

BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
36 EAST SEVENTH STREET
SUITE 1510
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202
TELEPHONE (513) 421-2255
TELECOPIER (513) 421-2764

VIA E-FILE

August 11, 2016

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
PUCO Docketing
180 E. Broad Street, 10th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215


In Re: Case Nos. 08-1094-EL-SSO, 08-1095-EL-ATA, 08-1096-EL-AAM, 08-1097-EL-UNC, 12-426-EL-SSO, 12-427-EL-ATA, 12-428-EL-AAM, 12-429-EL-WVR, and 12-672-EL-RDR

Dear Sir/Madam:

Please find attached the MEMORANDUM CONTRA MOTION TO WITHDRAW ITS APPLICATION AND MOTIONS TO IMPLEMENT PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED RATES OF THE OHIO ENERGY GROUP for filing in the above-referenced matters.

Copies have been served on all parties on the attached certificate of service. Please place this document of file.

Respectfully yours,



Michael L. Kurtz, Esq.

Kurt J. Boehm, Esq.

Jody Kyler Cohn, Esq.

BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY

MLKkew

Cc: Certificate of Service

**BEFORE THE
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of The Dayton Power and Light Company for Approval of Its Electric Security Plan.	:	Case No. 08-1094-EL-SSO
	:	
	:	
In the Matter of the Application of The Dayton Power and Light Company for Approval of Revised Tariffs.	:	Case No. 08-1095-EL-ATA
	:	
	:	
In the Matter of the Application of The Dayton Power and Light Company for Approval of Certain Accounting Authority Pursuant to Ohio Rev. Code § 4905.13.	:	Case No. 08-1096-EL-AAM
	:	
	:	
In the Matter of the Application of The Dayton Power and Light Company for Approval of Its Amended Corporate Separation Plan.	:	Case No. 08-1097-EL-UNC
	:	
	:	
In the Matter of the Application of Dayton Power And Light Company For Approval of Its Electric Security Plan.	:	Case No. 12-426-EL-SSO
	:	
	:	
In the Matter of the Application of Dayton Power And Light Company For Approval of Revised Tariffs.	:	Case No. 12-427-EL-ATA
	:	
	:	
In the Matter of the Application of Dayton Power And Light Company For Approval of Certain Accounting Authority.	:	Case No. 12-428-EL-AAM
	:	
	:	
In the Matter of the Application of Dayton Power And Light Company For Waiver of Certain Commission Rules.	:	Case No. 12-429-EL-WVR
	:	
	:	
In the Matter of the Application of Dayton Power And Light Company to Establish Tariff Riders.	:	Case No. 12-672-EL-RDR
	:	

**MEMORANDUM CONTRA MOTION TO WITHDRAW ITS APPLICATION
AND MOTIONS TO IMPLEMENT PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED RATES
OF THE OHIO ENERGY GROUP**

On July 27, 2016, The Dayton Power and Light Company (“DP&L” or “Company”) filed Motions (“Motions”) asking the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (“Commission”) for permission to withdraw its currently effective Electric Security Plan (the “2016 ESP”), which was approved in Case Nos. 12-426-EL-SSO *et al*, and to reinstate the ESP approved in Case Nos. 08-1094-EL-SSO *et. al* (the “2008 ESP”) in its place. DP&L’s request to withdraw its 2016 ESP and to reinstate its 2008 ESP relies on two legal theories. Both are incorrect. Accordingly, DP&L’s Motions should be rejected outright and the Commission should: 1) direct the Company to immediately cease collection of SSR costs; and 2) refund all SSR costs paid by customers since September 4, 2013.

ARGUMENT

I. DP&L's Motions Rely Upon Incorrect Legal Theories.

A. DP&L's Claim That The Supreme Court of Ohio Reversed "*In Total*" The Commission's Decision Approving The 2016 ESP Is Wrong.

DP&L claims that a recent Supreme Court of Ohio decision reversed "*in total*" the Commission's orders approving the Company's 2016 ESP.¹ This is a gross misstatement of the Court's holding. In addressing the limited legal challenges to DP&L's 2016 ESP, the Court was concise, stating: "[t]he decision of the Public Utilities Commission is reversed **on the authority of In re Application of Columbus S. Power Co....2016-Ohio-1608...**"² Hence, the scope of the Court's decision with respect to DP&L's 2016 ESP was limited by its findings in the *Columbus S. Power Co.* case (the "AEP Ohio ESP Appeal").

