed a certain charge

8 for a capacity to be provided or to be charged to

9 CRES providers, correct?

A. Yes.

11 Q. And that charge was in the neighborhood of

12 \$355 per megawatt-day?

13 A. Yes. That's my recollection.

14 Q. Did OEG take a view, to your

understanding, as to whether that was an appropriate

16 charge?

17 A. It's my recollection that OEG did take a

18 position.

19 Q. And the position was that it was not an

20 appropriate charge, correct?

21 A. That's correct.

Q. OEG took the position that the appropriate

23 charge for capacity to CRES providers should be an

4 RPM-based charge or price, correct?

25 A. Yes.

22

1 Q. Are you familiar with what the RPM prices

2 will be during the proposed ESP?

3 A. Yes. I was generally familiar with those.

4 And I did recall in one of the -- in testimony that I

5 reviewed today -- I think this morning, one of the

6 AEP witnesses may have provided a summary of that.

7 But --

8 Q. I'm not going to ask you about exact

numbers.

10 A. Yes, I'm generally familiar with it. I

11 know there was a recent auction, I believe in May of

12 this year, that set the new rates through two

.3 thousand -- well, up until, I guess, May 2015.

14 Q. And is it, based upon what you can recall

15 about the RPM prices, would it be fair to say that

the RPM prices that will be in existence during the

17 proposed period of the ESP are less than \$355 per

18 megawatt-day?

19 A. Yes. I would agree with that.

Q. Would it be fair to say that the RPM

21 prices that will be in effect during the proposed ESP

22 will be less than \$255 per megawatt-day?

23 A. Yes.

20

24

Q. Now, as part of your work in this case,

25 did you undertake to study or analyze the effect of



Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

capacity prices at 355 or 255 on shopping?

- A. No, I did not.
- Q. Have you seen any such studies or
- analyses? 4

2

3

6

7

20

1

6

7 8

9

10

13

- A. Not that I recall, no.
- Q. Have you undertaken any study or analysis of the effect of capacity prices on shopping at all?
- A. I'm sorry. I think the last part of your
- 9 sentence was cut off.
- 10 Q. The last two words were "at all."
- 11 A. Okay. Could -- have I -- could you repeat
- 12 it again? I'm sorry.
- Q. Sure. My question is: Have you done any 13 study or analysis of the effect of capacity prices on 14
- 15 shopping at all?
- 16 A. No.
- Q. Have you seen any studies or analyses on 17 that subject? 18
- A. Not that I recall. 19
 - Q. Do you believe that capacity prices do
- have an effect on shopping? 21
- A. Well, they can have an effect on shopping 22
- all else being equal; meaning that, if the price to 23
- compare of the standards service offer rate is fixed 24
- 25 at some level, all else being equal I would expect
- that the higher the charge to shopping customers, the
- all-in charge to shopping customers, the less 2
- attractive, relatively speaking, shopping would be.
- That seems relatively straightforward from an
- economic analysis standpoint. 5
 - Q. Under the set-aside provisions of the stipulation and obviously -- let me back up.

When I say the set-aside provisions of the stipulation, do you understand what I mean?

- A. Yes. I do.
- Q. And specifically we're talking about, 11
- among other things, Appendix C? 12
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Under the set-aside provisions of the 14
- stipulation, is the capacity that is received by a 15
- shopping customer that pays a capacity price at the 16
- RPM level any different than the capacity that a 17
- 18 shopping customer gets and pays a price of 255?
- A. Yes, And let me make sure I understand. 19 20 I'll try to rephrase your question in my -- in a full
- 21 answer.
- That to the extent that a shopping 22
- customer receives the RPM rate pursuant to the 23
- 24 set-aside provision, that RPM rate will be lower than
 - what's referred to as the interim rate, the 255 rate.

- 25 Q. Well, that wasn't my question. And it's
 - not your fault. It was probably an ill-phrased 2
 - question, so let me try it a different way.
 - What I want to know is: Comparing the
 - capacity that's provided, other than the price that's
 - paid, is there any difference?
 - A. Not to my knowledge.
 - Q. So that capacity that would be received by
 - a customer paying 255 is not different from the
 - capacity that's received from a customer who's paying 10
 - RPM? 11

12

13

17

18

22

24

- A. That's correct. That's my understanding.
 - Q. Now the ability of customers, shopping
- customers, under the stipulation to pay for service
- based upon an RPM capacity price is in part based 15
- upon the priority that they get, correct? 16
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And the priority is set out in Appendix C
- of the stipulation by virtue of the definition of 19
- five groups? 20
- A. Yes. I would agree with that. 21
 - Q. And one group consists of those customers
- 23 who are shopping as of July of this year, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- 25 Another group consists of customers who

- were shopping as of September 7th of this year,
 - correct? 2
 - A. Yes. 3
 - Q. Is there any basis to distinguish those

 - 6 A. I'm not sure I understand what you mean
 - "basis."
 - 8 Q. Well --
 - A. Except -- I mean the provisions of the two
 - 10 -- there's two groups; they have two definitions as
 - to when the customer first took service from a CRES 11
 - provider; that's a distinction. Beyond that, I don't 12
 - believe there's any difference. 13
 - Q. Well, let me ask my question a slightly 14
 - different way. Customers who have been shopping as 15
 - of July of this year are in group one, and customers 16
 - who are shopping as of September 7 are in group two, 17
 - 18 correct?
 - A. Who began taking service -- when you say 19
 - 20 shopping, who began shopping on those two dates,
 - 21 that's correct.

24

25

- 22 Q. And group one customers have a priority
- 23 that's higher than group two customers, correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And I guess my question is: Other than



Toll Free: 877,495,0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

2700 Centennial Tower 101 Marietta Street Atlanta, GA 30303 www.esquiresolutions.com

1

4

8

15 16

25

the date that they started taking service, is there a

basis to distinguish why group one customers should

receive a higher priority than group two?

A. Not that I'm aware of. But I -- I'm

basing that on my review of Appendix C. I don't see 5

6 any other distinction.

Q. Is -- I'll back up.

Are you familiar with the various

9 long-term forecasts of the electric distribution

utilities in Ohio? 10

11 A. I've seen some forecasts. And I guess

12 really to be -- I'm not sure it's going to make any

13 difference in my answer, but are you speaking of

14 forecasts of load, forecasts of prices? What -

Q. Well, you're familiar with something

called the long-term forecast report, are you not?

17 A. I have seen that -- those documents in the past. I think those are long-term load and energy

18 19 forecasts.

20

Q. Okay. And have you seen such documents

21 for all of the electrical distribution utilities in

Ohio? 22

A. Perhaps I've seen those over time. I 23

haven't reviewed any recently for any company. 24

Q. Do you have an understanding or a view as

29 understanding of the generation capacity of AEP Ohio.

> 2 AEP Ohio is generally considered to be long on

capacity?

A. That's my recollection, yes. I believe --4

or at least with respect to energy, that's my 5

recollection. But I -- again, I haven't really

reviewed any of that information in this case, and so

that's just an impression I have.

9 Q. And so you don't know whether with respect

10 to capacity, as opposed to energy, AEP is also long?

A. That's -- it's my -- my recollection or

impression is that the combined companies are long on

13 capacity but, again, I haven't -- with respect to the

AEP system. 14

11

15 But again, I haven't reviewed any of that

16 data in quite some time. I know that there's some

retirements being proposed that could have an impact 17

on that. So I just haven't done an analysis of that. 18

Q. But with respect to the impression that 19 20

you have, are you aware of any date in the future

21 where AEP Ohio is not expected to be long on

capacity? 22

A. Again, I haven't done an analysis, so I 23

really can't answer that. 24

25 Q. Is it your impression that AEP Ohio will

30

to whether Ohio is a net importer or exporter of

2 generation? A. I haven't reviewed any specific 3

statistics. But my general impression would be that

Ohio would be an exporter. But I haven't actually

6 reviewed any statistics on that subject in quite some

Q. And understanding that you have not 8

reviewed this data in quite some time, at least it's 9

your impression that Ohio is a net exporter of 10

11

12 A. Well, I'm generally familiar with AEP Ohio

with regard to transactions in the AEP interchange --13

interconnection agreement. And I believe the AEP 14 15 Ohio companies, in total, are long capacity in

16 energy.

17 And I believe -- my recollection is that with regard to FirstEnergy -- I have this 18

recollection I was in a case in a FirstEnergy 19

Corporation subsidiary, Met-Ed and Penelec, a couple 20

21 of years ago. And my recollection is that the Ohio

generation facilities served load for those two 22

23 Pennsylvania companies. So that's the basis for my

impression. 24

25

Q. Let me talk to you about your

be long on capacity at least through the proposed ESP

period?

3 A. I don't know.

Q. Now, is it correct to say that you have

not done any type of quantification of benefits

comparing the ESP and an MRO?

A. That's correct, certainly with regard to

the stipulation. 8

Q. And you have participated, have you not,

10 in a few of these ESP cases, correct?

A. Yes.

11

14

22

25

12 Q. And you have seen companies and other

1.3 witnesses provide such quantification, correct?

A. Yes. That's correct.

15 Q. Now, and you're also familiar, are you

16 not, with how MRO prices are required to be set?

A. Yes, with regard to the statutory

17 provision of an awaiting of market and ESP prices, 18

the phase-in over a five-year period, if that's what 19

you're referring to. 20

21 Q. Correct. And that phase-in that you talk

about for an MRO is an important -- has an important

23 role in achieving price stability in the first few

years of an MRO, correct? 24

A. Yes. All else being equal, that it would



Toll Free: 877,495,0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

35

36

tend to -- certainly with regard to non fuel-related

costs, it would have the effect of mitigating full

market prices. So it does provide that stability to

some extent.

11

12

20

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

21

22

Q. Now, the statute that we're talking about,

I will refer to, it requires a blending. Is that a

term that's okay with you?

