BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

- - -

In the Matter of the :
Application of the Ohio :
Development Services :
Agency for an Order :

Approving Adjustments to : Case No. 16-1223-EL-USF

the Universal Service Fund:
Riders of Jurisdictional:
Ohio Electric Distribution:
Utilities:

- - -

PROCEEDINGS

before Ms. Greta See, Attorney Examiner, at the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad Street, Room 11-D, Columbus, Ohio, called at 9:06 a.m. on Wednesday, November 30, 2016.

- - -

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.

222 East Town Street, Second Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201
(614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481
Fax - (614) 224-5724

- - -

2 1 APPEARANCES: 2 Bricker & Eckler, LLP By Mr. Dane Stinson 3 100 South Third Street Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291 4 On behalf of the Ohio Development 5 Services Agency. Bruce J. Weston, Consumers' Counsel 6 By Mr. Ajay K. Kumar 7 Assistant Consumers' Counsel 10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800 Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485 8 9 On behalf of the Residential Consumers of Jurisdictional Ohio Electric Distribution 10 Utilities. 11 McNees, Wallace & Nurick By Mr. Matthew Pritchard 12 Fifth Third Center 21 East State Street, Suite 910 13 Columbus, Ohio 43215 14 On behalf of Industrial Energy Users of Ohio. 15 Carpenter Lipps & Leland LLP 16 By Ms. Kimberly W. Bojko 280 North High Street, Suite 1300 17 Columbus, Ohio 43215 18 On behalf of The Kroger Company. 19 Mike DeWine, Ohio Attorney General By Mr. William L. Wright, Section Chief 20 Mr. Thomas W. McNamee Assistant Attorney General Public Utilities Section 21 30 East Broad Street, 16th Floor 2.2 Columbus, Ohio 43215 2.3 On behalf of the Staff of the PUCO. 24 2.5

```
3
 1
     APPEARANCES: (Continued)
 2
            FirstEnergy Corp.
            By Ms. Carrie M. Dunn
 3
            Ms. Erika Ostrowski
            76 South Main Street
            Akron, Ohio 44308
 4
 5
                 On behalf of FirstEnergy Corporation,
                 Ohio Edison Company,
                 The Cleveland Electric Illuminating
 6
                 Company, and The Toledo Edison Company.
 7
            Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy
 8
            By Ms. Colleen L. Mooney
            231 West Lima Street
 9
            Findlay, Ohio 45839
                 On behalf of Ohio Partners for Affordable
10
                 Energy.
11
            Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.
12
            By Ms. Elizabeth H. Watts
            155 East Broad Street
13
            Columbus, Ohio 43215
14
                 On behalf of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.
15
            The Dayton Power & Light Company
            By Mr. Randall V. Griffin
16
            Ms. Judi L. Sobecki
            Mr. Michael Shuler
17
            MacGregor Park
            1065 Woodman Avenue
18
            Dayton, Ohio 45432
19
                 On behalf of The Dayton Power & Light
                 Company.
20
2.1
22
23
24
25
```

| | | | | _ |
|----|--|------------|----------|---|
| | | | 4 | |
| 1 | INDEX | | | |
| 2 | | | | |
| 3 | WITNESS | | PAGE | |
| 4 | Susan M. Moser | _ | 8 | |
| 5 | Direct Examination by Mr. Stinsor | 1 | 0 | |
| 6 | | | | |
| 7 | ODSA EXHIBITS | IDENTIFIED | ADMITTED | |
| 8 | 1 - Application | 8 | 17 | |
| | 2 - Testimony of Susan M. Moser | 8 | 17 | |
| 9 | 3 - Testimony of Megan Meadows | 9 | 17 | |
| 10 | 4 - Amended Application | 9 | 17 | |
| 11 | 5 - Supplemental Testimony | 10 | 17 | |
| 12 | of Susan M. Moser | 10 | Ι, | |
| 13 | 6 - Testimony in Support of Joint Stipulation | 10 | 17 | |
| 14 | by Susan M. Moser | | | |
| 15 | | | | |
| 16 | JOINT EXHIBIT | IDENTIFIED | ADMITTED | |
| 17 | <pre>1 - Joint Stipulation and Recommendation</pre> | 10 | 17 | |
| 18 | Recommendation | | | |
| 19 | | | | |
| 20 | | | | |
| 21 | | | | |
| 22 | | | | |
| 23 | | | | |
| 24 | | | | |
| 25 | | | | |
| | | | | |

