

**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)	Case No. 14-1297-EL-SSO
Edison Company for Authority to Provide for)	
a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to R.C.)	
4928.143 in the Form of an Electric Security)	
Plan.)	

**JOINT INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL,
REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATION TO FULL COMMISSION
AND APPLICATION FOR REVIEW
AND COMMENTS ON TARIFFS
BY
NORTHWEST OHIO AGGREGATION COALITION
AND
THE OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL**

Thomas R. Hays, Attorney
(0054062)
8355 Island Lane
Maineville, OH 45039
419-410-7069
trhayslaw@gmail.com

**Attorney for Northwest Ohio Aggregation
Coalition (NOAC) and the Individual
Communities**

BRUCE J. WESTON (0016973)
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Larry S. Sauer
Larry S. Sauer (0039223)
Counsel of Record
Maureen R. Willis (0020847)
William J. Michael (0070921)
Kevin F. Moore (0089228)
Ajay Kumar (0092208)
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800

Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

Telephone [Sauer]: (614) 466-1312

Telephone [Willis]: (614) 466-9567

Telephone [Michael]: (614) 466-1291

Telephone [Moore]: (614) 387-2965

Telephone [Kumar]: (614) 466-1292

Larry.sauer@occ.ohio.gov

Maureen.willis@occ.ohio.gov

William.michael@occ.ohio.gov

Kevin.moore@occ.ohio.gov

Ajay.kumar@occ.ohio.gov

(All Attorneys Will Accept Service Via
E-mail)

**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)	Case No. 14-1297-EL-SSO
Edison Company for Authority to Provide for)	
a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to R.C.)	
4928.143 in the Form of an Electric Security)	
Plan.)	

**JOINT INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL,
REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATION TO FULL COMMISSION
AND APPLICATION FOR REVIEW
AND COMMENTS ON TARIFFS
BY
NORTHWEST OHIO AGGREGATION COALITION,
AND
THE OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL**

The Northwest Ohio Aggregation Coalition (“NOAC”)¹ and the Office of the Ohio Consumers’ Counsel (“OCC”)² (collectively “Consumer Advocates”) on behalf of the electric customers of Ohio Edison Company, the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and the Toledo Edison Company (collectively “FirstEnergy” or “the Utility”) submit this Interlocutory Appeal to the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (“PUCO” or “the Commission”). Consumer Advocates respectfully request that this appeal be certified to the full Commission for review of the Attorney Examiner’s May 10, 2016

¹ NOAC is the Northwest Aggregation Coalition, which jointly intervened with individual communities of Village of Holland, Lake Township Board of Trustees, Lucas County Board of Commissioners, City of Maumee, City of Northwood, Village of Ottawa Hills, City of Perrysburg, City of Sylvania, City of Toledo, and Village of Waterville. Each of the individual communities is an opt-out aggregator for electric services in the Toledo Edison service territory. See Joint Motion to Intervene (Sept. 26, 2014).

² The Consumers’ Counsel is the state’s representative of residential utility consumers and submits this filing on behalf of 1.9 million consumers of FirstEnergy.

Entry (“Entry”).³ The Entry contained a directive for FirstEnergy to file proposed tariff "consistent with the Opinion and Order" by May 13, 2016. FirstEnergy filed the tariffs on May 13, 2016 and included in their tariffs the ESP rates authorized by the PUCO, with a Retail Rate Stability Rider charged to all customers, beginning June 1, 2016, with no kWh value applied to the rider.⁴

The interlocutory appeal should be certified⁵ for an immediate determination by the Commission because it presents a new or novel question of interpretation, law, and policy, departs from past general practices, and is necessary in order to prevent undue prejudice to Ohio consumers and their representatives. Upon review,⁶ the PUCO should reverse or modify the Attorney Examiner’s Entry.

