FILE

Craig I. Smith
Attorney at Law
2824 Coventry Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44120
216-561-9410
wis29@yahoo.com

Via Fax/Next Day Delivery

January 8, 2010

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
PUCO Docketing
180 East Broad Street, 11th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

In Re: Case No. 09-906-EL-SSO

Greetings:

Material Sciences Corporation faxes this day for docketing its Initial Brief in this proceeding involving requested approval of a market rate offer by Ohio Edison, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company. The undersigned will send by next day delivery the original copy for docketing. Any questions please contact me.

Regards

Craig I Smith

Craig I. Smith (0019207)
Attorney at Law
2824 Coventry Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44120
Tel. (216) 561-9410
wis29@yahoo.com

Attorney for Material Sciences Corporation

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of the Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company for Approval of a Market Rate Offer to Conduct a Competitive Bidding Process for Standard Service Offer Electric Generation Supply, Accounting Modifications Associated with Reconciliation Mechanism, and Tariffs for Generation Service.	Case No. 09-906-EL-SSO

INITIAL BRIEF BY MATERIAL SCIENCES CORPORATION

Craig I. Smith (0019207)
Attorney at Law
2824 Coventry Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44120
Tel. (216) 561-9410
wis29@yahoo.com

Attorney for Material Sciences Corporation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

This proceeding considers the proposed MRO for SSO generation provided as default services by Ohio Edison, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company (collectively "Companies"), for a three year period beginning June 1, 2011 when the current Electric Security Plan expires. While hearings concerned a number of issues, including the Companies plan to become a member of PJM, this brief focuses on the retail price impacts of a Market Rate Offer (MRO") rate design that ends the current interruptible service programs and economic development initiatives through elimination on May 31, 2011 of Rider ELR (Economic Load Response Program Rider), Rider OLR (Optional Load Response Program Rider) and Rider EDR (Economic Development Rider).

The record establishes no credible justification for elimination of the current interruptible and economic development riders that results in far higher rate increases to General Transmission ("GT") customers than the Companies' Schedule 1 filings portray. Likewise, the narrowly focused RFP process on peak demand reductions, as part of a portfolio to comply with RC 4928.66, creates a poorly substituted interruptible program for the current credits provided to GT customers under Rider ELR and Rider EDR.

Without the current interruptible and economic development riders in place after May 31, 2011, the MRO rate design is not consistent with state policy enacted by the General Assembly under RC 4928.02 (A), (B), (D), and (N). This failure to comply requires Commission disapproval of the rate design proposed unless remedied by inclusion of those riders.

Continuation of Rider ELR, Rider OLR, and Rider EDR after May 31, 2011, through the term of the MRO, would comply with state policies to allow for approval of the MRO rate design.

These riders mitigate otherwise unreasonably high rate increases beginning June 1, 2011 to GT customers, provide those customers with elective price and quality options to remain competitive, further economic development and job retention, and facilitate Ohio's competitiveness in the global market.

II. ARGUMENTS

A. THE COMPANIES UNMITIGATED PROPOSED RATE DESIGN RESULTS IN RATE SHOCK FOR GT CUSTOMERS

1. Competitive Bid Process

The Companies propose that SSO generation supply charges, implemented on a service-rendered basis, pass through to all SSO customers covered by the MRO, including service under RC 4905.31 special contracts and under RC 4905.34. (*Companies App. Ex. 1, par. 57, pg. 20).*

As shown on Attachment B to the Application, The Competitive Bid Process ("CBP") results in six different clearing prices for each year of SSO service. From the customer's perspective, Rider GEN changes each year of the three-year period, unless no price change occurred. *(Warvell, Tr. II, pg. 234, L. 14-22).* The Companies arrive at a single blended price (the "Blended Competitive Bid Price") by determining the weighted average of the prices cleared by the number of tranches procured at each cleared price. *Companies App. Ex. 1, par. 60, pg. 21; Companies Ex. 4, Fanelli, pg. 4).* Actual rate impacts become known after the 2010, 2011, and 2012 bid results. (C*ompanies App. Ex. 1, par. 81-82, pg. 28. Companies Ex. 4, Fanelli, pg. 12).*

