

## THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

IN THE MATTER OF THE 2018 LONG-TERM FORECAST REPORT OF OHIO POWER COMPANY AND RELATED MATTERS.

CASE No. 18-501-EL-FOR

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF OHIO POWER COMPANY FOR APPROVAL TO ENTER INTO RENEWABLE ENERGY PURCHASE AGREEMENTS FOR INCLUSION IN THE RENEWABLE GENERATION RIDER.

CASE No. 18-1392-EL-RDR

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF OHIO POWER COMPANY FOR APPROVAL TO AMEND ITS TARIFFS.

CASE No. 18-1393-EL-ATA

### ENTRY

Entered in the Journal on October 22, 2018

#### I. SUMMARY

{¶ 1} The attorney examiner establishes a procedural schedule for the review of Ohio Power Company d/b/a AEP Ohio's long-term forecast report amendment and grants, to the extent set forth in this Entry, various motions filed in these proceedings.

#### II. DISCUSSION

{¶ 2} 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.

{¶ 3} R.C. 4928.143(B)(2)(c) provides that an electric security plan (ESP) may include a nonbypassable surcharge for the life of an electric generating facility that is owned or operated by an electric distribution utility, was sourced through a competitive bid process, and is newly used and useful on or after January 1, 2009. The statute directs the Commission to determine, in advance of authorizing any surcharge, whether there is

need for the facility based on resource planning projections submitted by the electric distribution utility.

{¶ 4} R.C. 4935.04(C) requires certain electric transmission line owners to furnish to the Commission, on an annual basis, a long-term forecast report (LTFR), including, among other information, a year-by-year, ten-year forecast of annual energy demand, peak load, reserves, and a general description of the resource planning projections to meet demand. Pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901:5-3-01(A) and 4901:5-5-06(A), an electric transmission owner or electric utility is required to file its LTFR, including an integrated resource plan, by April 15 of each year.

{¶ 5} R.C. 4935.04(D)(3) provides that the Commission shall hold a public hearing regarding a LTFR upon the showing of good cause to the Commission by an interested party. If a hearing is held, the Commission shall fix a time for the hearing, which shall be not later than 90 days after the report is filed, and publish notice of the date, time of day, and location of the hearing in a newspaper of general circulation in each county in which the person furnishing the report has or intends to locate a major utility facility and will provide service during the period covered by the report. The notice shall be published not less than 15 nor more than 30 days before the hearing and shall state the matters to be considered.

{¶ 6} On April 16, 2018, AEP Ohio filed its LTFR for 2018 in Case No. 18-501-EL-FOR (*LTFR Case*). AEP Ohio corrected and supplemented its LTFR on May 31, 2018, and June 26, 2018, at the request of Staff.

{¶ 7} On June 7, 2018, pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-12 and 4901:5-5-02(C), AEP Ohio filed a motion for waiver, requesting that the Commission waive certain portions of the LTFR requirements for electric utilities and electric transmission owners. In its motion, AEP Ohio stated that it intended to file an amendment to its 2018 LTFR to demonstrate the need for at least 900 megawatts (MW) of renewable energy projects in

Ohio, consistent with the Commission's orders in the Company's recent ESP proceedings and its earlier power purchase agreement (PPA) proceedings. *In re Ohio Power Co.*, Case No. 16-1852-EL-SSO, et al. (*ESP Case*), Opinion and Order (Apr. 25, 2018); *In re Ohio Power Co.*, Case No. 14-1693-EL-RDR, et al. (*PPA Rider Case*), Opinion and Order (Mar. 31, 2016), Second Entry on Rehearing (Nov. 3, 2016), Fifth Entry on Rehearing (Apr. 5, 2017). AEP Ohio explained that the stipulation approved by the Commission in the *PPA Rider Case* includes an agreement and commitment by the Company and its affiliates to develop a total of at least 500 MW nameplate capacity of wind energy projects in Ohio and at least 400 MW nameplate capacity of solar energy projects in the state, subject to Commission approval. AEP Ohio noted, however, that it must first submit a demonstration of need filing pursuant to R.C. 4928.143(B)(2)(c), as a predicate for advancing project-specific proposals through subsequent EL-RDR filings.

{¶ 8} With respect to its waiver request, AEP Ohio asserted that the designated information required by certain LTFR rules is not necessary for an efficient review of the Company's integrated resource plan that will be the focus of the LTFR amendment. AEP Ohio added that the information required by the rules is voluminous and would be time consuming for the Company to prepare, while much of the information is publicly available in the Company's Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Form 715.