It was error for the Entry to require FirstEnergy to file tariffs that otherwise cannot be implemented due to the recent ruling by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”).⁷ Consumer Advocates also provide comments on the tariffs filed by FirstEnergy in response to the Entry. As explained, the tariffs must be rejected as they cannot comply with PUCO directives. The tariffs present a new standard service offer that must be approved by the PUCO prior to implementing rates. That new standard service offer may not be implemented through a tariff filing, but must comply with the procedure set forth in Chapter 4928. In the meantime, under Ohio law, the Commission

³ Consistent with Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-15(c), we have attached a copy of the May 10, 2016 Entry. (Attachment 1).

⁴ FirstEnergy Tariffs, Attachment 2 (May 13, 2016).

⁵ Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-15(B).

⁶ Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-15(C).

⁷ *EPSA v. FirstEnergy Solutions*, FERC Docket No. EL16-345-000, Order Granting Complaint (Apr. 27, 2016).

must continue the conditions, terms and provisions of FirstEnergy's most recent standard service offer⁸ until a subsequent offer is authorized under R.C.4928.142 or 4928.143.

The reasons for this Interlocutory Appeal, including the Request for Certification and the Application for Review, and Comments are explained in the attached Memorandum in Support.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Thomas R. Hayes

Thomas R. Hays, Attorney
(0054062)

8355 Island Lane

Maineville, OH 45039

419-410-7069

trhayslaw@gmail.com

(Will accept service via email)

**Attorney for Northwest Ohio Aggregation
Coalition (NOAC) and the Individual
Communities**

BRUCE J. WESTON (0016973)
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Larry S. Sauer

Larry S. Sauer (0039223)

Counsel of Record

Maureen R. Willis (0020847)

William J. Michael (0070921)

Kevin F. Moore (0089228)

Ajay Kumar (0092208)

Assistant Consumers' Counsel

⁸ R.C. 4928.143(C)(2)(b) authorizes the PUCO to order any expected increases or decreases in fuel costs from those contained in that offer as well.

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800

Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

Telephone [Sauer]: (614) 466-1312

Telephone [Willis]: (614) 466-9567

Telephone [Michael]: (614) 466-1291

Telephone [Moore]: (614) 387-2965

Telephone [Kumar]: (614) 466-1292

Larry.sauer@occ.ohio.gov

Maureen.willis@occ.ohio.gov

William.michael@occ.ohio.gov

Kevin.moore@occ.ohio.gov

Ajay.kumar@occ.ohio.gov

(All Attorneys Will Accept Service Via
E-mail)

**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)	Case No. 14-1297-EL-SSO
Edison Company for Authority to Provide for)	
a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to R.C.)	
4928.143 in the Form of an Electric Security)	
Plan.)	

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

I. BACKGROUND

On March 31, 2016, the PUCO issued its Opinion and Order in this case. That Order approved a series of stipulations that resulted in a standard service offer containing, inter alia, a Retail Rate Stability rider. Under the terms of the PUCO approved Retail Rate Stability Rider, FirstEnergy was to enter into a purchase power agreement (“PPA”) with its affiliate, FirstEnergy Solutions. All customers of FirstEnergy were required to pay for the Retail Rate Stability Rider (“PPA Rider”) over the next eight years. Indeed the PPA Rider was the primary basis that made the electric security plan more favorable in the aggregate to customers than a market rate offer.⁹

⁹ The PUCO found the utility's ESP was more favorable to customers in the aggregate than a market rate offer on a quantitative basis by \$307 million, with \$256 million directly attributable to the PPA Rider. Opinion and Order at 119. The PUCO also found the PPA Rider was in the public interest because it would avoid transmission investment in the range of \$400 million to \$1.1 billion and will encourage resource diversity by supporting 2,220 MW in existing coal fired plants and 908 MW of nuclear generation. Opinion and Order at 87-88. The PUCO also described the significant economic impact upon the regions in which the plans are locating, noting the "economic impact of plant closures and the impact on local communities" is of concern to it. Opinion and Order at 88. With a new FE "proposal" that modifies the costs and revenues that flow through Rider RRS, (see Mikkelsen Rehearing Testimony at 3), all of the PUCO's findings are no longer valid.

