

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

- - -

In the Matter of the :  
Application of Ohio Power :  
Company and Columbus :  
Southern Power Company :  
for Authority to Merge and: Case No. 10-2376-EL-UNC  
Related Approvals. :

In the Matter of the :  
Application of Columbus :  
Southern Power Company :  
and Ohio Power Company :  
for Authority to Establish:  
a Standard Service Offer : Case No. 11-346-EL-SSO  
Pursuant to \$4928.143, : Case No. 11-348-EL-SSO  
Ohio Rev. Code, in the :  
Form of an Electric :  
Security Plan. :

In the Matter of the :  
Application of Columbus :  
Southern Power Company : Case No. 11-349-EL-AAM  
and Ohio Power Company : Case No. 11-350-EL-AAM  
for Approval of Certain :  
Accounting Authority. :

In the Matter of the :  
Application of Columbus :  
Southern Power Company to : Case No. 10-343-EL-ATA  
Amend its Emergency :  
Curtailement Service :  
Riders. :

In the Matter of the :  
Application of Ohio Power :  
Company to Amend its : Case No. 10-344-EL-ATA  
Emergency Curtailement :  
Service Riders. :

In the Matter of the :  
Commission Review of the :  
Capacity Charges of Ohio : Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC  
Power Company and Columbus:  
Southern Power Company. :

1612

1 In the Matter of the :  
Application of Columbus :  
2 Southern Power Company for:  
Approval of a Mechanism to: Case No. 11-4920-EL-RDR  
3 Recover Deferred Fuel :  
Costs Ordered Under Ohio :  
4 Revised Code 4928.144. :  
:

5 In the Matter of the :  
Application of Ohio Power :  
6 Company for Approval of a :  
Mechanism to Recover : Case No. 11-4921-EL-RDR  
7 Deferred Fuel Costs :  
Ordered Under Ohio Revised:  
8 Code 4928.144. :  
:

9 - - -

10 PROCEEDINGS

11 before Ms. Greta See and Mr. Jonathan Tauber,  
12 Attorney Examiners, at the Public Utilities  
13 Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad Street, Room 11-A,  
14 Columbus, Ohio, called at 10:30 a.m. on Monday,  
15 October 17, 2011.

16 - - -

17 VOLUME IX

18 - - -

19  
20  
21 ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.  
22 222 East Town Street, Second Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201  
23 (614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481  
Fax - (614) 224-5724  
24  
25

- - -

## 1 APPEARANCES:

2 American Electric Power  
3 By Mr. Steven T. Nourse  
4 Mr. Matthew J. Satterwhite  
5 1 Riverside Plaza  
6 Columbus, Ohio 43215-2373

7 Porter, Wright, Morris & Arthur, LLP  
8 By Mr. Daniel R. Conway  
9 41 South High Street  
10 Columbus, Ohio 43215-6194

11 On behalf of the Applicants.

12 FirstEnergy Service Company  
13 By Mr. Mark A. Hayden  
14 76 South Main Street  
15 Akron, Ohio 44308

16 Jones Day  
17 By Mr. David A. Kutik  
18 Ms. Allison Haedt  
19 North Point  
20 901 Lakeside Avenue  
21 Cleveland, Ohio 44114

22 Calfee, Halter & Griswold, LLP  
23 By Mr. James F. Lang  
24 1400 KeyBank Center  
25 800 Superior Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Calfee, Halter & Griswold, LLP  
By Mr. N. Trevor Alexander  
Ms. Laura McBride  
Fifth Third Center  
21 East State Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

On behalf of FirstEnergy Solutions  
Corporation.

- - -

## 1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2 McNeese, Wallace & Nurick, LLC  
3 By Mr. Frank P. Darr  
4 Mr. Samuel P. Randazzo  
5 Mr. Joseph Olier  
6 Ms. Gretchen Hummel  
7 Fifth Third Center, Suite 1700  
8 21 East State Street  
9 Columbus, Ohio 43215-4288

10 On behalf of Industrial Energy Users.

11 Chester, Willcox & Saxbe, LLP  
12 By Mr. Mark S. Yurick  
13 Mr. John Bentine  
14 Mr. Zach Kravitz  
15 65 East State Street, Suite 1000  
16 Columbus, Ohio 43215-4213

17 On behalf of the Kroger Company.

18 Janine L. Migden-Ostrander  
19 Ohio Consumers' Counsel  
20 By Mr. Terry L. Etter  
21 Ms. Maureen R. Grady  
22 Assistant Consumers' Counsel  
23 10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800  
24 Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

25 On behalf of the Residential Ratepayers  
of Columbus Southern Power Company and  
Ohio Power Company.

Mike DeWine, Ohio Attorney General  
By William Wright, Section Chief  
Public Utilities Section  
Mr. Werner L. Margard, III  
Mr. Steven Beeler  
Mr. John Jones  
Mr. Thomas McNamee  
Assistant Attorneys General  
180 East Broad Street, 6th Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793

On behalf of the staff of the Public  
Utilities Commission of Ohio.

- - -

## 1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2 Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy  
3 By Ms. Colleen L. Mooney  
4 Mr. David C. Rinebolt  
231 West Lima Street  
Findlay, Ohio 45840

5 On behalf of Ohio Partners for Affordable  
6 Energy.

7 Schottenstein, Zox & Dunn Co., LPA  
8 By Mr. Christopher L. Miller  
Mr. Gregory J. Dunn  
9 Mr. Asim Z. Haque  
250 West Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

10 On behalf of the Association of  
11 Individual Colleges and Universities,  
City of Hilliard, City of Grove City.

12 Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry  
13 By Mr. David Boehm  
Mr. Michael L. Kurtz  
14 Mr. Kurt Boehm  
36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

15 On behalf of Ohio Energy Group.

16 Ohio Environmental Council  
17 By Mr. Nolan Moser  
Mr. Trent A. Dougherty  
18 1207 Grandview Avenue, Suite 201  
Columbus, Ohio 43212-3449

19 On behalf of the Ohio Environmental  
20 Council.

21 Thompson Hine, LLP  
22 By Mr. Philip B. Sineneng  
Mr. Terrence A. Mebane  
41 South High Street, Suite 1700  
23 Columbus, Ohio 43215

24 On behalf of Duke Energy Retail.  
25

## 1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2 Covington & Burling  
3 By Mr. William Massey  
4 1201 Pennsylvania Avenue  
5 Washington, D.C. 20004

6 On behalf of The Compete Coalition.

7 Ohio Hospital Association  
8 By Mr. Richard L. Sites  
9 155 East Broad Street, 15th Floor  
10 Columbus, Ohio 43215

11 Bricker & Eckler, LLP  
12 By Mr. Thomas J. O'Brien  
13 Mr. Matthew W. Warnock  
14 100 South Third Street  
15 Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291

16 On behalf of Ohio Hospital Association.

17 Bricker & Eckler, LLP  
18 By Ms. Lisa Gatchell McAlister  
19 Mr. Matthew W. Warnock  
20 100 South Third Street  
21 Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291

22 On behalf of Ohio Manufacturers  
23 Association.

24 Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease, LLP  
25 By Ms. Lija Kaleps-Clark  
Mr. M. Howard Petricoff  
Mr. Stephen M. Howard  
Mr. Michael Settineri  
P.O. Box 1008  
52 East Gay Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008

On behalf of Exelon Generation  
Company, LLC, Constellation NewEnergy,  
Inc., Constellation Energy Commodities  
Group, Inc., Retail Energy Supply  
Association, The Compete Coalition,  
PJM Power Providers Group, and Direct  
Energy.