A. Yes. I think that's usually how it's

referred to, a blending, as opposed to a phase --9

when I say "phase-in," it was the same as a blending. 10

Q. And the things that were blending under

that part of the statute is what we'll call the 13 legacy ESP price and the new MRO, or a competitive

bidding process price, correct? 14

15 A. And it, basically, blending of the legacy

16 ESP and market, which would then form the MRO price.

Q. And that blending is required if a company 17

owns generation that is used and useful as of 18

July 31st, 2008, correct? 19

A. That's my recollection, yes.

Q. And it's also required if the MRO is the 21

first MRO that is filed by the company? 22

A. Yes. That's my recollection. 23

Q. So that if AEP Ohio were to have an MRO,

the blending statute would apply to AEP Ohio, 25

33 facilities sometime during the MRO?

MR. BOEHM: Same objection.

THE WITNESS: I don't recall one way or

4 the other a provision like that.

Q. (By Mr. Kutik) Let me have you refer to

your stipulation testimony.

A. Okay.

Q. Let me have you refer to Page 3. Are you

there, sir?

2 3

5

10

11

20

22

24

11

17

34

A. I'm on Page 3.

Q. And I want to specifically refer you to

the sentence that begins on line 21 and ends at line

23, which reads as follows:

14 "While the stipulation includes a

divestiture of existing generation within the context 15

of an ESP, the stipulation will not result in 16

absolute deregulation because of the provision 17

allowing for utility ownership of at least a new

19 500-megawatt gas combined-cycle power plant."

Did I read that correctly?

21

The power plant that you're referring to,

is that the unit that has been called MR6? 23

A. I believe so. Yes.

Do you know whether the MR6 unit will be 25

correct?

That would be my understanding.

Q. And that blending statute calls for a

five-year blending period, correct?

MR. BOEHM: I'm going to object at this

point. We're getting into a legal matter or

legal opinions here.

Q. (By Mr. Kutik) Can you answer my

9 question, sir?

A. Could you repeat the last question?

(The record was read by the reporter.)

12 THE WITNESS: The statute calls for a

13 minimum five-year blending period with possible

14 extensions for up to ten years depending on the

Commission determination of the impact of market 15

prices. 16

17 Q. (By Mr. Kutik) So that the five-year

18 period that's called for in the blending statute, as

far as you understand it, is a minimum period during 19

which blending would occur? 20

MR. BOEHM: Same objection.

THE WITNESS: That's my recollection.

23 Q. (By Mr. Kutik) Is there anything that

24 you're aware of in the statute that says that a

25 company can stop blending if it sells its generation built without prior Commission approval of a

nonbypassable rider for the recovery of the cost of

the construction of that plant?

A. It's my understanding that the Commission

would have to approve the construction of the plant.

Q. Right. Well, in other words, so that the

plant would not be built without prior Commission

approval; is that your understanding?

A. Yes. I think -- let me -- if you give me

10 a moment, let me just review the stipulation.

Q. Sure.

12 A. The stipulation on Page 19 does refer to

the MR6 unit to be recovered upon approval of a new

generation rate mechanism under a statutory

provision. And it would be my understanding that the 15

Commission would have to approve the unit. 16

Q. Before it's built?

18 A. I'm assuming that. But that, I can't tell

you -- I'm not sure whether this requires -- I'm 19

assuming it's a new unit that would be constructed. 20

21 But I just don't know with specificity whether I can

22 agree with the way you phrase the question. So --

23 Q. So the answer to my question whether the 24 stipulation requires Commission approval before the

plant can be built, your answer is "I don't know"?

Toll Free: 877,495,0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

A. Yes. My understanding is that it would have to be -- the Commission would have to approve the project before cost recovery. And I'm -- but I just -- I don't know whether to the extent that it would have to be approved before construction was 6 started or at some point.

Obviously, as a practical matter, if AEP were intending to build the plant and seek cost 8 recovery, I would assume, based on my experience in 9 10 the electric utility industry, that the company would request approval prior to expenditures of capital, 11 12 meaning construction, began -- before construction begins. But I don't know whether that's a specific 13 14 requirement.

15 Q. Well, would it be fair to say that there 16 is nothing in the stipulation that precludes AEP from 17 coming in to the Commission and seeking approval of 18 construction costs prior to the plant being built?

19 A. I would agree with that.

20 Q. And so it may well be the case that if AEP goes in to seek such approval, the Commission could 21 22 deny it, correct?

A Yes I would assume so.

23

Q. And in that case it's possible that there 24

never will be a 500-megawatt gas combined-cycle power

A. I haven't studied that aspect sufficiently 3 to form an opinion. I do believe that when and if the company makes a filing seeking approval of such a project, the company has the burden to present economic analyses demonstrating that it's a

Q. Do you have a recommendation in that

least-cost investment and will benefit Ohio

consumers, certainly if it's going to seek the

10 establishment of a nonbypassable charge through the

11 GRR; to the extent that the actual cost of the

12 project deviated from the assumptions used in the

initial approval, that it certainly may be reasonable

for parties or the Commission to raise issues. But I 14 just haven't focused on that and what the procedures 15

should be. 16

37

1

2

regard?

17 Q. Is it the case that the stipulation proposes a pool termination or modification charge? 18

19 A. If you'll just give me a moment to review it. I do recall that there are provisions in the 20 stipulation that address the pool termination issue. 21 22 I haven't found that provision yet, so I'm still

reviewing it. 23

38

24 I just -- I would have to review this in more detail to answer. So I don't know.

plant that would be owned by AEP Ohio? 1

A. Under a scenario where the Commission does not approve recovery under the GRR, it may well --

that's certainly a hypothetical outcome.

Q. And would it be fair to say that you could 6 have the same hypothetical outcome relating to the Turning Point facility?

A. I don't know. I don't know the status --I have not focused on that project, and I don't know the status of the project. 10

Q. What's your understanding of how the 11 12 approval process for Rider GRR will work? 13 A. I don't know. I assume that the company

14 would be required to make a filing with the 15 Commission, providing evidence that their proposed

16 project would be economic, reasonably prudent in the

17 public interest, and that other parties of the

18 proceeding that would presumably take place could

19 present other evidence if they so chose. But the

company would have a burden to present evidence that 20 21 it was an economic decision.

22 Q. Would the company be providing evidence of

prospective cost data or would it be an 24 after-the-fact cost review or both?

A. I don't know.

23

25

Q. Okay. Would a pool termination 1

2 modification rider be generation related?

A. Not necessarily. It depends on the costs that are being recovered.

Q. If the costs were differences between what 6 AEP Ohio could sell its capacity in the marketplace

versus what it was selling under its pool agreements

or the difference in the price of energy sold in the

market by AEP Ohio versus energy sold under the pool

10 agreements, would you view those types of charges as being generation related?

11

12 I don't know. It would have — I would have to really evaluate the proposal in detail, with specificity to really be able to answer that

question. I just don't know. 15 16

17

18

19

24

MR. KUTIK: Give me a moment, please. Mr. Baron, as much as it's always the usual pleasure to talk with you, I have no further questions at this time.

20 THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. 21 MR. KUTIK: I believe that Ms. Hand has 22 some questions for you.

23 THE WITNESS: All right.

MS. HAND: I do. Hello, Mr. Baron. Good

to speak with you again.



Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404,495.0766

THE WITNESS: Good to speak with you. 1 MS. HAND: I probably have about 15 or 2 20 minutes. Do you need a break before we get 3 4

THE WITNESS: Yes. Maybe a five-minute break, if that's okay.

MS. HAND: Okay. Let's take a five-minute break then.

(Recess from 2:08 p.m. to 2:15 p.m.)

EXAMINATION

BY MS, HAND: 11

5

6

7

8

9

10

12 Q. Mr. Baron, I'll keep using the "direct

13 testimony" and "stipulation testimony" terminology

that Mr. Kutik was using. I also wanted to make sure 14

15 that you understand if I refer to Ormet's unique

arrangement or special arrangement, I'm referring to

17 the power agreement entered into and approved by the

Commission in Case No. 09119. 18

A. Yes. 19

Q. Okav. So we're familiar with that. As I 20

go along, if you don't understand the question or any 21

of the terms I use or if anything is unclear to you, 22

please stop me and ask me to clarify and I'll be 23

happy to do so. 24

25 A. All right.

1

42

Q. So you said you had several questions -or several sets of discovery responses in front of

you. Do you have OEG's responses to the first set of

discoveries sent over by Ormet?

A. Yes, I believe I do.

Q. With regard to that set of discovery,

understanding that your counsel would have prepared

any objections to it, were you the person who

prepared the substantive answers to those questions?

10 A. Yes, in conjunction with counsel.

Q. Okay. With regard to the 250-megawatt 11

12 limitation on the load factor provision in the

13 stipulation, do you know what criteria were used to

14 determine that 250 megawatts is the correct threshold

15 to be applied?

A. No. 16

Q. Okay. Referring to -- going back to the 17

18 set of discovery there, the response to Question 1-5.

19 Α. Okay. Just give me a moment.

Q. Sure.

A. Okay. I've got that response.

Q. Okay. If you look under the response to

23 C.

20

21

22

24

A. Okav.

Q. And all the way towards the end of that 25

response, which looks like it's on about Page 8. 1

Okay. I'm on Page 8. 2

Q. The last sentence there at the bottom of

Page 8, the sentence reads: "This would be an

unreasonable result given that Ormet's unique

arrangement likely provides electric service to Ormet

at a rate that is lower than any other customer in

Ohio." 8

3

15

20

12

41

Now you see that passage there? 9

10 A. Yes, I do.

Q. Okay. Have you conducted a study 11

comparing Ormet's rate to the rates of all other 12

customers in Ohio? 13

A. No, I have not. 14

Q. And are you aware that there are

circumstances under Ormet's unique arrangement with 16

AEP Ohio under which it could pay up to 108 percent 17

of the AEP Ohio tariff rate?

