```
1
         BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO
2
3
     In the Matter of the
    Commission Review of the :
4
    Capacity Charges of Ohio : Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC
    Power Company and Columbus:
     Southern Power Company.
5
6
7
                          PROCEEDINGS
8
    before Ms. Greta See and Ms. Sarah Parrot, Attorney
9
    Examiners, and Commissioner Andre Porter, at the
10
    Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad
    Street, Room 11-A, Columbus, Ohio, called at 2:00
11
12
    p.m. on Wednesday, April 25, 2012.
13
14
                           VOLUME VII
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
                     ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.
               222 East Town Street, Second Floor
22
                   Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201
                (614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481
                      Fax - (614) 224-5724
23
24
25
```

1394 **APPEARANCES:** 1 2 American Electric Power Service Corporation By Mr. Steven T. Nourse 3 Mr. Matthew J. Satterwhite and Mr. Yazen Alami 4 One Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215 5 Porter, Wright, Morris & Arthur, LLP 6 By Mr. Daniel R. Conway and Ms. Christen Moore 7 41 South High Street Columbus, Ohio 43215 8 On behalf of the Ohio Power Company and 9 Columbus Southern Power Company. 10 Jones Day By Mr. David A. Kutik and Ms. Allison Haedt 11 North Point 12 901 Lakeside Avenue Cleveland, Ohio 44114 13 Calfee, Halter & Griswold LLP 14 By Mr. James F. Lang and Ms. Laura McBride 15 1400 Keybank Center 800 Superior Avenue Cleveland, Ohio 44114 16 17 Calfee, Halter & Griswold, LLP By Mr. N. Trevor Alexander Fifth Third Center 18 21 East State Street Columbus, Ohio 43215 19 20 FirstEnergy Service Company By Mr. Mark A. Hayden 21 76 South Main Street Akron, Ohio 44308 22 On behalf of the FirstEnergy Service 23 Corporation. 24 25

1395 APPEARANCES: (Continued) 1 2 McNees, Wallace & Nurick, LLC By Mr. Frank Darr 3 Mr. Samuel Randazzo and Mr. Matthew Pritchard Fifth Third Center, Suite 1700 4 21 East State Street Columbus, Ohio 43215-4228 5 6 On behalf of the Industrial Energy Users of Ohio. 7 Whitt Sturtevant, LLC 8 By Ms. Melissa L. Thompson and Mr. Andrew John Campbell 9 PNC Plaza, Suite 2020 155 East Broad Street Columbus, Ohio 43215 10 11 On behalf of the Interstate Gas Supply, Inc. 12 Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. 13 By Ms. Jeanne W. Kingery 155 East Broad Street, 21st Floor 14 Columbus, Ohio 43215 15 Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. By Ms. Amy B. Spiller 16 139 East Fourth Street Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 17 On behalf of the Duke Retail Sales and Duke Energy Commercial Asset Management. 18 19 Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease, LLP By Mr. Howard M. Petricoff 20 and Ms. Lija Kaleps-Clark 52 East Gay Street 21 P.O. Box 1008 Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008 22 On behalf of the Exelon Generation Company, Constellation NewEnergy, Inc., 23 Constellation Energy Commodities Group, 24 Inc., Retail Energy Supply Association, Direct Energy Services, and Direct Energy 25 Business, LLC.

1396 1 APPEARANCES: (Continued) 2 Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel By Ms. Kyle L. Kern and Ms. Melissa Yost 3 Assistant Consumers' Counsel 10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800 4 Columbus, Ohio 43215 5 On behalf of the Residential Customers of 6 Ohio Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company. 7 8 Taft, Stettinius & Hollister By Mr. Zachary D. Kravitz 9 and Mr. Mark Yurick 65 East State Street, Suite 1000 Columbus, Ohio 43215 10 On behalf of the Kroger Company. 11 12 Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry By Mr. Michael L. Kurtz 13 and Ms. Jody M. Kyler 36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510 14 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 15 On behalf of the Ohio Energy Group, Inc. 16 Bricker & Eckler, LLP By Mr. Thomas O'Brien 17 100 South Third Street Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291 18 Ohio Hospital Association By Mr. Richard L. Sites 19 155 East Broad Street, 15th Floor 20 Columbus, Ohio 43215 21 On behalf of the Ohio Hospital Association. 22 Bricker & Eckler, LLP By Ms. Lisa Gatchell McAlister 23 100 South Third Street 24 Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291 25 On behalf of Ohio Manufacturers

1397 1 APPEARANCES: (Continued) 2 Bailey Cavalieri 3 By Mr. Dane Stinson 10 West Broad Street 4 Columbus, Ohio 43215 5 On behalf of the Ohio Association of School Business Officials, Ohio School Boards Association, Buckeye Association 6 of School Administrators, and Ohio 7 Schools Council. 8 Bell & Royer Co., LPA By Mr. Barth E. Royer 9 33 South Grant Avenue Columbus, Ohio 43215 10 On behalf of Dominion Retail, Inc. 11 Ice Miller, LLP 12 By Mr. Christopher L. Miller Mr. Asim Haque 13 Mr. Gregory J.Dunn 250 West Street 14 Columbus, Ohio 43215 15 On behalf of the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Ohio and the City of Grove City. 16 17 Exelon Business Services Company, LLC By Ms. Sandy Grace 101 Constitution Avenue, NW 18 Suite 400 East 19 Washington, DC 20001 2.0 Eimer, Stahl, Klevorn & Solberg, LLP By Mr. David M. Stahl 2.1 224 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 1100 Chicago, Illinois 60604 2.2 On behalf of Exelon Generation Company, 23 LLC. 24 25

Ţ		1398
1	APPEARANCES (Continued):	
2	Kegler, Brown, Hill & Ritter	
3	By Mr. Roger P. Sugarman Capitol Square, Suite 1800 65 East State Street	
4	Columbus, Ohio 43215	
5	On behalf of National Federation of Independent Business, Ohio Chapter.	
6	Mike DeWine, Ohio Attorney General	
7	By William Wright, Section Chief Public Utilities Section	
8	Mr. Werner L. Margard, III Mr. Steven Beeler	
9	Mr. John Jones Assistant Attorneys General	
10	180 East Broad Street, 6th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793	
11		
12	On behalf of the staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

		1399
1	INDEX	
2		
3	WITNESSES PAGE	
4	Roger R. Geiger	
5	Direct Examination by Mr. Sugarman 1404 Cross-Examination by Ms. Moore 1407	
6	Ed Forshey	
7	Direct Examination by Ms. McAlister 1429 Cross-Examination by Ms. Moore 1432	
8	Richard J. Walters	
9	Direct Examination by Ms. McAlister 1450 Cross-Examination by Ms. Moore 1453	
10	John P. Seifker	
11	Direct Examination by Ms. McAlister 1465 Cross-Examination by Ms. Moore 1468	
12	John Burke	
13	Direct Examination by Ms. McAlister 1478 Cross-Examination by Ms. Moore 1481	
14	Bradley H. Belden	
15	Direct Examination by Ms. McAlister 1493 Cross-Examination by Ms. Moore 1495	
16		
17	OEG EXHIBIT IDENTIFIED ADMITTED	)
18	101 - Direct Testimony of R. Geiger 1404 1428	
19	1101 1120	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

				1400	
INDEX (Continued)					
OMA EXHI	IBIT	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED		
101-A -	<b>-</b>				
	Public Version	1430	1449		
101-в -					
	Confidential Version	1430	1449		
102-A -	<b>-</b>				
	Public Version	1451	1465		
102-в -	<b>-</b>				
	Confidential Version	1451	1465		
103-A -	<del>-</del>				
	Public Version	1466	1477		
103-в -	<b>-</b>				
	Confidential Version	1466	1477		
	_				
	Public Version	1479	1492		
104-A -	<b>-</b>				
	Confidential Version	1479	1492		
105-A -	<b>-</b>				
	LLC - Public Version	1493	1501		
105-в -					
		on 1493	1501		
	101-A -  101-B -  102-A -  102-B -  103-A -  104-A -  104-A -	OMA EXHIBIT  101-A - Direct Testimony of AMG Vanadium, Inc. Public Version  101-B - Direct Testimony of AMG Vanadium, Inc. Confidential Version  102-A - Direct Testimony of Whirlpool Corporation Public Version  102-B - Direct Testimony of Whirlpool Corporation Confidential Version  103-A - Direct Testimony of Lima Refining Company Public Version  103-B - Direct Testimony of Lima Refining Company Confidential Version  104-A - Direct Testimony of OSCO Industries, Inc. Public Version  104-A - Direct Testimony of OSCO Industries, Inc. Confidential Version  105-A - Direct Testimony of OSCO Industries, Inc. Confidential Version  105-A - Direct Testimony of Belden Brick Company, LLC - Public Version  105-B - Direct Testimony of Belden Brick Company,	OMA EXHIBIT  101-A - Direct Testimony of AMG Vanadium, Inc. Public Version  101-B - Direct Testimony of AMG Vanadium, Inc. Confidential Version  102-A - Direct Testimony of Whirlpool Corporation Public Version  102-B - Direct Testimony of Whirlpool Corporation Confidential Version  103-A - Direct Testimony of Edima Refining Company Public Version  103-B - Direct Testimony of Lima Refining Company Confidential Version  104-A - Direct Testimony of Dima Refining Company Confidential Version  104-A - Direct Testimony of OSCO Industries, Inc. Public Version  104-A - Direct Testimony of OSCO Industries, Inc. Confidential Version  105-A - Direct Testimony of OSCO Industries, Inc. Confidential Version  105-A - Direct Testimony of OSCO Industries, Inc. Confidential Version  105-A - Direct Testimony of Belden Brick Company, LLC - Public Version  105-B - Direct Testimony of Belden Brick Company,	OMA EXHIBIT  101-A - Direct Testimony of AMG Vanadium, Inc. Public Version  101-B - Direct Testimony of AMG Vanadium, Inc. Confidential Version  102-A - Direct Testimony of Whirlpool Corporation Public Version  102-B - Direct Testimony of Whirlpool Corporation Confidential Version  103-A - Direct Testimony of Lima Refining Company Public Version  103-B - Direct Testimony of Lima Refining Company Confidential Version  103-B - Direct Testimony of Lima Refining Company Confidential Version  104-A - Direct Testimony of Dima Refining Company Confidential Version  104-A - Direct Testimony of OSCO Industries, Inc. Public Version  105-A - Direct Testimony of Direct Testimony of OSCO Industries, Inc. Confidential Version  105-A - Direct Testimony of Belden Brick Company, LLC - Public Version  105-B - Direct Testimony of Belden Brick Company, LLC - Public Version  105-B - Direct Testimony of Belden Brick Company, LLC - Public Version  105-B - Direct Testimony of Belden Brick Company, LLC - Public Version  105-B - Direct Testimony of Belden Brick Company, LLC - Public Version  105-B - Direct Testimony of Belden Brick Company, LLC - Public Version  105-B - Direct Testimony of Belden Brick Company, LLC - Public Version  105-B - Direct Testimony of Belden Brick Company, LLC - Public Version	

1 Wednesday Afternoon Session, 2 April 25, 2012. 3 4 EXAMINER SEE: Let's go on the record. 5 I would like to take brief appearances of 6 the parties present. Start with the company and go 7 around the room. MS. MOORE: Thank you. On behalf of Ohio 8 9 Power Company, Steven T. Nourse, Matthew J. Satterwhite, Daniel R. Conway, Yazen Alami, and 10 11 Christine M. Moore. 12 EXAMINER SEE: Thank you. MR. PETRICOFF: On behalf of 13 14 Constellation NewEnergy, Direct Energy, Exelon 15 Generation, and Retail Energy Supply Association, 16 Howard Petricoff and Lija Kaleps-Clark. 17 MR. HAYDEN: Your Honor, on behalf of 18 FES, Mark Hayden, Jim Lang, and David Kutik. 19 MR. RANDAZZO: On behalf of the 20 Industrial Energy Users, Frank Darr, I would like to 21 enter a new appearance for Matthew Pritchard, and Sam 2.2 Randazzo. 23 MS. McALISTER: On behalf of the Ohio 24 Manufacturers Association, Lisa McAlister. 25 MR. SUGARMAN: Roger Sugarman on behalf

- 1 of NFIB/Ohio.
- 2 MS. KERN: On behalf of the Ohio
- 3 | Consumers' Counsel, Kyle Kern and Melissa Yost.
- 4 MR. JONES: On behalf of the staff, Steve
- 5 | Beeler and John Jones.
- 6 EXAMINER SEE: The rest of the counsel in
- 7 the room.
- MR. HAQUE: On behalf of the City of
- 9 | Grove City and the Association of Independent
- 10 | Colleges, Asim Haque.
- MR. ROYER: Thank you, your Honor, Barth
- 12 Royer for Dominion Retail.
- 13 MR. STINSON: On behalf of the Ohio
- 14 | Schools, Dane Stinson, Bailey Cavalieri.
- 15 EXAMINER SEE: Okay. I think,
- 16 Mr. Sugarman, you have the first witness?
- MR. SUGARMAN: Yeah, we are ready to
- 18 | proceed with Mr. Geiger.
- 19 EXAMINER SEE: Okay. Mr. Sugarman, I
- 20 | appreciate you contacting your witness and your
- 21 | witness's flexibility to be rescheduled to this
- 22 afternoon.
- MR. SUGARMAN: We appreciate the Bench's
- 24 accommodation as well.
- 25 EXAMINER SEE: As the witness is coming

forward, there are -- there was a motion to strike and a reply to the motion to strike. After considering the motions and the reply, we are going to grant that motion and deny that motion in part such that the motion to strike is granted for page 1 starting with the question "Why are you" -- "Why are you doing so in this proceeding?"