## APPEARANCES: (Continued)

Exelon Generation Company, LLC  
By Ms. Sandy Grace  
101 Constitution Avenue NW  
Washington, D.C. 20001

Eimer, Stahl, Klevorn & Solberg, LLP  
By Mr. David M. Stahl  
Mr. Scott Solberg  
224 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 1100  
Chicago, Illinois 60604

On behalf of Exelon Generation Company,  
LLC.

Mr. Henry W. Eckhart  
1200 Chambers Road, Suite 106  
Columbus, Ohio 43212

On behalf of the Sierra Club and Natural  
Resources Defense Council.

Ohio Poverty Law Center  
By Mr. Joseph V. Maskovyak  
Mr. Michael Smalz  
555 Buttles Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

On behalf of Appalachian Peace and  
Justice Network.

Keating, Muething & Klekamp PLL  
By Mr. Kenneth P. Kreider  
One East Fourth Street, Suite 1400  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Ms. Holly Rachel Smith  
HITT Business Center  
3803 Rectortown Road  
Marshall, VA 20115

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

- - -

## 1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2 Bell & Royer Co., LPA  
3 By Mr. Barth E. Royer  
4 33 South Grant Avenue  
5 Columbus, Ohio 43215

6 On behalf of Dominion Retail, Inc.

7 Bricker & Eckler, LLP  
8 By Mr. Christopher L. Montgomery  
9 Mr. Terrence O'Donnell  
10 100 South Third Street  
11 Columbus, Ohio 43215

12 On behalf of Paulding Wind Farm, II.

13 Environmental Law & Policy Center  
14 By Ms. Tara C. Santarelli  
15 1207 Grandview Avenue, Suite 201  
16 Columbus, Ohio 43212-3449

17 on behalf of the Environmental Law &  
18 Policy Center.

19 SNR Denton US, LLP  
20 By Ms. Emma F. Hand  
21 Mr. Douglas G. Bonner  
22 1301 K Street NW  
23 Suite 600 East Tower  
24 Washington, D.C. 20005

25 On behalf of Ormet Primary Aluminum  
Corporation.

EnerNOC, Inc.  
By Mr. Gregory J. Poulos  
101 Federal Street, Suite 1100  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110

On behalf of EnerNOC.

- - -

1619

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2 Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease, LLP  
3 By Ms. Lija Kaleps-Clark  
4 Ms. Benita A. Kahn  
5 P.O. Box 1008  
6 52 East Gay Street  
7 Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008

8 On behalf of the Cable Telecommunications  
9 Association.

10 - - -  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1620

## INDEX

- - -

Witnesses	Page
C. Todd Jones	
Direct Examination by Mr. Haque	1625
Cross-Examination by Ms. Grady	1631
Cross-Examination by Mr. Olier	1645
Jeffrey Hecker	
Direct Examination by Mr. Margard	1655
Cross-Examination by Mr. Olier	1656
Hisham M. Choueiki, PhD, PE	
Direct Examination by Mr. Margard	1658

- - -

IEU-Ohio Exhibits	Identified	Admitted
11 AICUO's Responses to the IEU-Ohio's Fourth Set of Interrogatories	1647	--

- - -

FES Exhibit	Identified	Admitted
15 (a) STIP-OCC-INT-361	1662	--
15 (b) INT-13-005	1662	--
15 (c) RFA-13-015	1662	--
15 (d) RFA-13-016	1662	--
15 (e) RFA-13-017	1662	--
16 (a) STIP-FES-INT-029	1662	--
16 (b) STIP-FES-INT-17-17-046	1662	--
16 (c) STIP-FES-INT-17-17-047	1662	--
16 (d) STIP-FES-INT-19-034	1662	--
16 (e) STIP-FES-INT-19-037	1662	--

1621

## INDEX (Continued)

- - -

## FES Exhibit Identified Admitted

16 (f) STIP-FES-INT-19-039 1662 --

16 (g) STIP-FES-INT-19-041 1662 --

16 (h) STIP-FES-RFA-21-005 1662 --

16 (i) STIP-IEU-RFA-6.8 1662 --

17 (a) STIP-FES-INT-17-17-043 1662 --

17 (b) STIP-IEU-INT-3-008 1662 --

17 (c) STIP-IEU-INT-6-001 1662 --

- - -

## AICUO Exhibit Identified Admitted

1 Direct Testimony of C. Todd Jones 1627 1651

- - -

## Staff Exhibit Identified Admitted

1 Direct Testimony of Jeffrey Hecker 1654 1657

2 Direct Testimony of Hisham M. Choueiki, PhD, PE 1658 1660

- - -

1622

Monday Morning Session,  
October 17, 2011.

- - -

EXAMINER SEE: Let's go back on the record. Before we proceed I just want clarification from IEU-Ohio that we can proceed with this next witness today.

MR. DARR: Yes, your Honor. We've noted an objection with regard to the current state of the proceedings, however, with regard to the witness on behalf of AICUO, IEU is prepared to go forward this morning and waive with regard to that witness any objection with regard to the current proceeding status.

EXAMINER SEE: Just so the record is clear, we had scheduled to go forward today with C. Todd Jones, Jeffrey Hecker with the staff and Hisham Choueiki also with the staff. And you're not waiving your objection --

MR. DARR: No, ma'am.

EXAMINER SEE: Your objection for proceeding with those witnesses.

MR. DARR: That is correct, ma'am.

EXAMINER SEE: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Haque.

1 MR. HAQUE: Yes, your Honor. On behalf  
2 of the AICUO we'd like to call C. Todd Jones, please.

3 EXAMINER SEE: Before we proceed,  
4 Mr. Jones, let me get brief appearances of the  
5 counsel starting with the company.

6 MR. NOURSE: Thank you, your Honor. On  
7 behalf of the company, Steven T. Nourse, Matthew J.  
8 Satterwhite, and Daniel R. Conway.

9 EXAMINER SEE: On behalf of OCC.

10 MR. ETTER: Good morning, your Honors.  
11 On behalf of Ohio's residential utility customers,  
12 the Office of Ohio Consumers' Counsel, Terry R. Etter  
13 and Maureen R. Grady, Assistant Consumers' Counsel.

14 EXAMINER SEE: FES.

15 MR. HAYDEN: Good morning, your Honor.  
16 On behalf of FES, Mark Hayden, James Lang, Laura  
17 McBride, Trevor Alexander, and David Kutik.

18 MR. HOWARD: Your Honor, on behalf of  
19 Compete Coalition, Constellation NewEnergy,  
20 Constellation Energies Commodity Group, Exelon  
21 Generation Company, PJM Power Providers Group, and  
22 Retail Energy Suppliers Association, please have the  
23 record reflect the appearance of M. Howard Petricoff,  
24 Michael Settineri, Lija Kaleps-Clark and Stephen M.  
25 Howard. Thank you.

1 EXAMINER SEE: On behalf of IEU.

2 MR. OLIKER: On behalf of IEU-Ohio, Sam  
3 Randazzo, Frank Darr, Joe Oliker, and Gretchen  
4 Hummel.

5 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Hand.

6 MS. HAND: On behalf of Ormet Primary  
7 Aluminum Corporation, Emma Hand and Doug Bonner.

8 MR. HAQUE: Your Honor, on behalf of the  
9 Association of Independent Colleges and Universities  
10 of Ohio, Asim Haque, Greg Dunn, and Chris Miller.

11 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. McAlister.

12 MS. McALISTER: On behalf of the OMA  
13 Energy Group, Lisa McAlister and Matt Warnock.

14 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Margard.

