

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

2012 FEB 27 PM 4: 18

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company for Approval of an Amendment to its Corporate Separation Plan)	Case No. 11-5333-EL-UNC
MOTION FOR DISMISSA	I. WITE	HOUT PREHIDICE

In light of the Commission's February 23, 2012 Entry on Rehearing in Case Nos. 11-346-EL-UNC et al., Ohio Power Company's (OPCo) considers its Application in this docket to be moot. For the reasons set forth in the attached memorandum in support, OPCo requests that the Application be dismissed without prejudice as being moot.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven T. Nourse

Matthew J. Satterwhite

American Electric Power Service Corporation 1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor

Columbus, Ohio 43215 Telephone: (614) 716-1606

Fax: (614) 716-2950

Email: stnourse@aep.com

misatterwhite@aep.com

This is to certify that the images appearably are an accurate and complete reproduction of a ceno tile document delivered in the regular ocurse of basines. Sechnician _____ Date Processed 2/2.7/12

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

Ohio Power Company's (OPCo) Application in this docket was filed as soon as practicable after the signatory parties agreed to the Stipulation and Recommendation in Case Nos. 11-346-EL-SSO *et al.* (Stipulation). The Application was premised on the Commission's adoption of the Stipulation. The Commission's December 14, 2011 Opinion and Order modified and approved the Stipulation (including the proposed divestiture of generation assets), but indicated (at 61) that the Commission would "continue to review the corporate separation plan's remaining issues in an expeditious manner" in Case No. 11-5333-EL-UNC. However, the February 23, 2012 Entry on Rehearing ultimately rejected the Stipulation and specifically concluded (at 8) that "the Commission's approval of AEP Ohio's generation asset divestiture pursuant to Section 4928.17(E), Revised Code, is revoked." Consequently, OPCo now considers its Application in this docket to be moot¹ and requests that the Commission dismiss the Application without prejudice to future requests for corporate separation under Section 4928.17, Revised Code.

In light of the mootness of the Application and OPCo's request for voluntary dismissal without prejudice, the recent rehearing requests filed by OCC and IEU are also moot. Of course, OPCo opposes the arguments made by OCC and IEU and reserves the right to contest such

¹ While acknowledging the mootness of its Application in this docket based on the February 23, 2012 Entry on Rehearing in Case Nos. 11-346-EL-SSO et al., OPCo fully reserves all legal rights and remedies with respect to separately challenging the Commission's orders in Case Nos. 11-346-EL-SSO et al. Further, the mootness of the present Application (which was premised on acceptance of the Stipulation) has no bearing on the merits of a future application by OPCo requesting corporate separation under Section 4928.17, Revised Code. Thus, the request for voluntary dismissal based on mootness is without prejudice.

arguments in future proceedings. Specifically, OCC sought rehearing relative to the Commission's approval of the asset transfer at net book value. OPCo opposes OCC's request for the same reasons stated in the October 18, 2011 Joint Motion for Waiver in this case, OPCo's December 29, 2011 reply comments in this docket (pages 12-15) and as explained in its December 22, 2011 application for rehearing in Case No. 11-3549-EL-SSO (equal treatment with Duke Energy Ohio). IEU claims that contractual obligations/liabilities that would be temporarily retained by OPCo under the plan are unlawful and that the Commission did not fully explain its approvals in this regard. OPCo opposes IEU's request for the same reasons stated in OPCo's December 29, 2011 reply comments in this docket (pages 5-12, 16-17) and as explained in its December 22, 2011 application for rehearing in Case No. 11-3549-EL-SSO (equal treatment with Duke Energy Ohio). In any case, the Commission should not further address any of the moot issues raised on rehearing and should, instead, dismiss the Application without prejudice as to future requests for full corporate separation.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the application should be dismissed without prejudice as being moot.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven T. Nourse

Matthew J. Satterwhite

American Electric Power Service Corporation

1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor

Columbus, Ohio 43215

Telephone: (614) 716-1606

Fax: (614) 716-2950

Email: stnourse@aep.com

misatterwhite@aep.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing document was served this 27th day of February, 2012 by U.S. Mail and electronic mail, upon the persons listed below.

Steven T. Nourse

M. Howard Petricoff Lija Kaleps-Clark Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP 52 East Gay Street P.O.Box 1008 Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008 mhpetricoff@vorys.com On Behalf of Exelon Generation Company	James F. Lang Laura C. McBride Calfee, Halter & Griswold, LLP 1400 Key Bank Center 800 Superior Avenue Cleveland, Ohio 44114 jlang@calfee.com lmcbride@calfee.com On Behalf of FirstEnergy Solutions, Corporation
Joseph E. Oliker McNees Wallace & Nurick, LLC 21 East State Street, 17 th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215 joliker@mwncmh.com On Behalf of Industrial Energy Users-Ohio	Kurt P Helfrich Ann B. Zallocco Thompson Hine, LLP 41 South High Street, Ste. 1700 Columbus, Ohio 43215 Kurt.Helfrich@ThompsonHine.com Ann.Zallocco@ThompsonHine.com On Behalf of Buckeye Power
William Wright Werner Margard Thomas Lindgren Stephen A. Reilly Assistant Attorneys' General Public Utilities Section 180 East Broad Street, 6 th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215	Thomas O'Brien Bricker & Eckler LLP 100 South Third Street Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291 tobrien@bricker.com On Behalf of Ohio Hospital Association

Lisa G. McAlister	
Matthew W. Warnock	
Bricker & Eckler LLP	
100 South Third Street	
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291	}
lmcalister@bricker.com	
mwarnock@bricker.com	ł
	Ì
On Behalf of OMA Energy Group	