2.2

On page 3 we're striking what is part of sentence 12 -- line 12 through to the end of line 13. We are keeping the question "What is the purpose of your testimony," and striking the first full sentence and "in addition," so that it reads "What is the purpose of your testimony?"

"My testimony will explain," and proceed through the end of the response to that question.

And we are striking the question that starts on that -- the last question on that page through to the following page where you start your third argument.

Yes, Mr. Sugarman.

MR. SUGARMAN: For record purposes would you like a resubmitted direct testimony or simply the ruling from the Bench is sufficient?

EXAMINER SEE: Ruling from the Bench is going to be sufficient on this one. Okay?

With that.

1404 1 (Witness sworn.) 2 EXAMINER SEE: Please proceed, 3 Mr. Sugarman. 4 MR. SUGARMAN: If I may approach, your 5 Honor? 6 EXAMINER SEE: Yes. 7 MR. SUGARMAN: I've handed the witness a 8 copy of his direct testimony as prefiled with the 9 Commission without obviously the ruling from the 10 Bench, but I would ask that it be marked NFIB/Ohio 11 Exhibit 1. 12 EXAMINER SEE: The exhibit is so marked. 13 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 14 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Sugarman, that's 15 marked as Exhibit 101. MR. SUGARMAN: 101, yes. I believe that 16 17 conforms with the convention. 18 EXAMINER SEE: Yes, it does. 19 20 ROGER R. GEIGER 21 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was 2.2 examined and testified as follows. 23 DIRECT EXAMINATION 24 By Mr. Sugarman: 25 Mr. Geiger, could you introduce yourself

Q.

to the Bench, please.

2.2

A. Yes. I am Roger Geiger, Vice President and Executive Director of the Ohio Chapter of the National Federation of Independent Businesses. We represent about 24,000 small independently owned --

EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Geiger, is your

microphone on?

THE WITNESS: The light's on.

EXAMINER SEE: Let's go off the record for a minute.

(Off the record.)

EXAMINER SEE: Let's go back on the record.

Mr. Geiger, go ahead and finish introducing yourself.

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, I am Roger

Geiger, Vice President and Executive Director of the

Ohio Chapter of the National Federation of

Independent Businesses, better known as NFIB/Ohio.

We represent about 24,000 small independently—owned businesses across the state of Ohio.

Q. Mr. Geiger, do you have in front of you what's been identified and marked as NFIB/Ohio Exhibit 101?

A. I do not.

- Q. Is that a copy of the direct testimony which was prepared by you or under your direction on behalf of NFIB/Ohio for purposes of these proceedings?
  - A. It is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- Q. Sir, do you have any corrections or changes to your prefiled testimony?
  - A. I do.
- Q. And if I were to ask you the same questions today that are asked in your prefiled testimony and understanding that you are under oath here today, would your answers be the same as they appear in your prefiled testimony?
  - A. They would be.
- MR. SUGARMAN: Thank you. Your Honor, I would tender the witness for cross-examination.
- 17 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Kern?
- MS. KERN: No questions, your Honor, thank you.
- 20 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. McAlister?
- MS. McALISTER: No questions, your Honor.
- 22 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Randazzo?
- MR. RANDAZZO: No questions, your Honor.
- EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Stinson?
- MR. STINSON: No questions, your Honor.

1407 1 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Haque? 2 MR. HAQUE: No questions, your Honor. 3 EXAMINER SEE: Sorry about that. 4 Mr. Hayden? 5 MR. HAYDEN: No questions. EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Petricoff? 6 7 MR. PETRICOFF: No questions, your Honor. 8 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Jones? 9 MR. JONES: No questions, your Honor. 10 MR. ALAMI: Ms. Moore will be handling 11 the cross. 12 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Moore? 13 MS. MOORE: Thank you, your Honor. 14 15 CROSS-EXAMINATION 16 By Ms. Moore: 17 Q. Hi, Mr. Geiger. Ηi. 18 Α. 19 Your education is in political science, Q. 20 history, and public administration; is that correct? 21 Α. Correct. 2.2 Q. And not in economics? 23 A. Correct. 24 Q. And not in electric regulations? 25 A. Correct.

EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Moore, I am going to need you to speak up.

MS. MOORE: Yes, your Honor, thank you.

- Q. Do any members of NFIB/Ohio receive electric service from CRES providers, Mr. Geiger?
  - A. I'm sure they do.
- Q. Do you know approximately what percentage of FNIB/Ohio members receive electric service from CRES providers?
  - A. I do not.

2.2

- Q. Do you know about how many as a number instead of a percentage?
  - A. I do not.
- Q. And I understand that since December, 2011, you have received contacts from some of your members regarding their electric rates; is that correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. And the amount that your members pay has changed since December, 2011?
- A. The ones that have inquired in our offices, they have seen what they perceive to be significant increases.
- Q. And are all of the members who have contacted you within AEP Ohio's service territory?

A. They are.

2.2

- Q. But you don't know whether any of the charges or increases to your members' bills are due to capacity increases; is that correct?
- A. The way I would answer that is I'm aware of changes that were made by the PUCO, its rulings, that led to those increases, so my assumption is that that most certainly played a role.
- Q. But you don't know sitting here today for a fact whether or not the capacity prices that your members pay has increased?
  - A. Their prices have increased.
- Q. Do you know sitting here today whether that increase is attributable to an increase in the capacity charge portion of their bill?
- A. Again, I believe from my own understanding that, yes, there would be some relationship. But am I an expert to say to what degree or how much? No. But my assumption is based on what has happened in the last several months, that clearly would have played because some of our members actually showed a decrease in usage of electricity and an increase in price.
- Q. Mr. Geiger, is it possible that the price changes could be due to other components of your

members' rates such as the distribution charge?

A. I'm assuming so.

2.2

- Q. So you can't say sitting here today whether the capacity charge has increased, correct?
- A. Have I done my own independent analysis?

  No. But, again, as I said earlier, I do believe when you look at the -- what has happened and what has transpired, one has to make the assumptions that it did play a role.
- Q. If you could turn with me to page 5 of your testimony, sir. On pages -- on page 5, lines 2 and 3, you state -- 2, 3, and 4 "The core philosophy of NFIB/Ohio is rooted in the concept of free markets limiting government intervention as necessary." Did I read that correctly?
  - A. You did.
- Q. You agree, though, Mr. Geiger, that the market for electric service in Ohio is not and has never been a purely free market, correct?
- A. Over time that's correct, but I do believe and as part of the -- part of the legislative debates 10 years or so ago, I do believe the direction is changing in this state to move us to a market-based environment for electricity.

So while your statement, in my opinion,

is correct in a historical perspective, I don't believe that's currently the track the state is on as a fact of stated policy.

2.2

MR. SUGARMAN: Mr. Geiger, when you turn your head that way, it's harder to hear on this side of the room, so if you do that, just keep your voice up.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

- Q. Is it your understanding that the market for electric service in Ohio presently is a competitive, open, free market?
  - A. I believe we are in that transition.
- Q. But it's still a regulated market presently; is that your understanding?

MR. RANDAZZO: I'll object. Can counsel define what they mean by "regulated market"? At the wholesale level? Retail level?

 ${\tt MS.\ MOORE:}$  I can rephrase my question.

EXAMINER SEE: Say it again.

 $$\operatorname{MS.\ MOORE:}$  I am happy to rephrase my question, your Honor.

EXAMINER SEE: Okay. Please do.

Q. (By Ms. Moore) Is it your understanding that the retail market for electric service in Ohio is a free market, Mr. Geiger?

- A. I believe as a matter of stated public policy established by the legislature and by what I believe to be rulings of the Commission, we are on that path to make us a deregulated marketplace.
  - Q. Have we gotten there yet?
- A. I think the fact that I'm sitting here today suggests no.
- Q. Mr. Geiger, are you aware that AEP Ohio has a legal obligation until June, 2015, to supply CRES providers with as much capacity as the CRES provider requires?

MR. SUGARMAN: Objection, your Honor.

EXAMINER SEE: On what basis,

Mr. Sugarman?

2.2

MR. SUGARMAN: On the basis she has asked him for his understanding of the law and the legal implications of the statement, which I don't believe the witness is able or should be asked to be testifying about. That's not why he is here.

MR. RANDAZZO: I will also object.

There's no basis for the assertion that there is a legal obligation.

EXAMINER SEE: Response, Ms. Moore?

MS. MOORE: Your Honor, I am asking

Mr. Geiger's opinion as a lay witness. I am not

asking for a legal opinion. And I'm simply asking for his understanding.

EXAMINER SEE: The objections are overruled.

2.2

You can answer the question to the best of your ability, Mr. Geiger.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.

No, I do not know the answer to that.

- Q. (By Ms. Moore) Mr. Geiger, on lines 5 through 7 of page 5 of your testimony you state that "The reinstated capacity charge of \$255 per megawatt day places the cost of shopping at a level that essentially denies customers the ability to shop elsewhere." Did I read that correctly?
  - A. Yes, you did.
- Q. Have you done any calculations yourself to determine whether there would be customer shopping at a capacity charge of \$255 per megawatt day?
  - A. We have not.
- Q. Are you aware of -- have you been reviewing testimony of other witnesses taken previously in this proceeding?
  - A. To a limited degree. Not every item.
  - Q. There's been a lot of testimony.
  - A. Yes, there has.

Q. Are you aware of testimony that has been given thus far in this proceeding that there would, in fact, be shopping at a capacity charge of \$255 per megawatt day?

MR. SUGARMAN: I have to object, your Honor.

EXAMINER SEE: On what basis,

Mr. Sugarman?

2.2

MR. SUGARMAN: Without a citation to the witness of any proffer of the author of that statement.

EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Moore?

MS. MOORE: Your Honor, I believe that there has been testimony from AEP Ohio witnesses and also possibly from RESA Witness Ringenbach to that effect.

EXAMINER SEE: Okay. The objection is overruled.

Mr. Geiger.

THE WITNESS: Your Honor. I have not -
I would like to see it in context because I can't

react to something I don't see in context. Do I know

that it has been -- that that has been proffered as

testimony? Yes, but I don't -- I don't have it in

context so I can't react to what I think about it.

Q. Okay. Assuming that you reviewed and felt comfortable with the proposition that a capacity charge of \$255 per megawatt day -- let me rephrase that.

2.2

Assuming you reviewed the testimony thus far and felt comfortable with the proposition there would be customer shopping at a customer charge of \$255 per megawatt day, do you still believe that that charge would stifle competition?

