

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

- - -

In the Matter of the :
Application of Ohio Edison:
Company, The Cleveland :
Electric Illuminating :
Company, and The Toledo :
Edison Company for : Case No. 14-1297-EL-SSO
Authority to Provide for :
a Standard Service Offer :
Pursuant to R.C. 4928.143 :
in the Form of an Electric:
Security Plan. :

- - -

PROCEEDINGS

before Mr. Gregory Price and Ms. Megan Addison,
Attorney Examiners, at the Public Utilities
Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad Street, Room 11-A,
Columbus, Ohio, called at 1:00 p.m. on Thursday,
July 21, 2016.

- - -

REHEARING VOLUME VI

- - -

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

- - -

1 APPEARANCES:

2 FirstEnergy Corp.
3 By Ms. Carrie M. Dunn
4 76 South Main Street
5 Akron, Ohio 44308

6 Calfee, Halter & Griswold LLP
7 By Mr. James Lang
8 and Mr. N. Trevor Alexander
9 The Calfee Building
10 1405 East Sixth Street
11 Cleveland, Ohio 44114

12 Jones Day
13 By Mr. David A. Kutik
14 901 Lakeside Avenue
15 Cleveland, Ohio 44114

16 On behalf of the Applicants.

17 Bruce J. Weston, Consumers' Counsel
18 By Mr. Larry Sauer
19 Ms. Maureen R. Willis
20 Mr. Kevin F. Moore
21 Mr. Ajay K. Kumar
22 and Mr. William Michael
23 Assistant Consumers' Counsel
24 10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
25 Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

On behalf of the Residential Consumers of
Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland
Electric Illuminating Company, and The
Toledo Edison Company.

McNees, Wallace & Nurick LLC
By Mr. Frank P. Darr
Mr. Samuel C. Randazzo
and Mr. Matthew Pritchard
21 East State Street, 17th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

On behalf of the Industrial Energy Users
of Ohio.

- - -

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2 Bricker & Eckler, LLP
3 By Mr. Dane Stinson
4 and Mr. Dylan Borchers
5 100 South Third Street
6 Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291

7 Bricker & Eckler, LLP
8 By Mr. Glenn S. Krassen
9 1001 Lakeside Avenue East, Suite 1350
10 Cleveland, Ohio 44114

11 On behalf of the Northeast Ohio Public
12 Energy Council, Ohio Schools Council,
13 Buckeye Association of School
14 Administrators, Ohio Association of
15 School Business Officials, Ohio School
16 Boards Association, and Power4Schools.

17 Earthjustice
18 By Mr. Shannon Fisk
19 Northeast Office
20 1617 John F. Kennedy Boulevard, Suite 1675
21 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

22 Earthjustice
23 By Mr. Michael Soules
24 1625 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Suite 702
25 Washington, D.C. 20036

Sierra Club Environmental Law Program
Mr. Tony Mendoza
and Ms. Kristin Henry
85 Second Street, 2nd Floor
San Francisco, California 94105

Richard Sahli Law Office, LLC
By Mr. Richard C. Sahli
981 Pinewood Lane
Columbus, Ohio 43230-3662

On behalf of the Sierra Club.

- - -

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2 IGS Energy
3 By Mr. Joseph Olikier
4 6100 Emerald Parkway
5 Dublin, Ohio 43016

6 On behalf of IGS Energy.

7 Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease, LLP
8 By Ms. Gretchen Petrucci
9 Mr. Stephen M. Howard
10 Mr. Michael J. Settineri
11 and Mr. Ilya Batikov
12 52 East Gay Street
13 Columbus, Ohio 43215

14 On behalf of Retail Energy Supply
15 Association, PJM Power Providers Group,
16 Electric Power Supply Association,
17 Constellation NewEnergy, Exelon
18 Generation, LLC, and Dynegy, Inc.

19 Carpenter Lipps & Leland LLP
20 By Ms. Kimberly W. Bojko
21 and Ms. Danielle Ghiloni Walter
22 280 North High Street, Suite 1300
23 Columbus, Ohio 43215

24 On behalf of the Ohio Manufacturers'
25 Association Energy Group.

Mike DeWine, Ohio Attorney General
By Mr. William L. Wright,
Section Chief
Mr. Thomas G. Lindgren
Mr. Thomas W. McNamee
and Mr. Steven L. Beeler,
Assistant Attorneys General
Public Utilities Section
30 East Broad Street, 16th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

On behalf of the Staff of the PUCO.

- - -

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2 Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry
3 By Mr. Michael L. Kurtz
4 Mr. Kurt J. Boehm
5 and Ms. Jody Kyler Cohn
6 36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510
7 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

8 On behalf of the Ohio Energy Group.

9 Environmental Law & Policy Center
10 By Ms. Madeline Fleisher
11 21 West Broad Street, Suite 500
12 Columbus, Ohio 43215

13 Mr. Robert Kelter
14 35 East Wacker Drive, Suite 1600
15 Chicago, Illinois 60601

16 On behalf of the Environmental Law &
17 Policy Center.

18 Barth E. Royer, LLC
19 By Mr. Barth E. Royer
20 2740 East Main Street
21 Bexley, Ohio 43209

22 and

23 Taft, Stettinius & Hollister LLP
24 By Mr. Adrian D. Thompson
25 200 Public Square, Suite 3500
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2300

On behalf of the Cleveland Municipal
School District.

Spilman, Thomas & Battle, PLLC
By Mr. Derrick Price Williamson
Ms. Carrie Harris
310 First Street, Suite 1100
Roanoke, Virginia 24011

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

- - -

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2 Mr. Richard L. Sites
3 155 East Broad Street
4 Columbus, Ohio 43215

5 Bricker & Eckler, LLP
6 By Mr. Matthew W. Warnock
7 100 South Third Street
8 Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291

9 On behalf of the Ohio Hospital
10 Association.

11 Ohio Environmental Council
12 By Mr. Trent A. Dougherty
13 and Ms. Miranda Leppla
14 1145 Chesapeake Avenue, Suite I
15 Columbus, Ohio 43212

16 On behalf of the Ohio Environmental
17 Council and the Environmental Defense
18 Fund.

19 Mr. Thomas R. Hays
20 8355 Island Lane
21 Maineville, Ohio 45039

22 On behalf of the Northwest Ohio
23 Aggregation Coalition and the Individual
24 Communities.

25 Ice Miller, LLP
By Mr. Christopher Miller
and Mr. Jeremy Grayem
250 West Street, Suite 700
Columbus, Ohio 43215-7509

On behalf of the Association of
Independent Colleges and Universities of
Ohio.