The Blended Competitive Bid Price becomes the generation retail rates charged to SSO customers ("Standard Service Offer Generation Charge") under a wholesale to retail rate conversion process. Subsequent auctions derive rates to annually update the SSOGC. *(See Att. C, C-1, Sch. 4a; Companies Ex. 4, Fanelli, pg. 4,7,8).* Rider GEN rates reflect service voltage adjustments, seasonality based on historic LMPs (Locational Marginal Prices), and grossed up for taxes. *(see Schedule 2, Attachment C; Companies App. Ex. 1, par. 60-62, pg. 21; Companies Ex. 4, Fanelli, pg. 4).* The rate design intended for Rider GEN relates directly to seasonally acquired retail energy, consistent with current generation rate design, without regard to class allocations, load factors, or other considerations. *(Companies App. Ex. 1, par. 63, pg. 21-22).* The Companies expect this rate design to reduce reconciliations by aligning received retail revenues with auction-based payments to SSO Suppliers. *(Companies App. Ex. 1, par. 64, pg. 22).*

2. Rate Impacts From MRO Rate Design

Schedule 1 of the Application compares the projected differences between annualized rates in effect on May 31, 2012 ("Proposed Rates") with those in effect on May 31, 2011 ("Current Rates"). The Companies provide no similar comparisons for 2011 and 2012 bid results. (C*ompanies App. Ex. 1, par. 81-82, pg. 28; Companies Ex. 4, Fanelli, pg. 12).* Key assumptions for Schedule 1 are:

(1) Rider GEN used for the 2012 Proposed Rates equals the $58.41/MWh Blended Competitive Bid Price resulting from the 2009 Auction, excluding estimated recoveries under proposed Rider NMB;
(2) Rider NMB used for the 2012 Proposed Rates equals $3.09/MWh, excluding distribution losses, to recover non-market based transmission service costs;
(3) Rider PDR used for the 2012 Proposed Rates equal the annualized estimated incurred costs under Rider ELR;
(4) The 2011 Current Rates include Rider RDD and Rider NDD;
(5) Both the 2012 Proposed Rates and 2011 Current Rates use, where applicable, the same reconcilable riders at October 2009 levels; and
(6) All customers receive only SSO services under the 2012 Proposed Rates and 2011 Current Rates.

(Companies Ex. 4. Fanelli, pg. 12,13)

Table A below shows from Schedule 1 the average rate, revenue, and percentage change differences between 2011 Current Rates and 2012 Proposed Rates for the GT customer class.

Table A

GT	**Average Rates $**	**Revenue $**	**% Change**
Ohio Edison	2011: 0.6640 2012: 0.0626	2011: 269,527,343 2012: 254,273,800	-6%
CEI	2011: 0.0572 2012: 0.0605	2011: 101,517,138 2012: 107,276,184	6%
TE	2011: 0.0566 2012: 0.0622	2011: 211,680,582 2012: 232,763,406	10%

OE Sch. 1, CE Sch. 1, and TE Sch. 1

The Companies provided details behind the numbers show on Schedule 1 the summary of revenues collected by the Proposed Rates. *(Fanelli, Tr. IV, pg. 529, L 2-7).* Revenues impacts analysis assumed all customers received service under the Companies' SSO. *(Fanelli, Tr. IV, pg. 529, L 2-7).*

As for specific rates and schedules, the Current Rates include riders ELR and OLR, but those revenues not specifically embed in Proposed Rates. *(Fanelli, Tr. IV, pg. 531, L 24-25; pg. 532, L 1-10).*

The Rider EDR (Economic Development Rider) mitigates substantial rate increases by applying gradualism principles for certain customers including those served under Rider ELR, when rates became effective under the Electric Security Plan on June 1, 2009. *(Fanelli, Tr. IV, pg. 532, L 11-25; pg. 532, L 1-12).* The MRO eliminates the ELR to make inapplicable its credit provisions (and for the EDR credit). *(Fanelli, Tr. IV, pg. 533, L 13-20).* The ELR Rider applies mostly to large customers receiving interruptible services as of February 2008 under contract or tariff provisions. *(Fanelli, Tr. IV, pg. 534, L 3-13).*