But, on April 27, 2016, FERC issued an Order that rescinded an earlier waiver given to FirstEnergy Corporation.¹⁰ FERC found that, prior to being allowed to transact under the Affiliate PPA, FirstEnergy Solutions (or any other FE Ohio Market affiliate) would have to submit the Affiliate PPA for review and approval under the tests set for the in the *Edgar* and *Allegheny* cases in accordance with 18 C.F.R. § 35.39(b).¹¹ In other words, FirstEnergy Corporation needs for its PPA to be approved by FERC before moving forward with a power purchase agreement (and the PPA Rider).

The PUCO-authorized electric security plan for FirstEnergy must vastly change as a result of the FERC ruling. Indeed, FirstEnergy recognized this and presented an entirely new Rider RRS in conjunction with its Application for Rehearing on May 2, 2016. Under FirstEnergy's modified proposal, as set forth in the Rehearing Testimony of Eileen Mikkelsen, there are no *actual* revenues to be booked as part of any *actual* wholesale capacity or energy transactions. There are no *actual* costs attributable to operating *actual* generation facilities. The new rider RRS is based on a comparison of phantom costs that the Utilities will not incur versus phantom PJM market revenue that the Utilities will not receive.

FirstEnergy's new proposed Rider RRS, as presented in Ms. Mikkelsen's Rehearing Testimony appears to be a fundamentally entirely different proposal than the Rider RRS approved by the PUCO (dated March 31, 2016). The PUCO-approved Rider RRS was the basis for a projected (and purported) \$256 million credit to consumers that enabled the PUCO to find that the ESP plan is more favorable in the aggregate than a

¹⁰ *EPSA v. FirstEnergy Solutions*, FERC Docket No. EL16-345-000 , Order Granting Complaint (Apr. 27, 2016).

¹¹ *EPSA v. FirstEnergy Solutions*, FERC Docket No. EL16-345-000 at 22 (April 27, 2016).(EPSA Complaint Case).

market rate offer, per R.C. 4928.143(C)(1). That Rider RRS was linked to the viability and operation of the Davis-Besse and Sammis power plants.¹² Also under the PUCO-approved Rider RRS, the Companies were directed to cap average customer bills for two years so that the bills do not increase as compared to average customer bills for prior periods.¹³

The Entry, containing an order for FirstEnergy to file tariffs "consistent with the Opinion and Order," contravenes the earlier ruling by FERC. The original Rider RRS cannot be implemented due to FERC's preemptive ruling. Therefore, under Ohio law, the Commission can only continue the conditions, terms and provisions of FirstEnergy's most recent standard service offer¹⁴ until lawful tariffs are authorized under R.C.4928.142 or 4928.143.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

If a party does not satisfy the criteria set forth in Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-15(A), the Commissions' procedural rules require an interlocutory appeal to be certified to the Commission. The rule states, in pertinent part:

[N]o party may take an interlocutory appeal from any ruling issued under rule 4901-1-14 of the Administrative Code or any oral ruling issued during a public hearing or prehearing conference unless the appeal is certified to the commission by the legal director, deputy legal director, attorney examiner, or presiding hearing officer.

The legal director, deputy legal director, attorney examiner, or presiding hearing officer shall not certify such an appeal unless he or she finds that the appeal presents a new or novel question of interpretation, law, or policy, or is taken from a ruling which

¹² Opinion and Order at 87-88.

¹³ Opinion and Order at 86.

¹⁴ R.C. 4928.143(C)(2)(b) authorizes the PUCO to order any expected increases or decreases in fuel costs from those contained in that offer as well.

represents a departure from past precedent and an immediate determination by the commission is needed to prevent the likelihood of undue prejudice or expense to one or more of the parties, should the commission ultimately reverse the ruling in question.¹⁵

The PUCO should reverse the Attorney Examiner's ruling. It presents a new and novel question of interpretation, law, and policy, and an immediate determination is needed to prevent undue prejudice to the Consumer Advocates.

III. CERTIFICATION OF INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL

The full Commission will review an Attorney Examiner's ruling if the Attorney Examiner (or other PUCO personnel) certifies the appeal. An interlocutory appeal should be certified if it presents "a new or novel question of interpretation, law, or policy, or is taken from a ruling which represents a departure from past precedent and an immediate determination by the commission is needed to prevent the likelihood of undue prejudice..." That standard is met in this instance and the appeal should be certified.