15 MR. MARGARD: Thank you, your Honor. On  
16 behalf of the Commission staff, Werner Margard, John  
17 Jones, and Steven Beeler and also show the appearance  
18 today of Thomas McNamee.

19 EXAMINER SEE: Is there any other counsel  
20 present?

21 Mr. Jones, if you could raise your right  
22 hand.

23 (Witness sworn.)

24 EXAMINER SEE: Thank you.

25 Mr. Haque.

1 C. TODD JONES

2 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was  
3 examined and testified as follows:

4 DIRECT EXAMINATION

5 By Mr. Haque:

6 Q. Good morning, Mr. Jones. This is a  
7 hearing regarding a stipulation signed by the AICUO  
8 in the ongoing AEP rate case, did you submit  
9 testimony in support of that stipulation?

10 A. Yes, I did.

11 Q. And do you have that direct testimony  
12 with you today?

13 A. Actually, I left it at my chair.

14 Q. Okay.

15 MR. HAQUE: Your Honor, if you don't  
16 mind.

17 EXAMINER SEE: You can approach.

18 MR. HAQUE: Thank you.

19 Q. Mr. Darr pointed out to me that I did not  
20 ask your name for the record.

21 MR. HAQUE: So I appreciate that,  
22 Mr. Darr.

23 Q. Could you please state your name for the  
24 record?

25 A. Yes. My name is C. Todd Jones.

1           Q.    Okay.  The direct testimony that I've  
2           just presented to you, that was prepared under your  
3           direction?

4           A.    Yes, it was.

5           Q.    And do you have any updates to the direct  
6           testimony?

7           A.    I do.  On page 3, line 11, I would direct  
8           that the phrase "made bypassable" be changed to the  
9           word "eliminated."

10          Q.    Okay.  And why are you making that  
11          revision, Mr. Jones?

12          A.    It's not that the phrase "made  
13          bypassable" was inaccurate but that my understanding,  
14          and I've been advised that the term "eliminated"  
15          would be more consistent with the term of art used in  
16          these type of proceedings.

17          Q.    Thank you, Mr. Jones.

18                Now, if you were asked the same questions  
19          today as you were asked in that direct testimony,  
20          would your answers be the same?

21          A.    Yes, they would.

22                MR. HAQUE:  Your Honor, I would like to  
23          move for the admission of, if I haven't marked the  
24          exhibit, I'm sorry, AICUO Exhibit 1 into the record  
25          subject to any cross-examination.

1 EXAMINER SEE: AICUO Exhibit 1 is so  
2 marked.

3 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

4 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Grady.

5 MS. GRADY: Yes, your Honor, would now be  
6 an appropriate time to hear motions to strike?

7 EXAMINER SEE: Yes.

8 MS. GRADY: Your Honor, OCC would move to  
9 strike portions of Mr. Jones's testimony beginning on  
10 page 3, line 12, the sentence beginning "This should  
11 result in savings to many consumers" and continuing  
12 on through line 14, page 3, ending with "the best  
13 possible rates."

14 EXAMINER SEE: So it's essentially those  
15 two sentences, correct?

16 MS. GRADY: Yes, your Honor. And if I  
17 could briefly explain the basis of our motion.

18 EXAMINER SEE: Yes.

19 MS. GRADY: In response to discovery when  
20 asked about these specific statements AICUO has  
21 indicated that it has conducted no independent  
22 investigation but has relied upon the expertise and  
23 the opinions of others. Mr. Jones did not attend --  
24 furthermore, Mr. Jones did not attend the  
25 negotiations but was merely kept advised by his

1 attorney. The statements should be struck on several  
2 grounds, your Honor.

3 In discovery in response to a request for  
4 admission AICUO stated Mr. Jones is a lay witness and  
5 not an expert, as such his testimony is governed by  
6 Ohio Rules of Evidence 701. That rule states that if  
7 the witness is not testifying as an expert, the  
8 witness's testimony in the form of opinions or  
9 inferences is limited to those opinions and  
10 inferences which are rationally based on the  
11 perception of the witness and helpful to a clear  
12 understanding of the witness's testimony, or the  
13 determination of a fact in issue.

14 This testimony, your Honors, is not  
15 rationally based on the witness's perception nor is  
16 it helpful to a clear understanding of the fact in  
17 issue. On the latter standard, one of the primary  
18 facts in issue in this case is whether the  
19 stipulation will effectuate shopping. The  
20 nonstipulating parties argue that the agreement will  
21 constrain shopping, not effectuate it. Mr. Jones's  
22 assertion based on what his attorney was told by AEP  
23 with respect to the effects of the stipulation on  
24 shopping is not helpful to a clear understanding of  
25 this fact in issue.

1           It is clearly hearsay, and Mr. Jones's  
2 lay opinion on this should be rejected as is not  
3 proper testimony under Rule 701 and is hearsay  
4 consisting of secondhand or thirdhand information or  
5 opinions relayed by Mr. Jones' counsels.

6           Also, under no exception to the hearsay  
7 rule it should be struck. Alternatively, your  
8 Honors, we would ask that the testimony be allowed in  
9 but not for the truth of the matter asserted.

10           MR. OLIKER: Your Honor, IEU-Ohio would  
11 join the motion.

12           EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Haque, did you wish to  
13 respond?

14           MR. HAQUE: Yes, your Honor. Again,  
15 we've dealt with this motion with respect to a  
16 previous witness. Again, the core of this motion is  
17 that essentially Mr. Jones was not in the room during  
18 settlement discussions and deciphering what was  
19 happening here in the stipulation.

20           Again, if Ms. Grady's motion is upheld,  
21 essentially every party other than AEP would be  
22 subject to this ruling that essentially the legal  
23 counsel for all of the parties cannot educate their  
24 respective witnesses with respect to what's happened  
25 in settlement discussions, first of all.

1                   Second of all, Rule 701 is correctly  
2                   stated by Ms. Grady, but it is her opinion that  
3                   Mr. Jones's testimony is not rationally based on the  
4                   perception of the witness or helpful to the clear  
5                   understanding of the witness's testimony.

6                   Mr. Jones's testimony can be given whatever weight  
7                   that the Commission wants to give it or the attorney  
8                   examiners want to give it at the end of the day, so  
9                   that portion of Ms. Grady's motion to strike, again,  
10                  is her opinion.

11                  With respect to hearsay, your Honor,  
12                  hearsay requires an out-of-court statement.  
13                  Mr. Jones at no point says "Asim Haque, my attorney,  
14                  said the following." Mr. Jones was educated about  
15                  the proceedings by his legal counsel, and it's not  
16                  hearsay.

17                  MR. NOURSE: Your Honor, the companies  
18                  would like to join in opposition to the motion. I  
19                  think it's pretty plain that the first sentence  
20                  sought to be struck relates to the riders to be  
21                  eliminated and it certainly is a rational inference  
22                  from an observation of the terms of the stipulation.

23                  The second sentence in and of itself  
24                  contains the observation about the fully competitive  
25                  model of the stipulation's end point and itself

1 contains an observation that that structure will  
2 benefit customers, and I think these are plain and  
3 simple statements and observations based on the  
4 stipulation itself. They're certainly not hearsay.  
5 And the Commission can assess the weight of the  
6 statements.

7 EXAMINER SEE: The motion to strike  
8 Mr. Jones's testimony is denied.

9 According to my notes, the only party  
10 that planned to cross-examine Mr. Jones is OCC.

11 MS. GRADY: Your Honor, OCC did indicate  
12 that it will have cross-examination, yes.

13 EXAMINER SEE: Okay. Proceed, Ms. Grady.

14 MS. GRADY: Thank you.

15 MR. OLIKER: Your Honor, IEU-Ohio also  
16 has cross-examination.

17 EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

18 - - -

19 CROSS-EXAMINATION

20 By Ms. Grady:

21 Q. Good morning, Mr. Jones.

22 A. Good morning.

23 Q. Let's talk for a moment about the  
24 association. The association consists of member  
25 institutions that include colleges within AEP Ohio's

1 service territory; is that correct?