5 1 Wednesday Morning Session, November 30, 2016. 2 3 EXAMINER SEE: Let's go on the record. 4 5 Scheduled for hearing today at this time 6 is Case No. 16-1223-EL-USF, being entitled In the 7 Matter of the Application of the Ohio Development Services Agency for an Order Approving Adjustments to 8 the Universal Service Fund Riders of Jurisdictional 9 10 Electric Distribution Utilities. 11 I am Greta See, the Attorney Examiner 12 assigned to this case by the Commission. 13 At this time I'd like to take appearances 14 of the parties, starting with Ohio Development 15 Services Agency. 16 MR. STINSON: Yes, your Honor. 17 you. On behalf of the Ohio Development Services 18 Agency, the law firm of Bricker & Eckler, Dane 19 Stinson, 100 South Third Street, Columbus, Ohio 20 43215. 2.1 I've also been authorized to enter the 22 appearance of the Dayton Power and Light Company by 23 Randall Griffin, Judi Sobecki, and Michael Shuler,

Also Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., by Elizabeth

1065 Woodman Avenue, Dayton, Ohio 45432.

24

1 H. Watts, 155 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 2 43215.

And the FirstEnergy Corporation, CEI,
Toledo Edison, and Ohio Edison, by Carrie Dunn, Erika
Ostrowski, 76 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio 44308.

And finally, Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy, by Colleen Mooney, 231 West Lima Street, Findlay, Ohio 45839.

Thank you, your Honor

EXAMINER SEE: Okay. I did not hear you say Ohio Power, did I?

MR. STINSON: I did not get authorization from Ohio Power yet.

EXAMINER SEE: Okay. Is anyone here representing Ohio Power?

16 (No response.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

EXAMINER SEE: Okay. On behalf of Industrial Energy Users Ohio.

MR. PRITCHARD: Thank you, your Honor.

On behalf of IEU Ohio, I am Matt Pritchard with the law firm McNees Wallace & Nurick, 21 East State

Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

EXAMINER SEE: On behalf of Kroger.

MS. BOJKO: Thank you, your Honor. On behalf of the Kroger Company, Kimberly W. Bojko with

the law firm Carpenter Lipps & Leland, 280 North High Street, Suite 1300, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

24

EXAMINER SEE: On behalf of the Office of Ohio Consumers' Counsel.

MR. KUMAR: Your Honor, on behalf of the residential consumers of the electric distribution utilities, the Office of Ohio Consumers' Counsel, Bruce Weston and Ajay Kumar, 10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800, Columbus, Ohio.

EXAMINER SEE: And on behalf of the Staff
of the Commission.

MR. STINSON: On behalf of the Staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, I'm Thomas W. McNamee. The address is 30 East Broad Street, 16th floor, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

EXAMINER SEE: Okay. Mr. Stinson.

Mr. Stinson, go ahead

MR. STINSON: I'd like to call our first witness, our only witness, Susan M. Moser. And if I could approach, your Honor?

EXAMINER SEE: Yes.

Ms. Moser, if you would please raise your right hand.

(Witness sworn.)

25 EXAMINER SEE: Thank you. Have a seat.

(EXHIBITS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

2

1

- - -

3

4

5

SUSAN M. MOSER

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

6

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

DIRECT EXAMINATION

7 By Mr. Stinson:

- Q. Ms. Moser, would you please state your full name and business address for the record.
- A. Susan M. Moser, Ohio Development Services
 Agency, 77 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.
 - Q. I placed a number of exhibits before you,

 Ms. Moser. I'd like you to identify them. The first

 is marked ODSA Exhibit No. 1. Could you identify

 that for the record, please?
 - A. I can. That is the Application that we filed with the Commission on October 30 -- 31st of this year, that outlines the rate case for this year.
 - Q. Thank you.

And ODSA Exhibit 2, if you could identify that, please.

- A. Yes. That's my testimony on behalf of the Application to give supplemental information as to how we got the numbers.
- Q. That is the original information that

supports the Application?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

- A. It's the original one that supports the app -- the original Application we filed in October, yes.
- Q. Okay. And I've also placed before you ODSA Exhibit 3. Could you identify that, please?
- A. Yes. This is the -- the testimony from Megan Meadows. It is in support of the administrative cost for the USF rate case, and this was filed with the original Application on October 31st.
 - Q. Thank you.