The Companies ultimate objective is to align retail rate design with costs incurred in providing SSO service. The EDR Rider approved in the Electric Security Plan intended to mitigate that alignment (transition) for some customers. *(Fanelli, Tr. IV, pg. 534, L 14-25; pg. 535, L 1-5).*

In this proceeding, the MRO rate design, having considered the dual objectives of aligning rate design with costs incurred, and mitigation of that alignment, eliminated the ELR interruptible credits taking into account under the Electric Security Plan that ELR rider expires on May 31, 2011 by its own terms. *(Fanelli, Tr. IV, pg. 535, L 6-12).* While no specific termination date applies to the EDR Rider, this rider likewise terminates because linked to the ELR Rider interruptible credits. *(Fanelli, Tr. IV, pg. 535, L 18-25).*

The $10/kW credit ($1.95 ELR credit and $8.05 EDR credit) is part of Current Rates used by Schedule 1 to assess revenue impacts of the Proposed Rates. The ELR and EDR credits are not included in the Proposed Rates. *(Fanelli, Tr. IV, pg. 538, L 24-25, pg. 539, L 1-15).* The Companies for the Proposed Rates assumed credit dollars for Peak Demand Reduction (PDR process) at equal to the $10/kW credit included in Current Rates. *(Fanelli, Tr. IV, pg. 540, L 1-15, 23-25; pg. 541, L 1-18).*

The Companies assumed customers would seek comparable credits to participate in the RFP process. The Companies believe Schedule 1 provides for reasonable rate impacts of the Proposed Rates, but concede to the extent customers actually receive lesser credits, such as $1/kW, the –6% revenue decrease for OE, by example, becomes less. *(Fanelli, Tr. IV, pg. 546, L 13-25; pg. 547, L 1-20).* Similarly, revenues under the Proposed Rates for GT customers of CEI and TE would increase with those credit reductions causing the percentage differences also to rise.

Table B demonstrates that Schedule 1 understates the revenue impacts on GT customers because of the credits assumed for the Peak Demand Reduction RFP, as shown below:

Table B

GT 2012	Ohio Edison	CEI	TE
Customer Bills	2,144	228	682
Distribution $	5,294,177	466,992	1,421,542
Transmission $	11,796,053	3,087,107	10,552,036
Generation $	237,522,685	103,967,709	219,086,960
Peak Demand Reduction RFP Credit $	-28,477,356	-12,473,449	-22,911,167
Total Rider $			
Without RFP Credit	28,144,237	12,227,825	24,614,034
With RFP Credit	-333,119	-245,624	1,702,867
Total Revenue $			
With RFP Credit	254,279,797	107,276,184	232,763,406
Change From 2011 Revenue $	-6%	6%	10%
Without RFP Credit	282,751,156	119,749,633	255,674,573
Change From 2011 Revenue $	5%	18%	21%

Derived from OE Sch. 1, pg.1, 6 of 12; CE Sch. 1, pg. 1, 6 of 11; and TE Sch.1, pg.1, 6 of 11

The variability of the RFP credit creates serious doubt as to the Schedule 1 reliable use in assessing the revenue differences between moving from Current Rates to Proposed Rate under the MRO rate design. The elimination of the RFP credit increases GT transmission revenues under the Proposed Rates from –6% to 5% for OE, from 6% to 18% for CEI, and from 10% to 21% for TE when compared to the Current Rates.