2 A. That is correct.

3 Q. And those members take service under a  
4 variety of schedules from the companies?

5 A. That is correct.

6 Q. They take service from Ohio Power plus  
7 Columbus Southern Power?

8 A. That is my understanding.

9 Q. Is it safe to say that the member  
10 universities do not take service under the  
11 residential rate schedules?

12 A. That, I do not know. Our members have a  
13 variety of operational structures. To the extent  
14 that any of them own residential buildings in the  
15 neighborhood of their campuses, as many of our  
16 colleges do, I am not aware as to whether those are  
17 residential rate or not.

18 Q. Now, AICUO is not aware of how many of  
19 its member colleges are currently shopping; is that a  
20 fair statement?

21 A. That is -- it is correct that I cannot  
22 tell you the number of our colleges that are engaged  
23 in shopping.

24 Q. So you wouldn't know how many of your  
25 members, as of September 7th, 2011, were shopping,

1 would you?

2 A. I cannot offer that information.

3 Q. And, Mr. Jones, AICUO has not analyzed  
4 whether there currently are impediments to shopping  
5 for its members, has it?

6 A. The association has taken advice from  
7 counsel and reviewed information associated with  
8 these proceedings in drawing its conclusions about  
9 shopping as a practice and believes that shopping  
10 will occur.

11 Q. Let me ask you again, Mr. Jones, AICUO  
12 has not analyzed whether there are currently  
13 impediments to shopping for its members.

14 A. I am aware that some of our members have  
15 not engaged in shopping. To what extent that they  
16 would engage in shopping because there are  
17 impediments I do not know so I can't answer your  
18 question.

19 Q. Thank you. Do you know if your members  
20 will receive a shopping credit of \$10 a megawatt-hour  
21 commencing on January 1st, 2012, under the  
22 stipulation?

23 A. I don't recall. That might be accurate,  
24 but I don't specifically recall.

25 Q. Now, let's refer to your testimony at

1 page 3, lines 12 through 15, which still remain, and  
2 you indicate there that the companies are gravitating  
3 to a model that will effectuate shopping. Do you see  
4 that reference?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And you conclude that this will  
7 invariably allow AICUO member colleges to shop more  
8 effectively for the best possible rates. Is that a  
9 fair --

10 A. That is my testimony.

11 Q. Now, that statement reflects the fact  
12 that in settlement discussions AICUO was informed by  
13 AEP Ohio that changes in AEP's business model would  
14 result in more shopping for AEP's current customers;  
15 is that correct?

16 A. That is accurate.

17 Q. And AICUO has no independent knowledge  
18 apart from what it was told by AEP with respect to  
19 whether the changes in AEP's business model will  
20 result in more shopping for AEP's customers; is that  
21 correct?

22 A. I have not had any advice other than from  
23 counsel and that which I gleaned from reading fine  
24 news sources such as Hanna and Gongwer.

25 MS. GRADY: May I approach the witness,

1 your Honor?

2 EXAMINER SEE: Yes.

3 MS. GRADY: Let me withdraw that.

4 EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

5 Q. Mr. Jones, you mentioned that you had had  
6 some information from news sources. Can you explain  
7 what you mean there and what you indicate there?

8 A. Well, I can't say what specific  
9 information I gleaned over time, but since engaging  
10 in these rate proceedings on behalf of the  
11 association I read the statehouse news sources that I  
12 read as any individual who's involved in government  
13 affairs does and so I can't tell you specifically  
14 what I gained from there, but I listened to my  
15 counsel and I read what is reported in the press.

16 Q. So was what is reported in the press,  
17 would that have addressed whether the changes in  
18 AEP's business model would result in more shopping  
19 for AEP's customers?

20 A. It may have. I don't specifically  
21 recall.

22 Q. And you don't recall specifically what  
23 information that was or what news source that was?

24 A. No.

25 Q. Or the date of that news source?

1           A.    Again, I was merely adding to your  
2   comment that when you asked whether specifically I  
3   was listening to counsel or exclusively listening to  
4   counsel and I said "no." I utilized other sources to  
5   draw information.

6           Q.    Now, you do not have independent  
7   information on how the stipulation will result in  
8   more shopping for the members of the AICUO, do you?

9           A.    I do not have.

10          Q.    And so you have not independently  
11   confirmed that the stipulation will invariably allow  
12   AICUO member colleges to shop more effectively for  
13   the best possible rates; is that correct?

14          A.    I would dispute that statement. I view  
15   independent information as being information I've  
16   gleaned from multiple sources so I would ask to --  
17   ask what your definition of "independent information"  
18   is.

19          Q.    What information do you have that you  
20   rely on for the basis of the statement that the  
21   stipulation will invariably allow AICUO member  
22   colleges to shop more effectively for the best  
23   possible rates?

24          A.    If you work from the premise that there  
25   is going to be more shopping, I subscribe to the

1     basic principles of economics that greater access to  
2     pricing information, to transparency of market  
3     processes, and potentially increased numbers of  
4     suppliers will inevitably lead to more competitive  
5     and transparent rates for any product or service.

6           Q.     Now, when you began that answer, you said  
7     "if you work from the premise that there will be more  
8     shopping." Is that correct?

9           A.     In my statement I said that the companies  
10    are gravitating toward a model that will effectuate  
11    shopping. My statement was meant to mirror that  
12    statement.

13          Q.     And the fact that you believe or the  
14    premise that there will be more shopping you're  
15    relying upon the company.

16          A.     No, I did not say that. I'm relying on  
17    advice of counsel who were participating in  
18    proceedings who gleaned their opinion, as I  
19    understand, from the experts who testified as part of  
20    the proceedings, from other information gained in the  
21    proceedings, from materials from the company, and  
22    from other news sources that I follow in the course  
23    of doing what I do.

24          Q.     So that information was also gleaned in  
25    the settlement discussions; is that correct?

1           A.    Well, I can't tell you from where it was  
2 gleaned. This is only a small part of my job, so I  
3 don't -- I'm a lay witness, I have general  
4 recollections about such matters.

5           Q.    Do you understand the RPM set-aside  
6 concept as set forth in the stipulation?

7           A.    I believe I have an understanding of it.  
8 It depends upon the depth of specificity into which  
9 you wish to probe.

10          Q.    Do you understand how the allocation of  
11 RPM capacity will affect the member colleges?

12          A.    I'm not sure I can give you specific  
13 information to explain it.

14          Q.    Do you know what customer group the  
15 members of AICUO would fall under?

16          A.    I would have to look back at my records.  
17 I know they fall currently in a variety of customer  
18 groups.

19          Q.    Now, you testify that some of the riders  
20 that were previously nonbypassable in the original  
21 SSO application have now been eliminated.

22          A.    That is correct.

23          Q.    And that's page 3 of your testimony,  
24 lines 9 through 11.

25          A.    The section that I recently asked to be

1 changed, that's correct.

2 Q. Yes. Do you know if evaluations have  
3 been assigned to all the riders that are part of the  
4 stipulation?

5 A. No. My statement was more one of an  
6 aggregate analysis of market pricing under any  
7 economic system, that if you have additional riders  
8 in a system like -- in a regulated system like this,  
9 you are likely to have, I won't call them price  
10 distortions, but lack of predictability and  
11 transparency pricing.

