SNR DENTON 7

 SNR Denton US LLP
 Emma F. Hand

 1301 K Street, NW
 Partner

 Suite 600, East Tower
 emma.hand@snrder

 Washington, DC 20005-3364 USA
 D +1 202 408 7094

Emma F. Hand Partner emma.hand@snrdenton.com D +1 202 408 7094 T +1 202 408 6400 F +1 202 408 6399 snrdenton.com



November 23, 2011

BY FACSIMILE & FEDERAL EXPRESS

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Docketing Division 180 East Broad Street Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793 Fax: (614).466.0313 Case No. 10-2376-EL-UNC Case No. 11-346-EL-SSO Case No. 11-348-EL-SSO Case No. 11-349-EL-AAM Case No. 11-350-EL-AAM Case No. 10-343-EL-ATA Case No. 10-344-EL-ATA Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC Case No. 11-4920-EL-RDR Case No. 11-4921-EL-RDR

Re: In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company for Authority to Establish a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan, Case Nos. 11-346-EL-SSO, 11-348-EL-SSO; et al

Dear Sir or Madam:

Enclosed please find an original and twenty copies of the *Reply of Ormet Primary Aluminum Corporation to the Joint Memorandum Contra Ormet Primary Aluminum Corporation's Motion to Strike of the Undersigned Parties* in the referenced proceeding. The document was originally filed by fax on November 23, 2011.

Two additional copies of each document are enclosed to be date-stamped and returned to me in the enclosed, self-addressed Federal Express envelope.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions please contact me at the telephone number above.

Sincerely,

im J. Non

Emma F. Hand Partner

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV 2011 NOV 28 AM 10: 32 PUCO

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a case file document delivered in the regular course of business. Technician______Date Processed_NAV-9 8 7011

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 Section 4928.143. Revised 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))
In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company for Approval of a Mechanism to Recover Deferred Fuel Costs Ordered Under Section 4928.144, Ohio Revised Code.))) Case No. 11-4920-EL-RDR))

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company for Approval of a Mechanism to Recover Deferred Fuel Costs Ordered Under Section 4928.144, Ohio Revised Code.

Case No. 11-4921-EL-RDR

(Consolidated)

REPLY OF ORMET PRIMARY ALUMINUM CORPORATION TO THE JOINT MEMORANDUM CONTRA ORMET PRIMARY ALUMINUM CORPORATION'S MOTION TO STRIKE OF THE UNDERSIGNED SIGNATORY PARTIES

)

)

)

)

)

INTRODUCTION

In their November 21, 2011 Joint Memorandum Contra Ormet Primary Aluminum Corporation's Motion to Strike of the Undersigned Signatory Parties ("Signatory Parties' Memo Contra") in this proceeding, the Signatory Parties continue to ignore precedent that requires a rate differential to be based on a difference in service furnished to a consumer. The Signatory Parties would have the Commission find that any distinguishing characteristic is enough to justify any form of discrimination. Such a loosely applied standard for differential rate treatment cannot hold. Indeed, each and every customer of a utility could be considered inherently unique. Taken to its logical conclusion, such an interpretation would allow a utility to justify a discriminatory rate against any specific customer simply by seizing upon some unique characteristic of that customer, regardless of whether that characteristic has any reasonable nexus to the proposed rate differential. Accordingly, Ohio law requires that there be a reasonable nexus between the rate differential and the services furnished to the customer, and the Signatory Parties have simply failed to demonstrate any nexus between Ormet's history of power agreements or its kilowatt hour tax status and the 250 MW monthly peak load limitation

2

designed to exclude Ormet from the Load Factor Provision ("LFP") proposed in the Stipulation. Therefore, those discussions should be stricken.

ARGUMENT

The Signatory Parties would have the Commission abandon the legal standard for determining discrimination by ruling that any difference between customers is sufficient to determine that they are not "similarly situated" regardless of whether there is any nexus between the difference and the rate differential the utility seeks to impose. Ohio law forbids AEP Ohio from charging different rates to customers for whom it does "a like and contemporaneous service under substantially the same circumstances and conditions." 49 Ohio Rev. Code § 4905.33; Constellation NewEnergy, Inc. v. Pub. Utils. Comm'n of Ohio, 820 N.E. 2d 885, 888 (Ohio 2004). A "reasonable differential or inequality of rates" can only be justified "where such differential is based upon some actual and measurable differences in the furnishing of services to the consumer." Mahoning Cnty. Townships v. Pub. Utils. Comm'n of Ohio, 388 N.E.2d 739, 742 (Ohio 1979) (emphasis added). The Commission is limited to discerning the reasonableness of such a justification "from the evidence" before it. See Office of Consumers' Counsel v. Public Utils. Comm'n of Ohio, 592 N.E.2d 1370, 1373 (Ohio 1992). The rule does not center around whether the customer has unique characteristics, but rather around whether there are unique characteristics of the service being provided to the customer that justify the discrimination. Neither Ormet's kilowatt hour tax status nor its history of power arrangements are relevant to the resolution of this issue. In fact, there is no evidence in the record to support any arguments regarding Ormet's kilowatt hour tax status.

