

EXHIBIT "B"

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

Federal Insurance Company,)	
as subrogee of Genesis Healthcare System,)	
)	
Complainant,)	Case No. 12-1750-EL-CSS
)	
v.)	
)	
American Electric Power Company, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

**RESPONDENT OHIO POWER COMPANY’S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES
TO COMPLAINANT’S FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION, FOURTH SET
OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION, AND FIFTH SET OF INTERROGATORIES**

Respondent Ohio Power Company (“OPCo”) hereby responds to Complainant’s First Set of Requests for Admission, Fourth Set of Requests for Production, and Fifth Set of Interrogatories (“Complainant’s Fifth Set of Discovery Requests”), which Complainant served July 5, 2013.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. OPCo has not completed its investigation of the facts and circumstances relating to this action, has not completed its search for documents, records, and information, and has not completed discovery in this action. All of the responses set forth below are based solely upon the information and documents presently available to OPCo. Discovery will continue as long as permitted and the investigation by OPCo, OPCo’s attorneys, and OPCo’s agents will continue throughout this proceeding. As the investigation and discovery proceed, witnesses, facts, documents, and evidence may be discovered that are not set forth herein but that may be responsive to Complainant’s Fifth Set of Discovery Requests. The following responses are given without prejudice to OPCo’s right to alter or amend these responses as the result of subsequently

discovered evidence and to present such evidence in any proceeding, including, but not limited to, expert testimony, discovered or obtained after the date of these responses.

2. OPCo objects to Complainant's Fifth Set of Discovery Requests. to the extent they seek the production of information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, and/or any other applicable privilege or protection.

3. OPCo incorporates the foregoing General Objections into each and every objection and/or individualized response contained herein and set forth below and into each and every amendment, supplement, or modification to these responses hereinafter provided to the specific request. OPCo does not waive any General Objections in response to any specific interrogatory propounded.

4. Because discovery in this matter is still ongoing, OPCo expressly reserves the right to supplement and amend its responses.

Subject to the foregoing objections, OPCo responds to the discovery requests as follows:

**OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION,
FOURTH SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION,
AND FIFTH SET OF INTERROGATORIES**

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 1. Admit that the control board for the tap changer involved in the incident would have provided information about the operation of the tap changer, including information about the operational status of the relays, motor drive, limit switches, dynamic breaking circuit, resistors, and other electrical and mechanical components. The tap changer and control board refers to the tap changer and control board identified by your former employee John Roberts in the e-mail message he sent to Charles Thomas Williams at Genesis Healthcare System on June 15, 2010 at 4:50 p.m., which was produced by Complainant as GHS007 and marked as Exhibit 3 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The incident refers to the subject of the e-mail message produced by Complainant as GHS008 and marked as Exhibit 1 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The term “incident” is further defined within paragraph number 2 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Objection. This request is vague and ambiguous inasmuch as the terms “relays,” “motor drive,” “limit switches,” “dynamic breaking circuit,” and “resistors” are neither defined nor their meanings specified. It also seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding because the load tap changer associated with the control panel at issue did not fail. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections and the general objections set forth above, OPCo denies this request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 2. Admit that the manufacturer's product

