# BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio	)	
Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric	j	Case No. 07-551-EL-AIR
Illuminating Company, and The Toledo	j	Case No. 07-552-EL-ATA
Edison Company for Authority to Increase	)	Case No. 07-553-EL-AAM
Rates for Distribution Service, Modify Certain	Ś	Case No. 07-554-EL-UNC
Accounting Practices and for Tariff Approvals	í	

## INDUSTRIAL ENERGY USERS-OHIO'S MEMORANDUM CONTRA THE OHIO SCHOOLS COUNCIL'S MOTION TO STRIKE

RECEIVED-DOOKETHIS BIY	08 APR 30 PM 1: 45	0000
ROE	2008	

Samuel C. Randazzo, Trial Attorney Lisa G. McAlister Daniel J. Neilsen Joseph M. Clark McNees, Wallace & Nurick

21 East State Street, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor Columbus, OH 43215-4228 Telephone: (614) 469-8000 Telecopier: (614) 469-4653

sam@mwncmh.com lmcalister@mwncmh.com dneilsen@mwncmh.com jclark@mwncmh.com

April 30, 2008

Attorneys for Industrial Energy Users-Ohio

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

Technician Dete Processed 4/30/03

## BEFORE The Public Utilities Commission Of Ohio

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio	)	
Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric	)	Case No. 07-551-EL-AIR
Illuminating Company, and The Toledo	)	Case No. 07-552-EL-ATA
Edison Company for Authority to Increase	)	Case No. 07-553-EL-AAM
Rates for Distribution Service, Modify Certain	)	Case No. 07-554-EL-UNC
Accounting Practices and for Tariff Approvals	)	

## INDUSTRIAL ENERGY USERS-OHIO'S MEMORANDUM CONTRA THE OHIO SCHOOLS COUNCIL'S MOTION TO STRIKE

Pursuant to the schedule established by the Attorney Examiners in the above-captioned proceedings, initial briefs and reply briefs were filed at the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("Commission") on March 28, 2008 and April 18, 2008, respectively, by interested parties to the proceeding, including Industrial Energy Users-Ohio ("IEU-Ohio"). On April 25, 2008, the Ohio Schools Council ("OSC" or "Schools") filed a Motion to Strike Portions of IEU-Ohio's Reply Brief, or, in the Alternative, for Leave to File a Sur-Reply ("Motion to Strike"). The Motion to Strike was followed by an Errata Notice, filed on April 28, 2008, clarifying that OSC seeks to strike Section II(A)(1) of IEU-Ohio's Reply Brief, which begins on page 3 and ends on page 11. Pursuant to Rule 4901-1-12(B)(1), Ohio Administrative Code, IEU-Ohio hereby files this Memorandum Contra OSC's Motion to Strike.

OSC argues that Section II(A)(1) of IEU-Ohio's Reply Brief should be stricken from the record, or, in the alternative, that OSC be granted leave to file a sur-reply to IEU-Ohio's Reply Brief, inasmuch as OSC alleges that "IEU-Ohio strategically chose to

wait to attack the Schools until its reply brief when the Schools would have no opportunity to respond." Motion to Strike at 4. OSC reasons that IEU-Ohio's arguments in its Reply Brief that are contrary to the position of the OSC violates OSC's due process right to be heard, and that while the Companies<sup>1</sup> responded directly to the arguments and testimony of the Schools, "IEU-Ohio waited in the weeds to file a twenty-three page reply brief of which it spends twelve pages<sup>2</sup>—nearly the length of its entire initial brief – addressing the objections of the schools." *Id.* at 2.

While IEU-Ohio may not have argued against the anticipated arguments of OSC in its Initial Brief, IEU-Ohio presented and argued its support of the Stipulation and Recommendation ("Stipulation"), filed with the Commission on February 11, 2008, and which proposes a rate design that does not contemplate special rates for the schools or any other class of customers. IEU-Ohio is not required to respond to arguments anticipated by other parties to a proceeding as OSC seems to suggest. Indeed, while parties may be afforded the luxury of presuming arguments based on stakeholder objections and their listing of issues in a rate case, it is not a foregone conclusion that those arguments will in fact continue to be at issue after the presentation of evidence.

Consequently, IEU-Ohio's Reply Brief appropriately responded to OSC's Initial Brief, which alleged that OSC was "bullied" by the Stipulation's rate design implications, and which then led OSC to propose and discuss its own alternatives. OSC Initial Brief

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> As defined throughout the proceedings, "Companies" refers to Ohio Edison Company ("OE"), The Toledo Edison Company ("TE") and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company ("CEI").