The vast majority of the Court's decision in the AEP Ohio ESP Appeal was dedicated to addressing Ohio Power Company's ("AEP Ohio") "*financial integrity*" charge – the Retail Stability Rider ("RSR").³ The Court found that a "*financial integrity*" charge such as the RSR provided the utility with "*the equivalent of transition revenue*" in violation of R.C. 4928.38.⁴ The Court reversed and remanded the part of the Commission's decision approving the RSR, ordering the Commission to determine the amount of unlawful "*transition revenue*" that AEP Ohio had collected from customers through the RSR and to refund that amount to customers on remand through an offset to its current RSR charge.⁵ The only other part of the AEP Ohio's ESP reversed and remanded to the Commission concerned the utility's significantly excessive earnings test threshold.⁶ Aside from those two components reversed by the Court, the remainder of the AEP Ohio's ESP stayed intact.

Given the limited scope of the Court's decision in the AEP Ohio ESP Appeal, the Court's citation to that case as the sole basis for its decision on DP&L's 2016 ESP can have only one meaning: that DP&L's Service Stability Rider ("SSR"), which is a "*financial integrity*" charge equivalent to AEP Ohio's RSR, similarly provides DP&L with unlawful "*transition revenue*" and is therefore barred by R.C. 4928.38. But no aspect of the

¹ See *In re Application of Dayton Power & Light Co.*, Slip Opinion No. 2016-Ohio-3490 (June 20, 2016).

² Id. (emphasis added).

³ *In re Application of Columbus S. Power Co.*, Slip Opinion No. 2016-Ohio-1608.

⁴ Id. at ¶25.

⁵ Id. at ¶40.

⁶ Id. at ¶66.

Court's limited AEP Ohio ESP Appeal decision provides a rationale upon which to reverse all of the non-SSR components of DP&L's 2016 ESP. For example, in DP&L's 2016 ESP, the Commission approved a competitive bidding process and master supply agreement,⁷ changes to the Alternative Energy rider true-up process,⁸ Reconciliation Riders,⁹ bifurcation of the Transmission Cost Recovery Rider,¹⁰ competitive retail enhancements,¹¹ and an Economic Development Fund.¹² Nowhere in the AEP Ohio ESP Appeal is there language that could reasonably be interpreted as reversing these components of DP&L's 2016 ESP. Consequently, DP&L's statement that its *entire* 2016 ESP was reversed on the basis of the AEP Ohio ESP Appeal is unfounded.

B. DP&L Is Barred From Withdrawing Its 2016 ESP Pursuant To R.C. 4928.143(C)(2)(a) Because DP&L Accepted The Commission's ESP Modifications By Allowing The ESP To Go Into Effect And There Is No Utility "Veto" Right Over Decisions Of The Supreme Court Of Ohio.

DP&L cites R.C. 4928.143(C)(2)(a) as the basis for its request to withdraw the 2016 ESP. But that statute is inapplicable to the current situation. R.C. 4928.143(C)(2)(a) provides:

*If the **commission** modifies and approves **an application** under division (C)(1) of this section, the electric distribution utility may withdraw the application, thereby terminating it, and may file a new standard service offer under this section or a standard service offer under section 4928.142 of the Revised Code.*¹³

The right of a utility to withdraw an ESP under R.C. 4928.143(C)(2)(a) is intended to address circumstances under which a *proposed* ESP application is modified by the *Commission*.

Here, the circumstances at issue are vastly different than those envisioned by the Legislature in enacting R.C. 4928.143(C)(2)(a). DP&L's 2016 ESP is not merely a proposal. Rather, that ESP is the result of a final, appealable Commission order, as the Company itself conceded.¹⁴ And the Commission is not *voluntarily* modifying DP&L's 2016 ESP. Rather, the only modifications that should occur – immediate cessation of the

⁷ Opinion and Order, Case Nos. 12-426-EL-SSO *et al* (September 4, 2013) at 16.

⁸ *Id.* at 31.

⁹ *Id.* at 35.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 36.

