

FILE

SNR DENTON 

SNR Denton US LLP  
1301 K Street, NW  
Suite 600, East Tower  
Washington, DC 20005-3364 USA

Emma F. Hand  
Partner  
emma.hand@snrdenton.com  
D +1 202 408 7094  
T +1 202 408 6400  
F +1 202 408 6399  
snrdenton.com

25

January 30, 2012

BY FACSIMILE & FEDERAL EXPRESS

Case No. 10-2376-EL-UNC  
Case No. 11-346-EL-SSO  
Case No. 11-348-EL-SSO  
Case No. 11-349-EL-AAM  
Case No. 11-350-EL-AAM  
Case No. 10-343-EL-ATA  
Case No. 10-344-EL-ATA  
Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC  
Case No. 11-4920-EL-RDR  
Case No. 11-4921-EL-RDR

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio  
Docketing Division  
180 East Broad Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793  
Fax: (614).466.0313

Re: In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company for Authority to Establish a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan, Case Nos. 11-346-EL-SSO, 11-348-EL-SSO; and consolidated cases.

Dear Sir or Madam:

Enclosed please find an original and twenty (20) copies of the *Reply Brief of Ormet Primary Aluminum Corporation*. This document was originally filed by fax on January 30, 2012.

Two additional copies of each document are enclosed to be date-stamped and returned to me in the enclosed, self-addressed Federal Express envelope.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions please contact me at the telephone number above.

Sincerely,



Emma F. Hand  
Partner

PUCO

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV  
2012 JAN 31 AM 9:52

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 le Date Processed JAN 31 2012

**BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

<b>In the Matter of the Application of</b>	)	
<b>Ohio Power Company and Columbus</b>	)	
<b>Southern Power Company for</b>	)	<b>Case No. 10-2376-EL-UNC</b>
<b>Authority to Merge and Related</b>	)	
<b>Approvals.</b>	)	
	)	
<b>In the Matter of the Application of</b>	)	
<b>Columbus Southern Power Company</b>	)	
<b>and Ohio Power Company for</b>	)	<b>Case No. 11-346-EL-SSO</b>
<b>Authority to Establish a Standard</b>	)	<b>Case No. 11-348-EL-SSO</b>
<b>Service Offer Pursuant to Section</b>	)	
<b>4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of</b>	)	
<b>an Electric Security Plan.</b>	)	
	)	
<b>In the Matter of the Application of</b>	)	
<b>Columbus Southern Power Company</b>	)	<b>Case No. 11-349-EL-AAM</b>
<b>and Ohio Power Company for</b>	)	<b>Case No. 11-350-EL-AAM</b>
<b>Approval of Certain Accounting</b>	)	
<b>Authority.</b>	)	
	)	
<b>In the Matter of the Application of</b>	)	
<b>Columbus Southern Power Company</b>	)	<b>Case No. 10-343-EL-ATA</b>
<b>to Amend its Emergency Curtailment</b>	)	
<b>Service Riders.</b>	)	
	)	
<b>In the Matter of the Application of</b>	)	
<b>Ohio Power Company to Amend its</b>	)	<b>Case No. 10-344-EL-ATA</b>
<b>Emergency Curtailment Service</b>	)	
<b>Riders.</b>	)	
	)	
<b>In the Matter of the Commission</b>	)	
<b>Review of the Capacity Charges of</b>	)	<b>Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC</b>
<b>Ohio Power Company and Columbus</b>	)	
<b>Southern Power Company.</b>	)	
	)	
<b>In the Matter of the Application of</b>	)	
<b>Columbus Southern Power Company</b>	)	
<b>for Approval of a Mechanism to</b>	)	<b>Case No. 11-4920-EL-RDR</b>
<b>Recover Deferred Fuel Costs Ordered</b>	)	
<b>Under Section 4928.144, Ohio Revised</b>	)	
<b>Code.</b>	)	

**In the Matter of the Application of  
Ohio Power Company for Approval of  
a Mechanism to Recover Deferred  
Fuel Costs Ordered Under Section  
4928.144, Ohio Revised Code.**

**(Consolidated)**

**Case No. 11-4921-EL-RDR**

**REPLY OF ORMET PRIMARY ALUMINUM CORPORATION  
TO AEP OHIO'S AND OMAEG'S MEMORANDA CONTRA  
ORMET'S APPLICATION FOR REHEARING**

**Emma F. Hand (PHV - 1353- 2012)  
Douglas G. Bonner (PHV - 1363-2012)  
SNR Denton US LLP  
1301 K Street, NW  
Suite 600, East Tower  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel: 202-408-6400  
Fax: 202-408-6399  
emma.hand@snrdenton.com  
doug.bonner@snrdenton.com  
*Attorneys for Ormet Primary Aluminum  
Corporation***