19 A. I have seen that provision, yes.

Q. Okay. And would you agree that if Ormet

is paying a premium, for example, the 108 percent of 21

the AEP Ohio tariff rate, it would not be paying,

quote, a rate that is lower than any other customer

in Ohio, end quote?

A. If you characterize rate as a tariff 25

structure itself, by definition, if some other 1

customer pays that tariff rate and Ormet is paying

that tariff rate, hypothetically, plus an 8 percent

adder, hypothetically, then it would be higher than

the other customer. I haven't done any analysis

though to determine if that's true or not.

Q. But you do agree that if that were true,

hypothetically speaking, Ormet would not be paying a

rate that is lower than any other customer in Ohio,

10 in the way that you used that sentence in the

11

response to the data request?

A. Well, I think I answered your question

before. By definition, if you refer to rate as the

tariff structure, a demand charge, an energy charge

and so forth, by definition, if hypothetically Ormet 15

were paying 8 percent more than that and some other 16

customer were paying the actual rate structure 17

18 charge, the tariff rate, then it certainly would be

true that Ormet would be paying more. 19

20 If one were to define rate in terms of

21 rate per kilowatt-hour, that would change the 22 calculation in the sense that Ormet has a 98 percent

23 load factor. And so in general, though I haven't

24 done an analysis, it may be that Ormet has a higher

load factor than any other customer as well.



Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404,495,0766

1

9

10

11

19

20

5

14

20

So I -- if you -- when I use the phrase "rate" in my discovery response, I really was referring to something more general, and so it could be really either one.

If you talk about it in rate per kilowatt-hour, you may get a different answer than if you talk about the rate structure - the applicable rate structure itself. 8

Q. All right. Are you aware that there are circumstances under Ormet's contract under which its discount could be smaller than the annual cap set by the Commission for any given year under the contract? 12

A. I reviewed the order and I just don't 13 14 recall -- there were a number of provisions and I 15 just don't recall. If you want to point me to a provision, I could certainly review it and maybe 17 answer your question. But I just don't recall at 18 this point.

Q. Maybe if I explain the question a little bit. I kind of packed a lot into that one.

21 You're aware that under the unique 22 arrangement, in the order approving the unique arrangement the Commission set caps for a rate -- cap 23 24 on the discount for each year?

A. I recall that, something to that effect. 25

contract and I just haven't focused on that specifically.

Q. Okay. So going back to the statement in Data Request 1-5, that this would be an unreasonable

result given that Ormet's unique arrangement likely

provides electric service to Ormet at a rate that is

7 lower than any other customer in Ohio, if Ormet is

not paying a rate that is lower than any other

customer in Ohio, would you still believe that the

inclusion of Ormet in the load factor provision would 10

11 create an unreasonable rate?

12 A. Yes. I still believe that it would not be appropriate, given the special arrangement that Ormet 13 has to provide for rate stability and reasonable 14 rates for Ormet pursuant to its special rate 15

arrangement with AEP Ohio companies. That 16

17 arrangement defines -- provides protection to Ormet

that was presumably agreed to and bargained for by 19

20 The load factor provision of the stipulation is designed to provide similar types of 21

stability for other Ohio manufacturing companies. And given the size of Ormet and its load factor,

it's, in my view, including Ormet in the load factor

provision would significantly skew the benefit to

46

45

Again, I reviewed the order but I haven't gone 1

through it in tremendous detail. But I generally

recall provisions like that.

Q. Okay. And you're aware that the rate Ormet pays under the unique arrangement is set -- is

essentially the type of formula rate where one

element of the formula is the London Metals Exchange

price for aluminum?

A. Yes.

10 Q. And depending on whether that price goes 11 up or down, the discount that Ormet gets against the tariff rate that would otherwise be applicable to

13 Ormet could go up or down?

A. Yes. That's my understanding.

Q. So my question is: Given that framework, 15

16 would you agree that there are years in which Ormet, 17 for example, if the LME price rose, might get a

19 discount but it might not be the full discount set by

19 the Commission under the cap?

A. That's generally my understanding, that 21 the discount will be affected by the LME price. But again, I haven't gone through the contract in great

22

23 detail to determine all of the possible

24 contingencies, that there are numerous alternatives

that are -- or contingencies that are stated in the

1 Ormet which -- and Ormet already has a benefit

through its special arrangement, and reduce any

benefit to all other Ohio manufacturing industrial

customers and commercial customers who are a high

load factor.

10

23

24

So the answer is that it still, in my 6 view, would be appropriate to exclude customers above the 250-megawatt limit, which it's my understanding would apply to Ormet.

Q. Okay. And if Ormet were paying a premium 11 over the tariff rate, if it was, for example, paying the 8 percent premium over the tariff rate, would your answer be the same?

A. Yes. It would definitely still be the 14 same. The premium would be a function of the LME 15 price. And if the LME price is high, that provides 16 economic benefits to Ormet, independent of its cost 17

of electricity; but nonetheless, the contract that 19 Ormet has with AEP companies provides significant

benefits, based on my understanding, to Ormet in 20

21 terms of rate stability, certainty that production can continue under a range of LME prices. 22

And so it really would be inappropriate, in my view, to apply this load factor provision to

Ormet because it effectively dilutes it for all other



Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

Ohio manufacturing customers on AEP companies. Q. Okay. Let's see. You also stated in that same ORM-OEG-1-5 discovery response, if you look at your response to Question A, B, and C, that the treatment of customers that take service through special arrangements should be considered on a	1 2 3 4	CERTIFICATE STATE OF GEORGIA:	51
Q. Okay. Let's see. You also stated in that same ORM-OEG-1-5 discovery response, if you look at your response to Question A, B, and C, that the treatment of customers that take service through	2 3 4	STATE OF GEORGIA:	ı
same ORM-OEG-1-5 discovery response, if you look at your response to Question A, B, and C, that the treatment of customers that take service through	3 4	-	
your response to Question A, B, and C, that the treatment of customers that take service through	4	-	
treatment of customers that take service through	I -		
.		COUNTY OF FULTON:	ı
special arrangements should be considered on a	5		١
	6	I hereby certify that the foregoing	١
case-by-case basis.	7	transcript was taken down, as stated in the	- 1
Would you agree that the stipulation	8	caption, and the questions and answers thereto	ı
contains no provision allowing for such a	9	were reduced to typewriting under my direction;	١
case-by-case consideration of special arrangement	10	that the foregoing pages 1 through 50 represent	١
customers?	11	a true, complete, and correct transcript of the	١
 A. I would agree with that, that the load 	12	evidence given upon said hearing, and I further	-
factor provision applies to all customers on GS2, GS3	13	certify that I am not of kin or counsel to the	ı
and 4 whose loads are less than or equal to 250	14	parties in the case; am not in the regular	-
megawatts.	15	employ of counsel for any of said parties; nor	- [
And so in answering the question posed, as	16	am I in anywise interested in the result of said	- [
a general matter, special arrangements, I'm agreeing	17	case.	- [
that special arrangements should be considered on a	18	This, the 29th day of September, 2011.	- [
case-by-case basis, which they were in the case of	19		١
Ormet. In this case, with respect to the LFP	20		-
provision, it's my opinion that the stipulation is	21	Deborah P. Longoria, CCR B-1557, RPR	
reasonable as written.	22		ı
 Q. Do you know if any analysis was performed 	23		١
by you or by anyone else to determine whether other	24		١
customers who currently have special arrangements	25		
with AEP should be eligible for the load factor provision? A. I myself have not done any such analysis. I don't know whether any other party has done an analysis of that type. Q. Okay. A. I'm not aware of it. MS. HAND: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Baron. That's all I have. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. KUTIK: Does anyone else have any questions? Hearing none, Kurt, I assume the witness will read the transcript? MR. BOEHM: Yes. MR. KUTIK: I guess we are concluded. Thank you. (Deposition concluded at 2:33 p.m.) (Pursuant to Rule 30(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and/or O.C.G.A. 9-11-30(e), signature of the witness has been reserved.)	1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	COURT REPORTER DISCLOSURE Pursuant to Article 8.b. of the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Court Reporting of the Judicial Council of Georgia which states: "Each court reporter shall tender a disclosure form at the time of the taking of the deposition stating the arrangements made for the reporting services of the certified court reporter, by the certified court reporter, the court reporter's employer, or the referral source for the deposition, with any party to the litigation, counsel to the parties or other entity. Such form shall be attached to the deposition transcript," I make the following disclosure: I am a Georgia Certified Court Reporter. I am here as a representative of Esquire Solutions. Esquire Solutions was contacted to provide court reporting services for the deposition. Esquire Solutions will not be taking this deposition under any contract that is prohibited by O.C.G.A. 9-11-28(c). Esquire Solutions has no contract/agreement to provide reporting services with any party to the case, any counsel in the case, or any reporter or reporting agency from whom a referral might have been made to cover this deposition. Esquire Solutions will not be given to any party to this litigation. DEBORAH P. LONGORIA, CCR B-1557, RPR	52
	case-by-case consideration of special arrangement customers? A. I would agree with that, that the load factor provision applies to all customers on GS2, GS3 and 4 whose loads are less than or equal to 250 megawatts. And so in answering the question posed, as a general matter, special arrangements, I'm agreeing that special arrangements should be considered on a case-by-case basis, which they were in the case of Ormet. In this case, with respect to the LFP provision, it's my opinion that the stipulation is reasonable as written. Q. Do you know if any analysis was performed by you or by anyone else to determine whether other customers who currently have special arrangements with AEP should be eligible for the load factor provision? A. I myself have not done any such analysis. I don't know whether any other party has done an analysis of that type. Q. Okay. A. I'm not aware of it. MS. HAND: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Baron. That's all I have. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. KUTIK: Does anyone else have any questions? Hearing none, Kurt, I assume the witness will read the transcript? MR. BOEHM: Yes. MR. KUTIK: I guess we are concluded. Thank you. (Deposition concluded at 2:33 p.m.) (Pursuant to Rule 30(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and/or O.C.G.A. 9-11-30(e), signature of the witness has been	case-by-case consideration of special arrangement customers? A. I would agree with that, that the load factor provision applies to all customers on GS2, GS3 and 4 whose loads are less than or equal to 250 megawatts. And so in answering the question posed, as a general matter, special arrangements, I'm agreeing that special arrangements should be considered on a case-by-case basis, which they were in the case of Ormet. In this case, with respect to the LFP provision, it's my opinion that the stipulation is reasonable as written. Q. Do you know if any analysis was performed by you or by anyone else to determine whether other customers who currently have special arrangements 50 1 with AEP should be eligible for the load factor provision? A. I myself have not done any such analysis. I don't know whether any other party has done an analysis of that type. Q. Okay. A. I'm not aware of it. MS. HAND: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Baron. That's all I have. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. KUTIK: Does anyone else have any questions? Hearing none, Kurt, I assume the witness will read the transcript? MR. BOEHM: Yes. MR. KUTIK: I guess we are concluded. Thank you. (Deposition concluded at 2:33 p.m.) (Pursuant to Rule 30(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and/or O.C.G.A. 9-11-30(e), signature of the witness has been reserved.)	case-by-case consideration of special arrangement customers? A. I would agree with that, that the load factor provision applies to all customers on GS2, GS3 and 4 whose loads are less than or equal to 250 megawatts. And so in answering the question posed, as a general matter, special arrangements, I'm agreeing that special arrangements should be considered on a case-by-case basis, which they were in the case of Ormet. In this case, with respect to the LFP provision, its my opinion that the stipulation is reasonable as written. Q. Do you know if any analysis was performed by you or by anyone else to determine whether other customers who currently have special arrangements 50 with AEP should be eligible for the load factor provision? A. I myself have not done any such analysis. I don't know whether any other party has done an analysis of that type. Q. Ckay, THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR, KUTIK: Does anyone else have any questions? Hearing none, Kurt, I assume the witness will read the transcript? MR, BOEHM: Yes. MR, KUTIK: I guess we are concluded. Thank you. (Deposition concluded at 2:33 p.m.) (Pursuant to Rule 30(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and/or O.C.G.A. 9-11-30(e), signature of the witness has been reserved.) 110 that the foregoing pages 1 through 50 frepresent a true, complete, and courted that certify, that I am not of kin or counsel to the ease and I further certify, that I am not of kin or counsel for the exact am not in the result of said case. 121 122 123 This, the 29th day of September, 2011. 223 Deborah P. Longoria, CCR B-1557, RPR 224 225 COURT REPORTER DISCLOSURE 226 COURT REPORTER DISCLOSURE 227 COURT REPORTER DISCLOSURE 238 Regulations of the Board of Court Reporter's employer, or the certific parties in the case, and an analysis of that type. 249 250 COURT REPORTER DISCLOSURE 251 COURT REPORTER DISCLOSURE 252 COURT REPORTER DISCL



Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET Cur' Assignment No. 253648 Case Capiton: Before the Public Utilities Commission of Choine Or Dro Power Company, Columbius Southern Power Company DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and except for changes and/or corrections, if any, as indicated by me on the Deposition that in the understanding that I offer these changes as if still under oath. Signed on theday of	ephen J. Baron		September 26, 20
1	T DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET	53	
A	2		
Case Captions: Before the Public Utilities Commission of Onior Power Company 5 Page NoLine NoChange to:	Our Assignment No. 253648	***************************************	
Power Company	Case Caption: Before the Public Utilities Commission	1	
DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY I declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the entire transcript of my deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and except for changes and/or corrections, if as y, as indicated by me on the Deposition Errata Sheet hereof, with the understanding that I offer these changes as if still under oath. Signed on the			-
DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY 1 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3			
Ideclare under penalty of perjury	DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY	l	
that I have read the entire transcript of my deposition taken in the captioned matter or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and true. The same is true and accurate, save and true. The same is true and accurate, save and true and accurate, save and true. The same is true and accurate, save and true. The same is true and accurate, save and true. The same is true and accurate, save and accurate, save and accurate, save and accurate, save and accurate	I declare under penalty of perjury	Ī	
my deposition taken in the captioned matter 10 Reason for change:	that I have read the entire transcript of	1	
or the same has been read to me, and the same is true and accurate, save and except for changes and/or corrections, if except for changes and/or corrections, if any, as indicated by me on the Deposition Errata Sheet hereof, with the understanding that I offer these changes as if still under oath. Signed on the day of	my deposition taken in the captioned matter	l	10 Reason for change:
Same is true and accurate, save and 13 Reason for change:	or the same has been read to me, and	1	11 Page No. Line No. Change to:
14		1	-
15		1	
Errata Sheet hereof, with the understanding that I offer these changes as if still under oath. 16			
that I offer these changes as if still under oath. 16	.5	-	
oath. Signed on the day of	.6	l	
19	.7		
20	.8	1	19 Reason for change:
STEPHEN J. BARON	.9	1	20 Page NoLine NoChange to:
STEPHEN J. BARON 23 24			21
STEPHEN J. BARON 24 SIGNATURE:DATE:	21	1	22 Reason for change:
24 SIGNATURE:DATE:			
DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET Page No Line No Change to:	23	1	
DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET Page NoLine NoChange to:			25 STEPHEN J. BARON
2	DEBOOTION EDDATA OVERT	54	
Reason for change: Page No Line No Change to: Reason for change: Page No Line No Change to: Reason for change: Reason for change: Reason for change: Page No Line No Change to: Reason for change: Reason for change: Reason for change: Reason for change:		1	
4 Reason for change: 5 Page NoLine NoChange to: 6		######################################	
5 Page NoLine NoChange to:		-	
6			
B Page NoLine NoChange to:			
9	7 Reason for change:		
Reason for change:	8 Page NoLine NoChange to:	l	
1. Page NoLine NoChange to:	9	.	
2	-		
3 Reason for change:			
4 Page NoLine NoChange to:		-	
Reason for change: Page NoLine NoChange to:			
Reason for change: Page NoLine NoChange to: Reason for change:			
7 Page No. Line No. Change to: 8	•	-	
8			
		.	
0 Page No. Line No. Change to:	9 Reason for change:		
	0 Page No. Line No. Change to:		



22 Reason for change:_____

STEPHEN J. BARON

_DATE:__

23

25

24 SIGNATURE:___

Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

2700 Centennial Tower 101 Marietta Street Atlanta, GA 30303 www.esquiresolutions.com

Approval

con
13:7,814:4, 6,10,1117:20 18:1721:14, 1723:724:6 30:12,13,14 31:1,2,10,14 21,2533:24, 2537:7,16,20 38:140:6,9 43:17,18,22 47:1648:19 49:150:1
AEP-filed 18:24
after-the
fact 38:24
agency 52:15
ago 30:21
agree 16:12 18:8 19:11 23:5 24:19 27:21 36:22 37:19 43:20 44:7 46:16 49:8,18
agreeable 6:11
agreed 47:18
agreeing 49:17
Agreement 8:14 30:14 41:17
8:4 40:7,10
al 7:14,15,16
all-in

26:2 allowing 35:18 49:9 along 41:21 already 48:1 also 7:1 31:10 32:15 33:21 41:14 49:2 alternatives 46:24 Aluminum 3:646:8 always 40:17 Amend 1:17 2:2 among 26:12 analyses 25:4,17 39:7 analysis 20:10 25:6,14 26:5 31:18,23 44:5,24 49:23 50:3,5 analyze 24:25 and/or 50:19 53:13 annual 45:11 another 13:12 17:7 27:25 answer 15:10 18:14, 20 19:10 20:21 26:21

29:13 31:24 34:8 36:23,25 39:25 40:14 45:6,17 48:6, 13 answered 9:16 22:18 44:12 answering 49:16 answers 42:951:8 anybody 14:22 anywhere 20:19 anywise 51:16 APPEARANCES 3:1 Appellants 7:15 appellees 7:16 Appendix 26:12 27:18 29:5 applicable 45:746:12 Application 1:3,7,12,16 2:1,87:13 applied 42:15 applies 49:13 apply 33:25 48:9,24 appropriate 23:15,20,22 47:13 48:7

1:14 2:9 36:1,8,13,24 37:11,17,21 38:12 39:5,13 Approvals 1:5 approve 36:5,16 37:2 38:3 approved 37:5 41:17 approving 45:22 approximatel 20:8 21:17 around 11:12 arrangement 41:16 43:6,16 45:22,23 46:5 47:5,13,16, 17 48:2 49:10 arrangements 49:6,17,18, 25 52:5 Article 5:3 52:2 aspect 9:22 10:3 18:19 39:3 aspects 7:23 8:5,17, 23 10:3,5 16:13 17:3 Assignment 53:3 assume 37:9,23 38:13 50:12



12:11,19,25

Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

assuming 36:18,20
assumptions
39:12
Assurance 8:14
Atlanta 2:21
attached 52:7
attractive 16:7 26:3
auction 24:11
Authority 1:5,8,14
Avenue 3:4
awaiting 32:18
aware
23:6 29:4
31:20 34:24
43:15 45:9,21
46:4 50:7
B
В

B 49:4
B-1557 2:22 51:21 52:20
back 17:25 26:7 29:7 42:17 47:3
bargained 47:18
BARON 1:20 2:16 4:2 5:1,7,12,13 40:17,24