A. The Entry raises a new and novel question of interpretation, law, and policy.

The Entry contravenes the April 27, 2016 ruling by FERC, which controls (prevents) the PPA Rider that is premised, in the PUCO's Order, on there being a PPA involving the FirstEnergy utilities and FirstEnergy Solutions. FERC's ruling rescinded the waiver upon which FirstEnergy's state application and settlements were premised with regard to the PPA. FERC's ruling requires a federal filing by FirstEnergy Solutions—and a FERC resolution—before there could be a PPA. And, to date, FirstEnergy Solutions has not made such a filing at FERC.

¹⁵ Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-15(B).

The PUCO's Order approving FirstEnergy's electric security plan, premised on a PPA, is therefore preempted. The PUCO cannot order the filing of tariffs that are "consistent with the Opinion and Order" that is premised on the PPA. The Entry, allowing for tariffs to be filed, contravenes FERC's order that sets conditions precedent to Rider RRS being implemented. The Entry thus presents a new and novel interpretation of law and policy.

B. The Entry departs from past precedent.

Not only does the Entry raise a novel issue but it departs from past precedent. Here, the Entry ignores FERC's ruling by requiring the utility to file tariffs consistent with its Opinion and Order and not FERC's ruling. The PUCO, when faced with a federal order or ruling squarely preempting its authority, has accepted the preemption and proceeded in accordance with the federal authority.¹⁶ The Entry here, contravening the directive of FERC, departs from past precedent.

C. Parties will suffer undue prejudice if the Utility files tariffs consistent with the PUCO Order.

The Consumer Advocates and other parties in this action will suffer undue prejudice if FirstEnergy files tariffs "consistent with the Opinion and Order." This is because tariffs that are "consistent with the Opinion and Order" will be inconsistent with

¹⁶ See, e.g., *In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company*, Case No. 85-726-EL-AIR, Entry on Rehearing at 6 (Sept. 2, 1986) ("All the Commission has done is incorporate into the company's tariffs, the FERC ruling to which the company insisted we had to adhere. Not to do so would cause us to be inconsistent with the federal preempting FERC decision which, as the company correctly pointed out, we cannot be..."); *In the Matter of GTE Mobilnet of Canton Limited Partnership for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity*, Case No. 84-1369-RC-ACE, Opinion and Order at 6-7 (Apr. 9, 1985); *In the Matter of the Application of the Youngstown-Warren MSA Limited Partnership*, Case No. 84-1487-RC-ACE, Opinion and Order at 6-7 (Apr. 9, 1985); *In the Matter of the Commission Investigation into the Feasibility and Costs of Blocking Devices for 976 Service*, Case No. 86-1044-TP-COI, Finding and Order at ¶2 (June 25, 1992); *In the matter of the Complaint of Wesley Mandrych v. GTE North.*, Case No. 91-587-TP-CSS, Entry ¶5 (Sept. 5, 1991); *In the Matter of the Commission Investigation into the Provision of Nontraditional Lifeline Service by Competitive Eligible Telecommunications Carriers*, Case No. 10-2377-TP-COI, Entry on Rehearing (June 20, 2012).

the FERC preemptive ruling. FirstEnergy's ESP tariffed rates, if implemented, will put into effect standard service offer rates that are fundamentally inconsistent with the FERC preemptive ruling.