**January 30, 2012**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION .....	1
ARGUMENT .....	3
I. The Commission's Decision is Unreasonable and Unlawful Because it Relied Upon Incorrect Evidence, Leading to a Dramatically Incorrect, Unsupported Conclusion.....	3
A. The Commission's Decision Relies Upon The Erroneous \$17 Million Per-Year Economic Impact Upon Ormet. ....	4
B. AEP Ohio Does Not Deny That the True Economic Impact on Ormet From the Discrimination is \$28 Million, \$11 Million More than it Previously Claimed. ....	4
C. The Commission Erred to the Extent It Held that the Economic Harm Inflicted on Ormet Would Be Offset By Ormet's Unique Arrangement. ....	5
II. The Commission's Decision is Unreasonable and Unlawful Because Its Determinations That There Are No Customers Similarly-Situated to Ormet Is Against the Manifest Weight of the Record.....	7
III. The Commission's Decision is Unreasonable and Unlawful Because It Fails to Adequately Explain Both Its Reasons for Denying Ormet's Request That The First 250 MW Of Its Load Be Treated Comparably to That Of Other High Load Factor Customers and Its Reasons for Departing from Its Prior Precedent with Regard to Cost-Causation. ....	9
A. The Commission Failed to Adequately Explain its Reasons for Denying Ormet's Request that the First 250 MW of Its Load Be Treated Comparably to the Loads of Other High Load Factor Customers. ....	10
B. The Commission Failed to Adequately Explain its Reasons for Departing from Its Precedent Regarding Cost-Causation. ....	11
IV. Conclusion. ....	12

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### CASES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Cincinnati Bell Telegraph Co. v. Public Utilities Commission of Ohio</i> , 466 N.E.2d 848 .....	5
<i>Elyria Telegraph Co. v. Public Utilities Commission</i> , 110 N.E.2d 59 .....	5, 7-8
<i>Mahoning Cnty. Townships v. Public Utilities Commission of Ohio</i> , 388 N.E.2d 739 .....	14
<i>Ohio Consumers' Counsel v. Public Utilities Commission</i> , 856 N.E.2d 213 .....	5, 11-12, 14

### STATUTES

Section 4928.143 .....	1
------------------------	---

**REPLY OF ORMET PRIMARY ALUMINUM CORPORATION  
TO AEP OHIO'S AND OMAEG'S MEMORANDA CONTRA  
ORMET'S APPLICATION FOR REHEARING**

**INTRODUCTION**

The Commission erred by adopting the Stipulation and Recommendation (“Stipulation”) filed by certain parties<sup>1</sup> without modification of the Load Factor Provision (“LFP”), which discriminates against Ormet and subjects Ormet to unjust and unreasonable rates. The Commission’s Order unlawfully and unreasonably adopts the Stipulation based on incorrect facts and unreasoned decision-making. Accordingly, the Commission should grant rehearing of the Order, and nothing in the Memoranda Contra of AEP Ohio or OMAEG indicate otherwise.

Through the Stipulation, the Commission has required Ormet to subsidize the fixed costs of lower load factor entities on the AEP Ohio system. It did so in reliance upon AEP Ohio’s mistaken representation that Ormet will subsidize the low load factor customers at a rate of **\$17 million per-year** when in reality, according to AEP Ohio’s own compliance filing,<sup>2</sup> the subsidy is approximately **\$28 million per-year**. Imposing such a burden upon Ormet without proper factual and legal considerations prejudices Ormet and justifies rehearing.

The Memoranda Contra filed by AEP Ohio and by OMAEG do not dispel the need for rehearing. Although AEP Ohio asserts that Ormet is seeking a windfall, this is simply not true.

---

<sup>1</sup> Parties that submitted the Stipulation include: Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company (together “AEP Ohio”), Staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (“Staff”), the Ohio Energy Group (“OEG”), Constellation NewEnergy Inc., Constellation Energy Commodities Group, Inc., the Ohio Hospital Association, OMA Energy Group (“OMAEG”), the Kroger Co., the City of Hilliard, the City of Grove City, the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Ohio, Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Duke Energy Retail Sales, LLC, AEP Retail Energy Partners, LLC, Wal-Mart Stores East, LLP and Sam’s East, Inc., Paulding Wind Farm II, LLC, Ohio Environmental Council, Environmental Law and Policy Center, EnerNOC, and the Natural Resources Defense Council (collectively “Signatory Parties”). Only AEP Ohio and OMAEG filed memoranda contra Ormet’s Application for Rehearing that demand the instant Reply.

<sup>2</sup> Compliance Tariffs of AEP Ohio, Original Sheet Nos. 324-1 - 324-3 (Dec. 21, 2011).