3

I. Both the Discussion of Ormet's History of Power Arrangements and the Kilowatt Hour Tax Exemption are Irrelevant to Any Issue in This Proceeding and Should Be Stricken.

It is clear that the Signatory Parties' position is that the reasons justifying discrimination do not need to cause, or even be related to, the rate differential in question. This is directly contrary to the precedent that a "*reasonable* differential or inequality of rates" can only be justified "where such differential is based upon some actual and measurable differences in the furnishing of services to the consumer." *Mahoning Cnty. Townships*, 388 N.E.2d at 742 (emphasis added). Moreover, the Signatory Parties' position that any unique characteristic can warrant a rate differential would open a Pandora's box of discrimination.

The Signatory Parties state in their Reply Brief that "[t]he fact that Ormet has operated under a series of unique arrangements over the last half century is not the reason that Ormet is effectively excluded from the LFP, although it does reinforce the point that it is not unduly discriminatory to treat Ormet as unique in this proceeding." Joint Reply Brief of the Undersigned Signatory Parties ("Signatory Parties' Reply Brief"), filed November 18, 2011, at pp. 23-24. This sentence makes it clear that the Signatory Parties do not believe it is necessary to find a nexus between the setting of a rate differential and the "differences" that justify the differential -- any "difference" will do to support discrimination, even if it is not a reason for the rate differential. Under the interpretation they advocate, a different rate could be set for any customer a utility could demonstrate was different from other customers in any way. Rate differentials could be imposed upon any "undesirable" characteristic not shared by all customers equally, such as any customers who receive local tax benefits or grants, or who have left the utility system and returned, or had reasonable arrangements in the past -- without regard to whether those customers are causing costs that differ from costs caused by other customers. The Signatory Parties admit that Ormet's history of power arrangements is not the reason for the rate

4

differential. Therefore, they should not be permitted to insert Ormet's history of power arrangements into this proceeding at this late date.

Similarly, Ormet's kilowatt hour tax exemption is not relevant to the issue of whether there is an actual and measurable difference in service furnished to Ormet. The Signatory Parties do not even attempt to show in their Memorandum Contra how the kilowatt hour tax is relevant to this issue. Rather, they try to change the legal standard to be applied by the Commission in evaluating discrimination to include the historical treatment of the customer to be discriminated against and any other utility-related laws that may distinguish a customer -- regardless of whether either of these factors are in any way related to the specific rate differential sought to be imposed. Because neither Ormet's history of power arrangements nor its kilowatt hour tax status have any relation to the rate differential sought for Ormet by the Signatory Parties, the Signatory Parties' discussions of these issues should be stricken.

II. The Entire Kilowatt Hour Discussion is Unsupported by the Record

The Signatory Parties' *entire* kilowatt hour tax discussion is unsupported by the record in this case, particularly their discussion of how the kilowatt hour tax applies to Ormet. Although Ormet only described in detail the two most egregious examples of their failure to rely on record evidence in its Motion to Strike, it did argue that the entire discussion is unsupported by the record in this case.¹ The Signatory Parties cite only to the statute granting the exception itself. They offer no record evidence to support any of their assertions in that discussion regarding Ormet's eligibility for the tax, the dollar amounts that Ormet does or does not pay under the tax, or the impact they allege it has on local governments. To introduce such a discussion for the first time in briefing, when affected parties such as Ormet are unable to probe any of the Signatory

¹ Motion to Strike and Memorandum in Support of Ormet Primary Aluminum Corporation, filed Nov. 15, 2011 ("Motion to Strike"), at pp. 3-4.