OEG witness Baron reached similar conclusions on understated revenues. Mr. Baron examined auction price sensitivity on rates using Companies witness Fanelli's assumptions for Schedule 1, but increased Rider GEN rate from $58.41/MWH to $68.41/MWH. This 17% change in generation rates caused GT revenues to increase by 9% for OE, 23% for CEI, and 28%

for TE over those revenues under the 2011 Current Rates. *(OEG Ex.1, Baron Test., pg. 8; SJB-2, pg. 1-3)*

Mr. Baron further examined rate impact sensitivity with Rider GEN at $68.41/MWH by also reducing the current interruptible credit to a rate of $1.95/kW per month, rather than assuming as Companies witness Fanelli that credit level remains unchanged under the "Peak Demand Reduction RFP. *(OEG Ex. 1, Baron Test., pg. 8; SJB-3).* The higher generation rate and lower credit levels dramatically increased transmission rates, characterized by Mr. Baron as rate shock, so that Ohio's largest manufacturing electric consumers pay rates over 3 to 14 times the 2012 retail average. The 2012 Proposed Rates increase over 2011 Current Rate for GT transmission services by 17% for OE, 43% for CEI, and 34% for TE service. *(OEG Ex. 1, Baron Test., pg. 8-9, Table 1, SJB-3, pg. 1-3).*

Nucor witness Dr. Goins criticized the Companies rate impact projections as non-compliant with OAC 4901:1-35-03(B)(2)(c), and likely understated future rate increases to all customers under its proposed MRO. Dr. Goins questioned use of Rider GEN at $58.41/MWH from the 2009 Auction because of depressed bid prices caused by the economic conditions at that time. Significantly higher cleared prices should occur as economic conditions improve. *(Nucor Ex. 1, Goins Test., pg 8, 9).*

Further, Dr. Goins criticized the Companies projections for failure to totally recognize the rate impacts on GT customers by replacing Rider ELR with the RFP Process. The combined $10.00/kW credits lost by elimination of both the Rider ELR and Rider EDR could cause GT customers to incur nearly a 50% price increase dependent of achieved load factors. *(Nucor Ex. 1, Goins Test., pg. 10).*

Upon closer scrutiny, the Companies projected revenue changes shown on Schedule 1 grow to the point that Ohio's largest energy users receiving transmission services confront rate shocking increases of startling percentages, over 30% to 50%, or 3 to 14 times 2012 retail average, based on the MRO rate design proposed.

B. APPROVAL OF MRO RATE DESIGN ALLOWED ONLY AFTER REQUIRED CHANGES TO BECOME CONSISTENT WITH STATE POLICIES ENUMERATED UNDER RC 4928.02

1. State Policy Guides Commission Review

Determination as to whether the MRO, proposed by the Companies as its SSO price, complies with the competitive bid process requirements set forth by RC 4928.142 (A), and the applicable requirements of RC 4928.142 (B), requires the Commission to consider those provisions together with those state policies enumerated by RC 4928.02. In Re Application of Ohio Edison, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company for Approval of a Market Rate Offer, Case No. 08-936-EL-SSO, Opinion and Order, dated November 25, 2008, pg. 6-7.

These policies under RC 4928.02 impose duties on the Commission, as confirmed by the Ohio Supreme Court, to guide its review of the proposed MRO. supra at 13-14. Policies enacted by the General Assembly pertinent to the Companies failure to design lawful rates under its MRO include under subpart (A) to:

Ensure the availability to consumers of * * * reasonably priced retail electric service (A);

Subpart (B)

> Ensure the availability of * * * retail electric service that provides consumers with the supplier, price, terms, conditions, and quality options they elect to meet their respective needs;

Subpart (D)

> Encourage * * * market access for cost-effective supply * * *including, but not limited to, * * * time-differentiated pricing * * *; and

Subpart (N)

> Facilitate the state's effectiveness in the global economy.

The Commission may approve under RC 4928.142 (A) (B) and (C), the MRO as the Companies competitively bid SSO price, upon which, to select the least cost bids and prescribe retail rates, only to the extent consistent with state policies enumerated under RC 4928.02 (A) through (N).

2. State Policy requires for approval of the Companies MRO Rate Design that the ELR Rider, OLR Rider and EDR Rider continue in effect after May 31, 2011 during the approved MRO's full term.