Requesting that Ormet only be required to pay for the costs it imposes upon the system is not a “windfall.” AEP Ohio asserts that Ormet already receives sufficient economic stability through its Unique Arrangement, but the Order requiring Ormet to subsidize lower load factor customers at \$28 million per year guts the rate stability and economic development benefits provided by that Unique Arrangement. Nothing that AEP Ohio or OMAEG now argue can undo the fact that the Commission committed reversible error in failing to properly explain why excluding Ormet, and only Ormet, from the LFP is not unduly discriminatory. In fact, the Commission’s decision went against the manifest weight of the evidence and was unsupported by the record due in large part to AEP Ohio’s material misstatements of fact.

The Commission’s rationale must be set forth “in sufficient detail [that] the facts in the record upon which the order is based, and the reasoning followed by the PUCO in reaching its conclusion,” are clear from the text of the opinion. *Ohio Consumers’ Counsel v. Pub. Utils. Comm’n*, 856 N.E.2d 213, 222 (Ohio 2006). The Commission is well within its power to hear new evidence on rehearing to correct an inaccurate or incomplete record. *Cincinnati Bell Tel. Co. v. Pub. Utils. Comm’n of Ohio*, 466 N.E.2d 848, 853-54 (Ohio 1984) (affirming Commission’s decision to hear new evidence on rehearing); *Elyria Tel. Co. v. Pub. Utils. Comm’n*, 110 N.E.2d 59, 61 (Ohio 1953) (upholding rehearing that took evidence that “might have been produced at the original hearing”). It is unlawful and unreasonable reversible error to decide an issue based upon incorrect evidence, against the manifest weight of the evidence, or without sufficiently explaining the reasoning used to arrive at the conclusion. *See* Ohio Rev. Code § 4903.09; *see also Consumers’ Counsel*, 856 N.E.2d at 222. The Commission’s Order commits all three errors and rehearing should therefore be granted..

First, the Commission's determination that Ormet's Unique Arrangement would adequately insulate it from the cost of the \$17 million per year subsidy has no basis in the record. It is also undermined by the fact, not reasonably available at hearing, that the actual cost to Ormet is approximately \$28 million per-year, not the \$17 million figure testified to at the hearing. Second, the Commission's determination that Ormet could not have been unduly discriminated against because it has no similarly situated peers goes against the manifest weight of the record. The record shows that there are three other high load factor customers who benefit from the LFP and have unique arrangements. Exhibit Nos. ORM-2, ORM-3. Third, the Commission failed to adequately explain its reasoning both for denying Ormet's request that the first 250 MW of its load be treated comparably with that of other high load factor customers and for declining to follow its precedent with respect to the principle of cost causation. For each of these reasons, AEP Ohio's arguments against granting rehearing on the LFP issue fail.

### **ARGUMENT**

#### **I. The Commission's Decision is Unreasonable and Unlawful Because it Relied Upon Incorrect Evidence, Leading to a Dramatically Incorrect, Unsupported Conclusion.**

The Commission's Order plainly relies upon AEP Ohio's inaccurate figure of a \$17 million impact upon Ormet resulting from its exclusion from the LFP. Nothing in the Commission's decision, however, indicates how the Commission would have decided if it had accurate evidence. AEP Ohio does not deny that the true economic impact upon Ormet is \$28 million per-year, it merely tries to explain why its Compliance Filing contained that number rather than the incorrect \$17 million figure it offered at the hearing. Each of these failures constitutes reversible error.



**A. The Commission's Decision Relies Upon The Erroneous \$17 Million Per-Year Economic Impact Upon Ormet.**

AEP Ohio's speculation that the Commission's decision "did not turn on any specific quantification of the impact of the LFP" is wrong and ignores the proper legal standard and common sense. AEP Ohio's Mem. Contra at 15. The Commission appears to have reasoned that Ormet's Unique Arrangement would mitigate the \$17 million per-year impact. *Id.* Because of AEP Ohio's misstatement on the record, however, the Commission was unable to consider the proper balance, knowing the true \$28 million per-year impact on Ormet. This dramatically higher figure calls the entirety of the Commission's reasoning into question and must be readdressed -- a course the Ohio Supreme Court has endorsed. *See Elyria*, 110 N.E.2d at 61-62. Accordingly, the Commission should grant rehearing so that it may take evidence on the true economic impact to Ormet and remedy the other defects in its Order.

**B. AEP Ohio Does Not Deny That the True Economic Impact on Ormet From the Discrimination is \$28 Million, \$11 Million More than it Previously Claimed.**

Although AEP Ohio's Memorandum Contra explains why the impact of the exclusion from the LFP upon Ormet is so much higher than was indicated in their testimony, this does not change the fact that the Commission relied upon incorrect information in reaching its decision. The reason that the information in the record was incorrect is irrelevant; the Commission should still base its decision on correct information. *See id.*

The hearing transcript is quite clear that AEP Ohio's position was that the going-forward impact upon Ormet would be \$17 million dollars per-year:

- Q. Okay. Do you agree that the impact on Ormet of being excluded from the load factor provision is roughly \$18 million per year?
- A. I'm having flashbacks to my deposition so let me just double-check the arithmetic. One moment.

