

BEFORE THE  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio )  
Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric )  
Illuminating Company and The Toledo )  
Edison Company for Authority to Provide ) Case No. 14-1297-EL-SSO  
for a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to R.C. )  
4928.143 in the Form of an Electric Security )  
Plan )

---

**FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF**  
  
**EILEEN M. MIKKELSEN**  
  
**ON BEHALF OF**  
  
**OHIO EDISON COMPANY**  
**THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY**  
**THE TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY**

---

**JUNE 4, 2015**

1 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, POSITION, AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.**

2 A. My name is Eileen M. Mikkelsen. I am employed by FirstEnergy Service Company as  
3 the Director of Rates and Regulatory Affairs for the FirstEnergy Corp. Ohio utilities  
4 (Ohio Edison Company (“Ohio Edison”), The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company  
5 (“CEI”) and The Toledo Edison Company (“Toledo Edison”) (collectively, the  
6 “Companies”)). My business address is 76 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio 44308.

7 **Q. ARE YOU THE SAME EILEEN MIKKELSEN WHO PREVIOUSLY PROVIDED**  
8 **TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?**

9 A. Yes. I provided direct testimony on August 4, 2014, Supplemental Testimony on  
10 December 22, 2014, Second Supplemental Testimony on May 4, 2015, and Third  
11 Supplemental Testimony on June 2, 2015.

12 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY**  
13 **IN THIS PROCEEDING?**

14 A. The purpose of this testimony is to support the Second Supplemental Stipulation filed on  
15 June 4, 2015, in this proceeding. The Second Supplemental Stipulation modifies the  
16 Stipulation and Recommendation filed in this proceeding on December 22, 2014 and later  
17 modified by the Supplemental Stipulation (collectively, the “Stipulation”). My  
18 Supplemental Testimony filed on December 22, 2014, provided an overview of the  
19 Stipulation and explained why the terms and conditions of the Stipulation are more  
20 favorable to customers in the aggregate than the expected results that would otherwise  
21 apply under a market rate offer (“MRO”). My Supplemental Testimony also explained  
22 how the Stipulation meets the criteria the Commission has used when reviewing

1 stipulations. In this testimony, I will explain why the Stipulation, as modified by the  
2 Second Supplemental Stipulation, continues to satisfy these criteria.

3 **Q. WHAT IS THE PROPOSED MODIFICATION INCLUDED IN THE SECOND**  
4 **SUPPLEMENTAL STIPULATION?**

5 A. The Second Supplemental Stipulation adds a new section V.A.3 to the Stipulation to  
6 include a Commercial High Load Factor (“HLF”) Experimental Time-of-Use rate  
7 proposal for commercial customers that meet certain criteria.

8 **Q. WHY ARE THE SIGNATORY PARTIES RECOMMENDING THAT THIS**  
9 **MODIFICATION BE MADE TO THE STIPULATION?**

10 A. The Companies have agreed with the other Signatory Parties that this modification  
11 improves the Stipulation by providing additional qualitative benefits to the Companies’  
12 customers. The new Section V.A.3 will give the Companies’ commercial customers that  
13 meet the specified criteria an opportunity to reduce their overall energy bills and to learn  
14 more about time-of-use rates. Recovery of differences, if any, between revenues  
15 collected to provide this generation service and the cost associated with providing this  
16 generation service would be recovered in Rider GCR. An illustration of the Commercial  
17 High Load Factor (“HLF”) Experimental Time-of-Use rates, based on the 2015/2016  
18 Delivery Year competitive bid process average clearing price, is contained on Attachment  
19 1 to the Second Supplemental Stipulation.

20 **Q. DOES THIS MODIFICATION TO THE STIPULATION ALTER THE**  
21 **CONCLUSIONS MADE IN YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY?**

22 A. No. The terms and conditions of the Stipulation, as modified by the Second  
23 Supplemental Stipulation, continue to be more favorable to customers in the aggregate

1       than the expected results that would otherwise apply under a MRO. In particular, the  
2       modification in the Second Supplemental Stipulation provides additional qualitative  
3       benefits to customers that would not otherwise be available under a MRO. In addition,  
4       the Stipulation, as modified by the Second Supplemental Stipulation, continues to meet  
5       the criteria the Commission utilizes when reviewing stipulations for the reasons stated in  
6       my Supplemental Testimony.

7   **Q.   DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY?**

8   **A.   Yes. I reserve the right to supplement my testimony.**

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

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**6/4/2015 12:17:54 PM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 14-1297-EL-SSO**

Summary: Testimony (Fourth Supplemental) of Eileen M. Mikkelsen electronically filed by Mr. James F Lang on behalf of Ohio Edison Company and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and The Toledo Edison Company