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Given OSC's Notice of Errata, filed April 28, 2008, IEU-Ohio assumes that the actual number of pages that OSC refers to is actually eight pages long, rather than twelve, inasmuch as the entire Section II(A)(1) that OSC moves to strike is only eight pages.

at 22-27.<sup>3</sup> Thus, the matters that IEU-Ohio addressed in its Reply Brief were in direct response to OSC's allegations and claims raised in OSC's Initial Brief. Indeed, IEU-Ohio cited all of the portions and arguments within OSC's Initial Brief to which IEU-Ohio responded.

In addition, contrary to the cases cited by OSC in support of its Motion to Strike, IEU-Ohio's Reply Brief does not propose that the Commission consider evidence not already admitted into the record. Rather, the support for IEU-Ohio's arguments that respond to OSC's Initial Brief arguments were derived from the record evidence. There is nothing sinister, inappropriate, or unconstitutional about IEU-Ohio's use of record evidence to rebut the claims made in OSC's Initial Brief. Moreover, each party must determine how to best support its position and IEU-Ohio was satisfied with the development of the record and, therefore, the fact that IEU-Ohio chose not to cross-examine OSC's witness does not render IEU-Ohio's Reply Brief invalid or inappropriate. Further, OSC's feigned surprise that IEU-Ohio chose to rebut arguments advanced by OSC in their Initial Brief is a red herring. IEU-Ohio has been a signatory supporter of the

<sup>3</sup> OSC argues at page 22 of its Initial Brief that it objects to the terms of the Stipulation and the elimination of school-specific rates, and then on page 23, goes on to propose its own alternatives, based on its foregoing argument.

In State ex rel. Canter v. Industrial Com. of Ohio, 28 Ohio St.3d 377 at 380 (1986), the Ohio Supreme Court found that presenting a report as evidence after the conclusion of an Industrial Commission hearing could not be considered without contravening the appellant's constitutional rights. In Ohio Bell Telephone Co. v. Pub. Utilities Com. of Ohio, 301 U.S. 292 at 300-301 (1937), the U.S. Supreme Court held that a party is precluded from due process when a Commission considers and relies upon findings not in evidence and which was being admitted through judicial notice after the case had already been submitted. Likewise, in U.S. v. Abilene & S.R. Co., 265 U.S. 274 at 288 (1924), the U.S. Supreme Court held that information obtained during an Interstate Commerce Commission ("ICC") investigation, but which was not entered into the record as evidence rendered the subsequent ICC Order that relied on the obtained information void. Finally, in In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained Within the Rate Schedules of Ohio Power Company and Related Matters, PUCO Case Nos. 98-101-EL-EFC et al., Opinion and Order at 26 (May 26, 1999), the Commission granted Ohio Power Company's and Columbus Southern Power Company's Motion to Strike a portion of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel's ("OCC") Reply Brief that introduced and referred to the results of a USEPA 1999 emission allowance auction that had not been admitted or introduced prior to the filing of the OCC's Reply Brief.

Stipulation since it was presented to the Commission on February 11, 2008 and IEU-Ohio made clear in its Initial Brief that it supported the rate design proposed in the Stipulation, which does not contemplate a special rate for the schools. Thus, OSC had ample notice that IEU-Ohio had taken an adverse position to OSC in this proceeding.<sup>5</sup>

For the foregoing reasons, IEU-Ohio respectfully urges the Commission to deny OSC's Motion to Strike portions of IEU-Ohio's Reply Brief, or in the Alternative, for Leave to File a Sur-Reply.

Respectfully submitted,

anni

Samuel C. Randazzo, Trial Attorney

Lisa G. McÁlister Daniel J. Neilsen Joseph M. Clark

McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC 21 East State Street, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor

Columbus, OH 43215

Telephone: (614) 469-8000 Telecopier: (614) 469-4653

Attorneys for Industrial Energy Users-Ohio

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Paragraph 13 of the Stipulation provides in part that "The Signatory Parties agree to support this Stipulation before the Commission and urge its acceptance and approval of this Stipulation, including identifying such support through Briefs filed in this Proceeding." Since OSC opposes the Stipulation in its Initial Brief, the fact that IEU-Ohio chose to rebut arguments advanced by OSC as to why the Stipulation is not just and reasonable was clearly a possibility.

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing *Industrial Energy Users-Ohio's Memorandum Contra the Ohio Schools Council's Motion to Strike*, was served upon the following parties of record this 30<sup>th</sup> day of April 2008, *via* electronic transmission or hand delivery as directed by the Attorney Examiners.

Stephen L. Feld, Counsel of Record Associate General Counsel James W. Burk, Senior Attorney Kathy J. Kolich, Senior Attorney Arthur E. Korkosz, Senior Attorney Mark A. Hayden, Attorney Ebony L. Miller, Attorney FirstEnergy Service Company 76 South Main Street Akron, OH 44308

Mark A. Whitt Jones Day 325 John H. McConnell Blvd., Suite 600 PO Box 165017 Columbus, OH 43216-5017

ATTORNEYS FOR THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY, OHIO EDISON COMPANY AND THE TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY

David F. Boehm Michael L. Kurtz Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry 36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

ATTORNEYS FOR OHIO ENERGY GROUP AND THE KROGER CO.