{¶ 9} By Entry dated September 19, 2018, the Commission granted AEP Ohio's unopposed motion for waiver, subject to certain conditions.

{¶ 10} On September 19, 2018, AEP Ohio filed the amendment to its 2018 LTFR, along with supporting testimony.

{¶ 11} On September 21, 2018, Staff filed a motion for a hearing in the *LTFR Case*.

{¶ 12} On September 27, 2018, in Case No. 18-1392-EL-RDR and Case No. 18-1393-EL-ATA (*Tariff Cases*), AEP Ohio filed an application seeking approval of the inclusion of

two solar energy resources totaling 400 MW of nameplate capacity in the Company's Renewable Generation Rider (RGR), as well as approval to establish a new Green Power Tariff under which customers may purchase renewable energy certificates (RECs) for the solar energy resources' environmental attributes. AEP Ohio states that, in accordance with the *PPA Rider Case* and the *ESP Case*, the Company has executed 20-year renewable energy purchase agreements (REPAs) for the energy, capacity, and environmental attributes associated with two solar energy projects to be constructed in Highland County, Ohio – a 300 MW nameplate capacity solar facility known as Highland Solar and a 100 MW nameplate capacity solar facility known as Willowbrook Solar. AEP Ohio further states that, although the solar facilities would be operated on its behalf, the Company would be responsible for the dispatch of the resources in the wholesale markets. AEP Ohio requests that the Commission find that it is reasonable and prudent for the Company to enter into the REPAs associated with the two solar energy projects and that the Company should be authorized under R.C. 4928.143(B)(2)(c) to recover through the RGR its REPA costs and debt equivalency costs for the life of the facilities. With respect to the Green Power Tariff, AEP Ohio notes that it requests approval to establish the tariff under R.C. 4909.18, as an application not for an increase in rates, in order to provide all customers, whether served by the Company's standard service offer or by a competitive retail electric service provider, the opportunity to purchase RECs to cover some or all of their usage.

{¶ 13} Also on September 27, 2018, AEP Ohio filed a motion seeking to consolidate the *LTFR Case* and the *Tariff Cases*, along with a request for an expedited ruling.

{¶ 14} Numerous motions for intervention have been filed and are pending in the *LTFR Case* and the *Tariff Cases*, including motions filed by the Ohio Consumers' Counsel (OCC), Ohio Manufacturers' Association Energy Group (OMAEG), and Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC).

{¶ 15} On October 4, 2018, OCC and OMAEG filed memoranda contra AEP Ohio's motion for consolidation of the *LTFR Case* and the *Tariff Cases*.

{¶ 16} Memoranda contra Staff's motion for a hearing in the *LTFR Case* were filed on October 9, 2018, by AEP Ohio and NRDC. OCC also filed a memorandum in response to Staff's motion on October 9, 2018. AEP Ohio filed a response to OCC's memorandum on October 15, 2018. On October 16, 2018, OMAEG filed a reply to NRDC's memorandum. On that same date, OCC filed a reply to AEP Ohio and NRDC.

{¶ 17} On October 16, 2018, OMAEG filed a motion to strike AEP Ohio's memorandum contra Staff's motion for a hearing in the *LTFR Case*. AEP Ohio filed a memorandum contra OMAEG's motion on October 17, 2018.

**A. Motion for Hearing in the *LTFR Case***

{¶ 18} In its motion for a hearing in the *LTFR Case*, Staff requests that the Commission hold a hearing to be scheduled for a date within 90 days of September 19, 2018. Staff further requests that the hearing be called on the established date and continued to a later date, in order to allow sufficient time for investigation and settlement discussions. Noting that the question presented by AEP Ohio's LTFR amendment filing is relatively novel, complex, and likely to attract considerable public interest, Staff asserts that good cause exists for a hearing on the LTFR pursuant to R.C. 4935.04(D)(3), given that the proposed renewable generation facilities would potentially have significant financial and environmental consequences for decades. Staff adds that additional time beyond the 90-day period set forth in R.C. 4935.04(D)(3) may be required to fully develop the record in the *LTFR Case* for the benefit of the Commission and the parties.