¹¹ *Id.* at 38.

¹² *Id.* at 42.

¹³ Emphasis added.

¹⁴ Fifth Entry on Rehearing, Case Nos. 12-426-EL-SSO *et al* (July 23, 2014); Notice of Cross-Appeal of the Dayton Power and Light Company (September 19, 2014) at 2 ("*Consequently, the Commission's ESP Orders are now final and appealable.*").

SSR during the 2016 ESP period and a refund of previously collected SSR charges - are entirely the result of the Court's mandate and are therefore involuntary on the part of the Commission. Accordingly, given that DP&L's requests stray far from the situation contemplated by the plain language R.C. 4928.143(C)(2)(a), the Company cannot use that statute as a basis upon which to withdraw its 2016 ESP.

A utility's statutory right to withdraw an ESP does not extend indefinitely. That right does not apply when the utility accepts a Commission-modified ESP by allowing that ESP to go into effect and then the Commission's final order is later modified by the Court. The law gives the utility a limited "*veto*" right over Commission modifications of a proposed application; it does not give the utility a "*veto*" right over decisions of the Supreme Court of Ohio.

Once the 2016 ESP was subject to a final, appealable Commission order and DP&L allowed the ESP to go into effect, the Company could no longer invoke R.C. 4928.143(C)(2)(a) to withdraw that ESP. Doing so would undermine the statutory appellate process provided for under R.C. 4903.13. The utility's statutory right to withdraw a proposed ESP must be read in concert with the other parties' statutory right to appeal a final Commission order and to receive the full relief ultimately provided by the Court. "*All statutes relating to the same general subject matter must be read in pari material, and in construing these statutes in pari material, this court must give them a reasonable construction so as to give proper force and effect to each and all of the statutes.*"¹⁵ The best way to harmonize those two statutes is to bar a utility from invoking R.C. 4928.143(C)(2)(a) after the date upon which the Commission issues a final appealable order on the utility's proposed ESP and the utility has accepted the Commission's modifications by allowing the ESP to go into effect.

In 2015, the Court stated that "[i]f the *commission* makes a modification to a proposed ESP that the utility is unwilling to accept, R.C. 4928.143(C)(2)(a) allows the utility to withdraw the ESP application."¹⁶ But the Court has never stated that a utility is entitled to thwart the Court's appellate mandate by withdrawing its ESP after receiving an unfavorable decision from the Court.

¹⁵ *State ex rel. Herman v. Klopffleisch*, 72 Ohio St. 3d 581, 585, 651 N.E.2d 995, 998 (1995) (citing *United Tel. Co. v. Limbach* (1994), 71 Ohio St.3d 369, 372, 643 N.E.2d 1129, 1131).

¹⁶ *In re Application of Ohio Power Co.*, 144 Ohio St. 3d 1, 2015-Ohio-2056 at ¶26 (emphasis added).

Approving DP&L's requests would render the appellate process ineffective and put this Commission on a collision course with the Court. The resolution that DP&L seeks – reinstatement of its entire 2008 ESP – would simply replace one unlawful “*financial integrity*” charge (the SSR) with another (the Rate Stabilization Charge included in DP&L's 2008 ESP). The cursory nature of the Court's remand order seems to demonstrate a certain amount of frustration with the Commission's recent handling of ESP matters. That frustration would only grow if the Court is effectively ignored in this instance. Were the Commission to approve this attempted end-run around the Court's recent decision, it would substantially harm customers by forcing them to continue to pay unlawful “*transition revenues*” in direct contravention of the Court's mandate, unjustly enriching DP&L's corporate parent, Virginia-based AES.

II. Consistent With The Supreme Court of Ohio's Ruling, The Commission Should Immediately Cease Collection Of Costs Through the SSR And Require DP&L To Refund The Unlawful “*Transition Revenues*” Already Paid By Customers Through That Rider.