The proposed MRO requires substantial changes before approval to become consistent with state policies enacted by the General Assembly to guide the Commission in meeting its statutory duties under RC 4928.142 (A) and (B), and (C).

The Commission should reject the Companies rate design that violates state policy by eliminating the availability of Rider ELR, Rider OLR and Rider EDR to GT customers that provide pricing and quality options to meet their needs in receiving reasonable rates to facilitate the state's effectiveness in the global markets. Further, those riders promote economic development and job retentions for the benefit of all Ohio. Those riders should continue in effect after May 31, 2011 through the term of the MRO approved in this case.

OEG witness Baron specific recommendations, before approval of the MRO, rate mitigation to cap GT rate increases at no more than 1.5 times the overall rate increase to further economic development and prevent GT customers from incurring unreasonably increases; continuation of the currently approved ELR (and OLR) riders to provide for interruptible credits and EDR Rider credits; and periodic prudency/performance review of an approved MRO. (*OEG Ex. 1, Baron Test., pg. 3-5)*.

Nucor witness Dr. Goins called for rejection of the MRO without substantial modifications that include promotion of economic development and incentives for customers to manage peak demands and efficiently use energy. *(Nucor Ex. 1, Goins Test., pg. 6-7)* Other recommendations include retention of the current $1.95/kW credit under the ELR Rider and the $8.05 credit under the EDR Rider, an increase to the current credit under Rider OLR, and approval of time-of-use rates as proposed. A cap on annual rate increases for GT (and lighting) customers at 1.5 times system average increases up to a maximum of 5% for mitigation and promotion of economic development is also included in Dr. Groins' recommendations. *(Nucor Ex. 1, Goins Test., pg. 6-8)*.

The current EDR Rider intends to gradually mitigate the substantial increases otherwise incurred by certain large industrial customers because of terminated special rate contracts. (*Companies App. Ex. 1, par. 76 pg. 26; Companies Ex. 4, Fanelli, pg. 10, L. 6-23)*. However, the Companies MRO eliminates the current Rider EDR, including those pertaining to large industrial load interruptible credits, except for continuation of mitigation measures for STL and TRF customers to cap at 5% their annualized increases. (*Companies Ex. 4, Fanelli. pg. 10-11)*.

Strikingly absent the proposed MRO rate design fails to promote economic development and retain jobs in the Ohio FE EDU's service territories. Rather, the Companies request Commission approval to eliminate after May 31, 2011 the successfully tested rate design riders

ELR, OLR, and EDR, and put in place a conceptual, untested RFP bid process with a much narrow focus not intended to continue the presently robust interruptible service options.

Few if any doubts can arise that the current programs structured around riders ELR and OLR, and rider EDR, benefit greatly customers, the Companies, and Ohio's competitiveness through annual peak demand reductions, enhanced system reliability, potentially reduced generation and transmission service cost, mitigated rates through credits received, and Ohio residents employed. *(see Nucor Ex. 1, Goins Test., pg.* 4-5)

The Companies replace their demonstratively successful current interruptible program with a narrow focused RTP process solely for the purpose to meet peak demand reduction benchmarks of RC 4928.66. *(Companies Ex. 5, Paganie, Attachment JEP-1, IV).* No reasonable basis exists to even argue the RFP process provides for the multi-facet benefits now achieved by customers, the Companies, and the state under the current interruptible program provided under the ELR/OLR riders, and Rider EDR *(see Nucor Ex. 1, Goins Test., pg.* 4-5). Critically, those riders expire on May 31, 2011 unless extended voluntarily by the Companies, or ordered . extended by the Commission for approval of a MRO rate design consistent with state policy.

