

BEFORE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio     )  
Power Company to Adjust Its Economic     )     Case No. 16-260-EL-RDR  
Development Rider Rate.                     )

FINDING AND ORDER

The Commission finds:

- (1) Ohio Power Company d/b/a AEP Ohio (AEP Ohio or the Company) is an electric distribution utility as defined in R.C. 4928.01(A)(6) and a public utility as defined in R.C. 4905.02, and, as such, is subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission.
- (2) R.C. 4928.141 provides that an electric distribution utility shall provide consumers within its certified territory a standard service offer (SSO) of all competitive retail electric services necessary to maintain essential electric services to customers, including a firm supply of electric generation services. The SSO may be either a market rate offer in accordance with R.C. 4928.142 or an electric security plan (ESP) in accordance with R.C. 4928.143.
- (3) R.C. 4905.31 authorizes the Commission to approve schedules or reasonable arrangements between a public utility and one or more of its customers. The statute provides that every such schedule or reasonable arrangement shall be under the supervision and regulation of the Commission, and is subject to change, alteration, or modification by the Commission.
- (4) In Case No. 13-2385-EL-SSO, et al., the Commission modified and approved AEP Ohio's application for an ESP for the period of June 1, 2015, through May 31, 2018, which included approval of the economic development rider (EDR) through which the Company recovers foregone revenues associated with reasonable arrangements approved by the

Commission under R.C. 4905.31. *In re Ohio Power Co.*, Case No. 13-2385-EL-SSO, et al., Opinion and Order (Feb. 25, 2015) at 69.

- (5) Under Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-38-08(A)(5), the Commission requires that an electric utility's EDR rate be updated and reconciled semiannually. Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-38-08(C) permits affected persons to file a motion to intervene, as well as comments and objections to the electric utility's application, within 20 days of the date on which the application is filed. Additionally, the Commission has previously directed AEP Ohio to file an application to adjust its EDR rate to allow the Commission sufficient time to review the filing and perform due diligence with regard to the application in order to facilitate implementation of the adjusted EDR rate with the first billing cycle of April and October. *In re Columbus Southern Power Co. and Ohio Power Co.*, Case No. 09-1095-EL-RDR, Finding and Order (Jan. 7, 2010) at 12.
- (6) On February 2, 2016, in the above-captioned case, AEP Ohio filed an application to adjust its EDR rate. Specifically, AEP Ohio proposes to increase the EDR rate from (0.13648) percent<sup>1</sup> of base distribution rates to (0.05858) percent, effective with the first billing cycle in April 2016, as shown below:

Current Rate	Proposed Rate	Proposed Increase
(0.13648) percent	(0.05858) percent	0.07790 percent

\*The EDR is determined by multiplying the customer's base distribution charges by the percentage EDR rate described in the chart above.

- (7) On March 4, 2016, Staff filed its review and recommendations regarding AEP Ohio's application to adjust the EDR rate. The application and Staff's review and recommendations are summarized below.

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this Finding and Order, numbers in parentheses indicate negative numbers.

Procedural Issues

- (8) On February 2, 2016, AEP Ohio filed a motion for protective treatment of customer-specific load information of Eramet Marietta, Inc. (Eramet) and Globe Metallurgical, Inc. (Globe), which is contained in certain schedules, and was filed under seal in accordance with Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-24.<sup>2</sup> While AEP Ohio takes no position as to the confidential and proprietary nature of the information under Ohio law, the Company notes that it filed the motions to permit its customers a timely opportunity to seek protective treatment. AEP Ohio also notes that the load information of Ormet Primary Aluminum Corporation (Ormet) has been publicly disclosed, consistent with Ormet's prior representations that there is no need to redact the information or to seek protective treatment.
- (9) On February 5, 2016, Eramet filed a motion for a protective order and a motion to intervene. On March 15, 2016, Globe filed a motion for a protective order, as well as a motion to intervene. A motion for protective order and motion to intervene were filed by TimkenSteel on March 16, 2016. In their respective motions to intervene, Eramet, Globe, and TimkenSteel state that they are each served by AEP Ohio, pursuant to a Commission-approved reasonable arrangement, and each also notes that its customer-specific information is part of the Company's EDR application. Eramet, Globe, and TimkenSteel assert that they may be affected by AEP Ohio's proposed adjustment to its EDR rate and, therefore, each claims a direct, real, and substantial interest in this case that cannot be adequately represented by any other party to the proceeding. For these reasons, Eramet, Globe, and TimkenSteel request that the Commission grant their respective motions for intervention. No memoranda contra the motions to intervene were filed.

---

<sup>2</sup> AEP Ohio's motion does not specifically mention the customer-specific load information of TimkenSteel Corp. (TimkenSteel), although the schedule containing TimkenSteel's information was also filed under seal by the Company.