literature produced by Respondent in this proceeding and for the tap changer involved in the incident required testing oil dielectric strength annually in order to determine if replacement was needed. The tap changer refers to the tap changer identified by your former employee John Roberts in the e-mail message he sent to Charles Thomas Williams at Genesis Healthcare System on June 15, 2010 at 4:50 p.m., which was produced by Complainant as GHS007 and marked as Exhibit 3 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The incident refers to the subject of the e-mail message produced by Complainant as GHS008 and marked as Exhibit 1 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The term "incident" is further defined within paragraph number 2 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Objection. This request seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding because the load tap changer associated with the control panel at issue did not fail. This request's reference to the "manufacturer's product literature" is also vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections and the general objections set forth above, OPCo admits that the document Bates labeled AEP085 states: "Check the condition and dielectric strength of the oil in the tap-selector compartment yearly and replace if necessary." OPCo denies the remainder of this request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 3. Admit that you have no records or other documents of any kind which indicate that you tested the oil dielectric strength for the tap changer annually. The tap changer refers to the tap changer identified by your former employee John Roberts in the e-mail message he sent to Charles Thomas Williams at Genesis Healthcare System on June 15, 2010 at 4:50 p.m., which was produced by Complainant as GHS007 and marked as Exhibit 3 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The terms “you” and “yours” are defined within paragraph number 10 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Objection. This request seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding because the load tap changer associated with the control panel at issue did not fail. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection and the general objections set forth above, OPCo admits that it presently does not have possession of any such records.

INTERROGATORY NO. 1. If your answers to Requests for Admission numbers 2 and 3 above are anything other than an unqualified admission, state all facts in support of your denial or qualified admission, identify all witnesses who will testify in support your denial or qualified admission, and identify all documents which support your denial or qualified admission. The term “your” is defined within paragraph number 10 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above, see response to Request for Admission No. 2.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1. Produce for inspection and copying all documents identified in the answer to Interrogatory number 1 above.

ANSWER:

OPCo has already produced the document Bates labeled AEP085.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 4. Admit that the manufacturer's product literature produced by Respondent in this proceeding and for the tap changer involved in the incident required inspection of the arcing contacts every two years or at every 25,000 operations. The tap changer refers to the tap changer identified by your former employee John Roberts in the e-mail message he sent to Charles Thomas Williams at Genesis Healthcare System on June 15, 2010 at 4:50 p.m., which was produced by Complainant as GHS007 and marked as Exhibit 3 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The incident refers to the subject of the e-mail message produced by Complainant as GHS008 and marked as Exhibit 1 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The term "incident" is further defined within paragraph number 2 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Objection. This request seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding because the load tap changer associated with the control panel at issue did not fail. This request's reference to the "manufacturer's product literature" is also vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections and the general objections set forth above, OPCo denies this request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 5. Admit that you have no records or other documents of any kind which indicate that you inspected the arcing contacts on the tap changer every two years or at every 25,000 operations. The tap changer refers to the tap changer identified by your former employee John Roberts in the e-mail message he sent to Charles Thomas Williams at Genesis Healthcare System on June 15, 2010 at 4:50 p.m., which was produced by Complainant as GHS007 and marked as Exhibit 3 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The terms “you” and “yours” are defined within paragraph number 10 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Objection. This request seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding because the load tap changer associated with the control panel at issue did not fail. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection and the general objections set forth above, OPCo admits that it presently does not have possession of any such records.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2. If your answers to Request for Admissions numbers 4 and 5 above are anything other than an unqualified admission, state all facts in support of your denial or qualified admission, identify all witnesses who will testify in support of your denial or qualified admission, and identify all documents which will support your denial or qualified admission. The term “your” is defined within paragraph number 10 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above, OPCo refers Complainant to the document Bates labeled AEP085, which OPCo previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2. Produce for inspection and copying all documents identified in the answer to Interrogatory number 2 above.

ANSWER:

