

**BEFORE THE
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|
| In the Matter of the Application of |) | |
| The Timken Steel Corporation |) | |
| For Approval of a Unique Arrangement |) | Case No. 15-1857-EL-AEC |
| for the TimkenSteel Corporation's |) | |
| Stark County Facilities |) | |

REPLY COMMENTS OF OHIO POWER COMPANY

TimkenSteel Corporation, (TimkenSteel) filed an application for a unique arrangement in this case on November 2, 2015. On November 23, 2015, the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel (OCC) filed comments on Timken's request. Ohio Power Company (AEP Ohio) did not file separate comments but stated in its motion to intervene that it does not oppose the proposal as filed. The Company would, however, like to reply to OCC's final position in its comment (at pages 4-5) that AEP Ohio should fund some of the discount requested by TimkenSteel.

In advancing its proposal that AEP Ohio fund the requested discount, OCC misapplies the precedent of the Commission and the Supreme Court. OCC notes a final order in the Company's 1991 base case application at a time that the Company was a bundled utility. OCC failed to include the language at the end of the paragraph which stated "Although we are adopting the 50/50 split in this case, in the future the Commission would like to explore alternatives to the 50/50 split. (May 12, 1992 Opinion and Order Page 48). More importantly, language was included in R.C. 4905.31 with the passage of SB 221 in 2008 that affirmatively provided for recovery of delta revenue. Thus, current Ohio law contemplates that AEP Ohio will be made whole as a result of any reasonable arrangement. Specifically, Section 4905.31(E), Ohio Rev. Code, provides

that electric light companies “recover costs incurred in conjunction with any economic development and job retention program of the utility within its certified territory, including recovery of revenue foregone as a result of any such program” And the reality is that the Commission has approved full delta revenue in all R.C. 4905.31 reasonable arrangement cases involving AEP Ohio¹ – except for a single case involving application of a single rider under highly unusual circumstances.

In the case involving the largest economic development subsidy in Ohio regulatory history, for Ormet Primary Aluminum Corporation,² the Commission held that the Provider of Last Resort (POLR) charge in effect at that time should not be included in the delta revenue to be recovered from other customers – all other delta revenues associated with the Ormet contract were to be recovered from other customers. That holding was, in effect, saying that the POLR charge should not be recovered in conjunction with Ormet given the unusual terms of the service contract. Specifically, one of the provisions in the arrangement proposed by Ormet (Article 2.01) was for AEP Ohio to be the exclusive supplier to Ormet during the 10-year term of the arrangement. (July 15, 2009 Opinion and Order at 13; Power Agreement at Article 2.03).

AEP Ohio argued against adoption of this provision, as violating the policy of the State of Ohio and the fundamental notion of customer choice embodied in SB 3 and SB 221. Over AEP Ohio’s objections, the Commission held as follows:

The Commission finds that under the terms of the unique arrangement AEP-Ohio will be the exclusive supplier to Ormet. *Therefore, there is no risk that Ormet will shop* for competitive generation and then return to AEP-Ohio's POLR service.

¹ See Case Nos. 10-3066-EL-AEC (TimkenSteel), 13-1170-EL-AEC (Globe Metallurgical), and 09-516-EL-AEC (Eramet Marietta Inc.)

² Case No. 09-119-EL-AEC

(Opinion and Order at 13) (emphasis added; internal citations omitted). Based on the Company's prior experience with Ormet, AEP Ohio sought a determination first by the Commission and subsequently by the Supreme Court of Ohio as to whether the exclusive supplier provision was valid and binding under Ohio law. In its September 15, 2009 rehearing decision in this case, the Commission confirmed that:

Under the terms of the unique arrangement as approved by the Commission, AEP Ohio will be the exclusive supplier to Ormet for ten years, commencing January 1, 2009.

(Entry on Rehearing at 8) (internal citations omitted). On appeal, the Supreme Court firmly upheld the Commission's imposition of the exclusive supplier provision:

*Even though AEP argues to the contrary, the orders issued by the commission do not allow [Ormet and Eramet] to shop for electric service for the duration of the arrangement. * * * We cannot say that the commission erred in finding that there was no risk that the manufacturers would shop. The commission relied on the fact that "AEP-Ohio will be the exclusive supplier" to the manufacturers. As we have already discussed, that is true—the orders require the customers to take service exclusively from AEP. If they must take service exclusively from AEP, then it follows that they cannot take it from another supplier.*

(*Ohio Power Co. v. Pub. Util. Comm.*, 2011-Ohio-2377 at Par. 22, 26) (emphasis added).

Thus, the narrow circumstance in the Ormet case was that the POLR charge (which compensated the Company for the risk of shopping) did not apply given the contractual provision that prevented Ormet from shopping for generation service. This was a "one off" situation involving the largest tab for delta revenue ever imposed on Ohio customers.

Notwithstanding OCC's position, the Ormet precedent should not be blindly extended beyond the highly unusual situation presented in that case which are not present here.

CONCLUSION

If the Commission deems a modification to the TimkenSteel contract is warranted, any such modification should provide for full delta revenue recovery. AEP Ohio notes that TimkenSteel's application request proposes full delta revenue recovery by the Company. But if the Commission does not plan to incorporate full delta revenue as proposed by TimkenSteel and instead seeks contribution from AEP Ohio, then the Company opposes adoption of the application. AEP Ohio does a lot to support economic development in its service territory but it should not have to fund rate discounts where the Commission determines provide a net benefit to Ohio's economy and the Company's other customers.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Steven T. Nourse
Steven T. Nourse, Counsel of Record
American Electric Power Service Corporation
1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Telephone: (614) 716-1608
Fax: (614) 716-2950
Email: stnourse@aep.com

Counsel for Ohio Power Company

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing the Ohio Power Company's *Reply*
Comments was served by U.S. Mail upon counsel identified below this 30th day of November
2015.

/s/ Steven T. Nourse
Steven T. Nourse

Michael J. Settineri
William A. Sieck
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP
52 E Gay Street
Columbus, OH 43215
msettineri@vorys.com
waseick@vorys.com

David F. Boehm
Micahel L. Kurtz
Jody Kyler Cohn
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry
36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
dboehm@BKLawfirm.com
mkurtz@BKLawfirm.com
jkyler@BKLawfirm.com

Jodi J. Bair
Assistant Consumers' Counsel
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485
jodi.bair@occ.ohio.gov

Kimberly W. Bojko
Ryan P. O'Rourke
Carpenter Lipps & Leland LLP
280 North High Street, Suite 1300
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Bojko@carpenterlipps.com
O'Rourke@carpenterlipps.com

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

11/30/2015 1:00:48 PM

in

Case No(s). 15-1857-EL-AEC

Summary: Comments -Reply Comments of Ohio Power Company electronically filed by Mr. Steven T Nourse on behalf of Ohio Power Company