12 Q. And are you familiar with the current  
13 riders that have no value assigned to them under the  
14 stipulation such as the generation resource rider and  
15 the pool termination rider?

16 A. I'm aware that there are riders, but I  
17 can't tell you specifically about them.

18 Q. Now, you testify on page 2 -- let me  
19 strike that.

20 You testify on page 3, lines 7 through  
21 10, that definitive evaluations have now been  
22 assigned to riders such that consumers from each  
23 customer class should now have a better understanding  
24 of the rates to be paid. Do you see that reference?

25 A. I do.

1           Q.    Would you agree with me that your  
2   understanding of the rates to be paid over the life  
3   of the SSO for the member colleges was gained by  
4   relying on and accepting the opinions of those  
5   involved in the negotiations?

6           A.    No.  I'm sorry, I can't make that  
7   statement.  The position of AICUO vis-a-vis its  
8   colleges was gained through information from the  
9   proceedings, analysis of those who participated in  
10  the proceedings, and advice of counsel, and, again,  
11  my understanding of the case from larger media  
12  reports.

13               MS. GRADY:  May I approach the witness,  
14  your Honor?

15               EXAMINER SEE:  Yes.

16           A.    And, I should say, general conversations  
17  I've had with my member institutions.

18               MR. HAQUE:  I'm going to object to this,  
19  your Honor.  I'd like to know the basis or the  
20  evidentiary foundation for what Ms. Grady is  
21  attempting to do which is essentially have Mr. Jones  
22  read an interrogatory and response that were prepared  
23  by counsel, under what evidentiary basis she can do  
24  that.

25               EXAMINER SEE:  You're inquiring of me --

1641

1 MR. HAQUE: No, I'm objecting because I'd  
2 like to know the evidentiary foundation for what's  
3 about to occur.

4 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Grady.

5 MS. GRADY: Yes, your Honor. I was going  
6 to go through the response to Interrogatory No. 7  
7 supplemental response for impeachment purposes.

8 EXAMINER SEE: The objection is --

9 MR. HAQUE: Can I just note one thing?

10 EXAMINER SEE: Yes.

11 MR. HAQUE: Rule 613 requires that the  
12 impeachment be a witness's previous statement. That  
13 interrogatory clearly states it was prepared by  
14 counsel. If the OCC would have deposed Mr. Jones, we  
15 might have created a statement where he could have  
16 been impeached, but that did not occur here.

17 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Jones, are you aware  
18 of the interrogatories that were prepared by your  
19 counsel?

20 THE WITNESS: I'm aware we had  
21 interrogatories prepared.

22 EXAMINER SEE: Did you prepare any of  
23 them?

24 THE WITNESS: Excuse me, ma'am?

25 EXAMINER SEE: Did you respond to any of

1       them?

2                   THE WITNESS:  No, I did not draft any of  
3       them.  No.

4                   EXAMINER SEE:  Ms. Grady.

5                   MS. GRADY:  Yes, your Honor.

6                   EXAMINER SEE:  Proceed.

7               Q.     (By Ms. Grady) Mr. Jones, I'm going to  
8       show you supplemental response, the Association of  
9       Independent Colleges and Universities of Ohio  
10      Supplemental Responses to the First Set of  
11      Interrogatories and Request for Admission, and I'm  
12      going to read Interrogatory No. 7, the question and  
13      the response, and I'm going to ask you if I'm  
14      correctly reading that into the record.

15                   Interrogatory 7, "Please provide the  
16      AICUO's understanding of the rates to be paid for the  
17      life of the company's SSO for member colleges of  
18      AICUO as referenced in Witness Jones's testimony at  
19      page 3, lines 8 through 9."  Did I read that  
20      correctly?

21               A.     You have recited what is on the page  
22      before me.

23               Q.     Response:  "Objection, see general  
24      objections.  AICUO further objects in that this  
25      interrogatory seeks information that is confidential

1 and is protected by the attorney-client privilege,  
2 subject to and without waiving the foregoing AICUO's  
3 understanding of the rates to be paid for the life of  
4 the company's SSO for residential customers is that  
5 the rates will be better than those rates initially  
6 proposed by AEP in its ESP.

7 "AICUO derived its understanding through  
8 its participation in the general settlement  
9 discussions regarding the stipulation and AICUO  
10 relied upon the expertise and the calculations of the  
11 PUCO staff, the AEP staff, and a number of  
12 participating parties in drawing its conclusions as  
13 to residential rates.

14 "AICUO did not commission an independent  
15 expert analysis in association with the stipulation.  
16 Furthermore, the stipulation and the appendices  
17 attached to the stipulation speak for themselves."

18 Did I read that correctly?

19 A. You accurately and enthusiastically read  
20 that.

21 Q. Thank you.

22 Now, Mr. Jones, you have not evaluated,  
23 have you, whether the stipulation meets the  
24 three-prong standard?

25 A. I have not.

1           Q.    Do you know what the three-prong standard  
2    is?

3           A.    I was able to give you that response  
4    because I'm not aware of what the three-prong  
5    standard is.

6           Q.    And you consider yourself a lay witness  
7    in this proceeding; is that correct?

8           A.    That is correct.

9           Q.    Now, you are not providing expert  
10   testimony on whether the settlement is a product of  
11   serious bargaining among capable and knowledgeable  
12   parties, are you?

13          A.    Not that I'm aware of.

14          Q.    And you are not providing expert  
15   testimony to address whether the settlement as a  
16   package benefits ratepayers and the public interest.

17          A.    As a lay witness I'm not providing expert  
18   testimony, and as a representative of AICUO I am only  
19   here to speak on the impact on my member colleges.

20          Q.    Thank you.

21                And you are not providing expert  
22   testimony to address whether the settlement as a  
23   package violates any important regulatory principle  
24   or practice, are you?

25          A.    Well, I am not testifying as an expert

1645

1 witness, so as a threshold matter I can't get to the  
2 latter part of your question.

3 MS. GRADY: Thank you very much,  
4 Mr. Jones.

5 That's all the questions I have, your  
6 Honor.

7 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Darr? Mr. Oliker?

8 MR. OLIKER: One minute, your Honor,  
9 please.

10 - - -

11 CROSS-EXAMINATION

12 By Mr. Oliker:

13 Q. Good morning, Mr. Jones.

14 A. Good morning.

15 Q. I'll try to be as brief as possible. I  
16 think you briefly talked to Ms. Grady about the RPM  
17 set-aside for capacity in the stipulation.

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. When you authorized your counsel to sign  
20 the stipulation on September 7th, were you aware that  
21 the amount of megawatt-hours that had been allocated  
22 to the commercial class had been exceeded?

23 A. I may or may not have. I don't  
24 specifically recall a discussion on that matter.

25 MR. OLIKER: May I approach, your Honor?

1 EXAMINER SEE: Yes.

2 MR. HAQUE: I'm going to renew my  
3 objection, presenting a discovery response prepared  
4 by legal counsel that are not the statements of  
5 Mr. Jones for impeachment purposes. For impeachment  
6 purposes they are improper under Rule 613.

7 MR. NOURSE: The companies join the  
8 objection. There's no foundation for doing so.

9 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Haque, I'm going to  
10 need you to speak up.

11 MR. HAQUE: Thank you.

12 MR. OLIKER: Your Honor, I have a  
13 response in a second once I pass these out.

14 Your Honor, first, I would state that  
15 these are requests for admissions which are  
16 conclusively established against the party for the  
17 proceeding. Additionally, I would also highlight  
18 that Mr. Jones most likely authorized counsel to  
19 respond to these interrogatories. And he also said  
20 he is familiar with them.