The inconsistency exists even if the value of Rider RRS is not set as FirstEnergy proposed in its May 13, 2016 filing. This is because the ESP rates were approved as a stipulation package, and evaluated as a package under the statutory more favorable in the aggregate test. Yet now one of the fundamental bases supporting those ESP rates (Rider RRS) cannot be implemented. Filing tariffs for a PPA rider with no value does not change the fact that the standard service offer rates to be implemented under the filed tariffs are premised upon a PPA rider that cannot function as ordered the PUCO, due to the FERC ruling. If the PUCO authorizes tariffs consistent with its Opinion and Order without rates being subject to refund (which the PUCO has declined to order), customers may be unable to obtain refunds for charges later determined to be unlawful.¹⁷

Under Ohio law, the Commission must continue the conditions, terms and provisions of FirstEnergy's most recent standard service offer¹⁸ until a subsequent offer is authorized under R.C.4928.142 or 4928.143. With the FERC Order, there can be no PUCO-authorized ESP plan because the PUCO was preempted from approving the PPA Rider in the form FirstEnergy requested. The most recent standard service offer rate is all that can be charged to customers.

¹⁷ See, e.g., *Keco Industries, Inc. v. Cincinnati & Suburban Bell Tel. Co.*, 166 Ohio St. 254, 257 (1957).

¹⁸ R.C. 4928.143(C)(2)(b) authorizes the PUCO to order any expected increases or decreases in fuel costs from those contained in that offer as well.

IV. APPLICATION FOR REVIEW

The PUCO should reverse the Attorney Examiner's May 10, 201 Entry because it is unjust and unreasonable. The Entry disregards the preemptive effect of the FERC decision. FERC's decision preempts an integral element of the Utilities' ESP plan. That element is the Rider RRS (the PPA Rider).

Rider RRS, as approved by the PUCO, cannot possibly go forward without modification or action by FirstEnergy Solutions or another FE Ohio Market Affiliate. Any modification would require FirstEnergy to withdraw, terminate, and file a new application for an SSO. The Attorney Examiner's Entry shortcuts the legislature's legal process¹⁹ by having the Utility file tariffs based on a preempted PUCO Order. The Attorney Examiner's Entry should be reversed.

V. COMMENTS

On May 13, 2016, FirstEnergy filed standard service offer tariffs that it alleged were "[i]n response to and compliance with" the Commission's Opinion and Order.²⁰ In Attachment 2, the Utility proposed a new Rider RRS with a Retail Rate Stability Rider charged to all customers, beginning June 1, 2016, with no kWh value applied to the rider.²¹ The tariff language appears to allow the Utility to propose rates on a quarterly basis, which are then effective one month later on a service rendered basis with no reconciliation until the Rider expires on May 31, 2024.

¹⁹ R.C. 4928.141 requires utilities to provide all customers a standard service offer. Only standard service offers authorized in accordance with R.C. 4928.142 or 4928.143 shall service as a standard service offer under R.C. 4928.141. Since the PUCO modified the utility's standard service offer, the utility can either accept the modifications or withdraw and terminate its application. Because of the FERC Order preempting the PUCO, FE cannot accept the PUCO modifications. Thus, it must withdraw and terminate, which would require it to file a new standard service offer, not just file tariffs.

²⁰ Correspondence accompanying tariffs (May 13, 2016).

²¹ FirstEnergy Tariffs, Attachment 2 (May 13, 2016) .

Contrary to FirstEnergy's claims otherwise, its proposed Rider does not comply with the PUCO's Order, but appears to be partially consistent with the modified proposal for Rider RRS, presented in the Rehearing Testimony of Witness Mikkelsen. The rider presented under the tariff filing does not appear to be tied to the sale of power into PJM through a purchase power agreement and does not appear to include periodic reviews and reconciliation to costs incurred. But those were the basis of the PUCO's Opinion and Order.²² The tariffs then are inconsistent with the PUCO's Order.

Instead, the tariffs appear to be based on the Rehearing Testimony of Ms. Mikkelsen. Under the modified RRS proposal she presents, the Rider would not be tied to the sale of power into PJM or reliance on a PPA or a contractual arrangement with FES.²³ And the Rider would not include reconciliation to costs incurred.²⁴

Through its tariff filing, FirstEnergy is attempting to withdraw and terminate its application. It can only do so through the process defined in Chapter 4928, Revised Code. That means a new application for a standard service offer must be filed. A tariff filing is insufficient. Given that the Utility has, through its tariff filing, rejected the PUCO's modifications to its ESP, the PUCO must issue an order continuing the provisions, terms, and conditions of its most recent standard service offer. That standard service offer must apply until there is a PUCO-authorized SSO.²⁵ The PUCO should reject the filed tariffs.