- A. Absolutely. It stands to reason. It simply drives up the cost, in my opinion, that takes us away from the market-based system and, therefore, yes, it does add to the bottom line cost, so it stands to reason that, yes, it would impact that cost and it will certainly, in my opinion, distort a market-based system which, therefore, means that there would be less of a competitive advantage in a true open marketplace.
- Q. Have you yourself analyzed the effect of a \$255 capacity charge on competition in AEP Ohio's service territory?
  - A. I have not.
- Q. At line 10 of your testimony on page 5, you state that "The two-tiered capacity pricing scheme," as you refer to it, "would have the effect

or has had the effect of locking small business owners into rates." Do you see where I am reading?

A. Uh-huh.

2.2

- Q. Can you explain what you mean by that statement?
- A. Again, as I said earlier, it makes sense that when you have that capacity pricing, you are clearly taking away the margin that would be used for competition, and so it clearly does in our opinion have a stifling effect on competition.

Every time you narrow what would be in the marketplace based on the fact that we have this, what I call a capacity scheme, you have other terms for it, that clearly takes away from the margins that allow you to have a truly competitive marketplace, so it is a logical conclusion in my opinion.

- Q. Are you aware of any specific example or member who has been, quote, locked into their electric rate as a result of the two-tiered capacity pricing scheme?
- A. The reality is many small businesses are locked into their rates in the current environment as it is today. So whether -- it's just the reality of what happens in the small business marketplace and unless there is a really -- a great opportunity for

true competitive market forces to work out, they generally are locked into their incumbent carrier.

And I use the "locked in" in parentheses because that's just reality what happens when you don't have competitive market forces at will.

- Q. Just so I understand, when you use the term "locked in," do you mean that they are unable to shop; they are unable to procure a competitive retail electric service?
- A. There isn't any competitive -- they have -- they don't have choices because there isn't really anything out there that's competitive for them.
- Q. Directing your attention to line 8 of your testimony on page 5, you state -- you use the phrase "open market pricing" in the context of the sentence "at a time when open market" -- "open market pricing is less than 10 percent." Do you see where I'm referring to?
- A. Unfortunately my lines are not numbered so I have to count down. What's the start of the sentence?
- Q. The beginning of line 8 says "Time when open market pricing."
  - A. Okay.

2.2

Q. When you use the term "open market pricing," are you referring to RPM-based pricing?

2.2

A. Again, I'm -- my reference is to what can be out in the open market.

EXAMINER SEE: What was the last part of that?

THE WITNESS: What was in the open marketplace that they can compete for.

EXAMINER SEE: And "they" would be small business?

THE WITNESS: Small business customers.

- Q. What is your -- and you may have just answered this, but what is your understanding of open market pricing? When you use that term, what do you use it to mean?
- A. From our perspective, as simplistic as it can be, it means that they have a system out there that allows for robust competitive pricing that is not encumbered by lots of regulatory requirements that allow for a number of different competitors to compete for the customer that's G1 and G2 class customers.
- Q. I'll ask my question a little differently because I think we may be crossing wires here.

You state beginning on line 7 of page 5

that "At a time when open market pricing is less than 10 percent of the AEP Ohio charge," and I assume when you use the term "AEP Ohio charge," you are referring to the capacity charge?

A. Correct.

2.2

- Q. Okay. Now, you've said that open market pricing for capacity is less than 10 percent of the AEP Ohio charge?
  - A. That's our understanding.
- Q. Okay. And where do you derive that open market price from? Where do you derive that open market price for capacity?
- A. Simply our understanding of what our members have submitted to us as information where they have called and inquired and given us their bills.
- Q. Okay. Have they commented on from where they derived that information, that open market price information?
- A. From what they get as their bill versus what they have the ability to try to get in true open market, so as those have tried to go out into the open market, the understanding that that's where the State's moving in many cases, unfortunately, in your service area they feel like it's not open. It's not

competitive and there is a big differential and so that's where we derive those comments from.

2.2

- Q. Okay. When your customers go out into the open market in an attempt to procure competitive retail electric service, are they purchasing that service as a bundled rate, or are they purchasing the components of their service separately, if you know?
- A. Again, I think it varies. I think part of it varies on their size maybe. I don't know the answer specifically what their -- what they're bundling and what they're not. At the end of the day what matters to them is what the bottom line is.
- Q. Would you agree that the capacity charge is included as part of the electric service charge that a customer pays?
- A. At the end of the day it's in the bottom line, yes.
- Q. Are you aware of any other market in Ohio through which capacity would be priced other than the RPM market?
- A. I'm not aware of any. There might be, I am just not thinking of anything.
- EXAMINER SEE: What was the last part of that response?
- THE WITNESS: I'm not aware of any. I am

not thinking of anything.

2.2

EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

- Q. Are you familiar with the RPM market?
- A. I'm not a technical expert; no. Again, my testimony is meant to be at a very high level. I am not the experts that you will hear from ad nauseam from others.
- Q. Sure. So just to make sure I understand, you are not familiar with that term?
  - A. Just in a very general way.
- Q. Okay. Mr. Geiger, let's assume that two parties dealing with each other in an arm's length transaction enter into a contract for a good under which one party agrees to purchase the goods from the other party, okay?

Is it your understanding as a general principle the price agreed to would be an indicator of the market price for that good, assuming an arm's length transaction?

A. A lot of it would depend on your business practice, I suppose. I mean, the reality is what you're getting at is absolutely what our members have to do every day, and that is compete in the marketplace where their prices are driven by what the market will bear.

Whether they are in a contract or not, oftentimes that may mean they have to go back and renegotiate that contract because it simply isn't what the customer is willing to pay.

2.2

And so every product that I know my members sell, whether it's a product or a service, it is most certainly driven by what the market will bear, what the customers are able to pay for that, and what their competitors are offering that same product or service for.

So whether it's in a contract or not often means that the contracts — if it is in a contract, most cases it's not but, if it is, it has to be renegotiated.

- Q. So is your answer to my last question yes?
- A. My answer is it depends, and it most certainly might be the starting point, but it isn't necessarily what happens in the general course of commerce in this state.
- Q. But you would agree, wouldn't you, at the time the two parties enter into a contract, they agree to a price that is reflective of the market price for that good or service regardless of whether it later has to be renegotiated because of changes in

the market?

2.2

A. You know, again, you are asking me to make a really broad statement in lots of -- in lots of different types of commerce. And so there is a lot of variations.

I would tell you that it is not common practice in the commerce of this state that you enter into an agreement of price that is based on — solely on what it costs you to produce it. You enter most of your agreements in price, whether it's a formal contract or what you put on the sticker on the product. Your cost may not reflect what's in that price at all.

I mean, many of my members will tell you that oftentimes there are products and services that they sell at a disadvantage to them. They aren't recovering their total cost of doing business on that commodity or product. They may offer it as a bigger portfolio of products but that individual product may actually cost that company.

- Q. Are there also times, sir, where your members sell a product at above their cost?
  - A. Absolutely; "profit" is not a bad word.
  - Q. Thank you.
  - A. And everyone is entitled to make a profit

because if you don't make a profit, you are not going to be in business. That's true with your business, that's true with every single of my members' business.

- Q. And you touched on this a few moments ago in response to another question, but on lines 15 and 16 of your testimony on page 5 you state "Our members operate in that very environment day in and day out," and when you refer to "that very environment," I believe you are referring to the free market "in order to remain competitive in the global marketplace." Do you see that statement?
  - A. Uh-huh, yes.

2.2

- Q. Your members do not operate, though, in a market where they are obligated to -- obligated to provide their goods and services to their competitors at a price that is below their cost, do they?
- A. I'm not aware of any. I wouldn't say there isn't any example out there, but I am not aware of any, none come to mind.
  - Q. And if you were --
- A. Let me rephrase that. You have different forces -- you obviously are in a regulated environment here. You most certainly have suppliers to large corporations and small businesses so

oftentimes there is market forces in play that do allow for the fact that you may not recover or you have to provide a price if you want the entire package.

2.2

If you want to do the entire amount of work for that given company, there may very well be examples of where you are providing a product or service at an amount that is below what you would recover from in an open marketplace.

So in that sense, yes, I think they have many of the similar examples of where they are providing a product or service and it may very well be as part of a deal with a competitor where there may be multiple suppliers to a single larger corporation, and so they most certainly are in — could be very much in that environment that, again, not regulated by government but regulated by an open competition process that they choose to participate in.

- Q. I believe you touched on a key point when you said that those of your members that engage in business in that type of circumstance want to. They are not required to or obligated to; is that correct?
- A. Obligated to if they want to stay in business.

- Q. But no one is telling them they have to.
- A. Obligated to if they want to stay in business.
  - Q. Is anyone telling them they have to, sir?
  - A. As in some government entity? No.
- Q. Now, would you advocate to your members that they should sell their goods or services at a price below their cost?
- A. That's not my role. As an organization I don't get into how they set their prices and what they do to price. That's an individual company's and owner's decision.
- Q. But you certainly advocate on behalf of independent businesses, correct?
  - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

- Q. Would you advocate independent businesses in Ohio sell their goods or services at a price below their cost?
- MR. RANDAZZO: I'll object. I don't see the relevance of the line of questions to any issue or position that's been advanced in this case.
- EXAMINER SEE: Would you like to respond,

  Ms. Moore?
- MS. MOORE: Yes, please, your Honor.
- 25 Mr. Geiger's -- in his testimony Mr. Geiger is

advocating that AEP Ohio provide capacity at a market-based price, and his testimony focuses on the free market.

I'm simply asking whether he would advocate that his members participate in such a market if they were forced to at a price below their cost.

EXAMINER SEE: The objection is overruled.

2.2

A. Your Honor, again, I said earlier it's not my role to tell them what kind of marketplace they ought to be in. I don't know all of the factors. And so that's an individual company decision.

The reality is if they operated that way consistently, they probably wouldn't be in business. But the truth is, as I said earlier, there are many circumstances in which an individual product or service may very well be at -- at a marketplace.

But, again, you are losing sight of the fact that my testimony and what I'm here today for is that we need to be moving in a direction where my members compete every day, and that is in a free, open marketplace, that allows for healthy, robust competition, and that should be whether you're buying

1 | 10 widgets or whether you're buying kilowatt hours.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

If we want our system to provide for the lowest price and best quality, we fundamentally believe let the market dictate that.

MS. MOORE: I have no further questions, your Honor. Thank you.

EXAMINER SEE: Redirect, Mr. Sugarman?

MR. SUGARMAN: No, thank you, your Honor.

I would move though at this time for the admission of NFIB 101 consistent with the Bench's ruling on the motion.

EXAMINER SEE: Are there any objections to the admission of NFIB Exhibit 101?

Hearing none, NFIB Exhibit 101 is admitted into the record.

(EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

EXAMINER SEE: Thank you, Mr. Geiger.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. SUGARMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

EXAMINER SEE: I think the next witness

is yours, Ms. McAlister?

MS. McALISTER: They are, your Honor, and I have received word they are on their way and should be here momentarily.

EXAMINER SEE: They were scheduled to

1429 arrive at 3:00? 1 2 MS. McALISTER: Yes. EXAMINER SEE: Let's take a 10-minute 3 recess. We are off the record. 4 5 (Discussion off the record.) 6 (Recess taken.) 7 EXAMINER PARROT: Let's go back on the 8 record. I believe OMA has our next witness. 9 MS. McALISTER: Thank you, your Honor. 10 OMA calls Ed Forshey to the stand. 11 (Witness sworn.) 12 EXAMINER PARROT: Please proceed. 13 MS. McALISTER: Thank you, your Honor. 14 15 ED FORSHEY 16 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was 17 examined and testified as follows. DIRECT EXAMINATION 18 19 By Ms. McAlister: 20 Q. Mr. Forshey, could you please state your 21 name and business address for the record. 2.2 Α. My name is Ed Forshey. Business address 23 is 60790 Southgate Road, Cambridge, Ohio. 24 And by whom are you employed? 0. 25 AMG Vanadium. I am the Director of Α.

Energy and Asset Management.

2.2

- Q. And on whose behalf are you providing testimony today?
  - A. The Ohio Manufacturers Association.
- Q. And was the testimony that was filed on April 5, 2012, in this proceeding prepared by you or at your direction?
  - A. Yes, it was.