Mr. Craig I. Smith
15700 Van Aken Boulevard #26
Shaker Heights, Ohio 44120

On behalf of Material Sciences
Corporation.

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2 Whitt Sturtevant LLP
3 By Mr. Mark A. Whitt
4 Mr. Andrew J. Campbell
5 and Ms. Rebekah J. Glover
6 88 East Broad Street, Suite 1590
7 Columbus, Ohio 43215

8 On behalf of Direct Energy Business, LLC,
9 and Direct Energy Services, LLC.

10 Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew, PC
11 By Mr. Michael Lavanga
12 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
13 Eighth Floor West Tower
14 Washington, D.C. 20007-5201

15 On behalf of Nucor Steel Marion, Inc.

16 - - -
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1283

INDEX

- - -

WITNESS

PAGE

Stephen J. Baron

Direct Examination by Mr. Kurtz 1285

Cross-Examination by Mr. Darr 1288

Cross-Examination by Mr. Settineri 1295

Cross-Examination by Mr. Moore 1299

Cross-Examination by Mr. McNamee 1311

Redirect Examination by Mr. Kurtz 1317

Recross-Examination by Mr. McNamee 1322

- - -

OEG EXHIBITS

IDENTIFIED ADMITTED

7 - Rebuttal Testimony of Stephen J. Baron	1285	1324
---	------	------

8 - Attachment 1	1288	1324
------------------	------	------

- - -

1284

1 Thursday Afternoon Session,
2 July 21, 2016.

3 - - -

4 EXAMINER ADDISON: Let's go ahead and go
5 on the record.

6 The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
7 has set for hearing at this time and place, Case
8 No. 14-1297-EL-SSO, being In the Matter of the
9 Application of Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland
10 Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison
11 Company for Authority to Provide a Standard Service
12 Offer Pursuant to R.C. 4928.143 in the Form of an
13 Electric Security Plan.

14 My name is Megan Addison and with me is
15 Gregory Price, and we are the Attorney Examiners
16 assigned to preside over this hearing.

17 We will dispense taking appearances
18 today.

19 Mr. Kurtz.

20 MR. KURTZ: Thank you, your Honor.

21 Mr. Baron, will you identify your name
22 and business address for the record, please.

23 EXAMINER ADDISON: Thank you.

24 Mr. Baron, I just need to swear you in
25 real quickly.

1 (Witness sworn.)

2 EXAMINER ADDISON: Thank you. You may be
3 seated.

4 - - -

5 STEPHEN J. BARON

6 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was
7 examined and testified as follows:

8 DIRECT EXAMINATION

9 By Mr. Kurtz:

10 Q. Will you state your name and business
11 address for the record, please.

12 A. Stephen Baron and my business address is
13 J. Kennedy and Associates, Inc., 570 Colonial Park
14 Drive, Suite 305, Roswell, Georgia 30075.

15 Q. Do you have in front of you a document
16 entitled "Rebuttal Testimony of Stephen J. Baron"?

17 A. Yes.

18 MR. KURTZ: Your Honor, I would like to
19 have this marked as OEG Exhibit 7.

20 EXAMINER ADDISON: It will be so marked.

21 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

22 Q. Mr. Baron, was this document prepared by
23 you or under your direct supervision?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Do you have any corrections or additions

1 you would like to make to your testimony?

2 A. I don't have any corrections to the
3 testimony, per se, but I have an addition of an
4 Attachment 1 which is a -- a schedule essentially
5 that's -- which I believe was provided to the parties
6 yesterday, I believe. And it shows the -- it
7 provides an illustration of the allocation method
8 that I've talked about in my testimony.

9 Q. Mr. Baron, why wasn't this Attachment 1
10 submitted with your testimony last Friday afternoon?

11 A. Basically, it is a matter of timing. I
12 think we found out the ability, that we had the
13 ability to file rebuttal -- or additional testimony
14 in response to the staff last Monday.

15 I was not -- I was traveling -- I was
16 preparing for this case, and then Tuesday I was
17 testifying in Ohio and the testimony was filed on
18 Friday. So it was just -- it was a question of
19 timing, and after the testimony was filed, I was able
20 to actually do some of the calculations.

21 Q. Did the data that went into Attachment 1
22 require you to go back to the 2008 distribution rate
23 case?

24 A. Yes. In order to get some of the inputs
25 for the calculations, and again, this is an

1 indicative calculation, I can describe it, but
2 basically I -- the most -- the only available
3 distribution revenue data that I had was from the
4 2008 rate case, so we have to go to the Commission's
5 website and try to identify schedules that would
6 provide that information.

7 Q. Okay. On this Attachment 1 to your
8 testimony, is Footnote 1 correct or should there be a
9 change there?

10 A. Footnote 1 which says "JMS-1" should be
11 "JMS-2."

12 Q. With those changes and additions, if I
13 were to ask you the same questions as those contained
14 herein, would your answers be the same?

15 A. Yes.

16 MR. KURTZ: Your Honor, I submit the
17 witness for cross.

18 MR. KUTIK: I just had a question,
19 perhaps to Counsel. The attachment is going to be
20 included as part of Exhibit 7? Is that a separate
21 exhibit?