21 And particularly I was talking about  
22 request for admission 4-7.

23 MR. NOURSE: Your Honor, I'm not sure I  
24 heard Mr. Olikier correctly, but I'm not aware of  
25 anything in the record where this witness indicated

1 his familiarity with these questions and these  
2 responses.

3 MR. OLIKER: I can ask him if you would  
4 like me to, your Honor.

5 EXAMINER SEE: Go ahead, Mr. Oliker.

6 MR. OLIKER: Proceed?

7 EXAMINER SEE: Proceed. Go ahead.

8 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

9 Q. (By Mr. Oliker) Mr. Jones, earlier you  
10 mentioned that you viewed the interrogatory  
11 responses. Did you also view the interrogatories  
12 that were served on the AICUO by the Industrial  
13 Energy Users of Ohio?

14 MR. HAQUE: Objection. That's a  
15 mischaracterization of the testimony, your Honor. He  
16 did not say he had viewed the interrogatories, he  
17 said -- he did not say that he had reviewed the  
18 interrogatories.

19 EXAMINER SEE: Rephrase, Mr. Oliker.

20 Q. Mr. Jones, you are familiar that  
21 interrogatories were served on the AICUO; is that  
22 true?

23 A. I'm familiar that we've had  
24 interrogatories served on us on multiple occasions.

25 Q. And did you authorize counsel to respond

1 on behalf of AICUO?

2 A. I have authorized counsel to respond to  
3 all interrogatories to which counsel has responded  
4 to.

5 Q. So his statements would reflect the views  
6 of the AICUO; is that correct?

7 A. The responses of counsel to  
8 interrogatories to AICUO are made on behalf of AICUO.

9 Q. Thank you.

10 And do you see what is in front of you  
11 that I marked as IEU-Ohio Exhibit 11?

12 A. What page are you on?

13 Q. I'm on page No. 4 which is a Request for  
14 Admissions, Fourth Set.

15 A. 4-7.

16 Q. That's correct.

17 A. That which you previously mentioned?  
18 Yes, I see that on the page before me.

19 MR. HAQUE: Your Honor, before we get  
20 into what I believe the next question will be, I  
21 don't think that there's been an official response  
22 from the Bench as to whether or not Mr. Olikar can  
23 question Mr. Jones as to the discovery that he's  
24 currently looking at that Mr. Jones has in front of  
25 him.

1 EXAMINER SEE: After going back and  
2 looking at the transcript, the Bench realizes that  
3 Mr. Jones responded that he was only aware of them  
4 and that he had not reviewed them.

5 MR. OLIKER: Your Honor, he authorized  
6 counsel to respond on behalf of AICUO --

7 MR. HAQUE: Yes, your Honor, but --

8 MR. OLIKER: -- in its submission.

9 MR. HAQUE: Yes, your Honor, but if this  
10 is under Evidence Rule 613 meant to impeach Mr. Jones  
11 it has to be a statement made by Mr. Jones.

12 MR. KUTIK: Your Honor, may I speak in  
13 opposition to the objection?

14 EXAMINER SEE: I'm sorry, Mr. Kutik?

15 MR. KUTIK: I'd like to speak in  
16 opposition to the objection. Your Honor, may I?

17 EXAMINER SEE: Go ahead.

18 MR. KUTIK: Commission's Rule  
19 4901-1-21(D) say that -- I'm sorry, 4901-1-22(D) says  
20 "Unless otherwise ordered by the Commission, the  
21 legal director, the deputy legal director, or the  
22 attorney examiner, any matter admitted under this  
23 rule is conclusively established against the party  
24 making the admission."

25 So this may be used for any purpose

1650

1 whether the witness was aware or not. He's a party,  
2 the party made the admission, it's proper.

3 MR. HAQUE: Your Honor, was that last  
4 piece read by Mr. Kutik, was that text from the rule  
5 or is that just --

6 MR. KUTIK: That's text from the rule.

7 EXAMINER SEE: The objection is  
8 overruled. Go ahead, Mr. Oliker.

9 Q. (By Mr. Oliker) Mr. Jones, I'm going to  
10 read to you 4-7, page 4. "Admit that on  
11 September 7th, 2011, You did not have information  
12 that the megawatt hours awarded for the commercial  
13 class as described under Appendix C of the  
14 Stipulation exceeded the pro rata allocation of the  
15 RPM set aside of 3,033,479 megawatt hours." And your  
16 response was "Admit."

17 MR. NOURSE: Your Honor, I object. I  
18 don't think Mr. Oliker read the question correctly as  
19 it appears in the document.

20 EXAMINER SEE: And I would agree with  
21 you. The objection is sustained.

22 MR. OLIKER: Can I have one minute, your  
23 Honor?

24 EXAMINER SEE: Yes.

25 Mr. Oliker, are you ready to proceed?

1 MR. OLIKER: I have no more questions,  
2 your Honor.

3 EXAMINER SEE: Any other party have  
4 cross-examination for this witness?

5 (No response.)

6 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Haque.

7 MR. HAQUE: No redirect, your Honor. We,  
8 again, ask to have admitted into the record AICUO  
9 Exhibit No. 1.

10 EXAMINER SEE: Are there any objections  
11 to AICUO Exhibit 1?

12 MS. GRADY: Your Honor, note our  
13 continuing objection based on our motion to strike.

14 EXAMINER SEE: Your objection is so  
15 noted.

16 MR. OLIKER: IEU-Ohio joins, your Honor.

17 EXAMINER SEE: Noted. If there are no  
18 other objections, AICUO Exhibit 1 is admitted into  
19 the record.

20 MR. HAQUE: Thank you, your Honor.

21 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

22 EXAMINER SEE: Thank you, Mr. Jones.

23 THE WITNESS: Thank you, ma'am.

24 EXAMINER SEE: With that, we're going to  
25 adjourn the hearing until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

1652

1 Thank you.

2 (Thereupon, at 11:35 a.m., a lunch recess  
3 was taken.)

4 - - -

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1653

1 Monday Afternoon Session,  
2 October 17, 2011.

3 - - -

4 EXAMINER SEE: Let's go back on the  
5 record. Throughout this proceeding we have followed  
6 the process that witnesses in support of the  
7 stipulation are crossed by those that have opposed  
8 the stipulation and there has not been an opportunity  
9 for what we referred to earlier as friendly cross.

10 Earlier this morning IEU voiced an  
11 objection to continuing the hearing as to the  
12 remaining witnesses which are only staff witnesses.  
13 Scheduled for today were Jeffrey Hecker and Hisham  
14 Choueiki. Over IEU's objection on the basis that  
15 only parties opposing the stipulation are going to be  
16 cross-examining staff witnesses we're going to  
17 continue with the testimony of Mr. Hecker and  
18 Mr. Choueiki.

19 So with that, Mr. Margard.

20 MR. MARGARD: Thank you, your Honors.  
21 Staff would call Mr. Jeffrey Hecker to the stand,  
22 please.

23 MR. DARR: Just note that we still need  
24 to resolve the issue with regard to Mr. Murray's  
25 testimony as well.

1 EXAMINER SEE: We're not continuing with  
2 Mr. Murray's testimony until further notice. The  
3 ruling that I just made as far as continuing the  
4 hearing is only as to the staff witnesses which will  
5 include Hecker, Choueiki, and tomorrow Fortney and  
6 Johnson.

7 MR. DARR: And we've already provided for  
8 the record our objection at this point. Thank you.

9 EXAMINER SEE: Yes.

10 Mr. Hecker, if you could raise your right  
11 hand.

12 (Witness sworn.)