MS. McALISTER: Your Honor, at this time I would like to have marked as OMA Exhibit 101 the confidential version of the prefiled direct testimony of Mr. Forshey and I would also like to have marked as OMA Exhibit 101-A the public version of the testimony of Mr. Forshey.

EXAMINER PARROT: I believe in keeping the convention with IEU Witness Murray's testimony, let's go with A and B markings.

Yes, OMA Exhibit 101-A shall be the public testimony and 101-B the confidential. And the exhibits are so marked.

(EXHIBITS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

- Q. (By Ms. McAlister) Mr. Forshey, do you have a copy of what has been marked as Exhibit 101-A and 101-B with you here?
  - A. Yes, I do.

- Q. Do you have any corrections or additions to make to those exhibits at this time?
  - A. No, I don't.
- Q. And if I were to ask you the same questions today as those that are in OMA Exhibits 101-A and 101-B, would your answers be the same?
  - A. Yes, they would.
- Q. And those answers are true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief?
  - A. That is correct.

MS. McALISTER: Thank you, your Honor. At this time I would move for admission of OMA Exhibits 101-A and 101-B into the record subject to cross-examination, and Mr. Forshey's available for cross-examination.

EXAMINER PARROT: Thank you.

Any cross, Ms. Kern?

MS. KERN: No questions, your Honor.

EXAMINER PARROT: Mr. Randazzo?

MR. RANDAZZO: No questions.

Thank you for coming, Mr. Forshey.

EXAMINER PARROT: Mr. Stinson?

MR. STINSON: No questions.

EXAMINER PARROT: Mr. Haque?

MR. HAQUE: No questions.

2425

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

EXAMINER PARROT: Mr. Hayden?

2 MR. HAYDEN: No question.

EXAMINER PARROT: Ms. Kaleps-Clark?

MS. KALEPS-CLARK: No questions, your

Honor.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

EXAMINER PARROT: Ms. Moore?

MS. MOORE: Thank you, your Honor.

- - -

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

By Ms. Moore:

Q. Good after, Mr. Forshey. Thank you for being with us today. I am Christen Moore, I represent Ohio Power Company.

Turning to page 3 of your prefiled testimony, and directing your attention to lines 7 and 8, it's under question 10. You state "...if we shopped, our competitive supplier will be compelled to pay a \$355 megawatt day capacity charge, which is significantly above market rates." Do you see that sentence?

- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. What do you mean when you use the term "market rates"?
- A. The market rates are the PJM rates that have been decided.

- Q. And those rates is it your understanding those rates were set in an auction process?
  - A. Three years in advance, yes.
  - Q. Great.
    - A. Correct.
- Q. Yes. And are you familiar with the term "RPM"?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. What do you understand that to mean?
- A. RPM as in the -- give me a moment here.

  RPM is the capacity auction that is

  conducted three years in advance of the actual
- 14 delivery.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

- Q. All right. And are you familiar with the base residual auction that takes place each year as a part of RPM?
- A. No.
- Q. But you are aware that there is an auction that takes place every year?
  - A. Yes.
- 22 Q. As RPM?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Mr. Forshey, do you know whether anyone can participate in the yearly auction? Any capacity

supplier? Do you know if there are any requirements that would -- that they would have to meet or anything they would have to do to be able to participate in the auction?

A. You have to be a part of the PJM to participate.

2.2

- Q. Do you know if there are any other limits or constraints?
  - A. I'm not familiar with any other.
- Q. Do you know whether there are any limits on the amount of capacity that certain entities are permitted to bid in the yearly auction through RPM?
- A. I'm aware that AEP has limits currently of what they allow capacity to go to market.
- Q. What do you understand those limits to be?
- A. My understanding is 21 percent the first year, 31 percent, 41, and then they will be going to market.
- Q. And I believe what you are referring to is the capacity pricing scheme that was adopted and then later rejected as part of the stipulation at the end of last year; is that correct?
  - A. Yes, that is what I am referring to.
  - Q. What I am asking about is the actual

participation in the auction itself. Do you know whether there is a limit on the amount that a -- an entity with capacity is allowed to buy into the market to set the market price?

- A. No, I'm not aware.
- Q. Are you aware that AEP Ohio did not participate in the most recent auction which set the RPM price for the 2014 and 2015 planning year?
  - A. Yes, I am aware of that.
- Q. And at lines 8 and 9 of your testimony on page 3, you state that the \$355 per megawatt day rate, you refer to it as the above-market rate, you state that it would likely be passed on to AMG Vanadium. Do you see that?
  - A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. What's the basis for your belief that an increase in capacity price would be passed on to AMG Vanadium?
- A. Well, if I were shopping -- which I am not currently, I did not make the deadline that was established to meet in the 21 percent. If I were shopping and this capacity rate approved, the supplier would have to pay it and most likely that rate would be passed back on to me as a customer.
  - Q. You don't know for sure though because

you are not shopping right now if that price would be passed on to you, correct?

2.2

- A. No, I don't know for sure. I'm assuming it would be. I don't -- I don't know of a supplier that would want to absorb that type of cost on their own.
- Q. Are you aware of the amount that AMG Vanadium -- let me rephrase my question.

Out of the total amount that AMG Vanadium pays for electric service, are you aware of what portion of that is capacity charges? On a yearly basis?

MR. RANDAZZO: I object to the question.

Is the witness to assume it's 355 which has been

AEP's position and what they are currently paying in the rates or some other number?

MS. MOORE: May I respond, your Honor.

EXAMINER PARROT: You may.

MS. MOORE: I'm simply asking Mr. Forshey whether he is aware of -- or what his understanding of the capacity component of his electric rate is right now.

EXAMINER PARROT: Mr. Forshey, you may answer the question.

A. I know what my capacity load is.

- Q. I believe that's information your counsel and you have already provided in discovery.
  - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

Q. Is that correct?

Do you know what -- are you able to put a price on that as you sit here today?

- A. That 355 capacity rate.
- Q. I'm asking are you able to quantify the amount that AMG Vanadium paid in, let's say over the last year as a dollar figure for the capacity component of their electric service rate?

MS. McALISTER: Your Honor.

Just a second, Mr. Forshey.

I believe we are starting to get into confidential information that's proprietary and sensitive.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MS.\ MOORE:}}$  I am happy to rephrase the question.

EXAMINER PARROT: Please do so.

- Q. On a percentage basis are you able to quantify the percentage of your total electric payment that went to capacity last year?
  - MS. McALISTER: Your Honor, same concern.
- MS. MOORE: Your Honor, I don't -- I think it's a stretch to say the percentage of the

total electric bill on a -- as a percentage number is getting into proprietary information without -- we are not asking for dollar figures. I am not asking for a quantifiable number. I am simply asking for a percentage if he knows.

A. Let me refer to my notes.

2.2

EXAMINER PARROT: The Bench agrees that the percentage information would not be considered confidential, but if we stray much further with this line of questioning, I think we may need to push those questions to the end of your cross-examination and we'll have to close the proceedings at that point. Do you have much more along this line or?

MS. MOORE: I don't, your Honor. Thank you.

EXAMINER PARROT: Well, then let's proceed.

Mr. Forshey, you may answer the question.

- A. I would estimate 15 percent.
- Q. (By Ms. Moore) Directing your attention to line 10 of page 3 of your testimony, the figure \$2,343,405, which you state is the difference between market pricing for capacity and AEP Ohio's proposed \$355 per megawatt day rate or price, did you calculate that figure?

- A. I provided the numbers, the base numbers for the calculation.
- Q. Do you know who did calculate that number?
  - A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. And who was that?
- A. And that was our attorney at the OMA.
- Q. Okay. Do you have any understanding of the methodology that was used to calculate that number?
- A. Yes, I am familiar with the way it was calculated.
- Q. And if you could explain how it was calculated.
- A. Well, it begins with the -- the demand -- peak demand number which is calculated by AEP based on some rates. That's the starting point. It's then trued up for the RPM. It's trued up for zonal and then that -- that rate is multiplied by the capacity. And that's compared to the proposal of 355 for the three years.
- Q. And the capacity price that is being multiplied and compared to the greater than 355, is that the RPM price for the next three delivery years?
  - A. That is correct, yes.

- Q. And did those calculations assume that 100 percent of an increase in the price of capacity would be passed on to AMG?
  - A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. Directing your attention to line -- lines 12 through 17 on page 3, specifically line 13 where you state that the inability to proactively manage AMG's electricity costs creates an operational strain. Do you see that?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Other factors besides the price of electricity could contribute to AMG's operational strain; is that correct?
- A. Sure. There could be many factors contributing.
  - Q. What are some of those other factors?
- A. Well, it could be pricing materials, it could be labor costs, operating costs, other operating costs.
- Q. And is it your understanding that the price of electricity is comprised of a number of different parts or elements? Such as capacity and distribution, other components?
  - A. Yes.
    - Q. Is it possible that other factors other

than the price of capacity within that rate could contribute to any operational strain that AMG experiences due to a change in its electric prices? For instance -- I'm sorry, go ahead.

- A. Well, from my standpoint the company power costs make up over 20 percent of my operation costs so it's a significant amount with all the items that are in that power rate.
- Q. On line 20 of page 3 of your testimony, you state that "AMG has engaged in negotiations with several competitive suppliers...." Do you see that?
  - A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. How many competitive suppliers has AMG engaged in negotiations with since December, 2010?
  - A. At least three.
- Q. And when did those negotiations -- each of those negotiations occur, if you recall?
- A. Those negotiations are basically still ongoing. I'm continuing to receive quotes from those vendors.
- Q. When did you begin negotiations with each of those three suppliers?
- A. I would say it was late in 2011, November/December timeframe.
  - Q. For each of the three?

A. Sure.

2.2

- Q. Now, at the very last line of line 3 going on to -- I'm sorry, on the very last line of page 3 going on to the first two lines of page 4, you state that the uncertainty created by the current state of capacity charges in AEP Ohio service territory has made it difficult if not impossible to predict the rates for even a short-term period. Do you see that?
  - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. And on the next line you say the result of the uncertainty is that AMG Vanadium hasn't been able to enter into an agreement with the supplier?
  - A. Correct, yes.
- Q. Can you explain how the uncertainty that you have described has caused AMG to not be able to enter into an agreement with the CRES supplier -- CRES provider?
- A. As stated earlier, certainly this capacity charge most likely will be passed back on to the -- to me, the customer, from the third party.

  If -- I'm not sure what that capacity charge is, how can I enter into a contract with another supplier?
- Q. And so the fact that you've not entered into a retail agreement with the CRES provider is

that you are not comfortable doing so until the price for capacity is set?

2.2

- A. There's -- there's not enough certainty to know whether I am going to have a low price or a high price or whether the vendor can even be competitive to supply.
- Q. If the price for capacity was known as it will be as a result of these proceedings, will AMG Vanadium then be able to enter into an agreement with a CRES provider?

MS. McALISTER: Objection, your Honor.

EXAMINER PARROT: Grounds?

MS. McALISTER: Assumes facts not in evidence. She's assuming the price will be known as a result of these proceedings.

MS. MOORE: I can rephrase my question.

- Q. If the price for capacity were known, would AMG Vanadium be able to enter into an agreement with a CRES provider if there were certainty?
- A. There would be other things that would have to be met, certainly I would have to give notice to AEP that I was going to negotiate or shop. And under the scenario I would have to be able to shop.
  - Q. What do you mean --
  - A. Capacity release that I could shop.

- Q. I don't think I understood the last part of your answer.
- A. Well, right now, I'm under contract with -- with AEP. So I would have to give them notification and the only way I would shop is if -- if I could lower my price or have savings for the business. Right now, there is no guarantee of that.
- Q. But if the capacity -- the price for capacity was known and the price that you were able to obtain from a CRES supplier was lower than that which you are paying to AEP Ohio, you would probably shop, correct?
  - A. Most likely, yes.
- Q. Directing your attention to page 4, lines 7 through 11, actually lines 6 through 11, the sentence at the end of line that begins on the end of line 6, "In other words, there are no practical ways to mitigate the increase as AEP Ohio's proposal inhibits customers' ability to shop for alternative suppliers and save money. It also holds customers captive to higher rates and essentially serves as a tax on shopping." Do you see that?
  - A. Yes.