22 MR. KURTZ: That's our intent, attachment
23 to Exhibit 7.

24 MR. McNAMEE: Would it be clearer if we
25 marked it separately perhaps?

1 EXAMINER ADDISON: Let's go ahead and
2 mark that separately.

3 MR. KURTZ: Should we mark it
4 attachment -- OEG Attachment Exhibit 1?

5 EXAMINER ADDISON: Let's just go ahead
6 and mark it as OEG Exhibit 8 just so the record is
7 clear.

8 MR. KURTZ: Thank you.

9 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

10 EXAMINER ADDISON: Thank you, Mr. Kurtz.
11 Mr. Dougherty, any questions?

12 MR. DOUGHERTY: No questions, your Honor.

13 EXAMINER ADDISON: Mr. Hays?

14 MR. HAYS: No questions, your Honor.

15 EXAMINER ADDISON: Mr. Darr?

16 MR. DARR: Thank you, ma'am.

17 - - -

18 CROSS-EXAMINATION

19 By Mr. Darr:

20 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Baron.

21 A. Good afternoon.

22 Q. I am here on behalf of the Industrial
23 Energy Users of Ohio. Turning to page 3 of your
24 testimony, you identify the basis for making the
25 allocation is a hybrid approach using distribution

1 and economic development factors; is that correct?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Now, are you familiar with the collection
4 mechanisms for economic development riders or
5 allocation methodologies used for economic
6 development riders of other companies?

7 A. I have -- certainly, in the past, I've
8 reviewed those. I actually -- I haven't reviewed
9 them recently, so I -- I can't tell you that I -- I
10 can't describe it right now.

11 Q. Based on that review, is it your
12 understanding that the Commission has approved for
13 the AEP company a rider that uses distribution
14 revenues as a means of allocating the revenue
15 requirement?

16 MR. MOORE: Objection, your Honor.
17 That's friendly cross.

18 MR. DARR: Not at all, your Honor.

19 MR. KUTIK: Had the question been
20 finished?

21 EXAMINER ADDISON: Please finish your
22 question, Mr. Darr.

23 And then if you feel the objection still
24 applies, Mr. Moore, you can raise it then.

25 Q. (By Mr. Darr) Again, my question was, are

1 you aware that the distribution rider -- excuse me,
2 the economic development rider approved for AEP Ohio
3 uses a collection mechanism that uses percentage of
4 distribution revenues as the allocator?

5 A. I have a general recollection of that and
6 I probably addressed it in testimony, but, again, I
7 haven't reviewed it recently.

8 Q. Are you familiar with the fact that
9 the -- familiar with the collection mechanism for the
10 economic development rider of Dayton Power and Light
11 Company?

12 A. I don't recall.

13 Q. How about the stipulation in this case
14 for purposes of calculating the delta revenue rider?

15 A. I don't have a recollection of that.

16 Q. Okay. Would it be fair to say that in
17 the case of AEP Ohio, the economic development rider
18 that you are familiar with uses a distribution-based
19 allocation methodology?

20 A. That's my general recollection to the
21 best of what I can remember.

22 Q. And it is collected on a percentage of
23 distribution revenues, correct?

24 A. That would be -- again, that's my
25 recollection.

1 Q. Mr. Baron, is there a reason why you did
2 not look at the allocation methodologies used by the
3 Commission or approved by the Commission in the
4 Dayton Power and Light -- for Dayton Power and Light
5 or for -- excuse me, for Dayton Power and Light?

6 A. For the costs that -- under the staff's
7 proposed \$131 million charge; is that what you are
8 speaking of?

9 Q. Right.

10 A. Is there a reason?

11 Q. Yeah.

12 A. It didn't occur to me.

13 Q. And in your determination of using this
14 hybrid approach, you've indicated a minute ago that
15 you did not consider the allocation methodology
16 approved by the Commission in the stipulation; is
17 that correct?

18 A. For the allocation method for what?

19 Q. For the delta revenue rider.

20 A. No.

21 Q. And was there a reason why you did not
22 investigate or look into that as an allocation
23 methodology for the staff's proposed rider?

24 A. I didn't -- it didn't occur to me there
25 would be a connection. I just haven't -- I haven't

1 reviewed it. The methodology that I am recommending
2 for the treatment of any charges pursuant to the
3 staff's proposal was based on the rationale that I
4 describe in my testimony, that is primarily
5 related -- it's justified on the basis of -- as a
6 distribution-related cost and it certainly -- it
7 could be argued that it would be -- could be
8 allocated or should be allocated 100 percent on
9 distribution revenues, but there are other aspects to
10 it as described by the staff.

11 And so, as a result of that, I'm
12 recommending what I believe is a reasonable, balanced
13 approach, which is 50 percent on distribution
14 revenues and 50 percent on rate class 4 coincident
15 peak demands.

16 The staff's proposed charge is -- is -- I
17 guess is unique and I didn't necessarily characterize
18 it in my -- it wasn't -- I didn't consider it in my
19 mind as similar to a delta revenue recovery.

20 Q. Well, you are aware that the delta
21 revenue recoveries are used in Ohio for purposes of
22 recovering economic development related shortfalls,
23 correct?

24 A. Yes. I mean, that's my understanding of
25 delta revenue and they -- go ahead.

1 Q. Go ahead.

2 A. No. I'm finished.

3 Q. Are you aware of any instance in Ohio
4 where the Commission has approved, for purposes of
5 economic development riders, an allocation
6 methodology that uses a 4 CP approach?

7 A. For -- for economic development related
8 costs?

9 Q. Yes.

10 A. I haven't investigated that and, of
11 course, the proposal I'm making is not to allocate
12 the costs on the basis of 100 percent 4 CP, but,
13 rather, to allocate 50 percent on distribution
14 revenues and 50 percent on 4 coincident peak.

15 Q. I understand that. My question is more
16 specific though. And I just want to make sure that
17 the record is clear on this. Are you aware of any
18 instance in which the Commission has approved an
19 allocation methodology for an economic development
20 related rider that uses a 4 CP methodology?

21 A. I haven't done an investigation, so I'm
22 not aware of it one way or the other.

23 MR. DARR: Thank you.

24 Nothing further of this witness.

25 For purposes of the record, however, I am

1 going to ask that the Commission take administrative
2 notice of the application and decision, approving
3 riders in -- economic development riders in Case
4 No. 16-0571-EL-RDR. The application was filed on
5 March 17, 2016. And also the application and
6 decision approving that application in Case
7 No. 16-260-ELR-RDR. The first is related to the
8 Dayton Power and Light Company. The second is
9 related to the AEP Ohio Company.