{¶ 19} AEP Ohio responds that the 90-day period for a hearing in a LTFR proceeding was mandated by the General Assembly and should not be bypassed through a procedural maneuver. AEP Ohio adds that the impending expiration of significant federal tax credits for renewable energy facilities poses an urgent need to proceed with

the *LTFR Case*. AEP Ohio acknowledges, however, the complexities of the *LTFR Case*, particularly if it is consolidated with the *Tariff Cases*. AEP Ohio states that, if its motion for consolidation of the three proceedings is granted, the Company agrees to waive the 90-day requirement and employ Staff's requested call-and-continue procedure, provided that it is coupled with an expedited procedural schedule for the consolidated cases that is generally consistent with the 90-day period. AEP Ohio also contends that, if consolidation is not granted, the 90-day requirement set forth in R.C. 4935.04(D)(3) should be strictly followed.

{¶ 20} In its limited memorandum contra Staff's motion, NRDC responds that the Commission should balance Staff's reasonable request for additional time with AEP Ohio's commitment in the *PPA Rider Case* to use its best efforts to maximize the potential value for customers associated with the procurement of renewable energy resources. NRDC asserts that Staff's request to have an open-ended continuance would unnecessarily delay the *LTFR Case* and could place at risk the significant value that available tax credits for solar projects could provide to AEP Ohio's customers. NRDC, therefore, proposes that the evidentiary hearing be called within the 90-day period and continued to a date no later than January 14, 2019.

{¶ 21} In its response to Staff's motion, OCC responds that the hearing in the *LTFR Case* should be called and continued to a date after the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) issues its order addressing PJM Interconnection, LLC's capacity market in FERC Docket No. EL18-178-000, et al., which, according to OCC, is expected to occur by March 15, 2019. OCC asserts that FERC's decision could materially impact the revenue that AEP Ohio derives from the wholesale capacity market, if the Company is permitted to proceed with the proposed renewable generation facilities. OCC requests that the Commission direct AEP Ohio to update its application and testimony in the *LTFR Case* to account for FERC's order within 30 days of its issuance, with the hearing reconvening no sooner than 90 days after the updated application and testimony are filed.

OCC argues that this approach would enable the Commission to consider FERC's ruling and provide the parties with sufficient time to develop a thorough factual record. In the alternative, OCC proposes that the hearing be called and continued, followed by an opportunity in early 2019, after initial review and discovery, for the parties to propose a case schedule. OCC contends that the magnitude of the charges at issue and experience gained from a prior LTFR case involving AEP Ohio, Case No. 10-501-EL-FOR, warrant a deliberative approach to the pending *LTFR Case* rather than a rush to judgment. Finally, OCC maintains that AEP Ohio's request for a hearing in November 2018 should be rejected under any circumstances.

{¶ 22} In response to OCC's memorandum, AEP Ohio replies that OCC's request to suspend the *LTFR Case* constitutes an untimely motion for affirmative relief that should be rejected. AEP Ohio also argues that OCC's proposal that the hearing be called and indefinitely continued, until after the issuance of a final order by FERC, is misguided and likely to harm Ohio consumers. Noting that there is no specific deadline for action by FERC, AEP Ohio asserts that an indefinite delay would negate the significant advantage of soon-to-expire federal tax credits and the resulting net financial benefit for customers.

{¶ 23} In its reply to AEP Ohio and NRDC, OCC reiterates that the Commission should not proceed with the *LTFR Case* until FERC issues its ruling. OCC also argues that AEP Ohio's testimony confirms that the availability of a limited and uncertain amount of tax credits should not dictate the procedural schedule, particularly given that the tax credits remain available for renewable projects with construction beginning in 2019 or later. OCC concludes that its proposed schedule would permit the parties time to develop a complete record in an important and complicated case involving significant costs for consumers.

{¶ 24} Replying to NRDC's position, OMAEG contends that NRDC's proposed schedule would impose arbitrary deadlines in order to maximize a claimed benefit that may not exist. According to OMAEG, the Commission should ensure that all parties are

afforded due process and a full opportunity to participate in the *LTFR Case*, including a complete discovery process. OMAEG urges the Commission to adopt Staff's proposal.

**B. *Motion to Consolidate Proceedings***

{¶ 25} In its motion to consolidate the above-captioned cases, AEP Ohio asserts that consolidation is appropriate, given the common and interrelated issues between the proceedings. Specifically, AEP Ohio states that the *Tariff Cases* will encompass the economic impacts and other details pertaining to the two proposed solar projects and the associated Green Power Tariff, which would offset a portion of the cost of the solar projects, while the *LTFR Case* will involve the Company's demonstration of need for the solar projects. According to AEP Ohio, its supporting testimony confirms that the three cases are fundamentally related. AEP Ohio also claims that consolidation would enable the efficient and expeditious resolution of all three matters, while avoiding potentially duplicative discovery, witness testimony, hearings, and post-hearing briefing. Noting that it has proposed the same procedural schedule in all three proceedings, AEP Ohio contends that there would be no resulting prejudice if the cases are consolidated.