The RFP process provides for interruptions of large commercial and industrial customer loads for which the Companies accepted their bids when needed to meet annually targeted load-reductions, as RC 4928.66 requires, or for system emergencies. *(Companies App. Ex. 1, par. 71, pg. 24; Companies Ex. 5, Paganie, pg. 2, 6-7).* The Companies provide reduction targets that change yearly upon which to request price and quantity bids from willing eligible customers who agree to interrupt their loads when requested during the interruptible periods of the MRO calendar year June 1 through May 31. *(Companies App. Ex. 1, par. 72, pg. 24-25; Companies Ex.*

5, Paganie, Attachment JEP-1). Customers payments are capped by the accepted MWs bided under the RFPs. *(Companies Ex. 5, Paganie, Attachment JEP-1, III).* No actual interruptions need to occur. Compliance with the peak demand reduction requirements suffice, since awarded bids achieve those reduction benchmarks. *(Companies Ex. 5, Paganie, Attachment JEP-1, IV).*

Less interruptible service options is the predictable result from replacing the ELR and OLR interruptible programs with the RFP process with the single goal to achieve statutory compliance without regard to stable rates, reliable service, economic development and job retention. *(see Nucor Ex. 1, Goins Test., pg. 26).* In contrast, the ELR and OLR interruptible programs already provided many broad ranging benefits consistent with state policy that should continue as now approved after May 31, 2011 through the full term of any approve MRO.

The RFP process never intends to replace the current ELR, OLR and EDR riders whose elimination could increase rates approaching over 30% to 50%, or 3 to 14 times 2012 retail average, for the state's largest energy consuming customers. The proposed MRO rate design, without these riders, fail to conform to state policy enumerated by RC 4928.02 that requires offering customers with reasonably priced service, price and quality options from which customer may elect to meet their needs, and for Ohio to effectively compete in the global market.

III. CONCLUSION

The Companies intended elimination of the current ELR rider, OLR rider, and EDR Rider after May 31, 2011 requires rejection of the MRO rate design as inconsistent with state policy. Alternatively, Commission ordered continuation of these riders to GT customers after May 31, 2011 until the end of the approved MRO allows for approval of the MRO rate design consistent with state policies if the Companies comply.

Respectfully Submitted,

Craig I. Smith (0019207)
Attorney at Law
2824 Coventry Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44120
Tel. (216) 561-9410
wis29@yahoo.com

Attorney for Material Sciences Corporation.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing Brief by Materials Science Corporation was served this 8th day of January 2010 by electronic mail upon the persons listed below.

Craig I. Smith

Arthur E. Korkosz
James W. Burk (Counsel of Record)
Mark A. Hayden
Ebony L. Miller
FIRSTENERGY SERVICE COMPANY
76 South Main Street
Akron, Ohio 44308
korkosza@firstenergycorp.com
burkj@firstenergycorp.com
haydenm@firstenergycorp. com
elmiller@firstenergycorp.com

FIRSTENERGY SOLUTIONS
Morgan E. Parke, Esq.
Michael L. Beiting, Esq.
mparke@firstenergycorp.com
beitingm@firstenergycorp.com

James F. Lang
Laura C. McBride
CALFEE, HALTER & GRISWOLD LLP
1400 KeyBank Center
800 Superior Ave
Cleveland, OH 44114
jlang@calfee.com
lmcbride@calfee.com

David A Kutik
Jones Day
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
dakutik@jonesday.com

Jeffrey L. Small (Counsel of Record)
Gregory J. Poulos
Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485
small@occ.state.oh.us
poulos@occ.state.oh.us

Samuel Randazzo (Counsel of Record)
Lisa G. McAlister
Joseph M. Clark
MCNEES WALLACE & NURICK LLC
Fifth Third Center
21 East State Street, 17th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215-4228
sam@mwncmh.com
lmcalister@mwncmh.com
jclark@mwncmh.com

M. Howard Petricoff
Stephen M. Howard
VORYS, SATER, SEYMOUR AND PEASE LLP
52 East Gay Street
P.O. Box 1008
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008
smhoward@vssp.com
mhpetricoff@vssp.com

Cynthia Fonner Brady
Senior Counsel
Constellation Energy Group, Inc.
550 W. Washington St., Suite 300
Chicago, IL 60661
Cynthia.Brady@constellation.com