10 MR. KUTIK: What was the first number?

11 MR. DARR: 16-571.

12 EXAMINER ADDISON: Thank you, Mr. Darr.

13 I don't believe we've required administrative notice
14 of past Commission decisions, so you are free to cite
15 to those. Any party is free to cite to those in
16 briefs following the hearing.

17 MR. DARR: Fine, your Honor. Thank you.

18 EXAMINER ADDISON: Thank you.

19 However, we will be taking administrative
20 notice of the application.

21 MR. DARR: In each -- excuse me, your
22 Honor. In each?

23 EXAMINER ADDISON: In each of those
24 cases, yes.

25 MR. DARR: Thank you.

1 EXAMINER ADDISON: Thank you, Mr. Darr.

2 Ms. Ghiloni?

3 MS. GHILONI: No questions, your Honor.

4 EXAMINER ADDISON: Mr. Mendoza?

5 MR. MENDOZA: No questions, your Honor.

6 EXAMINER ADDISON: Mr. Settineri.

7 MR. SETTINERI: Thank you, your Honor.

8 - - -

9 CROSS-EXAMINATION

10 By Mr. Settineri:

11 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Baron. My name is
12 Mike Settineri on behalf of P3/EPSA and RESA. Just a
13 few questions for you. If you could turn to page 3
14 of your testimony.

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Line 4. And when you are there, line 4,
17 you use a phrase "there is an economic development
18 component to the rider." Do you see that phrase?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And when you use that phrase, you're
21 referring to the economic impact of FirstEnergy
22 keeping its headquarters in Ohio, correct?

23 A. Yes. I think that's -- that's the nexus
24 for that argu -- position.

25 Q. If you could turn to page 2 of your

1 testimony. Let's look at lines 18 and 19.

2 A. You say 18 and 19?

3 Q. Uh-huh.

4 A. Okay.

5 Q. If you look at 18 and 19, you state that
6 "the DMR is primarily a distribution-related
7 rider...." Do you see that?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Now, you agree that under staff's
10 proposal, the companies, which would be the
11 FirstEnergy utilities, are not required to spend any
12 amount on grid modernization, correct?

13 A. That would be my understanding.

14 Q. But if the distribution modernization
15 rider which has been proposed by staff -- let me
16 strike that. Let's start over.

17 The distribution modernization rider
18 proposed by staff would be a distribution-related
19 rider if revenues were used to recover costs related
20 to grid modernization programs, correct?

21 A. Repeat that again.

22 Q. Sure. Would -- is it your understanding
23 that the distribution modernization rider proposed by
24 staff would be a distribution-related rider if
25 revenues from that rider were used to recover costs

1 related to grid modernization programs?

2 MR. MOORE: Objection, your Honor. It's
3 friendly cross. It's simply supporting his
4 testimony.

5 EXAMINER ADDISON: Mr. Settineri?

6 MR. SETTINERI: I don't think it's
7 supporting the testimony. It's going to -- it's
8 linking actual costs to the rider proposal itself.

9 MR. KUTIK: I'll object, your Honor, as
10 beyond the scope. We are not talking about the costs
11 that are included. We are talking about how
12 allocation; how the costs should be allocated for
13 rate-design purposes.

14 MR. SETTINERI: His testimony, at 18 to
15 20, he calls it "primarily a distribution-related
16 rider" since revenues are intended to incentivize.
17 So I am certainly entitled to explore his
18 understanding of what a distribution related rider is
19 and what it could be. And that's what the question
20 is.

21 EXAMINER ADDISON: I am going to sustain
22 the objection on Mr. Kutik's grounds.

23 Q. (By Mr. Settineri) If you could turn to
24 page 3, lines 18 to 21 of your testimony, please.
25 Are you there?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Okay. Now, in that testimony you believe
3 that an energy allocation for the distribution
4 modernization rider could adversely affect large
5 energy-intensive customers' ability to compete,
6 correct?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And you also agree that as proposed by
9 the staff, the distribution modernization rider will
10 be a charge at all times for large energy-intensive
11 customers, correct?

12 A. Well, the staff didn't actually propose
13 an allocation method or rate recovery method. That's
14 really the purpose of my testimony, but the -- if you
15 are asking me to assume that it's a nonbypassable
16 rider that would apply to every customer, I am
17 willing to assume that.

18 Q. And your understanding it would be a
19 charge at all times, correct?

20 A. In contrast to the RRS, for example, yes,
21 it would be a positive charge.

22 Q. Okay. And you also believe that large
23 energy-intensive customers derive little benefit from
24 grid modernization programs, correct?

25 A. Yes. Large customers that take service

1 on the -- subtransmission and transmission voltages
2 effectively don't use the distribution system. They
3 have meters and maybe some customer billing, but they
4 don't use the distribution system. So, obviously, a
5 grid -- a distribution system modernization wouldn't
6 provide -- wouldn't really be associated with any
7 service that is provided to those customers.

8 Q. Okay. And one way for large
9 energy-intensive customers to avoid the DMR charge is
10 to not implement the rider DMR, correct?

11 A. Yes.

12 MR. SETTINERI: No further questions.
13 Thank you.

14 EXAMINER ADDISON: Thank you,
15 Mr. Settineri.

16 Mr. Moore?

17 MR. MOORE: Thank you, your Honor.

18 - - -

19 CROSS-EXAMINATION

20 By Mr. Moore:

21 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Baron.

22 A. Good afternoon.

23 Q. If I could have you turn to OEG
24 Exhibit 8, the workpaper for your rebuttal testimony.

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. Ask you some questions on that. So this
2 workpaper shows the data you relied on in your
3 proposed cost allocation of staff's proposed rider;
4 is that correct?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. If you could look at Footnote 2 of your
7 workpaper, it states you relied on Case No. 07-551,
8 Schedule E-4 to determine the distribution of revenue
9 for FirstEnergy; is that correct?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And that's Case No. 07-551-EL-AIR; is
12 that right?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Now, the numbers you used as the
15 distribution revenue for FirstEnergy, those were the
16 proposed distribution revenue numbers in Schedule E-4
17 from Case No. 07-551-EL-AIR; is that right?