{¶ 26} In its memorandum contra, OCC argues that AEP Ohio's LTFR amendment is inconsistent with R.C. 4928.143(B)(2)(c) and the Commission's orders in the *ESP Case* and, therefore, there is no reason to consolidate the three proceedings. OCC asserts that AEP Ohio's request for a blanket finding of need for 900 MW in the *LTFR Case* is irrelevant to the question to be answered in the *Tariff Cases*, which, according to OCC, is whether there is a need for each of the specific solar facilities. Additionally, OCC argues that AEP Ohio's application in the *Tariff Cases* is premature under Ohio Adm.Code 4901:5-5-06(B), which requires the Company to file its LTFR in the forecast year prior to any filing for an allowance under R.C. 4928.143(B)(2)(c). OCC concludes that AEP Ohio must demonstrate the need for each of the two solar facilities in the *Tariff Cases* when it becomes timely to do so.



{¶ 27} OMAEG argues that AEP Ohio's motion for consolidation is procedurally improper and inconsistent with Ohio law and Commission practice. OMAEG notes that Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-35-03(C)(9)(b)(i) requires that, when an application seeking cost recovery for renewable generation owned or operated by an electric utility is filed, the need for the proposed facility must have already been reviewed and determined by the Commission through an integrated resource planning process filed pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901:5-5-05. OMAEG further notes that Ohio Adm.Code 4901:5-5-06(B) requires that the LTFR must be filed a year prior to any filing under R.C. 4928.143(B)(2)(c). Like OCC, OMAEG maintains that, before AEP Ohio can begin to seek cost recovery, the Commission must first find that specific proposed projects are necessary rather than a generic set of projects totaling at least 900 MW. OMAEG believes that the issue for determination in the *LTFR Case* is whether specific proposed projects are necessary, while the issue to be decided in the *Tariff Cases* is whether, and to what extent, the Company can seek cost recovery from customers through the RGR for specific projects that have already been deemed necessary. OMAEG concludes that these issues are not the same and that the Commission should adhere to its rules by first assessing the need for specific renewable facilities and then, if necessary, proceeding to AEP Ohio's cost recovery application.

### C. *Motion to Strike*

{¶ 28} As noted above, OMAEG filed a motion to strike AEP Ohio's memorandum contra Staff's motion for hearing. OMAEG argues that AEP Ohio's filing constitutes a procedurally improper reply to the memoranda contra the Company's motion for consolidation. OMAEG notes that AEP Ohio requested expedited treatment of its motion to consolidate the proceedings and, therefore, replies are not permitted pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-12(C). According to OMAEG, the Commission should reject AEP Ohio's attempt to offer additional arguments in support of its motion for consolidation. In the alternative, OMAEG requests that its motion to strike be construed as a reply to

AEP Ohio's memorandum contra. In its reply, OMAEG maintains that Staff's proposal should be adopted, as it would permit the parties to conduct discovery and develop a complete record to assist the Commission. OMAEG adds that AEP Ohio's opposition to Staff's proposed call-and-continue procedure as contrary to R.C. 4935.04(D)(3) is undermined by the Company's acceptance of Staff's proposal, provided that the three proceedings are consolidated.

{¶ 29} AEP Ohio argues that its memorandum contra was a proper response to Staff's hearing request and does not constitute a reply in support of the Company's motion to consolidate the proceedings. AEP Ohio asserts that the issue of whether the 90-day period in R.C. 4935.04(D)(3) should be strictly followed is inextricably intertwined with the issue of consolidation and, therefore, it was proper for the Company to address both issues in response to Staff's motion. AEP Ohio also notes that it would be inappropriate to strike its entire pleading, as the Company was entitled to file a response to Staff's motion.