2.2

Q. I have some questions for you about that -- those statements. Again, you are presuming

in that statement that CRES providers pass on 100 percent of the prices they pay for capacity, correct?

2.2

- A. From -- in my mind that's the most logical assumption, yes.
- Q. Do those statements also presume that there would be no other benefit or cost savings that a CRES provider would possess in order to enable it to compete?

MS. McALISTER: I'm sorry, could I have the question reread? I couldn't hear the last part of it.

## (Record read.)

- Q. And by compete I mean offer electric service price at a lower than AEP Ohio standard service offer rate?
- A. Yes, I would say that's an assumption, you know, it's pretty -- it would be difficult for them to overcome a potential \$2.3 million amount.
- Q. And when you say \$2.3 million, just for the record you are referring to the difference between market prices and the proposed --
  - A. And the 355.
  - Q. And that would be just for AMG Vanadium?
  - A. That's correct.

- Q. Mr. Forshey, are you aware that energy rates are presently low?
  - A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. Directing your attention back to lines 10 and 11 of page 4 of your testimony, could you please explain what you mean by the statement that "AEP Ohio's proposal holds customers captive to higher rates and serves as a tax on shopping"?
- A. Well, basically a high capacity charge limits my ability to -- to go out and solicit these market rates that are available for generation and transmission of power.
- Q. And so I understand that that's how -that's what you mean when you say that it "holds
  customers captive." What do you mean when you say it
  "serves as a tax on shopping"?
- A. It's a charge that I will have to pay, I am assuming would be passed through and most likely would be passed through. It's the same as putting a tax which prohibits me from participating in the market. It's a fee that I should not have to pay.
- Q. Mr. Forshey, you don't have any background in economics; is that correct?
  - A. No, I do not.
  - Q. What about in electric regulation?

- A. No; I'm not an expert. I'm a former plant manager. I have been a manager in manufacturing for over 40 years. That's my background.
- Q. And I understand, AMG Vanadium manufacturers themselves products and services for the metals manufacturing, refinery, and petro industries; is that correct?
  - A. That's correct, yes.

2.2

Q. Would AMG Vanadium voluntarily sell its products to competitors at a price less than cost?

MR. RANDAZZO: I object, relevance.

EXAMINER PARROT: Response.

MS. MOORE: I think the question is relevant to the issue of AEP Ohio's position that the RPM price for capacity is lower than its cost.

EXAMINER PARROT: The objection is overruled. You may answer the question.

A. The question was would I as a company sell product to a competitor at lower than what I would sell it in the market? I don't think that would make logical sense. I wouldn't stay in business.

But I also know that if I was selling my product, I wouldn't have it priced so high that I

couldn't sell it in the market. I would have to be at the market rates or I wouldn't stay in business.

2.2

- Q. Your statement there presumes that you would be -- would have participated in setting the market rates; is that correct?
- A. My statement presumes that if I'm -- you know, saying, you know, if my costs are such that I can't compete in the marketplace, why am I in business?

And I can't force my customers to pay a higher price really than what's in the market and should not be able to force a customer to do that.

Q. If AMG Vanadium were required to sell its products to its competitors at less than its cost, do you believe that would negatively affect its long-term financial viability?

MR. RANDAZZO: I object.

EXAMINER PARROT: Overruled.

A. If AMG over a period of time continued to do that, they would not survive. Now, certainly I would think AMG is a smart enough company they would figure out ways to mitigate other costs to be competitive with the marketplace. We have been in business for 60 years and that's what we have been doing.

1449 1 MS. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Forshey. 2 I have no further questions, your Honor. EXAMINER PARROT: Mr. Beeler? 3 4 MR. BEELER: No questions, your Honor. 5 EXAMINER PARROT: Any redirect? 6 MS. McALISTER: If I could have just a minute. 7 8 EXAMINER PARROT: Yes. 9 MS. McALISTER: Your Honor, we have no 10 redirect. And is it your preference I move the 11 exhibits all together at the end or individually? 12 EXAMINER PARROT: Let's just do them 13 individually as we go. 14 MS. McALISTER: I would renew my motion 15 to admit into evidence OMA Exhibits 101-A and 101-B. 16 EXAMINER PARROT: Are there any 17 objections? Hearing none, OMA Exhibits 101-A and 18 19 101-B are admitted. 20 (EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.) 21 EXAMINER PARROT: Thank you very much, 22 Mr. Forshey. 23 THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor. 24 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. McAlister, your next 25 witness?

1 MS. McALISTER: Thank you, your Honor. 2 OMA calls Lima Refinery witness Rick Walters to the 3 stand. 4 (Witness sworn.) 5 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. McAlister. MS. McALISTER: Thank you, your Honor. 6 7 8 RICHARD J. WALTERS 9 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was 10 examined and testified as follows. 11 DIRECT EXAMINATION 12 By Ms. McAlister: 13 Mr. Walters, could you please state your Ο. name and business address for the record? 14 15 My name is Richard Walters, Sr. I go by Α. 16 Rick. Our address is 1150 South Metcalf Street,

- Q. And by whom are you employed?
- A. Lima Refining Company.

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Lima, Ohio.

- Q. And on whose behalf are you providing testimony today?
  - A. The Ohio Manufacturers Association.
- Q. And was the testimony that was filed on April 5, 2012, in this proceeding prepared by you or at your direction?

A. It was at my direction.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

MS. McALISTER: Your Honor, at this time I would like to have marked as OMA Exhibit 102-A the public version of the prefiled testimony and OMA Exhibit 102-B as the confidential version of Mr. Walters' testimony.

EXAMINER SEE: The exhibits are so marked.

## (EXHIBITS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

- Q. Mr. Walters, do you have a copy of what's just been marked as OMA Exhibits 102-A and 102-B with you today?
  - A. I do.
- Q. Do you have any corrections or additions to make?
  - A. No.
  - Q. And if I were to ask you the same questions today as what are in those exhibits, would your answers be the same?
    - A. Yes, they would.
  - Q. And are those answers true to the best of your knowledge and belief?
    - A. They are.
- MS. McALISTER: Your Honor, at this time
  I would move for the admission of OMA Exhibits 102-A

1 and 102-B into the record subject to 2 cross-examination, and Mr. Walters is available for 3 cross-examination. 4 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Kern? 5 MS. KERN: No cross, thank you. EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Stinson? 6 7 MR. STINSON: No questions, your Honor. 8 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Haque? 9 MR. HAQUE: No question. 10 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Randazzo? 11 MR. RANDAZZO: No questions. Thank you 12 for coming, Mr. Walters. 13 EXAMINER SEE: I'm sorry, Mr. Randazzo? MR. RANDAZZO: I said no questions and 14 15 just thanked the witness for coming. 16 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Hayden? 17 MR. HAYDEN: No questions. 18 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Kaleps-Clark? 19 MS. KALEPS-CLARK: No questions. 20 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Moore or Mr. Alami. 21 MR. ALAMI: Ms. Moore will also be 2.2 handling cross of this witness, thank you, your 23 Honor. 24 MS. MOORE: Thank you, your Honor. 25

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 By Ms. Moore:

2.2

- Q. Hi, Mr. Walters.
- A. Hi.
- Q. And I will just echo our thanks for being here today.
  - A. You are welcome.
- Q. Turning to page 3 of your prefiled testimony, on lines 3 through 5 you state that "Under AEP Ohio's proposal, our competitive supplier will be compelled to pay a \$355 megawatt day capacity charge, which is significantly above market rates." Do you see that statement?
  - A. I do.
- Q. When you use the term "market rates," are you referring to RPM rates?
- A. I'm referring to this same rate. I can't -- if it's RPM versus -- I don't know. I'm not an expert and I get lost in the jargon, I will be the first to admit it. Which incidentally, I do have a consultant that Lima Refining Company uses, Susan Buckley who is back there, and we have done that just to mitigate through some of the jargon and help us as we went out to supply, so.

Sorry for the long-winded answer.

- Q. That's okay. What is your understanding of the term "market rates" then?
- A. Okay. My understanding is based on this capacity load that AEP has historically charged a market rate and my understanding of the genesis of the 355 is that that is AEP's claimed costs and that is what they are wanting to charge now.
  - Q. Are you familiar with the term "RPM"?
- A. I am only yesterday when I saw some verbiage on it but I wouldn't be able to describe it.
- Q. As you hear the term "market rates," is it your understanding that those rates are the rates set through an auction process?
- A. I'm aware that there is an auction process, and as Ed mentioned, I'm aware it's done three years in advance.
- Q. And you are aware it is administered through RPM?
  - A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. Do you know whether any entity that has capacity can participate in the yearly auction?
  - A. I don't know that.
- Q. Are you aware that AEP Ohio did not participate in the most recent auction?
  - A. I don't know that either.

- Q. Directing your attention to lines 5 and 6 of your testimony on page 3, you state that the \$355 per megawatt day capacity charge which you refer to as the above-market rate will be passed on to Lima Refining.
  - A. That's my understanding, yes.
  - Q. What's the basis for the understanding?
- A. Lima elected -- we started the process of investigating -- with the new ESP we started investigating going out to the market and in doing so was able to come in contact with Scioto Energy, start working through that process, and as we did that, we, you know, became aware of some of -- of some of these things, so I'm not sure if that answers your question.
- Q. It does in part so I'll ask you another one.
  - A. Okay.

2.2

- Q. Has any CRES provider represented to Lima Refining that the -- an increase in capacity pricing would be passed on?
- A. Yes. I'm sorry. I kind of lost track.

  When the -- we did shop and we went into contract

  with a CRES provider I think around September of last

  year, and in so doing, I mean without going into

contract language which I don't have in front of me
but --

2.2

- Q. And I don't want you to today anyway.
- A. Good. But they have -- that language is there, as I understand it.
- Q. And so just to clarify, it's your understanding Lima Refining -- that any increase in the price your CRES provider pays for capacity would be passed on to Lima Refinery?
- A. At their option. It's not mandatory, as I understand it, but to Ed's point earlier, logically, especially as large as this is, I would be stunned if they weren't wanting to pass it on.
- Q. Is there a similar provision that would provide for any decrease in the price your CRES provider pays for capacity would be passed on?

MS. McALISTER: Your Honor, could I -- are you asking about the contract specifically or his review in general of various CRES contracts?

MS. MOORE: Thank you.

MS. McALISTER: We are starting to cross over that line again.

MS. MOORE: Thank you for the clarification. I will rephrase the question.

EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

- Q. Mr. Walters, are you aware of whether generally CRES providers also pass through decreases in capacity prices?
  - A. I'm not aware.
- Q. Directing your attention to line 8 of page 3 of your testimony where you state that the difference between the market prices for capacity and AEP Ohio's proposed \$355 per megawatt day rate is approximately \$51,700,000 over the next three years?
  - A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. Did you calculate that figure?
- A. I reviewed the calculation and walked through it with several.
  - Q. And was that figure prepared by counsel?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And to your knowledge did that figure assume a -- that 100 percent of an increase in capacity pricing would be passed on to Lima Refining?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Have you or has anyone from your company calculated -- calculated the difference between the amount that Lima Refining presently pays for electric service and the amount it would pay if capacity is priced at \$355 per megawatt day?
  - A. I guess I'm not sure that I'm following

the question. I'm sorry.

2.2

- Q. As I understand it, the -- the \$51,700,000 number that appears in your testimony is based on the difference between AEP Ohio's proposal of \$355 per megawatt day --
  - A. Okay.
- Q. -- and the RPM rate that would be in effect for the next three delivery years?
  - A. Okay.
  - Q. Is that your understanding as well?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. What I'm asking is has anyone from Lima Refinery calculated -- done a similar calculation comparing the \$355 per megawatt day figure with the amount that Lima Refining presently pays or is charged for capacity right now?
- A. We talked about that in the last couple of days and I don't have a firm number, but I believe we're roughly at \$140, give or take, versus the 355, and so you could -- you could fairly easily do that math and come up with a number, but that's as far as I took that.
- Q. Thank you. Directing your attention to lines 9 through 13 of your testimony on page 3 where you discuss the impact on Lima, are there factors

besides the price of capacity that could affect
Lima's capacities to make capital investment, conduct
worker training, hire new employees, and retention of
existing employees? Is that correct?