13 EXAMINER SEE: Thank you.

14 Mr. Margard.

15 MR. MARGARD: Your Honor, if you please,  
16 I would like to ask that Mr. Hecker's prefiled  
17 testimony filed in this matter on August 4th of 2011  
18 be marked for purposes of identification as Staff  
19 Exhibit No. 1.

20 EXAMINER SEE: The exhibit is so marked.

21 MR. MARGARD: Thank you, your Honor.

22 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

23 - - -

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

JEFFREY HECKER

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

By Mr. Margard:

Q. Please state your name, Mr. Hecker.

A. Jeffrey Hecker.

Q. And by whom are you employed?

A. The Public Utilities Commission.

Q. Mr. Hecker, do you have before you what's  
been marked as Staff Exhibit No. 1?

A. Yes.

Q. What is that document, please?

A. It's my prefiled testimony.

Q. This is testimony that you prepared or  
was prepared at your direction?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you have any changes, corrections,  
modifications of any sort to this testimony?

A. No, sir.

Q. Mr. Hecker, if I were to ask you the same  
questions as are posed in this exhibit, would your  
answers today be the same?

A. Yes.

MR. MARGARD: Your Honor, I respectfully

1656

1 move for admission of Staff Exhibit No. 1 subject to  
2 cross-examination and tender the witness for that  
3 purpose.

4 EXAMINER SEE: Okay. Earlier the only  
5 party thus far that indicated they had some  
6 cross-examination for Mr. Hecker was IEU.

7 Mr. Olikar?

8 MR. OLIKER: That's correct, your Honor.

9 EXAMINER SEE: Go ahead.

10 - - -

11 CROSS-EXAMINATION

12 By Mr. Olikar:

13 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Hecker.

14 A. Good afternoon.

15 Q. In your testimony you support the  
16 company's storm damage recovery mechanism; is that  
17 true?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Did you perform any analysis regarding  
20 the current liability of AEP Ohio's distribution  
21 system?

22 A. No, I did not.

23 Q. And did you assess the effect of the  
24 storm damage recovery mechanism approved by the  
25 Commission on future reliability?

1           A.    No, sir.

2           Q.    Did you perform any assessment of whether  
3 customers' expectations and AEP Ohio's expectations  
4 are aligned?

5           A.    No, sir.

6           MR. OLIKER:  That's all I have, your  
7 Honor.

8           EXAMINER SEE:  Did any other party have  
9 cross-examination for Mr. Hecker?

10           (No response.)

11           EXAMINER SEE:  Thank you, Mr. Hecker.

12           MR. MARGARD:  Your Honor, I renew my  
13 motion for admission of Staff Exhibit No. 1.

14           EXAMINER SEE:  Are there any objections  
15 to the admission of Staff Exhibit 1?

16           (No response.)

17           EXAMINER SEE:  Hearing none, Staff  
18 Exhibit 1 is admitted into the record.

19           (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

20           MR. MARGARD:  Your Honor, staff would now  
21 like to call Dr. Hisham Choueiki to the stand,  
22 please.

23           EXAMINER SEE:  Dr. Choueiki, if you would  
24 raise your right hand.

25           (Witness sworn.)

1 EXAMINER SEE: Thank you.

2 MR. MARGARD: Your Honor, I respectfully  
3 request that the prefiled testimony of Hisham  
4 Choueiki filed in this matter on August 4th of 2011  
5 be marked for purposes of identification as Staff  
6 Exhibit No. 2.

7 EXAMINER SEE: The exhibit is so marked.

8 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

9 - - -

10 HISHAM M. CHOUEIKI, PhD, PE  
11 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was  
12 examined and testified as follows:

13 DIRECT EXAMINATION

14 By Mr. Margard:

15 Q. Would you please state your name.

16 A. Hisham M. Choueiki.

17 Q. And by whom are you employed?

18 A. The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.

19 Q. Dr. Choueiki, you have before you what  
20 has been marked for purposes of identification as  
21 Staff Exhibit No. 2?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Can you identify that document for us,  
24 please?

25 A. It's my prefiled testimony.

1           Q.    Was this prepared by you or at your  
2   direction?

3           A.    Yes.

4           Q.    Since the filing of this testimony do you  
5   have any changes, corrections, additions,  
6   modifications of any sort?

7           A.    No.

8           Q.    And, Dr. Choueiki, if I were to ask you  
9   the same questions as are posed in this exhibit,  
10   would your responses today be the same?

11          A.    Yes.

12               MR. MARGARD:  Your Honor, I respectfully  
13   move for the admission of Staff Exhibit No. 2 subject  
14   to cross-examination and tender the witness for that  
15   purpose.

16               EXAMINER SEE:  Okay.  Does Ormet have any  
17   questions for this witness?

18               MS. HAND:  No, your Honor.

19               EXAMINER SEE:  IEU?

20               MR. OLIKER:  No, your Honor.

21               EXAMINER SEE:  FES?

22               MR. HAYDEN:  No questions.

23               EXAMINER SEE:  APJN?

24               MR. MASKOVYAK:  No questions, your Honor.

25               EXAMINER SEE:  OCC?

1 MR. ETTER: No questions.

2 EXAMINER SEE: Is there any other party  
3 opposing the stipulation that has cross for this  
4 witness?

5 (No response.)

6 EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

7 MR. MARGARD: In that event, your Honor,  
8 I respectfully renew my motion for the admission of  
9 Dr. Choueiki's testimony.

10 EXAMINER SEE: Are there any objections  
11 to the admission of Staff Exhibit 2?

12 (No response.)

13 EXAMINER SEE: Hearing none, Staff  
14 Exhibit 2 is admitted into the record.

15 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

16 EXAMINER SEE: Thank you, Dr. Choueiki.

17 THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.

18 MR. KUTIK: Your Honor.

19 EXAMINER SEE: Yes.

20 MR. KUTIK: At this time FES would seek  
21 to admit certain documents as exhibits into the  
22 record. These documents are discovery responses.  
23 May I approach?

24 EXAMINER SEE: The Bench?

25 MR. KUTIK: Yes.

1 EXAMINER SEE: Yes, let's see what you  
2 have.

3 MR. KUTIK: Your Honor, if I could  
4 identify these and mark them for the record.

5 EXAMINER SEE: Yes.

6 MR. KUTIK: Your Honor, we propose three  
7 sets of exhibits. First, as Exhibit FES 15(a), (b),  
8 (c), (d), and (e), we would have marked as follows:  
9 Stipulation -- the Response to Stipulation OCC  
10 Interrogatory 16-361 we've marked as FES Exhibit  
11 15(a); Response to FES Request for Admission 13-005  
12 we've marked as FES Exhibit 15(b); Response to FES  
13 Request for Admission 13-015 would be marked as FES  
14 Exhibit 15(c); the Response to FES Request for  
15 Admission 13-016 would be marked as FES Exhibit  
16 15(d); and the Response to FES Request for Admission  
17 13-017 would be marked as Exhibit 15(e).

18 With respect to the series that we've  
19 marked as Exhibit -- or we'd like to have marked as  
20 Exhibit 16(a) through (i) there will be as follows:  
21 The Response to FES Interrogatory 17-029 would be  
22 marked Exhibit 16(a); the Response to FES  
23 Interrogatory 17-046 would be marked 17(b).