And also I have placed before you ODSA Exhibit No. 4. Could you identify that, please?

- A. I can. This is the Amended Application which updated all the numbers to give -- to put in the September numbers for the rate case and this was -- this was filed or is being filed. This is the updated numbers that we had to have another month's worth of usage.
 - O. That was filed November 29th?
- 22 A. Oh, okay.
- 23 Q. Is that "yes"?
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. Thank you.

And ODSA Exhibit No. 5, would you identify that, please?

- A. Yes. That is my updated testimony for the Amended Application, to give the background and to support the numbers that we filed on November 28th.
 - O. And ODSA Exhibit No. 6?
- A. Exhibit No. 6 is my testimony in support of the Joint Stipulation and that is dated today.
 - Q. And finally, Joint Exhibit No. 1.
- A. That is the Joint Exhibit for this rate case and it was -- it was filed today. It is filed November 30th, 2016.
 - Q. Thank you.
 - I'd like to direct your attention to ODSA Exhibit No. 5 which is your Supplemental Testimony, and ODSA Exhibit 6 which is the testimony in support of the Joint Stipulation.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. Did you prepare that testimony or was it prepared under your direct supervision?
- 22 A. It was.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. Do you have any changes or additions or corrections to that testimony?
- 25 A. No, I don't.

If I were to ask you the same questions 1 Ο. in that testimony today, would your answers be the 2 3 same? A. Yes. 4 5 MR. STINSON: Thank you. 6 Your Honor, I tender the witness for 7 cross-examination. 8 EXAMINER SEE: Any cross for this witness, Mr. Pritchard? 9 10 MR. PRITCHARD: No cross. 11 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Kumar? 12 MR. KUMAR: No cross. 13 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Bojko? 14 MS. BOJKO: No cross, your Honor. Thank 15 you. 16 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. McNamee? 17 MR. McNAMEE: No questions. Thank you. 18 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Moser, just one 19 question from the Bench. 20 There has been a significant drop in what 2.1 is projected to be the 2017 USF rates for most of the 22 company. Other than the revenue requirement that's 23 projected based on current rates, what is the reason 24 for that decrease? 25 THE WITNESS: There's two major reasons

for that and the one drives the other one. Starting around September -- August/September of last year, enrollment started decreasing dramatically in the -- EXAMINER SEE: And when you say "last year" you're talking about?

THE WITNESS: So 2015.

2.1

EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

THE WITNESS: And we noticed a decrease in enrollment. With the trending function that we used, it didn't pick that up. It was the end of last year, it didn't pick it up. So we -- the -- the projected revenue that we needed last year was off because we projected that we would need more because we didn't know that the rates were going -- the number of enrollment was going down.

The enrollment rates have continued to go down through 2016. So we had rates going at this level, but the enrollment going down, so we were overcollecting.

So the two things are the decrease in enrollment, which was the major thing that caused it, but then because we overcollected last year, you know, now we have account balances and projected account balances that are high positive, so those get deducted from the rate case for this year.

So the actual rate case for 2017, what we're asking to collect is actually less than what the cost of PIPP would be or just about the cost of PIPP. But that's to pay back for what we overcollected this year.

2.1

EXAMINER SEE: Okay. That's all I have.

MR. STINSON: Thank you, Ms. Moser.

At this time we'd move the admission of ODSA Exhibits 1 through 6, and Joint Exhibit 1.

EXAMINER SEE: Are there any objections to the admission of ODSA Exhibits 1 through 6, and Joint Exhibit 1?

MR. McNAMEE: Your Honor, I don't have an objection, but I do have an explanation.

EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

MR. McNAMEE: I believe this is the 16th time we've done this, and so I'm sure the Bench is aware that the Staff's role in these cases is limited to performing mathematical review to make sure that the numbers all jive in the Application. And normally, at this point in these hearings, I would say that's been done. Unfortunately, I can't say that this year. The Staff's review has not been completed to this point in time, and that is through no fault either of the Staff or of Mr. Stinson.