Q. If it helps, you might want to look at page 62.

A. I don't think I had a calculator with me at that time so I'm going to double check.

Having the advantage of having a calculator I think the number is actually closer to 17 million, but that is the impact of applying the load factor rider as is to Ormet [sic].

TR. 125:10-25. The time-frame contemplated by the question is clearly forward looking as it deals with the LFP's impact upon Ormet. Since the LFP is only in effect from 2012 onward, it was clear from the question that the time frame of 2012-forward was being considered in both the question and the answer. With this testimony, neither the Commission, the questioner, nor the parties could have reasonably known the true facts before AEP Ohio made its Compliance Filing.

AEP Ohio's quantification of the financial impact that Ormet will suffer as a result of its exclusion from the LFP was not only off target, but it significantly understated the annual financial impact by \$11 million (a 64% increase from the amount that AEP Ohio testified to at the hearing). This is a critically meaningful difference to, among other things, the viability of Ormet's Hannibal Facilities in Southeast Ohio. AEP Ohio's mistaken but severe understatement of the financial impact has tainted the record such that the Commission was unable to engage in well-informed decision-making in its consideration of the issues raised by Ormet. Accordingly, the Commission should grant rehearing and take new evidence sufficient to reach a reasoned decision.

**C. The Commission Erred to the Extent It Held that the Economic Harm Inflicted on Ormet Would Be Offset By Ormet's Unique Arrangement.**

In determining that it was reasonable to require Ormet to subsidize lower load factor customers by \$17 million per-year, the Commission appears to have relied upon the fact that Ormet has a Unique Arrangement in place which would protect it from the harm of the unjust and unreasonable rates throughout the term of the ESP. Order at 16, 37-38. Similarly, in

apparent support of this argument, AEP Ohio sets forth its unsubstantiated opinion that “Ormet’s unique arrangement still permits Ormet to receive substantial discounts” even if excluded from the LFP. AEP Ohio Mem. Contra at 20. Especially in light of the revelation that the impact on Ormet is approximately \$28 million per-year, this conclusion is inaccurate. As explained in Ormet’s Briefs, Ormet’s Unique Arrangement does not guarantee a discount. Ormet Application for Rehearing at 9; Ormet’s Initial Brief at 4-5. To the extent it *permits* a discount, the permitted discount is reduced by \$10 million each year. Ormet Unique Arrangement Order<sup>3</sup> at 10-11. In 2015, for example, the discount is only \$24 million -- \$4 million less than the subsidy Ormet is required to pay to the low load factor customers under Stipulation. *Id.* Based upon new information of the impact of being excluded from the low load factor provision upon Ormet, it is apparent that the exclusion dramatically erodes the economic stability provided by Ormet’s Unique Arrangement.

The proper question is whether the Commission had the information before it to make a reasoned decision and whether it adequately explained its conclusion based on the substantial evidence of the record. Here, the Commission unmistakably explained that its decision seeks to promote “economic development” and relied at least in part on an assumption that Ormet will continue to receive benefit from its Unique Arrangement to meet that goal. Order at 38. Given that the true impact to Ormet is drastically more grave than the Commission believed when it issued its Order, the Commission’s reasoning cannot be relied upon to reach the same result. The damage the Commission’s Order causes Ormet imperils Ormet’s operations at its Hannibal

---

<sup>3</sup> *In the Matter of the Application of Ormet Primary Aluminum Corporation for Approval of a Unique Arrangement with Ohio Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company*, Opinion and Order, Case No. 09-119-EL-AEC, issued July 15, 2009, (“Unique Arrangement Order”), *aff’d*, *In re: Application of Ormet Primary Aluminum Corp.*, 129 Ohio St. 3d 9, 2011-Ohio-2377, 949 N.E.2d 991 (Ohio 2011).

Facilities and calls into question Ormet's ability to maintain the employment levels required by its Unique Arrangement. Unique Arrangement Order at 11. For these reasons, the Commission's decision is unlawful and unreasonable and not based on substantial evidence. Accordingly, the Commission should grant Ormet's application for rehearing to take further evidence as necessary to analyze these material issues.

**II. The Commission's Decision is Unreasonable and Unlawful Because Its Determinations That There Are No Customers Similarly-Situated to Ormet Is Against the Manifest Weight of the Record**

The Commission committed reversible error when it distinguished Ormet based solely on the fact that Ormet has a Unique Arrangement and failed to explain why Ormet is different from the other GS-3/GS-4 customers who have their own unique arrangements. *See* Exhibit Nos. ORM-2, ORM-3; *see also* Order at 16, 38. AEP Ohio speculates, without record or Order support, that the specific details of Ormet's Unique Arrangement are what the Commission believes make Ormet different. AEP Ohio Mem. Contra at 19. This fact cannot distinguish Ormet, however, because the record contains no evidence regarding the specific details of the other reasonable arrangements enjoyed by parties that benefit from the LFP. Accordingly, the Commission has no basis to compare Ormet's Unique Arrangement to any other unique arrangement.