18 A. Yes, I believe so. And again, just to
19 clarify, this schedule -- this Exhibit 8 is an
20 illustrative calculation. I believe it's indicative
21 but it's not meant to be an updated calculation of
22 any particular rate, but the answer to your question
23 is yes, I think I used the proposed. I can check my
24 schedule, but I'm pretty certain I used the proposed.

25 MR. MOORE: Your Honor, I move to strike

1 everything after the word "yes." It's not responsive
2 to my question.

3 EXAMINER ADDISON: Mr. Kurtz.

4 MR. KURTZ: Well, I think he was just
5 explaining his answer for purposes of trying to help
6 Counsel and clarity of the record.

7 EXAMINER ADDISON: I agree. I am going
8 to deny the motion to strike.

9 Q. (By Mr. Moore) So, Mr. Baron, the numbers
10 from -- that you cite in Exhibit -- or excuse me,
11 Footnote 2 are not the, quote, current revenue
12 distribution numbers that were specified in
13 Schedule E-4 of Case 07-551; is that correct?

14 A. They are from the 2008 case, so they are
15 not current, yes, that's correct.

16 Q. But in the 2008 case there are proposed
17 distribution revenue numbers and current distribution
18 revenue numbers; is that correct?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And the numbers you used were the
21 proposed distribution revenue numbers, correct?

22 A. I believe -- yes, I believe that's
23 correct.

24 Q. Okay. Using this workpaper one could
25 determine what the allocation for each rate class

1 would be under your proposed cost allocation
2 methodology; is that correct?

3 A. Under my proposed methodology? You are
4 asking me is this workpaper indicative of how my
5 proposed methodology would result in rates for
6 different rate classes?

7 Q. Yes.

8 A. Yes, that is the purpose. It's supposed
9 to be an indicative example of what those rates would
10 be. As I tried to explain earlier, the -- if the --
11 if the staff's proposal were adopted and if the
12 recommended -- my recommended allocation were
13 adopted, then the proper way to implement that would
14 be to use actual -- the most recent distribution
15 revenues, actual.

16 Q. Okay. Just to clarify how this worksheet
17 is put together, I just want to run through some of
18 the calculations here and see if we are understanding
19 how this -- how this works out.

20 So the total revenue requirement
21 allocation for an RS customer would be the sum of the
22 RS rate class allocated revenue requirements for each
23 utility; is that right?

24 A. The -- are you talking about the staff's
25 distribution modernization rider revenue requirement

1 of 131 million?

2 Q. Yes.

3 A. Okay. And then -- I'm sorry. Then your
4 question is how -- what did I do? How did I allocate
5 it? I'm -- I can go through and explain if you would
6 like the process on the exhibit, but I don't want to
7 jump to conclusions.

8 Q. My question was the total revenue
9 requirement allocation for an RS rate class customer
10 would be the sum of the RS rate class allocated
11 revenue requirements under each utility that you
12 named; is that correct?

13 A. Yes. The method that I'm presenting here
14 first allocates the revenue requirement to operating
15 companies and then allocates within each operating
16 company following the same basic formulation,
17 50 percent on distribution revenues and 50 percent on
18 4 CP demand. But if you wanted to determine the
19 total residential allocation to all three companies,
20 you would add up the residential amount for CEI, the
21 residential amount for TE, and the residential amount
22 for OE.

23 Q. And so that would be the 30,157,016 plus
24 the 18,665,915 plus the 9,012,556?

25 A. Correct.

1 Q. That would give you \$57,835,487?

2 A. I haven't added it up.

3 Q. Subject to check.

4 A. I'll accept that.

5 Q. So that amount, 57,835,487 would be the
6 amount that FirstEnergy's residents would be
7 allocated for each year of staff's proposed rider
8 under your proposed allocation method; is that
9 correct?

10 A. That would be the total dollars, assuming
11 it was 131 million, as the total amount that was
12 authorized by the Commission.

13 Q. So the percentage share would be
14 57,835,487 divided by the total revenue requirement
15 in staff's proposed rider of \$131 million, correct?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. That would be about 44 percent, subject
18 to check?

19 A. I haven't done the calculation, but that
20 sounds like it could be right.

21 Q. And the same procedure could be followed
22 to calculate your proposed allocation for the rest of
23 the rate classes as well; is that correct?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Now, I could also determine what the

1 revenue requirement allocation for the residential
2 rate class would be based on a 100-percent kWh
3 allocation from your workpaper; is that correct?

4 A. That could be done. You could perform
5 that calculation based on the megawatt-hours shown.

6 Q. Right. So I would take the total
7 residential megawatt-hours, which would be the sum of
8 the 9,274,426, plus the 5,535,410 and the 2,507,806,
9 which would give you 17,317,712.

10 MR. KUTIK: I think you meant to say
11 "876."

12 MR. MOORE: Thank you, yes.

13 Q. Would the 17,317,712, subject to check,
14 is that correct for the total megawatts for the
15 residential class?

16 A. That looks roughly what I would get just
17 eyeballing it. And that you're -- you're asking
18 would that be the total megawatt -- yes, I think that
19 looks roughly correct.

20 Q. Okay. If I take that total and divide
21 that by the total megawatts for FirstEnergy,
22 53,289,046, and then multiply that by the total Ohio
23 revenue requirement of \$131 million, then, subject to
24 check, I would get \$42,571,981; is that correct?

25 A. I haven't done the calculation, but I'll

1 accept your calculation for purposes of answering
2 your question.

3 Q. So if the costs from staff's proposed
4 rider were allocated on the basis of kWh only,
5 residential customers would be allocated \$42,571,981
6 per year for the three-year period, correct?

7 A. Under the assumption, which I assume is
8 implicit in your question, that not one penny would
9 be allocated based on a rate class's distribution
10 usage or revenue requirement.

11 Q. Correct.

12 A. So that a transmission customer that
13 doesn't use a distribution system would still be
14 allocated based on its kilowatt-hours. That's what
15 you are asking me to assume.