A. Absolutely.

2.2

- Q. What are some of those other factors?
- A. We're negotiating a wage contract right now that's going to cost us more, new environmental regulations, new OSHA regulations, you know, the list goes on. If you have been in business in -- the factors are pretty limitless.
- Q. Sure. Now, you state at lines 16 and 17 on page 3 of your testimony that Lima has engaged in negotiations with several competitive suppliers.
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. How many competitive suppliers did Lima negotiate with?
- A. As I mentioned, when we decided to go down this path and investigate shopping, we engaged Scioto Energy. We went through this process and looked at I believe about eight suppliers and then, of course, narrowed that down through the process and ultimately did select one, as I mentioned.
- Q. And I believe you selected one in approximately September, 2011?

A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. When did you begin negotiations with CRES suppliers?
- A. When -- I want to say we started negotiations, I'm going to say June, but that's a guess, a rough guess.
  - Q. Around approximately June of 2011?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. You state at lines 20 and 21 on page 3 of your testimony that Lima Refining's competitive rate will be impacted by the 355 per megawatt day price adopted. That again assumes 100 percent of the difference in price would be passed on to Lima, correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. In the next line there you state that there are no practical ways to mitigate the increase as AEP Ohio's proposal inhibits customers' ability to shop for alternative suppliers and save money. And you go on on page 4 to state it holds customers captive to higher rates and essentially serves as a tax on shopping. Do you see that?
  - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Does -- do those statements assume that CRES suppliers do not possess any other price or

other benefits which would make them able to supply electricity at a rate below AEP Ohio standard service offer even if the capacity rates were \$355 per megawatt day?

2.2

A. Those statements are what I would call a general business sense, having gone through this process and to now, after we entered that contract be faced with a \$52 million over three year additional expense that I can't -- I can't in my pushing 30 years of manufacturing experience fathom how they could figure out how to absorb that. Nor any company, to be honest, ourselves included, how we would be able to absorb a \$52 million kick.

So that's maybe a long answer but that's -- no, I don't see how they could possibly mitigate that.

- Q. You would agree, would you not, that a CRES provider like any other business has numerous different cost components that go into its ultimate price that it charges its customers?
  - A. I would agree.
- Q. Are you aware that energy rates are presently very low? Relative to recent historical prices?
  - A. Are you meaning energy rates in general

or electricity capacity or --

2.2

- Q. I'm talking about the energy component of an electric rate.
- A. I guess when you say that, because I've seen our rates go up for the last five years every year, no, I guess everything is relative, but to me they are not low when they keep going up at 5 to 15 percent clips, so.
- Q. And it's possible that component of electric service could be low and others could have increased, could they not, to leading to an increase in the overall price?
- A. That's what I was trying to get. Are you referring to just the capacity piece? I think as Ed stated, I'm more interested from the refinery overall of the overall electricity costs to the refinery because it's 15 percent of our cost to manufacture.

So it's a huge expense, so the fact that now capacity is -- is the latest where we are facing potentially a huge additional expense, okay, it's capacity but my -- my interest is in the overall rate ultimately.

Q. And it is possible that other components of the overall rate could decrease as capacity

increases?

2.2

- A. I am sure that is possible, yes.
- Q. And, Mr. Walters, you are not an economist by background; is that correct?
  - A. No.
- Q. And you are not an expert in electric regulations.
  - A. I'm definitely not.
- Q. My understanding is Lima Refining processes crude oil and gasoline and diesel fuels; is that correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Lima Refining voluntarily sells its products to competitors at less than its cost to produce those products?
- A. On -- we don't get to set our rates. The market decides what we are going to get for gasoline, diesel, jet on a daily basis and, quite frankly, on an hourly basis. So ultimately, yes, unfortunately we do sell it below cost sometimes, believe it or not, those of you that are buying gasoline.

But so, no, not willingly, but it happens because you have got to keep the refinery -- you want to keep the refinery running to a certain level as well because of the unbelievable cost to bring the

```
refinery down. So again, I apologize for the long-winded answer.
```

- Q. Now, I understand that -- that as a part of your business you are sometimes -- it sometimes become necessary to sell your products at lower than your cost, but if you were required to undertake such transactions on a long-term basis, would that negatively affect your long-term viability?
  - A. Absolutely.
- MS. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Walters, I have no further questions.
- 12 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
- EXAMINER SEE: Redirect, Ms. McAlister?
- MS. McALISTER: I suspect not but if I
- 15 could have just one moment.
- 16 EXAMINER SEE: You may.
- 17 I'm sorry, Mr. Beeler.
- 18 MR. BEELER: No questions, thank you.
- 19 (Discussion off the record.)
- 20 EXAMINER SEE: Let's go back on the
- 21 record.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Ms. McAlister?
- MS. McALISTER: No redirect, your Honor.
- 24 And, your Honors, I would renew --
- 25 EXAMINER SEE: Thank you very much,

Mr. Walters. 1 2 MS. McALISTER: Excuse me. I would renew 3 my motion to admit into evidence OMA Exhibits 102-A 4 and 102-B. 5 EXAMINER SEE: Are there any objections to the admission of OMA 102-A and 102-B? 6 7 Hearing none, they are admitted into the 8 record. 9 (EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.) 10 EXAMINER PARROT: You may call your next 11 witness. 12 MS. McALISTER: Thank you, your Honor. 13 The OMA calls Whirlpool Corporation witness, Mr. John Seifker. 14 15 (Witness sworn.)

16

## JOHN P. SEIFKER

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

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

By Ms. McAlister:

17

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. Please state your name and business address for the record.
- A. My name is John P. Seifker.
- Q. And by whom are you employed -- I'm

sorry, please state your business record -- your business address?

2.2

- A. My business address is 4901 North Main Street, in Findlay, Ohio.
  - Q. Thank you. And by whom are you employed?
  - A. I am employed by Whirlpool Corporation.
- Q. And was the testimony that was filed on April 5, 2012, in this proceeding prepared by you or at your direction?
  - A. It was at my direction.

MS. McALISTER: Your Honor, at this time I would like to have marked as OMA Exhibits 103-A the public version of Mr. Seifker's testimony and 103-B the confidential version.

EXAMINER PARROT: So marked.

(EXHIBITS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

- Q. Mr. Seifker, do you have a copy of what has been marked OMA Exhibits 103-A and 103-B with you today?
  - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. And do you have any corrections or additions to make to those exhibits.
- A. Yes, I do. I have several and I would like to go through them now if I could, please. On page 1, line 16, there's a change from "35" to "20."

On page 3, line 13, please strike out "while" and "not" and put a period after "time."

2.2

Also on page 3, lines 14 and 15, strike out "if we shop."

On page 4, line 5, after the word "suppliers" insert "and has shopped" and strike out "in an attempt to shop."

Also on page 4, lines 10 through 11, strike out "The results of the uncertainty is that we have not been able to enter into an agreement with the competitive supplier. However."

And finally on that same page 4, line 12, strike out "even if we were to competitively source our generation."

That is my changes.

- Q. Okay. Just so the record is clear, those changes reflect the fact that Whirlpool is shopping; is that correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Thank you. Now, if I were to ask you the same questions today as what are in those exhibits with the changes that you just made, would your answers be the same?
  - A. Yes, they would.
  - Q. And are those true and correct to the

1 best of your knowledge and belief? 2 Α. Yes. MS. McALISTER: Thank you, your Honor, at 3 this time I would move for admission of Exhibits OMA 4 5 103-A and 103-B into the record subject to cross-examination, and Mr. Seifker is available for 6 7 cross. 8 EXAMINER PARROT: Ms. Kern? 9 MS. KERN: No cross, thank you, your 10 Honor. 11 EXAMINER PARROT: Mr. Randazzo? 12 MR. RANDAZZO: No questions. 13 Thank for coming. 14 EXAMINER PARROT: Mr. Hayden? 15 MR. HAYDEN: No questions. 16 EXAMINER PARROT: Ms. Kaleps-Clark? 17 MS. KALEPS-CLARK: No questions. EXAMINER PARROT: Ms. Moore? 18 19 MS. MOORE: Thank you, your Honor. 20 21 CROSS-EXAMINATION 22 By Ms. Moore: 23 Hello, Mr. Seifker, thank you for coming. 0. 24 Α. Thank you. I would ask you to speak up a 25 little bit. Plant noise has deteriorated my hearing

- a little, so if you would, I would appreciate it.
- Q. Sure, and if you can't hear any of my questions, just ask me and I'll repeat them.
  - A. Okay.

2.2

- Q. Thank you. If you'll turn with me to page 3 of your direct testimony.
  - A. Yes.
- Q. At lines 15 and 16 you state that Whirlpool's competitive supplier will be compelled to pay a \$355 per megawatt day capacity charge which is significantly above market rates?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. What do you mean by the term "market rates"?
- A. Market rates are the PJM market rates that are done during the public auction. That's what I refer to as market rates.
- Q. And so throughout your testimony when you use the term "market rates," you are referring to the RPM-based rates that are set in auctions?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. Do you know whether anyone can participate in the yearly auction to set the RPM-based rates?
  - A. I'm not -- I'm not sure.

- Q. Okay. Do you know whether there are any limits on the amount of capacity an entity who participates in the auction is permitted to bid into the auction each year?
  - A. I'm not aware. No, I do not know.
- Q. Are you aware that AEP Ohio did not participate in the most recent auction setting the current RPM price?
  - A. No; I do not know that information.
- Q. Directing your attention to lines 16 and 17 of your testimony on page 3, you state that the 355 megawatt day capacity charge which you characterize as the above-market rate will be passed on to Whirlpool.
- A. Would you repeat that again? What line are you on, please?
  - Q. Sure, I'm on lines 16 and 17.
  - A. Uh-huh.

2.2

- Q. Where you state that "This above-market rate," which I believe you are referring to as the \$355 per megawatt day capacity charge, will be passed on to Whirlpool. Do you see that sentence?
- A. Yes, I see that. Yes, I believe that will be passed on to us for any up charge to the capacity rate whether it's the 355, 246, whatever

that rate will be will be passed on to us.

2.2

- Q. What's the basis for that belief?
- A. Being in business, any time there's an up charge like that, you would think that that -- you would have to send it on to your -- whoever is paying the bill.
- Q. Has any CRES provider informed Whirlpool that, in fact, such an increase in capacity prices would be passed on to Whirlpool?
  - A. No, not that I know.
- Q. If you'll look at line 19 on page 3 of your testimony, you state that the difference between AEP Ohio's proposed \$355 per megawatt day charge and the RPM-based market, what you are characterizing as market prices for capacity, over the next three years will be \$3.4 million.
- A. That's an approximate estimation, yes, it is.
- Q. Did you calculate that \$3.4 million figure?
- A. No, I did not calculate that figure but I put -- input into the numbers so that they were calculated for us.
- Q. And who did calculate the \$3.4 million figure?

A. The OMA did that for us.

2.2

- Q. And to your knowledge does that figure assume that 100 percent of any increase in the price of capacity would be passed on to Whirlpool?
- A. Yes, I do believe that would be passed on to us.
- Q. You state, sir, on page 3 at lines 20 through 22 that the inability to proactively manage Whirlpool's electricity costs creates an operational strain on Whirlpool.

Other factors besides the price of capacity that a CRES provider pays could contribute to Whirlpool's operational strain, correct?

- A. All costs could have an effect on our business. I mean, you have to factor them all in, you know, Whirlpool looks at we do projects around the plant that take 4 or 5 cents out of our product. We are adding significant dollars. How do I -- we get that out of our product?
- Q. So other factors besides the price of capacity would or could contribute to Whirlpool's operational strain, correct?
  - A. Yes, it would.
- Q. And I understand from the changes to your testimony today that Whirlpool is now shopping.

- A. Yes.
- Q. Correct?

With how many CRES providers did

4 Whirlpool negotiate?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

18

- A. Our standard for Whirlpool Corporation is a minimum of three. And there's no limit on the top end.
  - Q. Do you know how many?
- A. No, I am not -- I am not privy to say how many. I really don't know.
- Q. You don't know or you don't feel that you are able to say?
  - A. I really don't know.
- 14 Q. Okay.
- 15 A. That negotiation is done at another level than me.
  - Q. Do you know when Whirlpool's negotiations with CRES providers began?
    - A. It began in summer last year.
- Q. Summer of?
- 21 A. 2011.
- Q. Thank you. And do you know on what date
  Whirlpool entered into its present agreement with a
  CRES provider?
- A. I do not have that date right in front of

me. I'm not sure.