The Commission's Order nevertheless held that Ormet is not similarly situated to other customers exclusively because of its Unique Arrangement: "The fact that Ormet is currently provided service pursuant to a unique arrangement effectively puts Ormet in a service class by itself." Order at 16. From there, the Commission justified excluding Ormet from the LFP because "as a result of Ormet's Unique Arrangement Case, Ormet is already a beneficiary of the rate stability benefits the LFP is designed to create." *Id.* at 38. Nothing in the record, however,

indicates that the reasonable arrangements enjoyed by the other high load factor customers that benefit from the LFP do not also provide them rate stability.

The other record evidence does not support the Commission's decision either. For example, OEG witness Baron testified that it was not his position that, as a rule, "customers with special arrangements should be excluded from the load factor provision." TR at 262:24-263:2. Such was not a reasonable basis to exclude a party from benefit of the LFP. The Signatory Party witnesses supporting the LFP admitted that they had not examined any contracts, including unique arrangements, other than Ormet's. TR at 264:6-11; *see* ORM-13 at 5 (witness Claytor stating that she had not reviewed Ormet's Unique Arrangement to prepare her testimony). The record contains nothing to support meaningfully distinguishing between Ormet's Unique Arrangement and that of the three other high load factor customers that gain the benefit of the LFP, and AEP Ohio and OMAEG cannot point to one because the record contains no details of other unique arrangements. Therefore, the Commission's logic is unlawful and unreasonable and unsupported by the substantial weight of the evidence. *Consumers' Counsel*, 856 N.E.2d at 222.

AEP Ohio argues that including Ormet in the LFP "would serve to partially off-set [sic] the \$10 million per year added benefit to the GS 2 customers which the Commission ordered when it increased the \$10/MWh GS 2 shopping incentive." AEP Ohio Mem. Contra at 21. AEP Ohio completely ignores, however, that excluding Ormet from the LFP provision offsets a very significant portion of the benefits that the Commission ordered in approving Ormet's Unique Arrangement in the first place.

**III. The Commission's Decision is Unreasonable and Unlawful Because It Fails to Adequately Explain Both Its Reasons for Denying Ormet's Request That The First 250 MW Of Its Load Be Treated Comparably to That Of Other High Load Factor Customers and Its Reasons for Departing from Its Prior Precedent with Regard to Cost-Causation.**

AEP Ohio's suggestion that the Commission's Order adequately addressed Ormet's arguments, AEP Ohio Mem. Contra at 17-18, is unsupported by the law. It also betrays AEP Ohio's fundamental misunderstanding of Ormet's argument. AEP Ohio's suggestion that the Commission's conclusion is sound because "[t]he Commission's rationale in determining that the LFP is not discriminatory towards Ormet is based on the fact that Ormet is not similarly situated to other customers" rests on precisely the type of unsupported legal conclusion that Ohio law does not allow. AEP Ohio Mem. Contra at 18-19.

The Ohio Supreme Court rejects the mere assertion of a legal conclusion as inadequate legal reasoning. *See, e.g., Consumers' Counsel*, 856 N.E.2d at 223. That is exactly what the Commission offered in its decision. The Commission concluded that because Ormet has a reasonable arrangement, there are no other similarly situated customers. It did so without addressing the record evidence that three other high load factor customers on the AEP Ohio system have reasonable arrangements. Order at 16. The Commission also failed to provide any rationale for its denial of Ormet's request that, at a minimum, the first 250 MW of its load be eligible for the LFP.

The conclusory reasoning that the Ohio Supreme Court rejected in *Consumer's Counsel* is nearly identical in form to the Commission's reasoning here. 856 N.E.2d at 223. The faults identified by the Supreme Court's analysis in that case apply equally to the Commission's decision here as well:

The portion of the commission's first rehearing entry approving CG & E's

alternative proposal is devoid of evidentiary support. There are no citations to the record supporting the commission's modifications on rehearing. In addition, the commission did not sufficiently set forth its reasoning for the changes on rehearing. Instead, it merely asserted, without further justification, that the modifications would provide rate certainty for consumers, ensure financial stability for CG & E, and further encourage the development of competitive markets.

*Id.* Likewise, the Commission here, without citation to the record, held that:

[T]he LFP does not violate any regulatory principle or practice. . . . The record sufficiently establishes that the proposed 250 MW peak threshold was created to ensure that rates would be stable enough to retain existing high load customers and promote economic development.