- (10) In their motions for protective treatment, Eramet, Globe, and TimkenSteel state that AEP Ohio's EDR application includes certain customer-specific information related to electric usage and pricing that is confidential, sensitive, and proprietary trade secret information, as defined in R.C. 1333.61(D), and, as recognized by Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-24(A)(7). According to Eramet, Globe, and TimkenSteel, if the customer-specific information is released to the public, it would compromise their business position and ability to compete, by disclosing actual customer usage and pricing terms that are not generally known or readily ascertainable by their competitors. Eramet, Globe, and TimkenSteel assert that non-disclosure of the customer-specific information is not inconsistent with the purposes of R.C. Title 49. No memoranda contra the motions for protective treatment were filed.
- (11) The Commission finds that Eramet has set forth reasonable grounds for intervention and, therefore, its motion to intervene should be granted. Further, although Globe's and TimkenSteel's motions for intervention were not filed within the time period prescribed by Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-38-08(C), we find that the motions, which are unopposed, should be granted, given that Globe's and TimkenSteel's primary interest in this proceeding is to seek protective treatment for their customer-specific information.
- (12) With respect to the pending motions for protective orders, we note that the Commission has previously granted protective treatment for the same customer usage and pricing information that is the subject of the pending motions. *In re Ohio Power Co.*, Case No. 15-1400-EL-RDR, Finding and Order (Nov. 18, 2015) at 4. The Commission again finds that the motions for protective treatment filed by AEP Ohio, Eramet, Globe, and TimkenSteel are reasonable and should be granted. Pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-24(F), this protective order shall expire 24 months after the issuance of this Finding and Order, unless an appropriate motion seeking to continue protective treatment is filed at least 45 days in advance of the expiration date.

Summary of the Application

- (13) In support of its application, AEP Ohio explains that the proposed EDR rate is based on estimated cost under-recoveries as evidenced by the projected 2016 delta revenues, as well as on the actual and projected delta revenues associated with the Company's current or prior reasonable arrangements with Eramet, Globe, Ormet, and TimkenSteel.
- (14) AEP Ohio states that its calculation of the proposed EDR rate is based on the over-/under-recovery balance as of December 2015, the projected over-/under-recoveries from January through March 2016, and the forecasted delta revenues and rider revenue from April through September 2016, which is consistent with the approach approved by the Commission in the Company's prior EDR case. AEP Ohio also notes that its rate approach continues to include the accrual of carrying costs at the weighted average cost of long-term debt.
- (15) In addition, AEP Ohio states that, if it determines during the EDR rate period that the EDR collections are or will be substantially different than anticipated or that the unrecovered costs based on delta revenues are or will be substantially different than anticipated, the Company will file an application to modify the EDR rate for the remainder of the rate period. AEP Ohio further states that it will continue to track the delta revenues and the EDR collections in order to reconcile any difference through subsequent EDR rate adjustments.
- (16) Finally, AEP Ohio asserts that its proposed EDR rate is just and reasonable and that a hearing is not necessary. AEP Ohio requests that, at the conclusion of the 20-day comment period prescribed by Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-38-08(C), the Commission approve the application in time for the new EDR rate to take effect with the first billing cycle of April 2016.

- (17) In Staff's review and recommendations regarding AEP Ohio's application to adjust the EDR rate, Staff states that the proposed EDR rate of (0.05858) percent reflects the current and projected costs through September 2016, which result from reasonable arrangements approved by the Commission. Staff, therefore, recommends approval of the application for rates to become effective with the first billing cycle for April 2016.

Consideration of the Application

- (18) Upon review of AEP Ohio's application to adjust its EDR rate and Staff's recommendations, the Commission finds that the application does not appear to be unjust or unreasonable and that it should be approved. Therefore, the Commission finds that it is unnecessary to hold a hearing in this matter.
- (19) Specifically, the Commission finds that AEP Ohio's proposed EDR rate of (0.05858) percent is reasonable and should be approved. Our approval of AEP Ohio's application will ensure that the Company recovers the costs resulting from foregone revenues associated with the reasonable arrangements approved for Eramet, Globe, Ormet, and TimkenSteel. Accordingly, the Commission authorizes AEP Ohio to file revised tariffs to implement the adjusted EDR rate.

It is, therefore,

ORDERED, That the motions for intervention filed by Eramet, Globe, and TimkenSteel be granted. It is, further,

ORDERED, That the motions for protective treatment filed by AEP Ohio, Eramet, Globe, and TimkenSteel be granted. It is, further,

ORDERED, That AEP Ohio's application to adjust its EDR rate be approved. It is, further,

ORDERED, That AEP Ohio be authorized to file tariffs, in final form, consistent with this Finding and Order. AEP Ohio shall file one copy in this case docket and one copy in its TRF docket. It is, further,


ORDERED, That the effective date of the new tariffs shall be a date not earlier than the date upon which the final tariff pages are filed with the Commission. It is, further,

ORDERED, That a copy of this Finding and Order be served upon all parties and interested persons of record.


THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO




Andre T. Porter, Chairman




Lynn Slaby



M. Beth Trombold



Asim Z. Haque



Thomas W. Johnson

SJP/sc

Entered in the Journal

MAR 31 2016



Barcy F. McNeal  
Secretary