Parties' assertions or offer any countervailing evidence of their own regarding the impact that the kilowatt hour tax exemption may or may not have on the electric service to be provided to Ormet by AEP Ohio under the proposed Stipulation would be a serious denial of due process and should not be permitted.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, for the reasons stated above, Ormet respectfully moves the Commission to strike (1) the kWh tax exemption discussion in the Signatory Parties' Brief that begins in the first full paragraph on page 47 with "As the above history reflects, . ." and continues through the second full paragraph on page 48, ending with ". . . as reflected in the Stipulation" and (2) the discussion of Ormet's contractual history with AEP Ohio and others dating back to 1957, which begins on page 43 with the heading "i. The LFP's 250 MW monthly peak demand limit is reasonable, as Ormet has frequently been treated as a unique customer and it is not unduly discriminatory to treat them differently in this case" and continues through the end of the first partial paragraph on page 46 which ends ". . . on January 7, 2009."

Respectfully submitted,

Emma F. Hand (PHV - 1353-2011) Douglas G. Bonner (PHV - 1363-2011) SNR Denton US LLP 1301 K Street, NW Suite 600, East Tower Washington, DC 20005 Tel: 202-408-6400 Fax: 202-408-6399 emma.hand@snrdenton.com doug.bonner@snrdenton.com

Attorneys for Ormet Primary Aluminum Corporation November 23, 2011

.

•

.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the *Motion to Strike and Memorandum in Support of Ormet Primary Aluminum Corporation* was served by U.S. Mail and email upon counsel identified below for all parties of record this 23rd day of November, 2011.

Emma F. Hand

SERVICE LIST

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

Daniel R. Conway Porter Wright Morris & Arthur 41 South High Street Columbus, Ohio 43215 dconway@porterwright.com Dorothy K. Corbett Duke Energy Retail Sales 139 East Fourth Street 1303-Main Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 Dorothy.Corbett@duke-energy.com

David F. Boehm Kurt Boehm Michael L. Kurtz Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry 36 East Seventh Street. Suite 1510 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 dboehm@bkllawfirm.com mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com Samuel C. Randazzo Joseph E. Oliker Frank P. Darr Vicki L. Leach-Payne Joseph M. Clark McNees Wallace & Nurick 21 East State Street, 17th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215 sam@mwncmh.com joliker@mwncmh.com

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

Colleen L. Mooney Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy 231 West Lima Street Findlay, Ohio 45840 cmooney2@columbus.rr.com

John W. Bentine Mark S. Yurick Zachary D. Kravitz Matthew S. White Chester Willcox & Saxbe, LLP 65 East State Street, Suite 1000 Columbus, Ohio 43215 jbentine@cwslaw.com myurick@cwslaw.com zkravitz@cwslaw.com Terry L. Etter Maureen R. Grady 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

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

Jay E. Jadwin American Electric Power Service Corporation 1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215 jejadwin@aep.com

Michael R. Smalz Ohio Poverty Law Center 555 Buttles Avenue Columbus, Ohio 43215 msmalz@ohiopovertylaw.org jmaskovyak@ohiopovertylaw.org Terrence O'Donnell Christopher Montgomery Bricker & Eckler LLP 100 South Third Street Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291 todonnell@bricker.com cmontgomcry@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 C. Todd Jones Schottenstein Zox & Dunn Co., LPA 250 West Street Columbus, Ohio 43215 cmiller@szd.com gdunn@szd.com ahaque@szd.com Lisa G. McAlister Bricker & Eckler LLP 100 South Third Street Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291 Imcalister@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

United Way of Jefferson County 501 Washington Street P.O. Box 1463 Steubenville, OH 43952 Sandy I-ru Grace Marianne M. Alvarez 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

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

John H. Jones Vern Margard Public Utilities Section Ohio Attorney General Mike DeWine 180 East Broad Street, 6th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215 john.jones@puc.state.oh.us werner.margard@puc.state.oh.us Gary A. Jeffries Dominion Resources Services, Inc. 501 Martindale Street, Suite 400 Pittsburgh, PA 15212-5817 gary.a.jeffries@dom.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

Greg Poulos EnerNOC, Inc. 101 Federal St. Boston, Massachusetts 02110 gpoulos@enernoc.com

Carolyn S. Flahive Terrance A. Mebane Thompson Hine LLP 41 S. High Street, Suite 1700 Columbus, Ohio 43215 Carolyn.Flahive@ThompsonHine.com Terrance.Mebane@ThompsonHine.com Leo Antons 1237 Cisler Dr. Marietta, OH 45750 leoantons@suddenlink.net E. Camille Yancey Nolan Moser Trent A. Dougherty Ohio Environmental Council 1207 Grandview Avenue, Suite 201 Columbus, Ohio 43212-3449 camille@theoec.org nolan@theoec.org trent@theoec.org