53:22 54:25 55:25 base 17:10,14 22:11 based 17:2,4,6,9, 11,16 18:22, 23 19:6,13, 17,24 20:24, 25 21:7 24:14 27:15 37:9 48:20 basic 17:7 basically 11:15 33:15 basing 29:5 basis 18:13 19:1 28:4,7 29:2 30:23 49:7.19	1
17:10,14 22:11 based 17:2,4,6,9, 11,16 18:22, 23 19:6,13, 17,24 20:24, 25 21:7 24:14 27:15 37:9 48:20 basic 17:7 basically 11:15 33:15 basing 29:5 basis 18:13 19:1 28:4,7 29:2 30:23 49:7.19	2
17:2,4,6,9, 11,16 18:22, 23 19:6,13, 17,24 20:24, 25 21:7 24:14 27:15 37:9 48:20 basic 17:7 basically 11:15 33:15 basing 29:5 basis 18:13 19:1 28:4,7 29:2 30:23 49:7.19	3 4 4
25 21:7 24:14 27:15 37:9 48:20 basic 17:7 basically 11:15 33:15 basing 29:5 basis 18:13 19:1 28:4,7 29:2 30:23 49:7.19	k 1
basic 17:7 basically 11:15 33:15 basing 29:5 basis 18:13 19:1 28:4,7 29:2 30:23 49:7.19	k 3 k
11:15 33:15 basing 29:5 basis 18:13 19:1 28:4,7 29:2 30:23 49:7.19	k 4
basis 18:13 19:1 28:4,7 29:2 30:23 49:7.19	k]
30:23 49:7.19	2 L
began	3 1
37:12 beginning	1 1
begins	1 1
12.15.14.7	3 2
17:6 25:23,25 31:17 32:25	<u> </u>
15.22	3 2 k
believe 9:9,10,12,17	1 k

10:23 12:24 16:2 24:11 25:20 28:13 30:14,17 31:4 35:24 39:4 40:21 42:5 47:9,12
benefit 16:3 39:8 47:25 48:1,3
benefits 32:5 48:17,20 best
12:23 17:17 between 40:5
beyond 18:21 28:12
bid 20:7 bidding
19:18,24 33:14 bill
22:5,8,10,14, 19,20 bit
45:20 blending
33:6,9,10,11, 15,17,25 34:3,4,13,18, 20,25
Board 5:4 13:22 52:3
BOEHM 3:15,16 34:5, 21 35:2 50:14
both 11:1,438:24 bottom

43:3
break 41:3,6,8 briefly 18:17
bring 5:16 7:1
brought 5:18,19,21, 22,236:2,19, 247:4
build 37:8
<pre>built 36:1,7,17,25 37:18</pre>
burden 38:20 39:6
С
C 26:12 27:18 29:5 42:23 49:4 51:1
calculation 7:644:22
call 6:11 17:10 33:12
called 6:16 8:13 21:3 29:16 34:18 35:23
calls 34:3,12
cannot 8:24 9:21
cap 45:11,23 46:19
Capacity 2:59:14

10:11 23:8,23 25:1,7,14,20 26:15,16,17 27:5,8,10,15 30:15 31:1,3, 10,13,22 32:1 40:6
capital 37:11
caps 45:23
caption 51:8 53:4
captioned 53:10
career 8:5
Case 1:3,7,12,13, 16 2:1,4,8 5:18,20,23 7:12 8:18 9:12 11:9,23, 25 12:9,10, 16,19,24 13:5,6 14:13 17:20,24 20:4 23:6 24:24 30:19 31:7 37:20,24 39:17 41:18 49:19,20 51:14,17 52:14,16 53:4 case-by-case 49:7,10,19 cases
11:11,19 12:4,5,813:6 32:10
CCR 2:22 51:21 52:20



Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

Certain 1:14 7:23 16:10 17:3 23:7 certainly 7:25 8:4,11 9:20,22 16:21 18:10 20:15 21:25 32:7 33:1 38:4 39:9,13 44:18 45:16
certainty 48:21
certified 52:5,9
certify 51:6,13
change 21:20 22:19 44:21 54:4,7, 10,13,16,19, 22 55:4,7,10, 13,16,19,22
changes 22:20 53:13, 16
characterize 43:25
charge 9:15 17:15, 19,21 18:13 21:23 22:11, 12,14,17,19 23:7,11,16, 20,23,24 26:1,2 39:10, 18 44:14,18 52:16
charged 23:8

on
17:11 18:7 22:3 40:10
choose 10:10 16:14
chose 38:19
Cincinnati 3:17 12:9 circumstances
43:16 45:10 cite
7:88:1,24 Civil
50:19 clarify 5:20 41:23
Cleveland 3:4
Code 1:10 2:11
collect 13:8
Columbus 1:4,7,12,16 2:6,83:13 7:13 53:5
combined 31:12
combined-
cycle 35:19 37:25
6:8
coming 37:17
commercial 48:4
COMMISSION 1:22:46:7
7:16 13:6 16:9 34:15

36:1,4,7,16, 24 37:2,17,21 38:2,15 39:14 41:18 45:12, 23 46:19 53:4 companies
10:9,13,16 12:11,25 13:8 14:4,6 19:15, 16 20:5,12 21:14 30:15, 23 31:12 32:12 47:16, 22 48:19 49:1
companion 12:5
Company 1:4,7,8,13,16 2:2,5,6,8 7:14 22:5,6 29:24 33:17, 22 34:25 37:10 38:13, 20,22 39:5,6 53:5
company's 19:25 20:14, 18
compare 25:24
Comparing 27:4 32:6 43:12
comparison 20:21
competitive 19:17,24 20:6 33:13
complete 51:11
concluded 50:15,17
conducted

Septe
43:11 conjunction 42:10
consider 7:21 8:19,23 9:6,7 10:1,5,
consideratio
n
49:10 considered 31:249:6,18
consists 27:22,25
constitute 12:11
constructed 36:20
construction 36:3,537:5, 12,18
consulted 14:15
consumer 16:10
Consumers 7:14 39:9
contacted 52:10
contains 49:9
context 35:15
contingencie
s 46:24,25
continue 48:22
contract 45:10,12

46:22 47:1 48:18 52:12 contract/agr eement 52:13 conversation 14:17 CONWAY 3:12 copies 6:1 сору 5:23 6:5,7 9:20 Corp 3:2 Corporation 3:630:20 correct 7:19 8:11 13:13,15 15:3,13,15, 17,22 16:19, 24 17:3,13 18:3 19:18 21:8,10,14, 24 23:2,9,20, 21,24 27:12, 16,23 28:2, 18,21,23 32:4,7,10, 13,14,21,24 33:14,19 34:1,4 37:22 42:14 51:11 corrections 53:13 correctly 35:20 cost 17:2,4,6,9,



Charges

2:59:14

Toll Free: 877,495.0777 Facsimile: 404,495.0766

2700 Centenniał Tower 101 Marietta Street Atlanta, GA 30303 www.esquiresolutions.com 11,16 18:13 19:1,6,13 21:736:2 37:3,838:23, 24 39:11 48:17 cost-based 16:17,22 17:21 18:9,19 Costs 2:10 13:9 17:5,619:9 33:237:18 40:3,5 Council 5:57:1552:3 counsel 14:18,20 15:21 42:7,10 51:13,15 52:7,14 counsel's 14:23 COUNTY 51:4 couple 5:25 14:17 30:20 course 8:16 19:5 Court 5:5,136:5 7:952:1,3,5, 6,9,10 cover 52:15 coworkers 14:21 create 47:11 credit

CRES 9:15 10:7 23:9,23 28:11 criteria 42:13 currently 10:14 49:25 cursory 18:23 Curtailment 1:17 2:2 customary 52:16 customer 16:17 22:10, 15,20 26:16, 18,23 27:9,10 28:11 43:7,23 44:2,5,9,17, 25 47:7,9 customers 10:916:13,23 22:6 26:1,2 27:13,14,22, 25 28:15,16, 22,23 29:2 43:13 48:4,7 49:1,5,11,13, 25 cut 25:9 D Dakutik@jones day.com 3:5 DANIEL 3:12 data 20:25 30:9

31:16 38:23

44:11 47:4

date 29:131:20 dates 28:20 DAVID 3:3 DAY 3:251:18 53:18 DC 3:9 DConway@porte rwright.com 3:14 Deborah 2:22 51:21 52:20 decision 6:67:938:21 DECLARATION 53:7 declare 53:8 Deferred 2:10 19:8 define 44:20 defines 47:17 definitely 48:14 definition 17:5 27:19 44:1,13,15 definitions 28:10 demand 44:14 demonstrating 39:7

DENTON 3:7 deny 37:22 depending 34:14 46:10 depends 40:3 DEPOSITION 1:20 2:15 5:1,176:12 50:17 52:4,6, 8,11,1553:1, 10,14 54:1 55:1 deregulation 11:5,935:17 designation 12:8 designed 17:8 21:10,11 47:21 designs 16:5 detail 39:25 40:13 46:2,23 determinatio 34:15 determinatio n s 16:10 determine 42:14 44:6 46:23 49:24 developed 7:24 deviated

39:12

difference

27:6 28:13 29:13 40:8 differences 40:5 different 26:17 27:3,9 28:15 45:6 differential 20:10 dilutes 48:25 direct 5:19,226:12 8:18 9:12 11:13 41:12 direction 51:9 disclosure 5:352:1,4,8 discount 45:11,24 46:11,18,21 52:16 discoveries 42:4 discovery 6:21 42:2,6, 18 45:2 49:3 discussions 14:19 15:21 distinction 28:12 29:6 distinguish 28:4 29:2 distribution 10:9,13 29:9, divestiture 35:15 documents 8:6 29:17,20