24 MR. CONWAY: 16(b)?

25 MR. KUTIK: 16(b), excuse me. The

1 Response to FES 17-047 would be marked 16(c); the  
2 Response to FES Interrogatory 19-034 would be marked  
3 16(d); the Response to FES Interrogatory 19-037 would  
4 be marked 16(e); the Response to FES Interrogatory  
5 19-039 would be marked as 16(f); the Response to FES  
6 Interrogatory 19-041 would be marked as 16(g); the  
7 Response to Stipulation FES Request for Admission  
8 21-005 would be marked as 16(h); and the Response to  
9 Stipulation IEU Request for Admission 6-008 would be  
10 marked as 16(i).

11 We'd also like to have marked as Exhibit  
12 17(a) through (d) the following: The Response to  
13 Stipulation FES Interrogatory 17-043 will be marked  
14 as 17(a); the Response to IEU Request for Admission  
15 3-008 would be marked as 17(b); and the response to  
16 Stipulation IEU Interrogatory 6-001 will be marked as  
17 17(c).

18 (EXHIBITS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

19 MR. KUTIK: Your Honor, as we noted  
20 earlier today, the interrogatories are statements  
21 under oath and these documents, and case law in Ohio  
22 is clear, interrogatories may be used and may be  
23 treated as statements under oath as if a witness were  
24 on the stand. With respect to requests for  
25 admission, as was earlier pointed out today, requests

1 for admission are conclusive admissions by a party  
2 and all of these have been made and responses by  
3 AEP Ohio with respect to matters at issue in this  
4 case.

5 With respect to the exhibits that have  
6 been marked as Exhibits 15(a) through (e), they all  
7 relate to rider GRR and the Turning Point project  
8 involved in that case. We believe that these  
9 requests for admissions are relevant to our argument  
10 that AEP and the signatory parties have not met their  
11 burden to show that even in the future a project such  
12 as the Turning Point project would be appropriate  
13 subject for a rider under Section 4928.143.

14 With respect to Exhibit 16(a) through  
15 (i), those interrogatories and requests for  
16 admissions have to deal with Appendix C to the  
17 stipulation as well as the detailed implementation  
18 plan. We believe that those interrogatory and  
19 request for admission responses are relevant to our  
20 argument that the rules themselves are incomplete and  
21 confusing and, therefore, do not serve the public  
22 interest, among other reasons.

23 With respect to the request for the  
24 exhibits that we've marked as Exhibits (a) through  
25 (c), these relate to the issue of AEP's pool

1 termination and corporate separation, and  
2 specifically with respect to what and what not AEP is  
3 committing to with respect to the stipulation.

4 So, your Honor, we believe that these  
5 documents are independently admissible, that is  
6 independent of a witness, and we also believe they're  
7 relevant, there can be really no question about their  
8 authenticity and, therefore, we move their admission.

9 MR. NOURSE: Your Honor, may I respond?

10 EXAMINER SEE: Yes.

11 MR. NOURSE: First of all, we have not  
12 seen these or counsel did not attempt to work out any  
13 kind of stipulation, so we would like the opportunity  
14 to review them. We have not seen that these are the  
15 particular, out of the thousands of questions we got  
16 in discovery, that these are the ones that were  
17 selected for putting in the record.

18 But I think it's the practice at the  
19 Commission the parties use discovery responses and  
20 they attach them to testimony where they're making  
21 certain points or relying on certain responses,  
22 they're also used in cross-examination and in context  
23 and the witness has an opportunity to respond and  
24 explain the context of answers they were responsible  
25 for, in addition to typically stating whether they

1665

1 still believe it applies in the context for which  
2 it's being used, either in testimony subject to cross  
3 or through cross where the witness is available to  
4 explain that context.

5 So I don't have any objection to the ones  
6 that are in here that are prepared by counsel. I  
7 don't have any objection to the ones that are  
8 admissions. But the interrogatories that relate to  
9 particular witnesses that have already come and  
10 testified and been subject to cross-examination could  
11 easily have been asked about these in a way that  
12 they're being sought to be used. I think it's  
13 inappropriate to wait until the witness leaves the  
14 stand and then just try to dump them in the record on  
15 that basis.

16 MR. KUTIK: Your Honor, may I respond?

17 EXAMINER SEE: Yes.

18 MR. KUTIK: Your Honor, I guess the  
19 Commission's practice is what you're used to. I can  
20 cite cases I've been in where interrogatories and  
21 requests for admission have come in independently, so  
22 I would assert that the Commission practice is as  
23 I've done it. It's also the practice in front of  
24 every court I've had the privilege of trying a case  
25 in.

1           With respect to the issue of I suppose  
2           unfairness, these are certainly admissions of the  
3           party. They are admissions of particular witnesses,  
4           as Mr. Nourse would have it. To the extent that  
5           these witnesses have made statements that are against  
6           the interests of AEP or need further explanation,  
7           well, that's grist for rebuttal testimony. This is  
8           being offered as part of our case. We don't have to  
9           wait to put these admissions in as part of their  
10          case, and if as part of their rebuttal case they want  
11          to explain their interrogatory answers, well, they  
12          are free to do that.

13               MR. NOURSE: Your Honor, again, to the  
14          extent that we've not had an opportunity to review  
15          these, one, and if counsel had raised them with us,  
16          we might have already addressed this, there may be  
17          other discovery responses that would also be  
18          appropriate to enter at the same time and perhaps, if  
19          that were the case, there wouldn't be any objection.  
20          But again, we're not quibbling or opposing the  
21          admission so that's not an issue, and the requests,  
22          there's a few in here prepared by counsel, but my  
23          argument and my objection went to the witnesses that  
24          have been appearing already in this hearing and now  
25          that they're gone, this issue is being raised.

1                   EXAMINER SEE: The Bench will further  
2 consider the motions to admit FES Exhibits 15, 16,  
3 and 17 and address it tomorrow morning, that will  
4 give AEP time to go through, make whatever issues  
5 specifically to each exhibit for which they have  
6 requested admission.

7                   MR. NOURSE: Thank you, your Honor.

8                   EXAMINER SEE: With that, we will start  
9 with Witnesses Fortney and Johnson tomorrow morning,  
10 in that order. We'll convene tomorrow at --

11                  MR. MARGARD: Your Honor, can we go off  
12 the record just a moment?

13                  EXAMINER SEE: Yes.

14                  (Discussion off the record.)

15                  EXAMINER SEE: Let's go back on the  
16 record. In an effort to accommodate the parties  
17 we'll start at 8:45.

18                  MR. HAYDEN: Thank you, your Honor.

19                  EXAMINER SEE: Was there something else,  
20 Mr. Hayden?

21                  MR. HAYDEN: Yeah, there's something  
22 else. We can go off.

23                  EXAMINER SEE: Let's go off the record.

24                  (Discussion off the record.)

25                  EXAMINER SEE: We're adjourned for the

1668

1 day until 8:45 tomorrow.

2 (Theeupon, the hearing was adjourned at  
3 2:42 p.m.)

4 - - -

5 CERTIFICATE

6 I do hereby certify that the foregoing is  
7 a true and correct transcript of the proceedings  
8 taken by me in this matter on Monday, October 17,  
9 2011, and carefully compared with my original  
10 stenographic notes.

11  
12 Maria DiPaolo Jones, Registered  
13 Diplomate Reporter and CRR and  
14 Notary Public in and for the  
State of Ohio.

15 My commission expires June 19, 2016.

16 (MDJ-3909)

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

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities**

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**10/28/2011 10:01:00 AM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 10-2376-EL-UNC, 11-0346-EL-SSO, 11-0348-EL-SSO, 11-0349-EL-AAM, 11-0350-EL-AAM**

Summary: Transcript Transcript of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company hearing held on 10/17/11 - Vol IX electronically filed by Mrs. Jennifer Duffer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Jones, Maria DiPaolo Mrs.