Janine L. Migden-Ostrander
Consumers' Counsel
Jeffrey L. Small, Counsel of Record
Richard C. Reese
Assistant Consumers' Counsel
Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, OH 43215-3485

DANIEL J. NEILSEN

## ATTORNEYS FOR OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

Thomas L. Froehle McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC 21 East State Street, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor Columbus, OH 43215

### ATTORNEYS FOR OHIO HOME BUILDERS ASSOCIATION

David C. Rinebolt Colleen L. Mooney Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy 231 West Lima Street PO Box 1793 Findlay, OH 45839-1793

ATTORNEYS FOR OHIO PARTNERS FOR AFFORDABLE ENERGY

Leslie A. Kovacik Kerry Bruce 420 Madison Avenue, Suite 100 Toledo, OH 43604-1219 Counsel for Toledo

Lance M. Keiffer 711 Adams Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Toledo, OH 43624-1680 Counsel for Lucas County

Sheilah H. McAdams, Law Director Marsh & McAdams 204 West Wayne Street Maumee, OH 43537 Counsel for Maumee

Brian J. Ballenger, Law Director Ballenger & Moore 3401 Woodville Road, Suite C Northwood, OH 43619 Counsel for Northwood

Paul S. Goldberg, Law Director 5330 Seaman Rd. Oregon, OH 43616 Counsel for Oregon

James E. Moan, Law Director 4930 Holland-Sylvania Road Sylvania, OH 43560 Counsel for Sylvania

Peter D. Gwyn, Law Director 201 West Indiana Avenue Perrysburg, OH 43551 Counsel for Perrysburg

Paul Skaff, Asst. Village Solicitor 353 Elm Street Perrysburg, OH 43551

Phil Dombey Dombey & Hart Village of Holland 110 West Second Street Perrysburg, OH 43551 Counsel for Holland Thomas R. Hays, Solicitor Counsel for Lake Township 3315 Centennial Road, Suite A-2 Sylvania, OH 43560

### ATTORNEYS FOR NORTHWEST OHIO AGGREGATION COALITION ("NOAC")

Robert J. Triozzi, Director of Law Harold A. Madorsky, Asst. Director of Law City of Cleveland Cleveland City Hall 601 Lakeside Avenue, Room 106 Cleveland, OH 44114-1077

John W. Bentine, Trial Counsel Mark S. Yurick Chester, Willcox & Saxbe LLP 65 East State Street, Suite 1000 Columbus, OH 43215-4213

#### ATTORNEYS FOR THE CITY OF CLEVELAND

Glenn S. Krassen Bricker & Eckler LLP 1375 East Ninth Street, Suite 1500 Cleveland, OH 44114

#### ON BEHALF OF THE OHIO SCHOOLS COUNCIL

Sally W. Bloomfield Thomas J. O'Brien Bricker & Eckler LLP 100 South Third Street Columbus, OH 43215-4291

### On Behalf of The Ohio Manufacturers' Association

M. Howard Petricoff Stephen M. Howard Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease, LLP 52 East Gay Street PO Box 1008 Columbus, OH 43216-1008

Terry S. Harvill, Vice President and Director, Retail Energy Policy Constellation Energy Resources 111 Market Place Baltimore, MD 21202 David I. Fein, Vice President, Energy Policy-Midwest/MISO Constellation Energy Group, Inc. 550 West Washington Blvd., Suite 300 Chicago, IL 60661

Cynthia A. Fonner, Senior Counsel Constellation Energy Group, Inc. 550 West Washington Blvd., Suite 300 Chicago, IL 60661

ON BEHALF OF CONSTELLATION NEWEMERGY, INC.

Garrett A. Stone, Counsel of Record Michael K. Lavanga Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C. 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW 8<sup>th</sup> Floor, West Tower Washington, DC 20007

#### ATTORNEYS FOR NUCOR STEEL MARION, INC.

Joseph P. Meissner The Legal Aid Society of Cleveland 1223 West 6<sup>th</sup> Street Cleveland, OH 44113

#### **ATTORNEY FOR CITIZENS COALITION**

John Jones
Thomas McNamee
William Wright
Assistant Attorneys General
Public Utilities Section
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215

### ATTORNEYS FOR THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

Bobby Singh, Trial Counsel Senior Attorney Integrys Energy Services, Inc. 300 West Wilson Bridge Road Suite 350 Worthington, OH 43085

#### ATTORNEY FOR INTEGRYS ENERGY SERVICES,