David I. Fein
Vice President
Constellation Energy Group, Inc.
550 W. Washington St., Suite 300
Chicago, IL 60661
david.fein@constellation.com

David F. Boehm, Esq.
Michael L. Kurtz, Esq.
BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY
36 East Seventh Street
Suite 1510
Cincinnati, OH 45202
dboehm@bkllawfirm.com
mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com

Duane Luckey
Attorney General's Office
Public Utilities Section
180 East Broad Street, 9th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
duane.luckey@puc.state.oh.us

Robert J. Triozzi
Director of Law, City of Cleveland, Ohio
Steven Beeler
Assistant Director of Law, City of Cleveland, Ohio
Cleveland City Hall
601 Lakeside Avenue, Room 106
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
RTriozzi@city.cleveland.oh.us
SBeeler@city.cleveland.oh.us

David C. Rinebolt
Colleen L. Mooney
Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy
231 West Lima Street
P.O. Box 1793
Findlay, OH 45839-1793
drinebolt@aol.com
cmooney2@columbus.rr.com

Glenn S. Krassen
BRICKER & ECKLER LLP
1375 East Ninth Street
Suite 1500
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
GKrassen@Bricker.com

Matthew W. Warnock
BRICKER & ECKLER LLP
100 South Third Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
MWarnock@Bricker.com

Michael K. Lavanga
E-Mail: mkl@bbrslaw.com
Counsel of Record
Garrett A. Stone
E-Mail: gas@bbrslaw.com
Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C.
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
8th Floor, West Tower
Washington, D.C. 20007

Thomas J. O'Brien
BRICKER & ECKLER LLP
100 South Third Street
Columbus, OH 43215-4291
tobrien@bricker.com

Richard L. Sites
General Counsel & Sr. Director of Health Policy
OHIO HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION
155 East Broad Street, 15th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215-3620
ricks@ohanet.org

Michael D. Dortch (0043897)
KRAVITZ, BROWN & DORTCH, LLC
65 East State Street
Suite 200
Columbus, OH 43215
mdortch@fgikravitzllc.com

Lance M. Keiffer
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney
Lucas County Courthouse
700 Adams Street, Suite 250
Toledo, Ohio 43604
lkeiffer @co.lucas.oh.us

Nolan Moser
Will Reisinger
Trent. A. Dougherty
The Ohio Environmental Council
1207 Grandview Avenue, Suite 201
Columbus, Ohio 4321
nmoser@theOEC.org
will@the OEC.org
trent@the OEC.org

Todd M. Williams
Attorney at Law
PO Box 6885
Toledo, Ohio 43612
williams.toddm@gmail.com

Christopher L. Miller
Andre T. Porter
Gregory H. Dunn
Schottenstein Zox & Dunn Co. LPA
250 West Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
cmiller@szd.com
aporter@szd.com
gdunn@szd.com

John W. Bentine, Esq. (0016388)
E-Mail: jbentine@cwslaw.com
Mark S. Yurick, Esq. (0039176)
E-mail: myurick@cwslaw.com
Matthew S. White, Esq. (0082859)
E-mail: mwhite@cwslaw.com
Chester, Willcox & Saxbe LLP
65 East State Street, Suite 1000
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4213

Douglas M. Mancino (0005355)
McDermott Will & Emery LLP
2049 Century Park East
Suite 3800
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3218
dmancino@mwe.com

Gregory K. Lawrence
McDermott Will & Emery LLP
28 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
glawrence@mwe.com

Joseph P. Meissner, Esq.
Matthew D. Vincel, Esq.
The Legal Aid Society of Cleveland
1223 W. 6th Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44113
jpmeissn@lasclev.org
mvincel@lasclev.org

Henry W. Eckhart
50 West Broad Street, #2117
Columbus, Ohio 43215
henryeckhart @aol.com

Theordore J. Robinson
2121 Murrary Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15217
robinson@citizenpower.com

Dane Stinson
Bailey Cavalieri LLC
10 West Broad Street #2100
Columbus, Ohio 43215
dane.stinson@baileycavalieri.com