What normally happens in these situations is the numbers are sent by Mr. Stinson to me and I convey those to the Staff. He dutifully sent them; I never got them. So, unfortunately, the Staff only — and I think that was because of a problem with the AG's server, with the firewall with the AG's server. But, at any rate, I'm not sure what, maybe I made a mistake, I don't know. But, at any rate, they didn't get the numbers to review in sufficient time to have a conclusion to — to present here this morning.

2.1

What I would propose, and normally these things work out very well, what I would propose is when the Staff has completed its review in a couple days to submit a letter indicating that they reviewed the numbers and there's hopefully no problem with them at that point in time.

I apologize for the situation. I don't fully understand how this happened, but it has.

EXAMINER SEE: Mr. McNamee --

MR. McNAMEE: And again, it's through no fault of Mr. Stinson or the Staff.

EXAMINER SEE: -- I need a date by which Staff will put a letter in the docket indicating its concerns, if any.

MR. McNAMEE: How about next Wednesday?

```
15
     Will that work?
 1
 2
                 EXAMINER SEE: So you're proposing
 3
     December 6 -- Wednesday the 7th?
                 MR. McNAMEE: Yes. I know there is a
 4
 5
     time pressure here.
 6
                 EXAMINER SEE: Yes, there is.
 7
                 MR. McNAMEE: Pardon?
 8
                 EXAMINER SEE: Yes, there is. While
     Staff would like to have time until next Wednesday,
9
10
     that is going to be late. It would need to be by
11
     close of business Monday.
12
                 MR. McNAMEE: I'm sorry?
13
                 EXAMINER SEE: It needs to be received by
14
     close of business, Monday the 5th.
15
                 MR. McNAMEE: Okeydoke. We will do that.
16
                 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Bojko.
17
                 MS. BOJKO: Your Honor, at this time I
18
     would just like to note that the Kroger Company does
19
     not oppose the stipulation, Joint Exhibit 1, but we
20
     also are not a signatory party, but we will not
2.1
     oppose it. Thank you.
22
                 EXAMINER SEE: And Staff also is not
23
     opposing.
24
                 Mr. Pritchard.
25
                 MR. PRITCHARD: Yes, your Honor. My
```

clients have not yet had an opportunity to review the Stipulation and, therefore, propose to file a letter in this docket either maintaining a non-opposing position or affirmatively joining in support of the Stipulation. We propose to file that in the next couple days. We can definitely file it by the close of business Monday.

2.1

EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Kumar.

MR. KUMAR: As is OCC's tradition in these cases, we were also not a signatory party and we will likely also not be opposing. But just barring any hiccups with Staff's mathematical review, we will not be opposing the Stipulation as well.

EXAMINER SEE: And that is a conclusive determination at this time; you're not waiting to see Staff's letter.

MR. KUMAR: No.

EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

MR. STINSON: Your Honor, I've been authorized by the Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy to indicate that although they are not a signatory party to the Stipulation, they will not oppose.

In addition, Duke Energy Ohio has authorized me to indicate they will not sign and will not oppose. And there's a footnote in the

Stipulation, itself, that indicates as much.

EXAMINER SEE: Okay. There was some conversation, but I did not hear anyone say that they had any objections to the admission of ODSA Exhibits 1 through 6, or Joint Exhibit 1. Therefore, those exhibits are admitted into the record.

(EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

EXAMINER SEE: And any indications about the mathematical accuracy or whether a party is not opposing or elects to join the Stipulation should be filed in the docket, with a courtesy copy by e-mail to the Attorney Examiner, by no later than close of business which is 5:30 p.m. on Monday, December 5th.

Is there anything further?

MR. STINSON: No, your Honor. Thank you.

MR. McNAMEE: Thank you.

17 EXAMINER SEE: With that, we are

18 | adjourned.

19 (Thereupon, the proceedings concluded at

20 9:21 a.m.)

CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings taken by me in this matter on Monday, November 30, 2016, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes.

Carolyn M. Burke, Registered Professional Reporter, and Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio.

My commission expires July 17, 2018.

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

12/5/2016 11:02:18 AM

in

Case No(s). 16-1223-EL-USF

Summary: Transcript In the Matter of the Application of the Ohio Development Services Agency for an Order Approving Adjustments to the Universal Service Fund Riders of Jurisdictional Ohio Electric Distribution Utilities, hearing held on November 30, 2016. electronically filed by Mr. Ken Spencer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Burke, Carolyn