OPCo has already produced the document Bates labeled AEP085.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 6. Admit that the manufacturer's product literature produced by Respondent in this proceeding and for the tap changer involved in the incident required lubrication of the motor drive bearings every five years. The tap changer refers to the tap changer identified by your former employee John Roberts in the e-mail message he sent to Charles Thomas Williams at Genesis Healthcare System on June 15, 2010 at 4:50 p.m., which was produced by Complainant as GHS007 and marked as Exhibit 3 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The incident refers to the subject of the e-mail message produced by Complainant as GHS008 and marked as Exhibit 1 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The term "incident" is further defined within paragraph number 2 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Objection. This request seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding because the load tap changer associated with the control panel at issue did not fail. This request's reference to the "manufacturer's product literature" is also vague and ambiguous, as is the term "motor drive bearings." Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections and the general objections set forth above, OPCo denies this request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 7. Admit that you have no records or other written documents of any kind which indicate that you lubricated the motor drive bearings for the tap changer every five years. The tap changer refers to the tap changer identified by your former employee John Roberts in the e-mail message he sent to Charles Thomas Williams at Genesis Healthcare System on June 15, 2010 at 4:50 p.m., which was produced by Complainant as GHS007 and marked as Exhibit 3 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The terms “you” and “yours” are defined within paragraph number 10 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Objection. This request seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding because the load tap changer associated with the control panel at issue did not fail. The request is also vague and ambiguous because “motor drive bearings” is neither defined nor its meaning specified. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections and the general objections set forth above, OPCo admits that it presently does not have possession of any such records.

INTERROGATORY NO. 3. If your answers to Request for Admission numbers 6 and 7 above are anything other than an unqualified admission, state all facts in support of your denial or qualified admission, identify all witnesses who will testify in support of your denial or qualified admission, and identify all documents which support your denial or qualified admission.

ANSWER:

Subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above, OPCo refers Complainant to the document Bates labeled AEP085, which OPCo previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3. Produce for inspection and copying all documents identified in the answer to Interrogatory number 3 above.

ANSWER:

OPCo has already produced the document Bates labeled AEP085.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 8. Admit that the manufacturer's product literature produced by Respondent in this proceeding and for the tap changer involved in the incident required periodic dynamic breaking adjustments. The tap changer refers to the tap changer identified by your former employee John Roberts in the e-mail message he sent to Charles Thomas Williams at Genesis Healthcare System on June 15, 2010 at 4:50 p.m., which was produced by Complainant as GHS007 and marked as Exhibit 3 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The incident refers to the subject of the e-mail message produced by Complainant as GHS008 and marked as Exhibit 1 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The term "incident" is further defined within paragraph number 2 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Objection. This request seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding because the load tap changer associated with the control panel at issue did not fail. This request's reference to the "manufacturer's product literature" is also vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections and the general objections set forth above, OPCo denies this request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 9. Admit that you have no written records or documents which indicate that you made dynamic breaking adjustments for the tap changer. The tap changer refers to the tap changer identified by your former employee John Roberts in the e-mail message he sent to Charles Thomas Williams at Genesis Healthcare System on June 15, 2010 at 4:50 p.m., which was produced by Complainant as GHS007 and marked as Exhibit 3 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The terms “you” and “yours” are defined within paragraph number 10 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Objection. This request seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding because the load tap changer associated with the control panel at issue did not fail. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections and the general objections set forth above, OPCo admits that it presently does not have possession of any such records.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4. If your answers to Requests for Admission numbers 8 and 9 above are anything other than an unqualified admission, state all facts in support of your denial or qualified admission, identify all witnesses who will testify in support of your denial or qualified admission, and identify all documents which support your denial or qualified admission. The term “your” is defined within paragraph number 10 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above, OPCo refers Complainant to the document Bates labeled AEP085, which OPCo previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4. Produce for inspection and copying all documents identified in the answer to Interrogatory number 4 above.

ANSWER:

OPCo has already produced the document Bates labeled AEP085.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 10. Admit that the manufacturer's product literature produced by Respondent in this proceeding and for the tap changer involved in the incident required maintenance and inspections of the relays. The tap changer refers to the tap changer identified by your former employee John Roberts in the e-mail message he sent to Charles Thomas Williams at Genesis Healthcare System on June 15, 2010 at 4:50 p.m., which was produced by Complainant as GHS007 and marked as Exhibit 3 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The incident refers to the subject of the e-mail message produced by Complainant as GHS008 and marked as Exhibit 1 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The term "incident" is further defined within paragraph number 2 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Objection. This request seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding because the load tap changer associated with the control panel at issue did not fail. This request's reference to the "manufacturer's product literature" is also vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections and the general objections set forth above, OPCo admits that the document Bates labeled AEP085 states: "To insure reliable and positive operation of the relays in the control circuit, wipe the sealing surfaces of the magnet frame and armature occasionally with a cloth moistened with a non-volatile cleaning fluid. The surfaces of the silver contacts should be kept clean, but require no further attention until the silver is almost gone." OPCo denies the remainder of this request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11. Admit that you have no records or other written documents of any kind which indicate that you maintained and inspected the relays referenced within Request for Admission number 10 above. The terms “you” is defined within paragraph number 10 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Objection. This request seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding because the load tap changer associated with the control panel at issue did not fail. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections and the general objections set forth above, OPCo admits that it presently does not have possession of any such records.

INTERROGATORY NO. 5. If your answers to Requests for Admission numbers 10 and 11 above are anything other than an unqualified admission, state all facts in support of your denial or qualified admission, identify all witnesses who will testify in support of your denial or qualified admission, and identify all documents which support your denial or qualified admission. The term “your” is defined within paragraph number 10 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above, OPCo refers Complainant to the document Bates labeled AEP085, which OPCo previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5. Produce for inspection and copying all documents identified in the answer to Interrogatory number 5 above.

ANSWER:

OPCo has already produced the document Bates labeled AEP085.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12. Admit that you do not include in the service you provide to Genesis Healthcare System information about why tap changers may fail and go into full boost. The term “you” is defined within paragraph number 10 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Objection. This request seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding because the load tap changer associated with the control panel at issue did not fail and because OPCo is not required to include in the service it provides to Genesis Healthcare System information about why tap changers may fail and go into full boost. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections and the general objections set forth above, OPCo admits this request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13. Admit that you do not include in the service you provide to your customers information about why tap changers may fail and go into full boost. The terms “you” and “your” are defined within paragraph number 10 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Objection. This request seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding because the load tap changer associated with the control panel at issue did not fail and because OPCo is not required to include in the service it provides to its customers information about why tap changers may fail and go into full boost. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections and the general objections set forth above, OPCo admits this request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14. Admit that you do not include in the service you provide to Genesis Healthcare System information about why control boards for tap changers may fail. The term “you” is defined within paragraph number 10 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Objection. This request seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding because OPCo is not required to include in the service it provides to Genesis Healthcare System information about why control boards for tap changers may fail. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection and the general objections set forth above, OPCo admits this request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15. Admit that you do not include in the service you provide to your customers information about why control boards for tap changers may fail. The terms “you” and “your” are defined within paragraph number 10 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Objection. This request seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding because OPCo is not required to include in the service it provides to its customers information about why control boards for tap changers may fail. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection and the general objections set forth above, OPCo admits this request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16. Admit that you did not notify Genesis

Healthcare System when the tap changer involved in the incident failed and went into full boost. The tap changer refers to the tap changer identified by your former employee John Roberts in the e-mail message he sent to Charles Thomas Williams at Genesis Healthcare System on June 15, 2010 at 4:50 p.m., which was produced by Complainant as GHS007 and marked as Exhibit 3 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The incident refers to the subject of the e-mail message produced by Complainant as GHS008 and marked as Exhibit 1 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The term “incident” is further defined within paragraph number 2 of the Definitions and Instructions section above. The term “you” is defined within paragraph number 10 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Subject to and without waiving the general objections set forth above, OPCo admits that it did not notify Genesis Healthcare “when the tap changer involved in the incident failed and went into full boost” because the load tap changer did not fail.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 17. Admit that you do not notify Genesis

Healthcare System when a tap changer fails and goes into full boost.