²² See, e.g., Order at 80; 20-21 (describing the Third Supplemental Stipulation as including review of Rider RRS).

²³ Rehearing Testimony of Mikkelsen at 4.

²⁴ Id. at 8.

²⁵ R.C. 4928.141.

VI. CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, this Appeal should be certified to the full Commission and the Commission should reverse the Attorney Examiner's ruling. The tariffs filed by FirstEnergy should be rejected. The PUCO should order FirstEnergy to continue the conditions, terms and provisions of FirstEnergy's most recent standard service offer²⁶ until a subsequent offer is authorized, pursuant to a new application, under R.C.4928.142 or 4928.143.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Thomas R. Hayes

Thomas R. Hays, Attorney
(0054062)
8355 Island Lane
Maineville, OH 45039
419-410-7069
trhayslaw@gmail.com

**Attorney for Northwest Ohio Aggregation
Coalition (NOAC) and the Individual
Communities**

BRUCE J. WESTON (0016973)
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Larry S. Sauer

Larry S. Sauer (0039223)
Counsel of Record
Maureen R. Willis (0020847)
William J. Michael (0070921)
Kevin F. Moore (0089228)
Ajay Kumar (0092208)
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

²⁶ R.C. 4928.143(C)(2)(b) authorizes the PUCO to order any expected increases or decreases in fuel costs from those contained in that offer as well.

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800

Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

Telephone [Sauer]: (614) 466-1312

Telephone [Willis]: (614) 466-9567

Telephone [Michael]: (614) 466-1291

Telephone [Moore]: (614) 387-2965

Telephone [Kumar]: (614) 466-1292

Larry.sauer@occ.ohio.gov

Maureen.willis@occ.ohio.gov

William.michael@occ.ohio.gov

Kevin.moore@occ.ohio.gov

Ajay.kumar@occ.ohio.gov

(All Attorneys Will Accept Service Via
E-mail)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Joint Interlocutory Appeal was served via electronic service upon the parties this 16th day of May 2016.

/s/ Larry Sauer

Larry Sauer
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

SERVICE LIST

Steven.beeler@puc.state.oh.us
mkurtz@BKLawfirm.com
kboehm@BKLawfirm.com
jkylercohn@BKLawfirm.com
stnourse@aep.com
mjsatterwhite@aep.com
yalami@aep.com
ghull@eckertseamans.com
dparram@taftlaw.com
Schmidt@sppgrp.com
ricks@ohanet.org
mkl@smxblaw.com
gas@smxblaw.com
wttplmc@aol.com
lhawrot@spilmanlaw.com
dwilliamson@spilmanlaw.com
blanghenry@city.cleveland.oh.us
hmadorsky@city.cleveland.oh.us
kryan@city.cleveland.oh.us
mdortch@kravitzllc.com
rparsons@kravitzllc.com
gkrassen@bricker.com
dstinson@bricker.com
dborchers@bricker.com
DFolk@akronohio.gov
mkimbrough@keglerbrown.com
sechler@carpenterlipps.com
gpoulos@enernoc.com
dwolff@crowell.com
rlehfeldt@crowell.com
rkelter@elpc.org
evelyn.robinson@pjm.com

burkj@firstenergycorp.com
cdunn@firstenergycorp.com
jlang@calfee.com
talexander@calfee.com
dakutik@jonesday.com
sam@mwncmh.com
fdarr@mwncmh.com
mpritchard@mwncmh.com
cmooney@ohiopartners.org
callwein@keglerbrown.com
joliker@igsenergy.com
mswhite@igsenergy.com
Bojko@carpenterlipps.com
ghiloni@carpenterlipps.com
barthroyer@aol.com
athompson@taftlaw.com
Christopher.miller@icemiller.com
Gregory.dunn@icemiller.com
Jeremy.grayem@icemiller.com
blanghenry@city.cleveland.oh.us
hmadorsky@city.cleveland.oh.us
kryan@city.cleveland.oh.us
tdougherty@theOEC.org
jfinnigan@edf.org
Marilyn@wflawfirm.com
todonnell@dickinsonwright.com
matt@matthewcoxlaw.com
mfleisher@elpc.org
drinebolt@ohiopartners.org
meissnerjoseph@yahoo.com
LeslieKovacik@toledo.oh.gov
trhayslaw@gmail.com