As discussed above, the Court expressly stated that the AEP Ohio ESP Appeal was the basis for its decision with respect to DP&L's 2016 ESP.¹⁷ In that AEP Ohio ESP Appeal, the Court's chosen remedy was to require AEP Ohio to refund to customers the unlawful “*transition revenues*” previously collected through the SSR.¹⁸ The Court did not find any conflict between its chosen remedy and the retroactive ratemaking principles set forth in *Keco Industries, Inc. v. Cinci. & Suburban Bell Telephone Co.*, 166 Ohio St. 254 (March 27, 1957). Accordingly, the same remedy applies to this case. Specifically, the Court's decision means that the Commission must require DP&L to immediately cease collection of costs through the SSR and to refund customers all SSR charges paid since September 4, 2013, when the SSR was initially approved by the Commission.¹⁹ The remainder of the Company's 2016 ESP should continue throughout its Commission-approved term, which is scheduled to end May 31, 2017.²⁰

¹⁷ See *In re Application of Dayton Power & Light Co.*, Slip Opinion No. 2016-Ohio-3490 (June 20, 2016).

¹⁸ *In re Application of Columbus S. Power Co.*, Slip Opinion No. 2016-Ohio-1608 at ¶40.

¹⁹ Opinion and Order, Case Nos. 12-426-EL-SSO *et al* (September 4, 2013) at 25.

²⁰ Entry Nunc Pro Tunc, Case Nos. 12-426-EL-SSO *et al* (September 6, 2013) at 2.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, the Commission should not jeopardize its own legal integrity in the eyes of the Supreme Court in order to prop up the financial integrity of DP&L and Virginia-based AES by indulging the Company's unlawful requests to evade the Court's holding. Instead, the Commission should deny DP&L's Motions outright. The Commission should also direct the Company to immediately cease collection of SSR costs and to refund all SSR costs paid by customers since September 4, 2013.

Respectfully submitted,



David F. Boehm, Esq.

Michael L. Kurtz, Esq.

Kurt J. Boehm, Esq.

Jody Kyler Cohn, Esq.

BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY

36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510

Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Ph: 513.421.2255 Fax: 513.421.2764

E-Mail: dboehm@BKLawfirm.com

mkurtz@BKLawfirm.com

kboehm@BKLawfirm.com


jkylercohn@BKLawfirm.com

August 11, 2016

COUNSEL FOR THE OHIO ENERGY GROUP

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that true copy of the foregoing was served by electronic mail (when available) or ordinary mail, unless otherwise noted, this 11th day of August, 2016 to the parties listed on the attached Certificate of Service.



Michael L. Kurtz, Esq.
Kurt J. Boehm, Esq.
Jody Kyler Cohn, Esq.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Philip B. Sineneng, Esq.
THOMPSON HINE LLP
41 South High Street, Suite 1700
Columbus, OH 43215
Philip.Sineneng@ThompsonHine.com

Amy B. Spiller, Esq.
Deputy General Counsel
Jeanne W. Kingery, Esq.
Associate General Counsel
DUKE ENERGY RETAIL SALES, LLC and
DUKE ENERGY COMMERCIAL ASSET
MANAGEMENT, INC.
139 East Fourth Street
1303-Main
Cincinnati, OH 45202
Amy.Spiller@duke-energy.com
Jeanne.Kingery@duke-energy.com

Attorneys for Duke Energy Retail Sales, LLC and
Duke Energy Commercial Asset Management,
Inc.

Stephen Chriss, Esq.
Wal-Mart Corporation
702 Southwest 8th Street
Bentonville, AR 72716-021
Stephen.Chriss@wal-mart.com

Attorneys for Wal-Mart Stores East, LP
and Sam's East, Inc.

Mark A. Hayden, Esq.
FIRSTENERGY SERVICE COMPANY
76 South Main Street
Akron, OH 44308
haydenm@firstenergycorp.com

James F. Lang, Esq.
Laura C. McBride, Esq.
CALFEE, HALTER & GRISWOLD LLP
1400 KeyBank Center
800 Superior Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114
jlang@calfee.com
lmcbride@calfee.com

N. Trevor Alexander, Esq.
CALFEE, HALTER & GRISWOLD LLP
1100 Fifth Third Center
21 E. State Street
Columbus, OH 43215-4243
talexander@calfee.com

David A. Kutik, Esq.
JONES DAY
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114
dakutik@jonesday.com

Attorney for FirstEnergy Solutions Corp.