16 Q. Yeah, based on straight kWh allocation,
17 cost allocation.

18 A. I'm willing to accept your calculation.
19 Obviously, not the premise, but I accept the
20 calculation.

21 Q. Thank you.

22 So -- and to determine what the cost
23 allocation to the residential rate class would be
24 under a straight revenue distribution allocation, you
25 would just take the revenue requirement data that you

1 have listed for the residential rate class for all
2 three utilities and multiply that number by 2,
3 correct?

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. That would give you, subject to check,
6 about 73,333,432, correct?

7 A. That sounds roughly correct.

8 Q. And the same procedure could be done to
9 calculate the allocated revenue requirement for each
10 rate class under a straight 4 CP demand cost
11 allocation, correct?

12 A. Yes, using the same approach that you
13 just described, which is add up the dollars under the
14 4 CP column and multiply by 2.

15 Q. And subject to check, that would give you
16 about \$42,337,353 for the RS rate class, correct?

17 A. What was your number again?

18 Q. \$42,337,353.

19 A. That looks roughly in line with just my
20 eyeballing the numbers.

21 Q. We could also determine the cost per
22 megawatt-hour for a residential customer from your
23 workpaper, correct?

24 A. Well, under my recommended allocation,
25 the last column, in fact, shows the rate per

1 megawatt-hour for each rate class.

2 Q. Correct. But that's per utility,
3 correct?

4 A. Yes. And you could take -- basically you
5 could just take the dollars, you could take a
6 weighted average of that among the three utilities.

7 Q. If we take the total residential revenue
8 requirement you confirmed earlier, the 57,835 --
9 57,835,488, and you divide that by the total
10 megawatt-hours for residential customers that you
11 confirmed earlier, the 17,317,712, you get \$3.37 --
12 \$3.34 cents per MWh, correct?

13 A. I haven't done that calculation. You
14 want me to accept your calculation? I am happy to
15 accept it. I haven't done it.

16 Q. Okay.

17 A. I don't have it in front of me, put it
18 that way.

19 Q. But that sounds about right, subject to
20 check?

21 A. You would take -- if you want to
22 calculate the weighted average under a -- under the
23 50 percent distribution revenue, 50 percent 4 CP, you
24 would add up the 30 million for OE residential, the
25 18.7 million for CEI, the 9 million for TE, and then

1 you would divide that by the corresponding sum of the
2 megawatt-hours for those three companies' residential
3 class. And those dollars, divided by those
4 megawatt-hours, would give you the effective weighted
5 average rate, which would be somewhere in between
6 the three rates that I'm showing. And what was
7 your -- I don't recall now your result of your
8 calculation?

9 Q. Right. You take the RS revenue
10 requirement, \$57 million, divide that by the total
11 megawatt-hours for residential customers that you
12 confirmed earlier, the \$17 million, and you get \$3.34
13 per megawatt-hour; is that correct?

14 A. Well, it's your calculation, but that --
15 the number I have for OE is 3.25, \$3.25 per
16 megawatt-hour; for CEI, it's \$3.37; and for TE, it's
17 \$3.59. And the weighted average based -- looks like
18 it would tend to weight towards OE. So your 3.34
19 would logically -- it's not inconsistent with what I
20 would eyeball as a weighted average.

21 Q. Okay. Now, if we took the total revenue
22 requirement for the residential class under the
23 100 percent kWh allocation we spoke about earlier,
24 and you confirmed that number was \$42,571,981, and we
25 divide that by the total MWh for the residential

1 customers of 17,317,712, subject to check, you get
2 about \$2.46 per MWh; is that correct?

3 A. Well, that I can agree with because
4 that's the number that I show under the "Ohio Total"
5 line. And if you were to do a straight energy
6 allocation where you didn't look at anything else,
7 distribution revenues whether rate class takes
8 distribution service or not, every single customer
9 would pay the \$2.46 which I showed there. So I think
10 it's -- if I recall that's what your number was.

11 MR. MOORE: If I could have just one
12 minute, your Honor.

13 EXAMINER ADDISON: You may.

14 MR. MOORE: No further questions, your
15 Honor.

16 Thank you, Mr. Baron.

17 EXAMINER ADDISON: Thank you, Mr. Moore.
18 Mr. Kutik?

19 MR. KUTIK: No questions, your Honor.

20 EXAMINER ADDISON: Thank you.

21 Mr. McNamee?

22 MR. McNAMEE: I have questions, but I
23 need a microphone. There. Am I on? Good.

24 - - -
25

CROSS-EXAMINATION

By Mr. McNamee:

Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Baron.

A. Good afternoon.

Q. Some very straightforward questions for you; at least I hope they are straightforward.

Under your proposal, how much of the \$131 million revenue requirement which is a residential class is allocated to the residential class?

A. Well, I went over some of those calculations. But if you look at -- the Exhibit 8 --

Q. I was hoping to get a number.

A. I think -- I am going to add it up just so I'm --

Q. I am going to ask you a number of questions just like this.

A. Approximately 57,800,000.

Q. Okay. How about the same question for the GP class?

A. Well, I have got to add them up. I get approximately 12.3 million.

Q. Thank you. The same question for the GS class. I am sorry to make you do all this math.

A. All the numbers you are asking me are on

1 the schedule. It's just adding three numbers
2 together, but if you want me to do it, I'm -- I can
3 do it.

4 Q. I would appreciate it, yes.

5 A. You are going to have me do every single
6 rate class? That's going to take a while.

7 Q. Just GS and GT.

8 A. Okay. I am going to have to start again.
9 Sorry.

10 Q. I appreciate your patience, sir.

11 EXAMINER ADDISON: Mr. Baron, would you
12 like us to go off the record while you --

13 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, your Honor?

14 EXAMINER ADDISON: Would you like us to
15 go off the record while you do the calculations?

16 THE WITNESS: It's just going to take
17 me -- I mean it's up to you, your Honor. Maybe that
18 would be the thing to do. Maybe I could be asked
19 what calculations he wants. I could do them and then
20 come back on the record.

21 MR. McNAMEE: Just those two, GS and GT.

22 MR. KUTIK: Are these questions
23 foundational? What's the point? We can all add.

24 MR. SETTINERI: Speak for yourself.

25 THE WITNESS: Okay. Your Honor, I'm

1 ready.