mhpetricoff@vorys.com
mjsettineri@vorys.com
glpetrucci@vorys.com

Jeffrey.mayes@monitoringanalytics.com
msoules@earthjustice.org
sfisk@earthjustice.org
Thomas.mcnamee@ohioattorneygeneral.gov
Thomas.lindgren@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

Attorney Examiners:

Gregory.price@puc.state.oh.us
Mandy.willey@puc.state.oh.us
Megan.addison@puc.state.oh.us

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) Case No. 14-1297-EL-SSO
Provide for a Standard Service Offer)
Pursuant to R.C. 4928.143 in the Form of)
an Electric Security Plan.)

ENTRY

The attorney examiner finds:

- (1) Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company (collectively, FirstEnergy) are electric distribution utilities as defined in R.C. 4298.01(A)(6) and public utilities as defined in R.C. 4905.02 and, as such, are subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission.
- (2) R.C. 4928.141 provides that an electric distribution utility shall provide customers within its certified territory a standard service offer (SSO) of all competitive retail electric services necessary to maintain essential electric services to customers, including 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) On August 4, 2014, FirstEnergy filed an application pursuant to R.C. 4928.141 to provide for an SSO to provide generation pricing for the period of June 1, 2016, through May 31, 2019. The application is for an ESP, in accordance with R.C. 4928.143 (ESP IV).
- (4) On March 31, 2016, the Commission issued its Opinion and Order in this proceeding, approving FirstEnergy's application and the stipulations filed in this proceeding with several modifications (Opinion and Order). The Commission directed FirstEnergy to file tariffs consistent with the Opinion and Order by May 1, 2016. Opinion and Order at 99.

14-1297-EL-SSO

-2-

- (5) On April 27, 2016, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) issued an order granting a complaint filed the Electric Power Supply Association, the Retail Energy Supply Association, Dynegy Inc., Eastern Generation, LLC, NRG Power Marketing LLC, and GenOn Energy Management, LLC, and rescinding the waiver of its affiliate power sales restrictions previously granted to FirstEnergy Solutions Corporation. 155 FERC ¶ 61,101 (2016) (FERC Order).
- (6) On April 29, 2016, FirstEnergy filed a motion for an extension of time to file its tariffs in order to fully consider the FERC Order and its impact on the Companies' tariffs to be filed pursuant to the Opinion and Order.
- (7) On April 29, 2016, the attorney examiner granted FirstEnergy's request, noting that the new filing deadline would be established by a subsequent entry.
- (8) At this time, the attorney examiner directs the Companies to file their proposed tariffs, consistent with the Opinion and Order, by May 13, 2016. Such tariffs will be effective June 1, 2016, subject to Commission review and final approval.

It is, therefore,

ORDERED, That the Companies file proposed tariffs consistent with the Opinion and Order, by May 13, 2016. It is, further,

ORDERED, That a copy of this Entry be served upon all parties of record.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

s/Megan Addison

By: Megan J. Addison
Attorney Examiner

JRJ/sc

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

5/10/2016 10:28:48 AM

in

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

Summary: Attorney Examiner Entry directing Companies to file proposed tariffs consistent with the Opinion and Order by 05/13/2016. - electronically filed by Sandra Coffey on behalf of Megan Addison, Attorney Examiner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

ATTACHMENT 2

Ohio Edison Company

Original Sheet 127

Akron, Ohio

P.U.C.O. No. 11

Page 1 of 1

RIDER RRS
Retail Rate Stability Rider

APPLICABILITY:

Applicable to any customer who receives electric service under the Company's rate schedules. This Retail Rate Stability Rider (RRS) will be effective for service rendered beginning June 1, 2016. This Rider is not avoidable for customers during the period the customer takes electric generation service from a certified supplier.