Order at 38. The Commission “merely asserted, without further justification, that the [LFP] would provide” rate stability and economic development. Such is unlawful and unreasonable decision-making according to the Ohio Supreme Court. *Id.*

**A. The Commission Failed to Adequately Explain its Reasons for Denying Ormet’s Request that the First 250 MW of Its Load Be Treated Comparably to the Loads of Other High Load Factor Customers.**

AEP Ohio further suggests that the size of Ormet’s load justifies excluding Ormet from the LFP. AEP Ohio’s basis for this position is that including Ormet in the LFP would dramatically skew the calculations. Exhibit No. ORM-8. However, the Commission did not have the proper evidence before it to have made such a balancing determination. Furthermore, the record contains not a scintilla of evidence that including the first 250 MW of Ormet’s load skews the calculations to any greater or different degree than allowing 250 MW of any other high load factor customer’s load. In fact, one company’s megawatts are completely fungible with another’s. Certainly nothing in the record contradicts this fact.

To sidestep this difficulty, AEP Ohio argues that the Commission was correct not to address Ormet’s argument that if it cannot be included entirely in the LFP, then its first 250 MWs of load should be included, just like the other eligible customers. AEP Ohio Mem. Contra

at 21-22. AEP Ohio's basis for this position is its opinion that Ormet's partial eligibility "would still be a significant windfall to Ormet shareholders, and a corresponding detriment to the Ohio economy as a whole." *Id.* at 22. AEP Ohio's speculation is neither supported by the record nor responsive to the relevant legal standard, which requires that the Commission explain its reasoning. *Consumers' Counsel*, 856 N.E.2d at 222. Here, the Commission failed to offer any reasoning explaining why Ormet's first 250 MW of load should not be treated comparably to the 250 MW loads of other high load factor customers. The Commission failed to address or explain why discriminating against Ormet is justified when a simple, non-discriminatory way to address the size of Ormet's load exists -- allow Ormet to benefit only to the extent of its first 250 MWs. For this reason, the Commission's Order is unlawful and unreasonable.

**B. The Commission Failed to Adequately Explain its Reasons for Departing from Its Precedent Regarding Cost-Causation.**

The Commission also failed entirely to explain why it departed from its legal precedent regarding cost-causation principles. Ohio precedent provides that a "reasonable differential or inequality of rates" can only be justified "where such differential is based upon some actual and measurable differences in the furnishing of services to the consumer." *Mahoning Cnty. Townships v. Pub. Utils. Comm'n of Ohio*, 388 N.E.2d 739, 742 (Ohio 1979); *see also In re MCI WorldCom Comms.*, slip copy, no. 04-1901, 2005 WL 407346, \*1 (Ohio P.U.C. Feb. 9, 2005) (finding a particular fee "unjust and unreasonable . . . because [the fee] is a flat-rate fee . . . [that] will allow MCI to over-recover its costs from some customers and shift costs to other customers who do not cause those costs.").

The Commission also failed to base its decision on, or even address, the substantial evidence in the record with regard to cost-causation. Both OEG witness Baron and OMAEG



witness Claytor agree with the following statement regarding the rate design AEP Ohio proposed in this case:

Collecting revenues related to fixed costs, which are customer-related or demand-related, on a variable energy charge violates cost causation principles and fails to produce rates that send proper price signals and minimize price distortions. Additionally, the shift of these costs from per KW demand charges to per KWh variable energy charges results in a shift in demand cost responsibility from lower load factor customers to higher load factor customers. This results in misallocation of cost responsibility as higher load factor customers overpay for the demand-related costs incurred by the Company to serve them.

See Exhibit Nos. ORM-5 and ORM-13 at p. 5. Both parties admit that the proposed rate design, if not mitigated by the LFP, results in higher load factor customers overpaying for demand-related costs in violation of the regulatory principle of cost-causation. The rates applied to Ormet under the Commission's order are not mitigated by the LFP, and thus result in Ormet overpaying for demand-related costs. The Commission erred in failing to address why its decision, which violates the principle of cost-causation and otherwise departs from Ohio precedent, is warranted. Because the Commission disregarded Ohio precedent with regard to cost-causation and failed to explain its departure from that precedent, rehearing is appropriate.

#### **IV. Conclusion.**

For each of the foregoing reasons, none of AEP Ohio's or OMAEG's arguments in their Memoranda Contra can remedy the critical and fundamental errors of fact, law, and reasoning relied upon by the Commission in its Order. For the reasons stated herein and in Ormet's Memorandum in Support of its Application for Rehearing, Ormet respectfully requests that the Commission grant Ormet's Application for Rehearing.



**Emma F. Hand (PHV-1353- 2012)**

**Douglas G. Bonner (PHV-1363-2012)**

**SNR Denton US LLP**

**1301 K Street, NW**

**Suite 600, East Tower**

**Washington, DC 20005**

**Tel: 202-408-6400**

**Fax: 202-408-6399**

**emma.hand@snrdenton.com**

**doug.bonner@snrdenton.com**

***Attorneys for Ormet Primary Aluminum  
Corporation***

**January 30, 2011**

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of the *Reply to AEP Ohio's and OMAEG's Memoranda Contra Ormet's Application for Rehearing* was served by US mail and email upon counsel identified below for all parties of record this 30th day of January, 2012.