2.2

- Q. Okay. Directing your attention to lines 14 through 17 of your testimony on page 4. You state that there are no practical ways to mitigate the increase in capacity pricing as AEP Ohio's proposal inhibits customers' ability to shop for alternative suppliers and save money. It also holds customers captive to higher rates and essentially serves as a tax on shopping. Did I read that correctly?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. These statements assume that CRES providers will pass on 100 percent of the price they pay for capacity, correct?
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. These statements also presume that CRES providers possess no other benefits or ability to offer a price that is lower than AEP Ohio's standard service offer rate?
- A. I don't -- I do not know that. All I do know is anything that they would come up with as far as capacity would be passed on whether it's 355 like I stated before, 255, whatever that rate is.
- Q. Is it possible that a CRES provider that is compelled to pay \$355 per megawatt day for capacity could -- strike that.

Please explain, sir, what you mean by the statement that "the \$355 per megawatt day price holds customers captive to higher rates."

- A. It's part of what the other generation companies would have to acquire and would have to pass on through to your customers.
- Q. When you say "other generation companies," do you mean CRES providers?
  - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. And can you explain your statement that the proposed capacity charge is a tax on shopping?
- A. It's up and beyond what the market rate is out on the open market, so how would you consider it any more than an up charge or a tax to do business with somebody other than the power company?
- Q. And when you use the term "market rate," are you again referring to the market-based rate?
  - A. Yes, I am.
  - Q. Is RPM an open market?
  - A. RPM is a bid market as I know it.
    - Q. Is it an open market?
    - A. I don't know.
- Q. Mr. Seifker, your background is not in economics; is that correct?
  - A. That is correct.

- Q. And it's not in electric regulations?
- A. No. I'm no expert. I run a plant.
- Q. And Whirlpool Manufacturing sells a number of products, including washers, dryers, refrigerators, dishwashers, correct?
  - A. That's correct.

2.2

- Q. Would Whirlpool voluntarily sell its products to one of its competitors at less than Whirlpool's cost to produce those products?
  - A. No, I don't think they would.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. If Whirlpool were required to undertake to sell its product to its competitors at less than its costs, would you agree that would negatively impact Whirlpool's long-term financial viability?
- A. Yes, it would, but you can sustain that for a while to keep your market share so you keep your factories running. You know, to hold off the LGs and the Samsungs of the world that we are in the world market with.
- Q. And the amount of time that it would be feasible to sell products at less than cost would depend on the company, right, financially feasible?
- A. It would depend on somebody higher than me.

1 And it would depend on each company is Ο. 2 unique, correct? 3 Α. That is correct. 4 Q. Okay. I have no further questions. 5 Thank you. Thank you, your Honor. 6 MS. MOORE: 7 EXAMINER PARROT: Mr. Beeler? 8 MR. BEELER: We have no questions, your 9 Honor. 10 EXAMINER SEE: Any redirect? 11 MS. McALISTER: I don't think so. 12 EXAMINER PARROT: Take a moment. 13 MS. McALISTER: Thank you, your Honor. 14 No redirect, your Honor. 15 EXAMINER PARROT: Thank you. All right. 16 I believe you already moved for the admission of your 17 exhibits. Are there any objections to the admission of OMA Exhibits 103-A or 103-B? 18 19 Hearing none, Exhibits 103-A and 103-B 20 are admitted. 21 (EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.) 2.2 EXAMINER PARROT: Thank you. You are 23 excused. 24 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 25 EXAMINER SEE: Your next witness,

1478 Ms. McAlister. 1 2 MS. McALISTER: Thank you, your Honor, the OMA calls OSCO Industries witness Mr. John Burke. 3 4 (Witness sworn.) 5 EXAMINER SEE: Thank you. Have a seat. 6 Ms. McAlister? 7 MS. McALISTER: Thank you, your Honor. 8 9 JOHN BURKE 10 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was 11 examined and testified as follows. 12 DIRECT EXAMINATION 13 By Ms. McAlister: 14 Could you please state your name and business for the record. 15 16 My name is John Burke, and the business 17 address is Chillicothe -- 11th and Chillicothe 18 Streets, Portsmouth, Ohio. 19 And by whom are you employed? Q. 20 Α. OSCO Industries. 21 And on whose behalf are you providing Ο. 22 testimony today? 23 The OMA. Α.

April 5, 2012, in this proceeding prepared by you or

Was the testimony that was filed on

24

25

Ο.

at your direction?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

A. At my direction.

MS. McALISTER: Your Honor, at this time I would like to have marked as OMA Exhibit 104-A the public testimony of OSCO Industries and OMA Exhibit 104-B the confidential version.

EXAMINER SEE: The exhibits are so marked.

(EXHIBITS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

- Q. Mr. Burke, do you have a copy of what's just been marked as OMA Exhibits 104-A and B today?
- A. Let's see, I'm a little confused. Is B the purchase agreement? I'm a little --
  - Q. No, B is the confidential version of your testimony.
    - A. Okay.
    - Q. It should be marked at the top as "Confidential Version."
- A. Okay. It appears to be the same document. Am I confused about that or?
- MS. McALISTER: Your Honor, may I approach the witness?
- 23 EXAMINER SEE: Yes, you may.
- MS. McALISTER: And, your Honor, I am providing the witness with OMA Exhibits 104-A and

104-B.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

2 EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.

- Q. Now, Mr. Burke, do you have what's just been marked as OMA Exhibits 104-A and B with you today?
  - A. I do.
- Q. Okay. Do you have any corrections or additions to those exhibits?
  - A. I do not.
- Q. And if I were to ask you the same questions today as what are in those exhibits, would your answers be the same?
  - A. Yes, they would.
- Q. And are those answers true and correct to the best of your understanding and belief?
  - A. They are.

MS. McALISTER: Your Honor, at this time I would move for admission of OMA Exhibits 104-A and B into the record, subject to cross-examination, and Mr. Burke is available for cross.

EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Kern?

MS. KERN: No questions, your Honor.

EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Randazzo?

MR. RANDAZZO: No questions. Thanks for

1481 1 coming, Mr. Burke. 2 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Hayden? 3 MR. HAYDEN: No questions. 4 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Kaleps-Clark? 5 MS. KALEPS-CLARK: No questions, your 6 Honor, thank you. 7 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Beeler? 8 MR. BEELER: No questions, your Honor. 9 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Moore? 10 MS. MOORE: Thank you, your Honor. Thank 11 you. 12 13 CROSS-EXAMINATION 14 By Ms. Moore: 15 Mr. Burke, thank you for coming this Q. 16 afternoon. 17 Directing your attention to lines 7 and 8 of your prefiled testimony on page 3, you state that 18 19 AEP Ohio's proposal would compel your competitive 20 supplier to pay \$355 per megawatt day capacity charge 21 which is significantly above market rates. 2.2 Α. Yes. 23 When you use the term "market rates," 0. 24 what do you mean? 25 Α. Okay. I guess in repetition on the -- in

the queue here and, yes, I understand that there's an auction conducted out there that determines these capacity charges in what's called the larger market out there. And that by comparison to that marketplace, you know, the 355 stands pretty tall.

- Q. And when you refer to that "marketplace," you are referring to the RPM reliability pricing mechanism?
  - A. Yes, yes.

2.2

- Q. And so throughout your testimony when you use the term "market rates," are you referring to RPM-based rates?
  - A. Yes, I am.
- Q. Okay. Do you know whether anyone can participate in the auction that is held as part of RPM?
- A. I did not know the details of that auction and what -- you know, what's required for eligibility.
- Q. Okay. Do you know whether there are any limits on the amount of capacity an entity participating in that auction is permitted to bid in the auction?
  - A. I don't know that either.
  - Q. Okay. Are you aware that AEP Ohio did

not participate in the most recent auction?

- A. Not until yesterday.
- Q. But you were aware prior to today.
- A. Yes. I heard that yesterday. You are supplying out of your own capacity and did not elect to participate.
- Q. Directing your attention to lines 8 and 9 of your testimony on page 3, you state that the \$355 per megawatt day capacity charge which you characterize as the above-market rate will be passed on to OSCO?
  - A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. What's the basis for your belief that that increase will be passed on to OSCO?
- A. Yes. I have a -- or we buy marketed electricity and there's a clause in there that it indicates that my supplier certainly has the capability of passing those charges through to our company.
- Q. So it's in your -- in your company's contract with the CRES provider?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Directing your attention to line 11 on page 3 of your testimony where you state that the difference between the RPM-based price for capacity

which you call the market price "...and AEP Ohio's proposed \$355 per megawatt day charge is approximately \$2,572,000 over the next three years."

A. Correct.

2.2

- Q. Did you calculate that figure?
- A. I didn't do the direct calculation, but as commented, we have an individual within our company who is familiar with electricity and electrical billing, and I sought out his expertise in that area.
  - Q. Okay.
- A. And learned what peak load capacity means.
- Q. Okay. And in calculating that figure was it assumed that 100 percent of a capacity increase -- of an increase in the price of capacity would be passed on to OSCO?
  - A. It was.
- Q. Okay. Have you or has anyone from your company calculated the difference between the amount that OSCO presently pays for capacity and the amount it would pay if capacity were priced at \$355 per megawatt day?
  - A. No. I have not made that calculation.
  - Q. Okay. Directing your attention to lines

15 through 17 -- actually lines 13 through 17 on page 3 of your testimony, you state that the proposed \$355 per megawatt day capacity charge will have a significant impact on OSCO. Do you see that paragraph?

A. Yes, I do.

2.2

- Q. There are other factors besides the price of capacity that a CRES provider is required to pay that could affect OSCO's ability to, for instance, make capital investments, conduct worker training, hire new employees, and retain new employees correct that, retaining of existing employees, I'm sorry; is that correct?
- A. I'm not sure you exactly said that question right.
  - Q. Sure, I'll repeat my question.
- A. In other words, beyond my contract I don't really care what my CRES provider does.
  - Q. Sure.
- A. I'm under contract and have a price that's locked in.
- Q. That's not what I'm asking. I'm asking are there other factors in OSCO's business that could that could impact its ability to make capital investments, conduct worker training, hire

new employees, or retain existing employees?

- A. Yes, you're correct. There are many.
- Q. What are some of those factors?
- A. Well, the price of energy is a key -- key factor. The price of our labor, the price of metal in our case is probably central to our cost structure, and as others have pointed out, regulation.
  - Q. And OSCO presently shops --
  - A. We do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. -- for its generation portion of its service, correct?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. When did OSCO begin shopping?
- A. In the summer of 2010 is when we concluded the shopping and contracted.
- Q. You entered into your contract in summer, 2010?
- A. Let's see, I think the contract -because I heard you ask that question previously.
  Yeah, it's actually dated in August of 2010.
  - Q. Okay.
- A. And then there is a 90-day waiting period that AEP has, so we wouldn't have actually gone on brokered power until December of 2010.

- Q. Do you know with how many CRES providers OSCO negotiated prior to entering into its present agreement in August, 2010?
- A. That's a good question. We had several fliers, and, when I spoke with our electrical engineer about this, he is -- we quickly narrowed it down to one and actually moved pretty quickly on it, so I think there were -- my answer would be three.
- Q. And when you -- you just stated that you had several fliers. Do you mean like pamphlets and information about competitive retail electric --
  - A. Yes.

2.2

Q. -- supply? Okay.

When did all of the negotiations with CRES providers occur?

- A. In the summer of 2010.
- Q. Do you know when they began?
- A. I wouldn't know the exact date, no.
- Q. Has OSCO's CRES provider informed OSCO that it plans to increase the amount it charges OSCO if the price of capacity increases?
- A. We have had no communication with them in that regard.
  - Q. So the answer is no?
  - A. The answer would be no.