2 Q. (By Mr. McNamee) Great.

3 A. GS, I calculated 43,932,171.

4 GT, 12,299,789.

5 Q. Perfect. Thank you.

6 You are aware, Mr. Baron, that in
7 cross-examination Ms. Turkenton suggested an
8 allocation approach that would allocate the revenue
9 requirements based on 50 percent energy and
10 50 percent demand? Do you recall that?

11 A. I don't recall it. I was informed by
12 Counsel something to that effect. I don't have all
13 the details, but I heard something like that.

14 Q. Okay. Did -- excuse me. Did you perform
15 an analysis of the allocation based on your
16 understanding of Ms. Turkenton's suggestion?

17 A. No. The first I heard of it was about an
18 hour ago or hour-and-a-half ago.

19 Q. Okay. All right. Okay. Let me clarify
20 a couple of things here. You did not recommend
21 charging all customers on a demand basis, right?

22 A. No. The distribution modernization rider
23 is related to distribution as I said. You could
24 argue that all of it should be allocated on
25 distribution revenues, but --

1 MR. KURTZ: I think Mr. McNamee was
2 referring to the design aspect.

3 Q. Yes.

4 A. Oh. You are talking about the recovery
5 within rate classes, yes.

6 Q. Yes.

7 A. I did not, and I proposed as I -- sorry.
8 I misunderstood.

9 Q. No problem.

10 A. I proposed a kilowatt-hour recovery
11 within classes so that it would provide a balanced
12 approach for higher- and lower-load factor customers
13 within the class.

14 Q. Okay. You are familiar with the concept
15 of gradualism?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Okay. Would you agree with me that
18 gradualism is important for all classes of customers?

19 A. Yes. I would agree.

20 Q. Okay. And the point of implementing
21 gradualism is to avoid rate shock.

22 A. Yes. That's -- that's correct.

23 Q. Okay. I only have a couple more
24 questions.

25 Do you think it's important to understand

1 the impacts of a rate design and allocation for all
2 classes of customers before a rate is implemented?

3 A. Yes. That's -- I mean, in part, that's a
4 reason that I proposed a 50 percent distribution
5 revenue, 50 percent 4 CP demand allocation. As I
6 indicated, given that it's a distribution
7 modernization rider and it would appear to be related
8 to distribution function, the distribution function
9 on the utility system, and, therefore, allocating all
10 of the costs on distribution revenues could be
11 justified. But as a balanced approach, I've
12 recommended a 50 percent weighting.

13 In terms of rate shock, I think we had
14 done -- at least I accepted, subject to check, a
15 calculation earlier of the weighted average result
16 that I'm recommending using my 50 percent -- 50/50
17 allocation for residential customers, for example, of
18 \$3.34 a megawatt-hour. And we also went through that
19 if it was a pure energy allocation, it would be
20 \$2.46. That would be 100 percent energy allocation.

21 The difference between 3.34 and 2.46 is
22 about 88 -- 88 cents a megawatt-hour, which, for a
23 typical residential customer using 750 kilowatt-hours
24 a month is about 65 cents.

25 So we're talking, you know, between the

1 approach that I am recommending and a 100-percent
2 energy allocator, which is not what the staff witness
3 had -- suggested, about a 65-cent impact per month on
4 a customer bill. So we are not talking about huge
5 dollars in terms of the impact -- I mean because you
6 asked me about rate shock.

7 MR. McNAMEE: Move to strike. I asked
8 the question is it important to understand the
9 impacts of rate design and allocation before rates
10 are implemented, and I got a broad exposition about
11 the witness's proposal.

12 MR. KURTZ: I believe he got a full and
13 complete explanation of the impact on residential
14 customers of his proposal versus a 100-percent energy
15 proposal and he determined that it's relatively
16 small, 65 cents a month, so I think it was just a
17 complete answer.

18 EXAMINER ADDISON: Thank you. I tend to
19 agree with Mr. McNamee. I think it was stretching it
20 a little bit too much and I feel it's more
21 appropriate to raise that type of commentary on
22 redirect. So motion to strike is granted.

23 Q. (By Mr. McNamee) So let me ask the
24 question again. Is it important to understand the
25 impacts before -- of rate allocation before rates are

1 put in place?

2 A. Yes. I would think that's a fair
3 consideration.

4 Q. And that's something the Commission
5 should consider when it's making its decision?

6 A. Yes. I think that's fair.

7 Q. (By Mr. McNamee) I may be finished if I
8 could have just a moment.

9 EXAMINER ADDISON: You may.

10 MR. McNAMEE: That's all the questions I
11 have. Thank you, Mr. Baron. I appreciate your
12 patience.

13 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

14 EXAMINER ADDISON: Thank you,
15 Mr. McNamee.

16 Mr. Kurtz, redirect?

17 MR. KURTZ: Thank you, your Honor. Very
18 briefly.

19 - - -

20 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

21 By Mr. Kurtz:

22 Q. Mr. Baron, you were asked questions about
23 energy allocation of this distribution modernization
24 rider; do you recall that?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. Okay. How many times have you testified?

2 A. I've testified in about 335 cases. I had
3 to do the calculation the other day. It's been 40
4 years; it's not like last week.

5 Q. And how many of those cases involved cost
6 of service revenue allocation type issues?

7 A. Well over 100.

8 Q. And those 100 cases, I assume this is
9 across the country?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Over 20, 30 states or so?

12 A. Yes. At least.

13 Q. Okay. In those over 100 cases, in at
14 least 20 to 30 states, have you ever seen a
15 Commission allocate distribution costs on the
16 basis -- basis of energy usage?

17 A. No. I've never in my experience -- I
18 have seen some proposals for that, but I've never
19 seen -- I've never seen a utility propose it and I've
20 never -- I am not aware of any regulatory Commission
21 approving an allocation of distribution-related costs
22 on the basis of energy.

23 It's simply distribution costs -- first
24 of all, they would only be assigned to the rate
25 classes that use the distribution system. So a

1 customer class like GT that takes service at
2 transmission that does not use the distribution
3 system wouldn't pay for secondary lines and primary
4 lines and transformers and poles which are
5 distribution-related costs. That's the grid --
6 that's the grid system that would tend to be
7 modernized.