Samuel C. Randazzo, Esq.
Frank P. Darr, Esq.
Matthew R. Pritchard, Esq.
MCNEES WALLACE & NURICK LLC
21 East State Street, 17th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215-4225
sam@mwncmh.com
fdarr@mwncmh.com
mpritchard@mwncmh.com

Attorneys for Industrial Energy Users-Ohio

M. Anthony Long, Esq.
Senior Assistant Counsel
HONDA OF AMERICA MFG., INC.
24000 Honda Parkway
Marysville, OH 43040
tony_long@ham.honda.com

Attorney for Honda of America Mfg., Inc.

David F. Boehm, Esq.
Michael L. Kurtz, Esq.
BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY
36 East Seventh Street Suite 1510
Cincinnati, OH 45202-4454
dboehm@BKLLawfirm.com
mkurtz@BKLLawfirm.com

Attorneys for Ohio Energy Group

Gregory J. Poulos, Esq.
EnerNOC, Inc.
471 East Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215
Telephone: (614) 507-7377
gpoulos@enernoc.com

Attorney for EnerNOC, Inc.

Robert A. McMahon, Esq.
EBERLY MCMAHON LLC
2321 Kemper Lane, Suite 100
Cincinnati, OH 45206
bmcmahon@emh-law.com

Rocco O. D'Ascenzo, Esq.
Associate General Counsel
Elizabeth Watts, Esq.
Associate General Counsel
DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC.
139 East Fourth Street, 1303-Main
Cincinnati, OH 45202
Elizabeth.Watts@duke-energy.com
Rocco.D'Ascenzo@duke-energy.com

Attorneys for Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.

Jay E. Jadwin, Esq.
AMERICAN ELECTRIC POWER
SERVICE CORPORATION
155 W. Nationwide Blvd., Suite 500
Columbus, OH 43215
jejadwin@aep.com

Attorney for AEP Retail Energy Partners LLC

Richard L. Sites, Esq.
General Counsel and Senior Director of
Health Policy
OHIO HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION
155 East Broad Street, 15th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215-3620
ricks@ohanet.org

Matthew W. Warnock, Esq.
Dylan F. Borchers, Esq.
BRICKER & ECKLER LLP
100 South Third Street
Columbus, OH 43215-4291
mwarnock@bricker.com
dborchers@bricker.com

Attorneys for Ohio Hospital Association

Colleen L. Mooney, Esq.
OHIO PARTNERS FOR AFFORDABLE
ENERGY
231 West Lima Street
P.O. Box 1793
Findlay, OH 45839-1793
cmooney2@columbus.rr.com
Attorney for Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy

Ryan P. O'Rourke
Carpenter Lipps & Leland LLP
280 Plaza, Suite 1300
280 North High Street
Columbus, OH 43215
Email: o'rourke@carpenterlipps.com

Attorneys for The Kroger Company

Mark A. Whitt, Esq.
Andrew J. Campbell, Esq.
WHITT STURTEVANT LLP
The KeyBank Building
88 East Broad Street, Suite 1590
Columbus, OH 43215
whitt@whitt-sturtevant.com
campbell@whitt-sturtevant.com

Vincent Parisi, Esq.
INTERSTATE GAS SUPPLY, INC.
6100 Emerald Parkway
Dublin, OH 43016
vparisi@igsenergy.com
mswhite@igsenergy.com

Attorneys for Interstate Gas Supply, Inc.

Trent A. Dougherty, Esq.
OHIO ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL
1207 Grandview Avenue, Suite 201
Columbus, OH 43212-3449
trent@theoec.org

Attorneys for the Ohio Environmental Council

Thomas W. McNamee, Esq.
Assistant Attorney General
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215
Thomas.mcnamee@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

Attorneys for the Staff of the Public Utilities
Commission of Ohio

Maureen R. Willis, Esq.
Assistant Consumers' Counsel
Office of The Ohio Consumers' Counsel
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, OH 43215-3485
Maureen.willis@occ.ohio.gov

Attorneys for Office of the Ohio Consumers'
Counsel

M. Howard Petricoff, Esq.
Stephen M. Howard, Esq.
VORYS, SATER, SEYMOUR AND
PEASE LLP
52 East Gay Street
P.O. Box 1008
Columbus, OH 43216-1008
mhpetricoff@vorys.com
smhoward@vorys.com

Attorneys for the Retail Energy Supply
Association, Exelon Generation Company,
LLC, Exelon Energy Company, Inc.,
Constellation Energy Commodities Group,
Inc., and Constellation NewEnergy, Inc.