The RRS charges will apply, by rate schedule, as follows:

RATE:

RS (all kWhs, per kWh)		\$
GS (per kW of Billing Demand)	\$	
GP (per kW of Billing Demand)	\$	
GSU (per kVA of Billing Demand)	\$	
GT (per kVA of Billing Demand)	\$	
STL (all kWhs, per kWh)		\$
TRF (all kWhs, per kWh)		\$
POL (all kWhs, per kWh)		\$

RIDER UPDATES:

The charges contained in this Rider shall be updated on a quarterly basis. No later than February 1st, May 1st, August 1st, and November 1st of each year, the Company will file with the PUCO a request for approval of the Rider charges which, unless otherwise ordered by the PUCO, shall become effective on a service rendered basis on March 1st, June 1st, September 1st, and December 1st of each year. This Rider shall expire with service rendered through May 31, 2024, subject to final reconciliation.

ATTACHMENT 2

The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company

Original Sheet 127

Cleveland, Ohio

P.U.C.O. No. 13

Page 1 of 1

RIDER RRS
Retail Rate Stability Rider

APPLICABILITY:

Applicable to any customer who receives electric service under the Company's rate schedules. This Retail Rate Stability Rider (RRS) will be effective for service rendered beginning June 1, 2016. This Rider is not avoidable for customers during the period the customer takes electric generation service from a certified supplier.

The RRS charges will apply, by rate schedule, as follows:

RATE:

RS (all kWhs, per kWh)		\$
GS (per kW of Billing Demand)	\$	
GP (per kW of Billing Demand)	\$	
GSU (per kW of Billing Demand)	\$	
GT (per kVA of Billing Demand)	\$	
STL (all kWhs, per kWh)		\$
TRF (all kWhs, per kWh)		\$
POL (all kWhs, per kWh)		\$

RIDER UPDATES:

The charges contained in this Rider shall be updated on a quarterly basis. No later than February 1st, May 1st, August 1st, and November 1st of each year, the Company will file with the PUCO a request for approval of the Rider charges which, unless otherwise ordered by the PUCO, shall become effective on a service rendered basis on March 1st, June 1st, September 1st, and December 1st of each year. This Rider shall expire with service rendered through May 31, 2024, subject to final reconciliation.

ATTACHMENT 2

The Toledo Edison Company

Original Sheet 127

Toledo, Ohio

P.U.C.O. No. 08

Page 1 of 1

RIDER RRS
Retail Rate Stability Rider

APPLICABILITY:

Applicable to any customer who receives electric service under the Company's rate schedules. This Retail Rate Stability Rider (RRS) will be effective for service rendered beginning June 1, 2016. This Rider is not avoidable for customers during the period the customer takes electric generation service from a certified supplier.

The RRS charges will apply, by rate schedule, as follows:

RATE:

RS (all kWhs, per kWh)		\$
GS (per kW of Billing Demand)	\$	
GP (per kW of Billing Demand)	\$	
GSU (per kVA of Billing Demand)	\$	
GT (per kVA of Billing Demand)	\$	
STL (all kWhs, per kWh)		\$
TRF (all kWhs, per kWh)		\$
POL (all kWhs, per kWh)		\$

RIDER UPDATES:

The charges contained in this Rider shall be updated on a quarterly basis. No later than February 1st, May 1st, August 1st, and November 1st of each year, the Company will file with the PUCO a request for approval of the Rider charges which, unless otherwise ordered by the PUCO, shall become effective on a service rendered basis on March 1st, June 1st, September 1st, and December 1st of each year. This Rider shall expire with service rendered through May 31, 2024, subject to final reconciliation.

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

5/16/2016 5:20:06 PM

in

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

Summary: Request Joint Interlocutory Appeal, Request for Certification to Full Commission and Application for Review and Comments on Tariffs by Northwest Ohio Aggregation Coalition and the Office the Ohio Consumers' Counsel electronically filed by Ms. Deb J. Bingham on behalf of Sauer, Larry S.