8 Q. Now, there is a kilowatt-hour or an
9 energy component to your rate design, correct?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Okay. And you described how that is a
12 balance between the high- and the low-load factor
13 customers within the same rate schedule?

14 A. Correct. That's -- once the costs are
15 allocated to the class, it would tend to balance the
16 impact among various load factors within the class.

17 Q. And as opposed to a demand charge for
18 demand-metered customers, what type of customer does
19 a kilowatt-hour rate design help? The high-load
20 factor or the low-load factor customers?

21 A. Because -- the answer is it would help
22 the low-load factor customers. The very large
23 manufacturing customers tend to have high-load
24 factors and so those customers are going to -- all
25 else being equal, they would be paying less under a

1 pure demand allo -- recovery, rate recovery. And so
2 an energy recovery within the class helps lower-load
3 factor, typically smaller customers.

4 Q. And would you agree that this aspect of
5 your rate design proposal actually hurts the OEG
6 members who tend to be the higher-load factor
7 customers within the rate schedules?

8 A. Yes. There's no question about it.

9 Q. And then why did you propose it?

10 A. Again, because it was -- we are -- I
11 tried to come up with a method that was balanced,
12 that recognized -- that considered tradeoffs of rate
13 impacts and cost causation and all of the factors
14 that I really discuss.

15 Q. I just want to walk through this one
16 example that you were discussing earlier. The
17 weighted average cost to the residential customers
18 under your 50/50 proposal is \$3.34 per megawatt-hour?

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. And if you went with 100-percent energy
21 allocation, that's the bottom right hand corner
22 number, 2.46, \$2.46 cents per megawatt-hour, correct?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And that's the -- that's a difference
25 of -- so if the residential customers pure -- if the

1 whole system was pure energy versus your proposal the
2 residential customers would pay 88 cents per
3 megawatt-hour less.

4 A. Correct.

5 Q. Okay. And the ample residential customer
6 in Northern Ohio and FirstEnergy system uses about
7 how much --

8 A. It's my understanding about 750 kilowatt
9 hours which are three-quarters of a megawatt-hour.

10 Q. So the difference between your 50/50
11 proposal and 100 percent energy is how much to the
12 typical residential customer per month?

13 A. It would be about 66 cents difference on
14 a customer's total bill.

15 MR. KURTZ: Thank you, your Honor. No
16 further questions.

17 EXAMINER ADDISON: Thank you.

18 Mr. Dougherty?

19 MR. DOUGHERTY: No questions.

20 EXAMINER ADDISON: Mr. Hays?

21 MR. HAYS: No questions, thank you.

22 EXAMINER ADDISON: Mr. Darr?

23 MR. DARR: No questions. Thank you.

24 EXAMINER ADDISON: Ms. Ghiloni?

25 MS. GHILONI: No questions.

1 EXAMINER ADDISON: Mr. Mendoza?

2 MR. MENDOZA: No questions.

3 EXAMINER ADDISON: Mr. Settineri?

4 MR. SETTINERI: No questions, your Honor.

5 EXAMINER ADDISON: Mr. Moore?

6 MR. MOORE: No questions, your Honor.

7 EXAMINER ADDISON: Mr. Kutik?

8 MR. KUTIK: No questions, your Honor.

9 EXAMINER ADDISON: Mr. McNamee.

10 MR. McNAMEE: Got one.

11 - - -

12 RECROSS-EXAMINATION

13 By Mr. McNamee

14 Q. Dr. Moore -- what am I saying?

15 Dr. Baron.

16 A. It's Mr. Baron.

17 Q. I'm sorry. It's been a long day already.

18 Do you know of any other instance in Ohio where the
19 50 percent base distribution revenue and 50 percent
20 demand or by demand 4 CP methodology you lay out has
21 been adopted in Ohio?

22 A. I -- I'm not aware one way or the other.
23 I've not done that research so I don't know.

24 MR. McNAMEE: Okay. Fair enough. I
25 appreciate your patience. Thank you, sir.

1 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

2 MR. McNAMEE: No more questions.

3 EXAMINER ADDISON: Thank you.

4 Examiner Price.

5 EXAMINER PRICE: In preparing your
6 testimony, did you review how FirstEnergy delivery
7 capital recovery rider is allocated and how the rate
8 is designed?

9 THE WITNESS: I did not -- I did not,
10 your Honor.

11 EXAMINER PRICE: Okay. How about their
12 rider AMI?

13 THE WITNESS: I -- I did not. I focused
14 simply on the nature of the characteristics of
15 what -- as I understood the staff's proposal which is
16 sort of a hybrid, I guess.

17 EXAMINER PRICE: Fair enough. Thank you.

18 EXAMINER ADDISON: I have no additional
19 questions. You are excused, Mr. Baron.

20 THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.

21 EXAMINER ADDISON: Thank you very much.
22 Mr. Kurtz.

23 MR. KURTZ: Oh, your Honor, we move the
24 admission of OEG Exhibits 7 and 8.

25 EXAMINER ADDISON: Are there any

1 objections to the admission of OEG Exhibits No. 7 and
2 8?

3 MR. McNAMEE: No objection.

4 EXAMINER ADDISON: Hearing none, they
5 will be admitted.

6 (EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

7 EXAMINER ADDISON: We will reconvene
8 tomorrow at 9:15 a.m. We are adjourned.

9 (Thereupon, at 1:59 p.m., the hearing was
10 adjourned.)

11 - - -
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1325

CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is
a true and correct transcript of the proceedings
taken by me in this matter on Thursday, July 21,
2016, and carefully compared with my original
stenographic notes.

Karen Sue Gibson, Registered
Merit Reporter.

Carolyn M. Burke, Registered
Professional Reporter.

(KSG-6224)

- - -

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

8/2/2016 12:58:51 PM

in

Case No(s). 14-1297-EL-SSO

Summary: Transcript in the matter of Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and The Toledo Edison Company hearing held on 07/21/16 - Volume VI electronically filed by Mr. Ken Spencer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Gibson, Karen Sue Mrs.