22:13

Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

2700 Centenniai Tower 101 Marietta Street Atlanta, GA 30303 www.esquiresolutions.com

			19,20,22	34:14
doesn't 19:13 20:24	electrical	equal 20:8 25:23,25	51:12	' '
· ·	29:21	'		extent
22:7,19,22	electricity	32:25 49:14	exact 24:8	8:21 15:18 21:19 26:22
down	7:19 10:2	ERRATA		33:4 37:4
11:14 46:11,	48:18	53:1,15 54:1	Examination	39:11
13 51:7	electronic	55:1	4:5,65:9	l ————
Duke	6:2	ESP	41:10	F
10:16 14:8	element	16:8 17:1,12	EXAMINATIONS	F
duly	8:24 46:7	19:16,23	4:1	3:751:1
5:8	eligible	24:2,17,21	example	FAC
during	50:1	32:1,6,10,18	17:7,10 23:1	18:4,12 19:1,
14:15,18 15:1	Emergency	33:13,16	43:21 46:17	4,522:12
21:20 24:2,	1:17 2:2	35:16	48:11	23:1
16,21 34:19		ESPs	Exchange	facilities
35:1	EMMA 3:7	15:24 16:2,5	46:7	30:22 35:1
E		ESQ	exclude	facility
	Emma.hand@snr	3:3,7,12,16	48:7	38:7
E 51:1	denton.com	Esquire	 Exh i bit	fact
i	3:10	52:10,11,13,	11:13	10:7
each	employ	15	EXHIBITS	
11:16 45:24	51:15	essentially	4:8	factor
52:3	employer	46:6	- ' -	7:6 42:12 44:23,25
East	52:6	EST	existence 24:16	47:10,20,23,
3:8,16	end	1:21 2:18		24 48:5,24
economic	42:25 43:24	 Establish	existing	49:13 50:1
26:5 38:16,21	ends	1:9	35:15	fair
39:7 48:17	35:12	establishment	expect	11:1,4 13:17
effect		39:10	20:6 25:25	14:25 15:19
24:21,25	Energy 3:15 10:11,16		expected	16:117:1,14
25:7,14,21,22	13:15 14:8	estimate	31:21	19:23 20:16
33:2 45:25	29:18 30:16	21:20	expenditures	21:6 22:21
effectively	31:5,10 40:8,	estimated	37:11	24:15,20
48:25	9 44:14	21:17	experience	37:15 38:5
either	entered	et	37:9	fairly
12:11 14:22	41:17	7:14,15,16	expert	19:25
22:13 45:4		ETP	7:21 8:7,19,	familiar
Electric	entire 17:24 53:9	11:18 12:7,24	23 10:1,6	8:11,13 9:25
1:11 10:8,9,		evaluate	explain	10:15,18,21,
13 11:6,9	entity	40:13	45:19	24 13:18 21:3
12:9 29:9	52:7	l		24:1,3,10
		evidence	l ownerter	[24:1,3,10
37:10 43:6	Environmental	17:22 18:4	exporter	29:8,1530:12
37:10 43:6 47:6			exporter 30:1,5,10 extensions	



Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

2700 Centennial Tower 101 Marietta Street Atlanta, GA 30303 www.esquiresolutions.com

			·	
 far	13,17	fuel-related	36:14 40:2,11	GRR
34:19	fixed	33:1	generation-	38:3,12 39:11
fault	25:24	full	related	GS2
27:2	focus	26:20 33:2	18:7 21:23	49:13
favorable	18:9	46:18	22:3	GS3
16:8	focused	FULTON	Georgia	49:13
Federal	38:939:15	51:4	2:215:551:3	guess
50:18	47:1	function	52:3,9	6:611:12,17
FERC	following	48:15	getting	22:16 24:13
9:13	52:8	fundamental	34:6	28:25 29:11
figures	follows	16:13	give	50:15
20:13	5:8 35:13	further	7:8 11:22,25	H
filed	forecast	40:18 51:12	12:2 36:9	HAND
6:10,15 18:17	29:16	future	39:19 40:16	3:74:6
33:22	forecasts	31:20	42:19	40:21,24
files	29:9,11,14,19	G G	given	41:2,7,11
6:2	foregoing		18:24 43:5	50:8
filing	51:6,10	Gas	45:12 46:15	happy
15:9 38:14	Form	12:9 35:19 37:25	47:5,13,23 51:12 52:17	41:24
39:5	1:10 33:16	}		haven't
financial	39:4 52:4,7	general	go	9:10,23 10:24
52:16	former	8:25 9:3,9, 19,24 12:17	41:21 46:13	19:9 20:2,10,
find	6:23	15:23 16:4,7,	goes	20 29:24
11:23	forms	25 22:24 30:4	37:21 46:10	30:3,531:6,
firm	8:4	44:23 45:3	going	13,15,18,23
14:22,23	formula	49:17	18:5 24:8	39:3,15,22 44:5,23 46:1,
	46:6,7	Generally	29:12 34:5 39:9 42:17	22 47:1
first 5:811:8	forth	10:15 13:3	47:3	
28:11 32:23	44:15	24:3,10 30:12		Hearing 50:12 51:12
33:22 42:3	forums	31:246:2,20	gone 46:1,22	
FirstEnergy	7:18	generate		Hello 40:24
3:2 10:16	İ	21:13	Good 40:24 41:1	
14:8 19:20	found 39:22	generated		hereby
20:4,12,14,18		7:3	great 46:22	51:6
30:18,19	framework 46:15	generation	<u> </u>	hereof
five		10:11 17:8,	Group	53:15
27:20	front	11,15 18:10	3:15 13:15,24 27:22,25	High
five-minute	42:2	20:7,822:7,	28:16,17,22,	3:12 48:4,16
41:5,7	Fuel	11,17,19,23	23 29:2,3	higher
five-year	2:10 17:5 19:8	23:4 30:2,11,	groups	20:18 26:1
32:19 34:4,	13:0	22 31:1 33:18 34:25 35:15	27:20 28:5,10	28:23 29:3
•	I	1 34:45 35:15	1 - , , 20 20 . 5 , 10	44:4,24



Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

hypothetical	4:1,8	iPad	20:21 45:20	31:5 32:1
22:24 38:4,6	indicated	6:2	know	35:18
hypotheticall	53:14	issue	9:1 11:20	least-cost
У	industrial	9:14 39:21	12:18 13:11,	39:8
44:3,4,8,15	48:3	issues	21,23,24	led
I	industry	9:4 39:14	14:1,5 18:23 20:3 24:11	14:13
	37:10	J	27:4 31:9,16	legacy
identified	information		32:3 35:25	33:13,15
6:25	18:16,18,25	J 1:202:16	36:21,25	legal
ill-phrased	31:7	3:16 4:2 5:1,	37:4,13 38:8,	34:6,7
27:2	informed	7 53:22 54:25	9,13,25 39:25	less
impact	15:19	55:25	40:12,15	16:6 20:9
31:17 34:15	inherent	JONES	42:13 49:23	24:17,22 26:2
implement	16:2	3:2	50:4	49:14
11:17	initial	Judicial	knowledge	let's
implications	39:13	5:5 52:3	9:7,18 17:17	12:7 41:7
8:22	intending		27:7	49:2
important	37:8	July 6:10 27:23	knowledgeabl	level
32:22	interchange	28:16 33:19	e	25:25 26:17
importer	30:13		10:12	LFP
30:1		just 11:22,23 18:3	known	49:20
imposes	interconnecti	19:9 22:21	11:18	lieu
22:6	on	31:8,18	KURT	10:10
impression	30:14	36:10,21 37:4	3:16 50:12	likely
20:17,23,25	interest	39:15,19,24	KURTZ	43:647:5
21:1 30:4,10,	38:17	40:15 42:19	3:15	limit
24 31:8,12,	interested	45:13,15,17	KUTIK	48:8
19,25	51:16	47:1	3:34:55:10	limitation
inappropriate	interim	K	34:8,17,23	42:12
48:23	26:25	ĸ	35:5 40:16,21	limitations
include	interrogatory	3:8	41:14 50:11,	13:7
15:8	6:1,20,21	KBoehm@bkllaw	15	
includes	investment	:	L	line
35:14	39:8	firm.com	T -1	14:3 35:12
including	involved	3:18	Lakeside	list
8:247:24	9:511:9	keep	3:4	14:3,9
inclusion	12:18	41:12	last	litigation
47:10	involvement	kilowatt-hour	25:8,10 34:10 43:3	52:7,17
	11:8	44:21 45:6		little
independent 48:17	involving	kin	least	45:19
	9:13 12:24	51:13	6:78:179:4, 615:2030:9	LLP
INDEX	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	kind	0 T2:50 30:A	3:7



Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

LME		Merge	8:23 50:3	nonbypassabl
46:17,21	manufacturing	1:5	N	e
48:15,16,22	47:22 48:3	merits	name	36:2 39:10
load	49:1	15:23	5:11 6:10,15	nonetheless
7:6 19:17	Marked	Metals	7:12	48:18
29:14,18	4:9	46:7	NE	North
30:22 42:12	market	Met-Ed	2:20	3:3
44:23,25	7:19,22 10:2	30:20	necessarily	nothing
47:10,20,23,	11:6,10 20:9	million	20:24 40:3	37:16
24 48:5,24 49:12 50:1	32:18 33:3,16	21:18,20	need	number
	34:15 40:9	mind	41:3	12:1 17:19
loads	market-based	6:8		45:14
49:14	16:16,22		negotiation 14:18	numbers
locate	marketplace	minimum 34:13,19	1	24:9
12:13	40:6		negotiations	
London	Matter	minutes	14:12,16 15:1	numerous
46:7	1:3,6,12,15	41:3	neighborhood	7:17,18 46:24
long	2:1,4,79:3,	mitigating	23:11	NW
30:15 31:2,	19,24 16:4,7,	33:2	net	3:8
10,12,21 32:1	25 34:6 37:7	modification	30:1,10	0
Longoria	49:17 53:10	39:18 40:2	neutral	O.C.G.A
2:22 51:21	mean	moment	21:10,11	50:19 52:12
52:20	8:10 19:13	11:22 36:10	never	oath
long-term	22:22 26:9	39:19 40:16	12:14 37:25	53:17
29:9,16,18	28:6,9	42:19	new	OATT
look	meaning	morning	24:12 33:13	8:3
42:22 49:3	25:23 37:12	24:5	35:18 36:13,	object
looking	means	move	20	34:5
11:13 14:1	17:5 20:24	12:3	No.Change	1
looks	Mechanism	MR6	54:2,5,8,11,	objection 34:21 35:2
43:1	2:936:14	35:23,25	14,17,20	
lot	megawatt-day	36:13	55:2,5,8,11,	objections
45:20	23:12 24:18,	MRO	14,17,20	42:8
lower	22	16:7,832:6,	No.Line	Obviously
16:17,18,22	megawatts	16,22,24	54:2,5,8,11,	16:5 26:7
26:24 43:7,23	42:14 49:15	33:13,16,21,	14,17,20	37:7
44:947:7,8	member	22,24 35:1	55:2,5,8,11,	occasions
lowest	14:1	MROs	14,17,20	13:14
16:14,24	members	15:24 16:3	nomenclature	occur
	wanter o	MTR	11:21	34:20
-	13.24 14.3 5			
LOWRY 3:15	13:24 14:3,5, 8,10 15:1,4,	21:4,6,22	non	occurred



Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

OEG	18:2 25:11	ORM-OEG-1-5	part	30:20
6:21,22 14:3,	29:20 33:7	49:3	24:24 25:8	Pennsylvania
7,8,1015:1,	35:7 40:1	outcome	27:15 33:12	30:23
5,12,15,17,	41:6,7,20	38:4,6	partial	percent
19,20 23:14,	42:11,17,19,	l '	11:5	43:17,21
17,22	21,22,24	outside		44:3,16,22
OEG's	43:2,11,20	14:22	participate	48:12
42:3	46:4 47:3	over	12:10 14:12	
	48:10 49:2	16:3 29:23	participated	performed
Offer	50:6,8	32:19 42:4	32:9	49:23
1:9 10:11,14	open	48:11,12	particularly	period
25:24 53:16	6:3	owned	19:20	24:17 32:2,19
	opinion	38:1	parties	34:4,13,18,
offhand	7:10,11 39:4	owner	38:17 39:14	19
12:18	49:21	8:4	51:14,15	PERJURY
Office	opinions	ownership	52:7,16	53:7,8
7:14	34:7	35:18	parties!	person
officers	I - · · ·		6:21	42:8
13:20	opposed 31:10 33:9	owns		perspective
OHIO		33:18	party	16:6
1:2,3,8,10,13	opt	P	50:4 52:6,14,	phase
2:1,5,103:4,	16:18,23	P	I	33:9
11,13,15,17	order	2:22 51:21	passage	
7:11,14 10:2,	6:7 13:6	52:20	43:9	phase-in
13,17 11:6,	45:13,22 46:1	p.m	Paul	32:19,21
10,17 12:11,	Ordered	41:950:17	11:19	33:10
25 13:7,15	2:10		pay	phrase
14:4,8,11	organization	packed 45:20	27:14 43:17	36:22 45:1
16:919:20	13:18		paying	pin
21:14 29:10,	Ormet	Page	27:9,10	11:14
22 30:1,5,10,	3:66:77:5	4:414:2	43:21,22	РЛМ
12,15,21	17:24 42:4	35:8,10 36:12	44:2,8,16,	7:22,24 8:3,8
31:1,2,21,25	43:6,20 44:2,	43:1,2,4	17,19 47:8	place
33:24,25 38:1	8,15,19,22,24	54:2,5,8,11,	48:10,11	38:18
39:8 40:6,9	46:5,11,13,16		pays	
43:8,13,17,	47:6,7,10,13,	55:2,5,8,11, 14,17,20	22:11,15,20	Plan
18,22,24 44:9	15,17,19,23,	l ' '	26:16,18 44:2	1:11
47:7,9,16,22	24 48:1,9,10,	pages	46:5	plant
48:3 49:1	17,19,20,25	51:10	Peachtree	35:19,22
53:5	49:20	paid	2:20	36:3,5,7,25
Ohio's	Ormet's	27:6		37:8,18 38:1
13:8	41:15 43:5,	papers	PENALTY	please
Okay	12,16 45:10	5:24 6:1,25	53:7,8	40:16 41:23
6:9,15 12:6	47:5	7:1,2,4	Penelec	pleasure
	[ļ	J	i



Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

40:18	20 39:6	17:24	17:20 19:15	Q
plus	presented	proceeding	23:8 24:6	quantificati
44:3	18:4 19:3,8	38:18	27:5	on
 Point	presumably	proceedings	provider	32:5,13
3:39:11	38:18 47:18	8:29:5,13	28:12	•
19:12 34:6	pretty	11:15,16	providers	quarter 21:18,21
37:6 38:7	6:8	process	9:15 10:8	i i
45:15,18	previously	19:18,24 20:7	23:9,23	question
pool	7:58:15	33:14 38:12	provides	9:17 12:15 19:11 22:16
39:18,21		procured	43:6 47:6,17	25:13 26:20
40:1,7,9	<pre>price 16:16,17,19,</pre>	19:17	48:16,19	27:1,3 28:14,
PORTER	22,23,24	production	providing	25 34:9,10
3:11	23:24 25:23	48:21	38:15,22	36:22,23
portion	26:16,18	prohibited	provision	40:15 41:21
9:2 22:8,17	27:5,15 32:23	52:12	7:718:20	42:18 44:12
posed	33:13,14,16		22:1,2 26:24	45:17,19
49:16	40:8 46:8,10,	<pre>project 37:3 38:9,10,</pre>	32:18 35:4,17	46:15 49:4,16
position	17,21 48:16	16 39:6,12	36:15 39:22	questions
23:18,19,22	prices	· '	42:12 43:19	40:19,22
possible	16:14 20:9	promulgated 8:8	45:16 47:10,	42:1,950:12
12:13 18:18	24:1,15,16,21	Ī	20,25 48:24	51:8
34:13 37:24	25:1,7,14,20	proposal	49:9,13,21 50:2	quicker
46:23	29:14 32:16,	40:13		12:3
Power	18 33:3 34:16	proposed	provisions	quite
1:3,4,7,8,13,	48:22	17:15 21:4	8:3,22 9:8, 18,24 10:19,	10:23 30:6,9
162:1,5,6,8	Primary	23:7 24:2,17, 21 31:17 32:1	21 16:5 17:4	31:16
7:14 35:19,22	3:6	38:15	26:6,8,14	quote
37:25 41:17	prior		28:939:20	43:23,24
53:5	5:19,22 23:6	proposes 39:18	45:14 46:3	R
practical	36:1,737:11, 18		prudent	R
37:7	•	propounded 6:22	38:16	3:12 51:1
precludes	priority		PUBLIC	RAA
37:16	27:16,18 28:22 29:3	prospective	1:27:15	8:20,22,25
premium		38:23	38:17 53:4	9:8,18
43:21 48:10,	probably	protection	purposes	raise
12,15	11:21 12:3 27:2 41:2	16:11 47:17	6:11	39:14
preparation		provide	Pursuant	range
8:17,18 9:11	Procedure	10:8 16:10	1:95:317:20	48:22
prepared		32:13 33:3	26:23 47:15	rate
42:7,9	procedures	47:14,21 52:10,14	50:18 52:2	18:10 25:24
present	39:15		putting	26:23,24,25
12:14 38:19,	proceed	provided	12:21	36:14 43:7,
	•	·		



Toll Free: 877,495.0777 Facsimile: 404,495.0766

				•
12,18,22,23,	receive	52:6,15	14	retail
25 44:2,3,9,	29:3	referred	reporter's	10:8
13,17,18,20,	received	26:25 33:9	52:6	retirements
21 45:2,5,7,	26:15 27:8,10	referring	Reporting	31:17
8,23 46:4,6,	receives	32:20 35:22	5:552:3,5,	Rev
12 47:6,8,11,	26:23	41:16 42:17	11,14,15	1:10
14,15 48:11,	ļ	45:3	represent]
12,21	Recess	regard	51:10	revenue
rate-design	41:9	9:14 20:4,11		21:10,11
22:1,2	recollect	30:13,18	representati	revenues
rates	18:25	32:7,17 33:1	ve	21:14
17:8 20:8	recollection	39:242:6,11	52:10	reverse
24:12 43:12	12:12,17,23	regarding	request	16:21
47:15 52:16	13:1,3,10	6:67:519:4	37:11 44:11	Review
reached	23:13,17		47:4	2:4 18:17,24
12:16	30:17,19,21	regular	required	19:9 29:5
read	31:4,6,11	51:14	17:2,11 32:16	36:10 38:24
34:11 35:20	33:20,23	Regulations	33:17,21	39:19,24
50:13 53:9,11	34:22	5:4 52:3	38:14	45:16
reads	recommendatio	relate	requirement	reviewed
35:13 43:4	n	11:5	37:14	7:25 8:2,6,
really	39:1	Related	requires	15,16,25 9:1,
18:14,20	record	1:519:8,13	33:636:19,24	10,11,13,21,
29:12 31:6,24	34:11	21:25 22:23	reserved	23 10:24
40:13,14	Recover	23:4 40:2,11	50:21	20:3,13,20
45:2,448:23	2:9	relating		24:5 29:24
Reason	1	7:2,18 38:6	resolved	30:3,6,9
54:4,7,10,13,	recovered 17:736:13	relatively	12:21,25	31:7,15 45:13
16,19,22	40:4	26:3,4	respect	46:1
55:4,7,10,13,		Reliability	6:9,14 9:4	reviewing
16,19,22	recovery	8:14	14:618:6,12	39:23
reasonable	17:5 19:8		31:5,9,13,19 49:20	Revised
39:13 47:14	36:2 37:3,9 38:3	remember 11:20,24		2:11
49:22		l '	response	rider
	reduce	repeat	42:18,21,22	21:3,6,9,22
reasonably 38:16	48:2	25:11 34:10	43:1 44:11	22:4,9,13,22
ነ	reduced	rephrase	45:249:3,4	23:1 36:2
recall	51:9	26:20	responses	38:12 40:2
12:15 13:4	refer	report	6:1,20,21	Riders
18:3,15 19:2, 12 24:4,14	33:635:5,8,	29:16	42:2,3	1:18 2:3
25:5,19 35:3	11 36:12	Reporter	result	Right
39:20 45:14,	41:15 44:13	5:3,14 34:11	13:4,535:16	36:640:23
15,17,25 46:3	referral	52:1,4,5,6,9,	43:5 47:5	41:25 45:9
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	51:16	I
				



Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

rigorous	securitizatio	1:9,172:3	SIGNATUREDAT	52:6
19:25		10:8,10,14	E	South
robust	n 21:19	14:4,10	54:24 55:24	3:12
20:11		16:18,24		Southern
	Security	19:16,25	signed	1:4,7,13,16
role	1:11	20:7,14,18	15:5 53:18	2:6,87:13
32:23	see	25:24 27:14	significant	53:5
room	11:14,22	28:11,19 29:1	48:19	speak
5:14	12:6,7,18,20	43:6 47:6	significantl	15:1 40:25
rose	29:5 43:9	49:5	у	41:1
46:17	49:2	services	47:25	
Roush	seeing	52:5,11,14	similar	speaking 26:3 29:13
5:24 7:1	18:16	set	12:10 47:21	44:8
RPM	seek	24:12 27:18	1	
24:1,15,16,20	37:8,21 39:9	32:16 42:3,6,	sir 34:935:9	special
26:17,23,24	seeking	18 45:11,23		41:16 47:13,
27:11,15	37:17 39:5	46:5,18	sit	15 48:2 49:6,
RPM-based	seen	set-aside	18:22	10,17,18,25
23:24	25:3,17	26:6,8,14,24	sitting	specific
RPR	29:11,17,20,	sets	9:21	9:24 11:23
2:22 51:21	23 32:12	42:2	size	20:4,25 30:3
52:20	43:19	settled	47:23	37:13
	sell	12:13	SJB-1	specifically
rule 8:150:18	40:6	Seventh	11:13	14:9 26:11
	selling	3:16	skew	35:11 47:2
Rules	40:7		47:25	specificity
5:47:248:8,		shall	slightly	36:21 40:14
9,12 50:19	sells	52:4,7	28:14	spoken
52:2	34:25	SHEET		15:4,11
s	sense	53:1,15 54:1	slip 7:10	stability
salient	44:22	55:1		32:23 33:3
9:8,18	sent	shop	smaller	47:14,22
save	42:4	10:10	45:11	48:21
53:12	sentence	shopping	SNR	Standard
says	25:9 35:12	19:24 20:3,	3:7	1:910:10,14
34:24	43:3,4 44:10	11,13,17	sold	19:15 20:7
	SEPTEMBER	25:1,7,15,21,	40:8,9	standards
SB221	1:21 2:17 5:2	22 26:1,2,3,	Solutions	25:24
10:19 16:13	6:15 28:1,17	16,18,22	3:252:10,11,	
SB3	51:18	27:13,23	13,15	standpoint 26:5
10:22 11:17	served	28:1,15,17,20	sorry	
scenario	30:22	signature	25:8,12	started
38:2	Service	50:20		29:1 37:6
	D31 4109		source	state



Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

				
20:19 51:3	32:8 35:6,14,	7:5	43:18,22,25	 Thank
stated	16 36:10,12,	supplying	44:2,3,14,18	7:17 40:20
15:14,16,18	24 37:16	10:14	46:12 48:11,	50:8,10,16
22:12 46:25	39:17,21	support	12	thereto
49:251:7	41:13 42:13	5:21 18:9,12	TELEPHONIC	51:8
statement	47:21 49:8,21	-	1:20 2:15 5:1	
47:3	stop	supported	tell	thing
_ · · · -	34:25 41:23	17:22 19:1	9:1,21,23	18:25
statements	straightforwa	Supreme	12:236:18	things
17:22	-	6:57:8		26:12 33:11
states	rd 26:4	sure	ten	think
52:3	ì	9:16 11:21	34:14	7:5,108:16
stating	Street	25:13 26:19	tend	15:16 18:2,6,
52:4	2:20 3:8,12,	28:6 29:12	33:1	7 19:11 20:2
statistics	16	36:11,19	tender	21:17 22:18,
20:3 30:4,6	structure	41:14 42:20	52:4	24 24:5 25:8
status	44:1,14,17	suspect	term	29:18 33:8
38:8,10	45:7,8	12:20	33:7	36:9 44:12
·	studied	sworn	termination	thousand
statute	39:3	5:8	39:18,21 40:1	24:13
6:633:5,12,	studies		,	threshold
25 34:3,12,	25:3,17	system	terminology	42:14
18,24	·	14:11 31:14	41:13	
statutes	study	T	terms	throughout
11:2	24:25 25:6,14	T	41:22 44:20	8:5
statutory	43:11	51:1	48:21	time
32:17 36:14	subject	take	territory	10:23 15:8
STEPHEN	25:18 30:6	14:3,10	20:1,14,18	20:5 29:23
1:20 2:16 4:2	subjects	23:14,17	testified	30:7,931:16
5:1,7,12	7:18	38:18 41:7	7:17 13:14	40:19 52:4
53:22 54:25	subsidiary	49:5	14:7	today
55:25	30:20		testifies	5:16 18:22
stip	substantive	taken	5:8	24:5
15:12	42:9	51:7 53:10		total
l		taking	testimony	22:5,10,14,
stipulation	sufficient	10:10 28:19	5:18,19,20,	19,20 30:15
5:22,24 6:16	19:10	29:1 52:4,11	21,22,23,25	towards
12:16,25 13:5	sufficiently	talk	6:9,12,14,17	42:25
14:2,13,20 15:2,5,6,9,14	39:3	30:25 32:21	8:18 9:12 11:14 12:14,	Tower
17:15,21,24	Suite	40:18 45:5,7	18,20,21 14:2	3:8
18:1,2,15	2:20 3:8,17	talking	15:9,15	
19:4 21:4	summary	14:21 17:23,	18:17,19 19:4	transactions
23:7 26:7,9,	24:6	25 26:11 33:5	24:4 35:6	30:13
15 27:14,19	supplied	tariff	41:13	transcript
	pubbiten			50:13 51:7,11



Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

52:8 53:9	Under	41:22 45:1	way	36:6
transition	2:10 16:18,24	useful	13:11 20:22	work
13:9 22:13	17:12 19:16	33:18	21:227:3	5:24 6:1,24,
transmission	20:6 26:6,14	usual	28:15 35:3	25 7:1,2,4
8:3	27:14 33:11	40:17 52:16	36:22 42:25	8:16 12:19
1	36:14 38:2,3	· ·	44:10	24:24 38:12
treatment	40:7,942:22	usually	 we'll	working
49:5	43:16,17	33:8	33:12	9:7,17
tremendous	45:10,12,21	UTILITIES	1	·
46:2	46:5,1948:22	1:27:15	went 11:17	WRIGHT 3:11
true	51:9 52:11	11:16 19:21		
16:4 17:18	53:7,8,16	29:10,21 53:4	we're	written
18:7 22:25	underlying	utility	26:11 33:5	49:22
44:6,7,19	17:8	35:18 37:10	34:6 41:20	<u> </u>
51:11 53:12	understand	V	whether	year
try	8:21,25 9:3		9:16 12:16	11:12,24 12:3
26:20 27:3	10:18 26:9,19	various	13:4,618:3	24:12 27:23
trying	28:634:19	8:2,3,4,59:5 29:8	19:3 23:15	28:1,16
11:23 18:3	41:15,21		30:131:9	45:12,24
tune	Understanding	verbatim	35:25 36:19,	years
21:16	10:7 18:11	8:24	21,23 37:4,13	30:21 32:24
	19:5 21:9	versus	46:10 49:24 50:4	34:14 46:16
Turning	23:15 27:12	15:24 40:7,9		yourself
38:7	29:25 30:8	view	willing	7:21 8:19 9:6
two	31:1 34:2	16:8 21:22	13:2	10:1,5,12
12:11,24 13:7	36:4,8,15	23:14 29:25	wires	
24:12 25:10	37:1 38:11	40:10 47:24	21:25	0
28:5,9,10,17,	42:746:14,20	48:7,24	within	09119
20,23 29:3	48:8,20 53:15	views	20:14,17	41:18
30:22	undertake	15:15,17,18,	35:15	1
type	24:25	20	WITNESS	-
32:5 46:6	undertaken	virtue	4:234:12,22	1 14:251:10
50:5	25:6	27:19	35:3 40:20,23	· ·
types		W	41:1,550:10,	100
8:5 40:10	unique 41:15 43:5,16		13,20	1:21 2:18
47:21	45:21,22 46:5	want	witnesses	10-2376-BL-
typewriting	47:5	12:2,4 27:4	5:25 24:6	UNC
51:9	\	35:11 45:15	32:13	1:3
Ū	unit	wanted	word	10-2929-EL-
	35:23,25	41:14	20:23	UNC
unbundling	36:13,16,20	Washington	words	2:4
11:16	unreasonable	3:9	13:11 15:11	
unclear	43:5 47:4,11	wasn't	22:11 25:10	10-343-EL-
41:22	use	27:1	22.11 23.10	ATA
1	•	–	•	•



Toll Free: 877.495.0777 Facsimile: 404.495.0766

1:16 10-344-EL-ATA 2:1 2012 20:112,13,20 36 3:16 28:17 7 7 28:17 7 7 28:17 7 7 28:17 7 7 28:17 7 7 28:17 7 7 7 28:17 7 7 7 7 7 8:17 7 7 7 7 7 7 8:17 7 7 7 7 7 8:17 7 7 7 8:17 7 7 7 8:17 7 7 8:17 7 7 7 8:17 7 7 7 8:17 7 7 7 8:17 7 7 7 8:17 7 8:17 8 8 8 49:14 43:1,2,4 44:4 43:1,2,4 44:3,16:48:12 8 8 00 2:20 3:14 41:4 3:12 42:16 43:215-6194 3:14 8 800 2:20 9 9 9 14:3 3:4 45202 3:17 14:3 99 14:3 3:4 99 11-30e 50:20 50:18 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 7 7 7 7 7
1
2011



Toll Free: 877,495,0777 Facsimile: 404,495,0766