Mark A. Hayden FirstEnergy Service Company 76 South Main Street Akron, OH 44308 haydenm@firstenergycorp.com

David A. Kutik Jones Day 901 Lakeside Avenue Cleveland, OH 44114 dakutik@jonesday.com

Christopher J. Allwein 1373 Grandview Ave. Suite 212 Columbus, OH 43212 wein@williamsandmoser.com Tara C. Santarelli Environmental Law & Policy Center 1207 Grandview Ave., Suite 201 Columbus, Ohio 43212 tsantarelli@elpc.org

James F. Lang Laura C. McBride N. Trevor Alexander Calfee, Halter & Griswold LLP 1400 KeyBank Center 800 Superior Ave. Cleveland, OH 44114 jlang@calfee.com lmcbride@calfee.com talexander@calfee.com

Allison E. Haedt Grant W. Garber Jones Day P.O. Box 165017 325 John H. McConnell Boulevard Suite 600 Columbus, Ohio 43216-5017

J. Kennedy And Associates 570 Colonial Park Drive Suite 305 Roswell, GA 30075 Jennifer Duffer Armstrong & Okey, Inc. 222 East Town Street 2nd Floor Columbus, OH 43215 jduffer@ameritech.net

Lija K. Kaieps-Clark M. Howard Petricoff Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease 52 E. Gay St. PO Box 1008 Columbus, OH 43216 lkalepsclark@vorys.com mhpetricoff@vssp.com

Bill Dingus Lawrence Economic Development Corporation P.O. Box 488 South Point, OH 45680-0488

Constellation NewEnergy Inc Cynthia Fonner Brady 550 W Washington Street Suite 300 Chicago, IL 60661 Cynthia.Brady@constellation.com

Denis George Kroger Company 1014 Vine Street-G07 Cincinnati, OH 45202-1100 Shannon Fisk 2 North Riverside Plaza Suite 2250 Chicago, IL 60606 sfisk@nrdc.org

Canton Chamber Of Commerce 229 Wells Ave N.W. Canton, OH 44703-1044

Amy Spiller Duke Energy Ohio 139 E. Fourth Street, 1303-Main P.O. Box 961 Cincinnati, OH 45201-0960 Amy.Spiller@Duke-Energy.com

FirstEnergy Solutions Corp Louis M. D'Alessandris 341 White Pond Drive Akron, OH 44320 Idalessandris@firstenergy.com

Ohio Partners For Affordable Energy David C. Rinebolt 231 West Lima St. P.O. Box 1793 Findlay, OH 45839-1793 drinelbolt@aol.com Steve Howard 52 East Gay St. P.O. Box 1008 Columbus, OH 43215 smhoward@.vorys.com

AEP Retail Energy Partners LLC Anne M. Vogel 1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor Columbus, OH 43215 amvogel@aep.com

Shawnee State University 940 Second Street Portsmouth, OH 45662

Mark A. Whitt Carpenter, Lipps & Leleand LLP 280 Plaza, Suite 1300 280 North High Street Columbus OH 43215

Jeffrey Small Jody M. Kyler Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel 10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800 Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485 small@occ.state.oh.us kyler@occ.state.oh.us

Jacqueline Lake Roberts EnerNOC, Inc. 13212 Haves Corner Road SW Pataskala OH 43062 The Sierra Club 50 West Broad Street #2117 Columbus, OH 43215

Meigs County Commissioners Michael Davenport, President 100 East Second Street Pomeroy, OH 45769

Tuscarawas County 330 University Drive NE New Philadelphia, OH 44663

Paul F. Wight Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP 1440 New York Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20005

Deb J. Bingaham Patti Mallarnee Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel 10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800 Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

Philip B. Sineneng
Thompson Hine LLP
41 S. High Street, Suite 1700
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Philip.Sineneng@ThompsonHine.com

25396837\V-7

	##							##
	#							#
####	# #	ŧ#	###	#	## \$	##	###	: #
# #	. ##		.#	. <u>#</u>	##.		#	##
######	#	#	###	##	#	#	#	#
#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
#	#	#	#	##	#	#	#	##
#####	###	###	###	##	###	###	###	: ##

Ł

Job : 42 Date: 11/23/2011 Time: 1:51:44 PM