Emma F. Hand

## **SERVICE LIST**

Steven T. Nourse  
Matthew J. Satterwhite  
American Electric Power Corp.  
1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
stnourse@aep.com  
mjsatterwhite@aep.com

Daniel R. Conway  
Porter Wright Morris & Arthur  
41 South High Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
dconway@porterwright.com

Dorothy K. Corbett  
Duke Energy Retail Sales  
139 East Fourth Street  
1303-Main  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
Dorothy.Corbett@duke-energy.com

David F. Boehm  
Kurt Boehm  
Michael L. Kurtz  
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry  
36 East Seventh Street. Suite 1510  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
dboehm@bkllawfirm.com  
mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com

Samuel C. Randazzo  
Joseph E. Olikier  
Frank P. Darr  
Vicki L. Leach-Payne  
Joseph M. Clark  
McNees Wallace & Nurick  
21 East State Street, 17th Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
sam@mwncmh.com  
joliker@mwncmh.com  
fdarr@mwncmh.com

Richard L. Sites  
Ohio Hospital Association  
155 East Broad Street, 15th Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3620  
ricks@ohanet.org

Colleen L. Mooney  
Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy  
231 West Lima Street  
Findlay, Ohio 45840  
cmooney2@columbus.rr.com

John W. Bentine  
Mark S. Yurick  
Zachary D. Kravitz  
Matthew S. White  
Chester Willcox & Saxbe, LLP  
65 East State Street, Suite 1000  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
jbentine@cwsllaw.com  
myurick@cwsllaw.com  
zkravitz@cwsllaw.com

Terry L. Etter  
Maureen R. Grady  
Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel  
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485  
etter@occ.state.oh.us  
grady@occ.state.oh.us

Thomas J. O'Brien  
Teresa Orahod  
Bricker & Eckler  
100 South Third Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291  
tobrien@bricker.com  
torahood@bricker.com

Jay E. Jadwin  
American Electric Power Service Corporation  
1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
jejadwin@aep.com

Michael R. Smalz  
Ohio Poverty Law Center  
555 Butts Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
msmalz@ohiopoveritylaw.org  
jmaskovyak@ohiopoveritylaw.org

Terrence O'Donnell  
Christopher Montgomery  
Bricker & Eckler LLP  
100 South Third Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291  
todonnell@bricker.com  
cmontgomery@bricker.com  
Jesse A. Rodriguez  
Exelon Generation Company, LLC  
300 Exelon Way  
Kennett Square, Pennsylvania 19348  
jesse.rodriguez@exeloncorp.com

Glen Thomas  
1060 First Avenue, Ste. 400  
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406  
gthomas@gtpowergroup.com

Henry W. Eckhart  
2100 Chambers Road, Suite 106  
Columbus, Ohio 43212  
henryeckhart@aol.com

Christopher L. Miller  
Gregory H. Dunn  
Asim Z. Haque  
Stephen J. Smith  
C. Todd Jones  
Schottenstein Zox & Dunn Co., LPA  
250 West Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
cmiller@szd.com  
gdunn@szd.com  
ahaque@szd.com  
sjsmith@szd.com

Lisa G. McAlister  
Bricker & Eckler LLP  
100 South Third Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291  
lmcaster@bricker.com  
mwarnock@bricker.com

William L. Massey  
Covington & Burling, LLP  
1201 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
wmassey@cov.com

Laura Chappelle  
4218 Jacob Meadows  
Okemos, Michigan 48864  
laurac@chappelleconsulting.net

Pamela A. Fox  
Law Director  
The City of Hilliard, Ohio  
pfox@hilliardohio.gov

United Way of Jefferson County  
501 Washington Street  
P.O. Box 1463  
Steubenville, OH 43952

Sandy I-ru Grace  
Marianne M. Alvarez  
Exelon Business Services Company  
101 Constitution Avenue N.W., Suite 400 East  
Washington, DC 20001  
sandy.grace@exeloncorp.com

Kenneth P. Kreider  
David A. Meyer  
Keating Muething & Klekamp PLL  
One East Fourth Street, Suite 1400  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
kpkreider@kmmklaw.com

Holly Rachel Smith  
Holly Rachel Smith, PLLC  
Hitt Business Center  
3803 Rectortown Road  
Marshall, Virginia 20115  
holly@raysmithlaw.com

John H. Jones  
Vern Margard  
Public Utilities Section  
Ohio Attorney General Mike DeWine  
180 East Broad Street, 6th Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
john.jones@puc.state.oh.us  
werner.margard@puc.state.oh.us

Carolyn S. Flahive  
Terrance A. Mebane  
Thompson Hine LLP  
41 S. High Street, Suite 1700  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
Carolyn.Flahive@ThompsonHine.com  
Terrance.Mebane@ThompsonHine.com