- Q. And has OSCO had the same CRES provider since August, 2010?
  - A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. On lines 2 through 5 of your testimony on page 4, you state that OSCO's competitive rates will be impacted even though OSCO is shopping before September of 2011 and that there are no practical ways to mitigate the increases as AEP Ohio's proposal inhibits customers' ability to shop for alternative suppliers and save money?
  - A. Yes, I see that language.
- Q. Do those statements assume that OSCO's CRES provider will pass on 100 percent of any increase in the price of capacity?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Do these statements also assume that OSCO's CRES provider possesses no other means by which it could compete and offer a price lower than AEP Ohio's standard service offer if capacity were priced at \$355 per megawatt day?
- A. That -- that's really beyond my knowledge. I wouldn't know the circumstances of the CRES provider.
- Q. Well, you say there are -- you say that your rates -- that OSCO's rates will be impacted,

correct? And you are assuming that 100 percent of the capacity price will be passed on to OSCO, correct?

2.2

- A. Yes. The agreement allows them to pass those costs on.
- Q. Are you assuming that there would be no other way for a CRES provider to prorate a lower rate?
- A. I'm not -- I'm not going to assume anything.
- Q. Are you aware that energy rates are presently very low?
- A. As another individual spoke, we have seen no decrease even though we are buying brokered power. The price of power has done nothing but go up, so if the market is low, I don't know that. Not in my bill.
- Q. Mr. Burke, your background is not in economics; is that correct?
  - A. It is not.
- Q. And you are not an expert in electric regulation?
  - A. I'm not.
  - Q. And OSCO is a gray iron foundry, correct?
    - A. Yes. We have three locations.

- Q. And it produces and sells green sand and shell molding among other processes?
  - A. We sell metal parts.
- Q. Would OSCO voluntarily sell its products to competitors at a price less than cost to sell its products?
- A. I was curious about your question. Do you mean to put the word "competitor" in there?
  - Q. I do.

2.2

- A. Because typically we would -- I can't think of a situation unless it would be to help somebody out where we would sell to a competitor.
  - Q. So OSCO would not sell to a competitor?
- A. We would not unless they were in an emergency, unless it was an emergency.
- Q. And would OSCO voluntarily sell its products to anyone at less than its cost to produce its products?
  - A. At times that can happen, yes.
- Q. And under what circumstance would that happen?
- A. Well, a mistake, for instance can cause that to happen or a change in the, for instance, the quality requirements might change the processing and that would change, you know, the profitability of a

certain part. As another individual mentioned,
market share is sometimes a consideration or if with
that customer you have good things and bad things,
you might take it as a package and.

- Q. Would that be a sustainable business model for OSCO?
  - A. Not 100 percent.
- Q. And would you agree that if OSCO were required to undertake such transactions on a long-term basis, it would affect OSCO's financial viability as a company?
  - A. It certainly would.

MS. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Burke.

I have no further questions, your Honor.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

16 EXAMINER SEE: Wait just a minute. Just

17 a minute.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18 THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.

19 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. McAlister, any

20 redirect?

MS. McALISTER: Unlikely, but may I have

22 a moment?

EXAMINER SEE: You may. Let's go off the

24 record for a couple of minutes.

25 (Discussion off the record.)

Volume VII OPC/CSP 1492 1 EXAMINER SEE: Let's go back on the 2 record. 3 Ms. McAlister? 4 MS. McALISTER: No redirect, your Honor. 5 EXAMINER SEE: And I think you already moved -- you did already move OMA Exhibits 104-A and 6 7 104-B into the record. Are there any objections to the admission of 104-A and 104-B? 8 9 Hearing none, OMA Exhibits 104-A and 104-B are admitted into the record. 10 11 (EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.) 12 EXAMINER SEE: And thank you very much, 13 Mr. Burke. 14 THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honors. 15 EXAMINER PARROT: Ms. McAlister, you may 16 call your next witness. 17 MS. McALISTER: Thank you, your Honor. The OMA calls Belden Brick witness Mr. Brad Belden. 18 19 (Witness sworn.) 20 EXAMINER PARROT: Please be seated. 21 Please proceed. 2.2 MS. McALISTER: Thank you, your Honor. 23

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC., Columbus, Ohio (614) 224-9481

24

BRADLEY H. BELDEN 1 2 being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was examined and testified as follows: 3 4 DIRECT EXAMINATION 5 By Ms. McAlister: 6 Please state your name and business and address for the record. 7 8 Α. My name is Bradley Belden. The business 9 address is 700 West Tuscarawas Street, Canton, Ohio. 10 And by whom are you employed? Q. 11 Α. The Belden Brick Company. 12 Q. And on whose behalf are you testifying 13 today? 14 The OMA. Α. 15 Was the testimony that was filed on Q. 16 April 5, 2012, in this proceeding prepared by you or 17 at your direction? At my direction. 18 Α. 19 MS. McALISTER: Your Honor, at this time 20 I would like to have marked as OMA Exhibit 105-A the 21 public version of Belden's testimony and 105-B the 2.2 confidential version. 23 EXAMINER PARROT: So marked. 24 (EXHIBITS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 25

Mr. Belden, do you have a copy of what

Q.

has been marked OMA Exhibits 105-A and B with you today?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- Q. And do you have any corrections or additions to make to those exhibits at this time?
  - A. No.
- Q. And if I were to ask you the same questions today as what's in those exhibits, would your answers be the same?
  - A. They would be the same.
- Q. And are those answers true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief?
  - A. Yes, they are.

MS. McALISTER: Thank you, your Honor. At this time I would move for the admission of OMA Exhibits 105-A and B into the record, subject to cross-examination, and Mr. Belden is available for cross.

EXAMINER PARROT: Ms. Kern?

MS. KERN: No questions, your Honor.

EXAMINER PARROT: Mr. Randazzo?

MR. RANDAZZO: No questions. Thank you

for coming, Mr. Belden.

EXAMINER PARROT: Mr. Hayden?

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC., Columbus, Ohio (614) 224-9481

MR. HAYDEN: No questions.

1495 1 EXAMINER PARROT: Ms. Kaleps-Clark? 2 MS. KALEPS-CLARK: No questions, your 3 Honor. 4 EXAMINER PARROT: Ms. Moore? 5 MS. MOORE: Thank you, your Honor. 6 7 CROSS-EXAMINATION 8 By Ms. Moore: 9 And thank you for coming today, Mr. Belden. 10 11 You're welcome. Α. 12 Q. Directing your attention to your prefiled 13 testimony on lines 11 and 12 on page 3, you state that under AEP Ohio's proposal Belden Brick's 14 15 competitive supplier will be compelled to pay a \$355 16 per megawatt day capacity charge which is significantly above market rates. When you use the 17 term "market rates," to what are you referring? 18 19 I am -- I am referring to the PJM RPM Α. 20 auction. 21

- Great. Do you know whether anyone can participate in the yearly PJM RPM auction?
  - I do not know. Α.

2.2

23

24

25

Do you know whether there are any limits on the amount of capacity an entity that is bidding

in the auction is permitted to bid?

- A. I do not know that either.
- Q. Are you aware that AEP Ohio did not participate in the most recent auction?
  - A. I am aware of that, yes.
  - Q. Were you aware of that before today?
  - A. I was.

2.2

- Q. Okay. Directing your attention to lines 12 and 13 on page 3 of your direct testimony, you state that the \$355 per megawatt day capacity charge, which you call the above-market rate, will be passed on to Belden Brick. What is the basis for that belief?
- A. We do have a CRES provider, and in our contract it does state that they have the ability to change the rate that they charge us if capacity charges would change.
- Q. And has Belden Brick's CRES provider informed Belden that it will, in fact, increase its, Belden's, rates if capacity prices increase?
- A. No. They have not indicated to us that that would happen if this passed.
- Q. Directing your attention to line 15 on page 3 of your testimony, you state that the difference between the RPM-based price for capacity,

which you called the "market price" for capacity, and AEP Ohio's proposed 355 per megawatt day number is approximately \$896,270 over the next three years; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

2.2

- Q. Did you calculate that figure?
- A. No. It was calculated by the OMA but with information provided by us.
- Q. Okay. And do you know whether that figure assumes that 100 percent of an increase in the price of capacity would be passed on to Belden?
- A. Yes, it assumes that 100 percent of that change would be passed on.
- Q. Have you or anyone from Belden Brick calculated the difference between the amount that Belden presently pays for electric service and the amount it would pay if capacity was priced at \$355 per megawatt day?
- A. The only calculation we have done is this one so we pay a flat rate and which already has the auction-based prices in that model so we're assuming if they would if the capacity charges were raised, that they would raise it by that amount.
- Q. But you haven't performed the calculation
  I just asked about; is that correct?

- A. No. Just this calculation here.
- Q. Okay. Directing your attention to line 17 through 23 of page 3 of your direct testimony where you discuss the significant impact that Belden Brick believes the \$355 per megawatt day proposal made by AEP Ohio would have on it. It's true, is it not, that other factors besides the price of capacity that a CRES provider was required to pay to AEP Ohio could affect Belden Brick's ability to make capital investment, conduct worker training, hire new employees, and retain existing employees, right?
  - A. That's true.

2.2

- Q. What are some of those other factors?
- A. The market for brick, for one, labor costs, the price of natural gas is another for instance.
- Q. And Belden Brick is presently shopping the generation portion of its electric service, correct?
  - A. Correct.
  - Q. For how long has it been shopping?
- A. We signed an agreement in December of 2010. So then there is a 90-day period after that.
- Q. And before signing that agreement when did Belden Brick begin negotiating with CRES

providers?

2.2

- A. It was about September, 2010, give or take a month or two.
- Q. And with how many CRES providers did Belden negotiate?
- A. I know of two, but in the process we hired a consultant so I don't know if there were any that she saw during that time, but there were two presented to me.
- Q. And has Belden had the same CRES provider since September -- I'm sorry, since December, 2010?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. On lines 7 and 8 of page 4 of your direct testimony you testified competitive rates will be impacted as well even though Belden Brick was shopping well before September, 2011, and in context they will be impacted by the proposed \$355 per megawatt day price.

Does that, again, assume that 100 percent of any change in the price of capacity would be passed on to Belden Brick?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Mr. Belden, Belden manufactures bricks, pavers, and related products; is that correct?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Would Belden Brick voluntarily sell its products to its competitor at less than Belden's cost to produce those products?
- A. We would not be voluntarily -- we would not voluntarily sell those at below market costs. I guess if we were forced to by law, we would probably try to find ways to reduce the cost of our product, as we always do anyway.
  - Q. But it would not do so voluntarily?
  - A. Not voluntarily.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. If Belden Brick were required to sell its products to its competitors at less than Belden Brick's cost to produce those products, would you agree that the result to undertake such transactions would negatively affect Belden Brick's long-term viability as a company?
  - A. Yes, I agree.
- MS. MOORE: Thank you. I have no further questions, your Honor.
- 20 EXAMINER PARROT: Mr. Beeler?
- MR. BEELER: No questions.
- 22 EXAMINER PARROT: Any redirect?
- MS. McALISTER: Probably not.
- 24 EXAMINER PARROT: Take a moment.
- MS. McALISTER: Thank you.

1501 No redirect, your Honor. 1 Thank you. 2 EXAMINER PARROT: 3 Thank you very much, Mr. Belden. You are 4 excused. 5 Thank you, your Honor. THE WITNESS: 6 EXAMINER PARROT: I believe you already 7 moved for the admission of Exhibits 105-A and 105-B. 8 Are there any objections? 9 Hearing none, OMA Exhibits 105-A and 105-B are admitted. 10 11 (EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.) 12 EXAMINER PARROT: Is there anything else 13 to come before us today? 14 All right. Seeing nothing, we are 15 adjourned until tomorrow. We will reconvene at 16 8:30 a.m. 17 Let's go off the record. 18 (Thereupon, the hearing was adjourned at 19 4:42 p.m.) 20 21 2.2 23 24 25

## CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings taken by me in this matter on Wednesday, April 25, 2012, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes.

Karen Sue Gibson, Registered Merit Reporter.

11 (KSG-5516)

\_ -

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on** 

5/9/2012 2:14:24 PM

in

Case No(s). 10-2929-EL-UNC

Summary: Transcript of Commission Review of the Capacity Charges of Ohio Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company hearing held on 04/25/12 - Volume VII electronically filed by Mrs. Jennifer Duffer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Gibson, Karen Sue Mrs.