Ellis Jacobs, Esq.
Advocates for Basic Legal Equality, Inc.
130 West Second Street, Suite 700 East
Dayton, OH 45402
ejacobs@ablelaw.org

Attorney for Edgemont Neighborhood
Coalition

Jennifer L. Spinosi, Esq.
21 East State Street, Suite 1900
Columbus, OH 43215
jennifer.spinosi@directenergy.com

Christopher L. Miller, Esq.
Gregory J. Dunn, Esq.
Alan G. Starkoff, Esq.
ICE MILLER LLP
2540 West Street
Columbus, OH 43215
Christopher.Miller@icemiller.com
Gregory.Dunn@icemiller.com

Attorneys for City of Dayton, Ohio,
Direct Energy Services, LLC
and Direct Energy Business, LLC

Matthew J. Satterwhite, Esq.
Steven T. Nourse, Esq.
AMERICAN ELECTRIC POWER SERVICE
CORPORATION
1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
mjsatterwhite@aep.com
stnourse@aep.com

Attorneys for Ohio Power Company

Matthew R. Cox, Esq.
MATTHEW COX LAW, LTD.
4145 St. Theresa Blvd.
Avon, OH 44011
matt@matthewcoxlaw.com

Attorney for the Council of Smaller Enterprises

Stephen Bennett, Manager
State Government Affairs
300 Exelon Way
Kenneth Square, PA 19348
stephen.bennett@exeloncorp.com

Bill C. Wells, Esq.
AFMCLO/CL
Industrial Facilities Division
Bldg 266, Area A
Wright Patterson AFB, OH 45433
bill.wells@wpafb.af.mil

Christopher C. Thompson, Esq.
Staff Attorney (admitted *pro hac vice*)
USAF Utility Law Field Support Center
139 Barnes Drive, Suite 1
Tyndall AFB, FL 32403-5319

Attorneys for Federal Executive Agencies

Kimberly W. Bojko, Esq.
Joel E. Sechler, Esq.
Mallory M. Mohler, Esq.
CARPENTER LIPPS & LELAND LLP
280 Plaza, Suite 1300
280 North High Street
Columbus, OH 43215
Bojko@carpenterlipps.com
Sechler@carpenterlipps.com
Mohler@carpenterlipps.com

Attorneys for SolarVision, LLC

Scott C. Solberg, Esq.
Eimer Stahl LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 1100
Chicago, OH 60604
ssolberg@eimerstahl.com

Attorney for Exelon Generation Company,
LLC

Cynthia Fonner Brady, Esq.
Assistant General Counsel
EXELON BUSINESS SERVICES COMPANY
4300 Winfield Road
Warrenville, IL 60555
Cynthia.Brady@constellation.com

Attorney for Constellation
an Exelon Company

Lt Col John C. Degnan
Thomas A. Jernigan
Ebony M. Payton
Federal Executive Agencies (FAE)
139 Barnes Drive, Suite 1
Tyndall AFB FL 32403
John.Degnan@us.af.mil
Thomas.Jernigan.3@us.af.mil
Ebony.Payton.ctr@us.af.mil

Attorney for Federal Executive Agencies

Robert A. Brundrett, Esq.
The Ohio Manufacturers' Association
33 North High Street
Columbus, OH 43215
Email: rbrundrett@ohiomfg.com

Attorneys for The Ohio Manufacturers'
Association Energy Group

Mary W. Christensen, Esq.
Christensen Law Office LLC
8760 Orion Place, Suite 300
Columbus, OH 43240-2109
mchristensen@columbuslaw.org

Attorneys for People Working Cooperatively,
Inc.

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

8/11/2016 5:08:00 PM

in

Case No(s). 08-1094-EL-SSO, 08-1095-EL-ATA, 08-1096-EL-AAM, 08-1097-EL-UNC, 12-0426-EL-SSO,

Summary: Memorandum Ohio Energy Group (OEG's) Memorandum Contra Motion to Withdraw its Application and Motions to Implement Previously Authorized Rates electronically filed by Mr. Michael L. Kurtz on behalf of Ohio Energy Group