Gary A. Jeffries  
Dominion Resources Services, Inc.  
501 Martindale Street, Suite 400  
Pittsburgh, PA 15212-5817  
gary.a.jeffries@dom.com

Steve W. Chriss  
Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.  
2001 SE 10th Street  
Bentonville, Arkansas 72716  
stephen.chriss@wal-mart.com

Barth E. Royer  
Bell & Royer Co., LPA  
33 South Grant Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3927  
barthroyer@aol.com

Greg Poulos  
EnerNOC, Inc.  
101 Federal St.  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110  
gpoulos@enernoc.com

Leo Antons  
1237 Cisler Dr.  
Marietta, OH 45750  
leoantons@suddenlink.net

E. Camille Yancey  
Nolan Moser  
Trent A. Dougherty  
Ohio Environmental Council  
1207 Grandview Avenue, Suite 201  
Columbus, Ohio 43212-3449  
camille@theoec.org  
nolan@theoec.org  
trent@theoec.org

Mark A. Hayden  
FirstEnergy Service Company  
76 South Main Street  
Akron, OH 44308  
haydenm@firstenergycorp.com

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

Christopher J. Allwein  
1373 Grandview Ave.  
Suite 212  
Columbus, OH 43212  
wein@williamsandmoser.com

Tara C. Santarelli  
Environmental Law & Policy Center  
1207 Grandview Ave., Suite 201  
Columbus, Ohio 43212  
tsantarelli@elpc.org

James F. Lang  
Laura C. McBride  
N. Trevor Alexander  
Calfee, Halter & Griswold LLP  
1400 KeyBank Center  
800 Superior Ave.  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
jlang@calfee.com  
lmcbride@calfee.com  
talexander@calfee.com

Allison E. Haedt  
Grant W. Garber  
Jones Day  
P.O. Box 165017  
325 John H. McConnell Boulevard  
Suite 600  
Columbus, Ohio 43216-5017

J. Kennedy And Associates  
570 Colonial Park Drive  
Suite 305  
Roswell, GA 30075

Jennifer Duffer  
Armstrong & Okey, Inc.  
222 East Town Street  
2nd Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
jduffer@ameritech.net

Lija K. Kaieps-Clark  
M. Howard Petricoff  
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease  
52 E. Gay St.  
PO Box 1008  
Columbus, OH 43216  
lkalepsclark@vorys.com  
mhpetricoff@vssp.com

Bill Dingus  
Lawrence Economic Development Corporation  
P.O. Box 488  
South Point, OH 45680-0488

Constellation NewEnergy Inc  
Cynthia Fonner Brady  
550 W Washington Street  
Suite 300  
Chicago, IL 60661  
Cynthia.Brady@constellation.com

Denis George  
Kroger Company  
1014 Vine Street-G07  
Cincinnati, OH 45202-1100

Shannon Fisk  
2 North Riverside Plaza Suite 2250  
Chicago, IL 60606  
sfisk@nrdc.org

Canton Chamber Of Commerce  
229 Wells Ave N.W.  
Canton, OH 44703-1044

Amy Spiller  
Duke Energy Ohio  
139 E. Fourth Street, 1303-Main  
P.O. Box 961  
Cincinnati, OH 45201-0960  
Amy.Spiller@Duke-Energy.com

FirstEnergy Solutions Corp  
Louis M. D'Alessandris  
341 White Pond Drive  
Akron, OH 44320  
ldAlessandris@firstenergy.com

Ohio Partners For Affordable Energy  
David C. Rinebolt  
231 West Lima St.  
P.O. Box 1793  
Findlay, OH 45839-1793  
drinelbolt@aol.com



Steve Howard  
52 East Gay St.  
P.O. Box 1008  
Columbus, OH 43215  
smhoward@vorys.com

AEP Retail Energy Partners LLC  
Anne M. Vogel  
1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
amvogel@aep.com

Shawnee State University  
940 Second Street  
Portsmouth, OH 45662

Mark A. Whitt  
Carpenter, Lipps & Leleand LLP  
280 Plaza, Suite 1300  
280 North High Street  
Columbus OH 43215

Jeffrey Small  
Jody M. Kyler  
Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel  
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485  
small@occ.state.oh.us  
kyler@occ.state.oh.us

Jacqueline Lake Roberts  
EnerNOC, Inc.  
13212 Haves Corner Road SW  
Pataskala OH 43062

The Sierra Club  
50 West Broad Street #2117  
Columbus, OH 43215

Meigs County Commissioners  
Michael Davenport, President  
100 East Second Street  
Pomeroy, OH 45769

Tuscarawas County  
330 University Drive NE  
New Philadelphia, OH 44663

Paul F. Wight  
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP  
1440 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005

Deb J. Bingham  
Patti Mallarnee  
Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel  
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

Philip B. Sineneng  
Thompson Hine LLP  
41 S. High Street, Suite 1700  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
Philip.Sineneng@ThompsonHine.com