ANSWER:

Objection. This request seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding because the load tap changer associated with the control panel at issue did not fail and because OPCo is not required to notify Genesis Healthcare System when a tap changer fails. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection and the general objections set forth above, OPCo admits this request.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18. Admit that you do not notify your customers when a tap changer fails and goes into full boost. The term “you” and “yours” are defined within paragraph number 10 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Objection. This request seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding because the load tap changer associated with the control panel at issue did not fail and because OPCo is not required to notify its customers when a tap changer fails. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection and the general objections set forth above, OPCo admits this request.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6. If your answers to Requests for Admission numbers 12 through 18 above are anything other than an unqualified admission, state all facts in support of your denial or qualified admission, identify all witnesses who will testify in support of your denial or qualified admission, and identify all documents which support your denial or qualified admission. The term “your” is defined within paragraph number 10 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Not applicable.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6. Produce for inspection and copying all documents identified in the answer to Interrogatory number 6 above.

ANSWER:

Not applicable.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19. Admit that the control panel for the HVAC chiller unit involved in the incident at the Genesis Healthcare System facility shut down the HVAC chiller unit in response to the over voltage condition as a result of the tap changer that went into full boost. The incident refers to the subject of the e-mail message produced by Complainant as GHS008 and marked as Exhibit 1 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The term “incident” is further defined within paragraph number 2 of the Definitions and Instructions section above. The tap changer which went into full boost refers to the tap changer identified by your former employee John Roberts in the e-mail message he sent to Charles Thomas Williams at Genesis Healthcare System on June 15, 2010 at 4:50 p.m., which was produced by Complainant as GHS007 and marked as Exhibit 3 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013.

ANSWER:

Objection. This request calls for OPCo to make an admission about facts not within its personal knowledge. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection and the general objections set forth above, OPCo states that it has made reasonable inquiry and that the information known or readily obtainable by it is insufficient to enable OPCo to admit or deny this request.

INTERROGATORY NO. 7.

If your answers to Request for Admission number 19 above is anything other than an unqualified admission, state all facts in support of your denial or qualified admission, identify all witnesses who will testify in support of your denial or qualified admission, and identify all documents which support your denial or qualified admission. The term “your” is defined within paragraph number 10 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

See response to Request for Admission No. 19.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 20.

Admit that the control panel shut down the HVAC chiller unit in response to the over voltage condition as a result of the incident in order to prevent damage to the HVAC chiller unit. The incident refers to the subject of the e-mail message produced by Complainant as GHS008 and marked as Exhibit 1 during the deposition of Charles Thomas Williams on June 27, 2013. The term “incident” is further defined within paragraph number 2 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

Objection. This request calls for OPCo to make an admission about facts not within its personal knowledge. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection and the general objections set forth above, OPCo states that it has made reasonable inquiry and that the information known or readily obtainable by it is insufficient to enable OPCo to admit or deny this request.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8.

If your answers to Request for Admission number 20 above is anything other than an unqualified admission, state all facts in support of your denial or qualified admission, identify all witnesses who will testify in support of your denial or qualified admission, and identify all documents which support your denial or qualified admission. The term “your” is defined within paragraph number 10 of the Definitions and Instructions section above.

ANSWER:

See response to Request for Admission No. 20.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Christen M. Blend

Steven T. Nourse

Counsel of Record

Yazen Alami

American Electric Power Service Corp.

1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor

Columbus, Ohio 43215-2373

(614) 716-1608

(614) 716-2014 *fax*

stnourse@aep.com

yalami@aep.com

Christen M. Blend

Porter Wright Morris & Arthur, LLP

41 South High Street, 30th Floor

Columbus, Ohio 43215

(614) 227-2086

(614) 227-2100 *fax*

cblend@porterwright.com

Counsel for Respondent

Ohio Power Company

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was served by e-mail upon counsel for the
Complainant on this 25th day of July, 2013.

Daniel C. Theveny, Esq.
Cozen O'Connor
1900 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
DTheveny@cozen.com

/s/ Christen M. Blend
Christen M. Blend

COLUMBUS/1683258v.1