#### **D. Conclusion**

{¶ 30} Initially, addressing OMAEG's motion to strike AEP Ohio's memorandum contra Staff's motion for a hearing in the *LTFR Case*, the attorney examiner finds that the portion of the Company's memorandum contra that "reiterates its position" regarding consolidation is procedurally improper and should be stricken.<sup>1</sup> Given that Staff's motion does not address the issue of consolidation, the attorney examiner agrees with OMAEG that AEP Ohio's arguments on consolidation do not relate in any way to Staff's hearing request and instead constitute an improper reply to OCC's and OMAEG's memoranda contra the Company's motion for consolidation, which requested expedited

---

<sup>1</sup> Specifically, the paragraph beginning with "[a]s a threshold matter" on page two and continuing through the remainder of the Law and Argument section of AEP Ohio's memorandum contra should be stricken. Although AEP Ohio characterizes this portion of its memorandum as a mere reiteration of its position on consolidation, the Company proceeds to respond to the arguments raised by OCC and OMAEG in their memoranda contra the Company's motion to consolidate the proceedings.

consideration under Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-12(C). Replies in support of motions seeking an expedited ruling are not permitted under the rule. However, the attorney examiner finds that, to the extent that AEP Ohio's memorandum contra relates to Staff's hearing proposal, the Company's arguments in response to Staff should not be stricken.

{¶ 31} With respect to Staff's motion for a hearing in the *LTFR Case*, the attorney examiner finds that AEP Ohio's proposal to demonstrate the need for at least 900 MW of renewable energy resources in the state constitutes good cause for a hearing, in accordance with R.C. 4935.04(D)(3). Staff's request for a hearing should, therefore, be granted, consistent with this Entry.

{¶ 32} Regarding AEP Ohio's motion for consolidation of the above-captioned cases, the attorney examiner finds that the motion should be granted to the extent set forth in this Entry. Consistent with prior precedent, the attorney examiner finds that consolidation of all three cases is reasonable and appropriate, in light of their common issues and the administrative efficiencies to be gained from consolidation. *See, e.g., In re National Gas and Oil Corp.*, Case No. 89-34-GA-GCR, et al., Entry (Aug. 22, 1989) (consolidating LTFR case with gas cost recovery proceeding); *In re Ohio Gas Co.*, Case No. 89-874-GA-FOR, et al., Entry (June 26, 1989) (consolidating LTFR case with gas cost recovery proceeding); *In re Ohio Power Co.*, Case No. 88-333-EL-FOR, et al., Entry (Jan. 11, 1989) (consolidating LTFR case with electric fuel component proceeding). The attorney examiner notes, however, that Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-35-03(C)(9)(b)(i) provides that, when an electric utility in an ESP application seeks authority to impose a surcharge pursuant to R.C. 4928.143(B)(2)(c) for an electric generating facility owned or operated by the utility, the need for the proposed facility must have already been reviewed and determined by the Commission through an integrated resource planning process filed pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901:5-5-05. Further, Ohio Adm.Code 4901:5-5-06(B) requires that certain information, including an integrated resource plan and a discussion of the need for additional electricity resource options, be included in the LTFR and filed

by the electric utility in the forecast year prior to any filing for an allowance under R.C. 4928.143(B)(2)(c). The Commission's rules, therefore, contemplate that the need for a proposed generating facility should generally be heard first as a distinct issue. Separately, the Commission will also consider, through its review of the electric utility's EL-SSO or EL-RDR filing, whether all of the criteria set forth in R.C. 4928.143(B)(2)(c), including need for the facility, have been satisfied, in advance of authorizing any cost recovery through a nonbypassable surcharge. The attorney examiner, therefore, finds that it is appropriate under the circumstances to proceed initially with the review of AEP Ohio's LTFR amendment and, separately, to address the Company's application in the *Tariff Cases*. Accordingly, the consolidated cases should proceed in two phases, with the first phase to consist of a hearing on the issue of need, as set forth below. In the second phase of the consolidated proceedings, a separate hearing will be held to consider the issues raised by AEP Ohio's application in the *Tariff Cases*. The attorney examiner notes that the bifurcation of the hearing process does not preclude AEP Ohio from offering its direct testimony, as submitted in support of the application in the *Tariff Cases*, at the hearing on the issue of need.

{¶ 33} As noted above, R.C. 4935.04(D)(3) directs the Commission, if it holds a public hearing regarding a LTFR, to fix a time for the hearing that is not later than 90 days after the report is filed. Consistent with the statute, the attorney examiner finds that the following procedural schedule should be established for the consideration of the issue of need and any other issues presented in AEP Ohio's LTFR amendment filed in the *LTFR Case*:

- (a) Motions to intervene in the consolidated cases should be filed by October 29, 2018.
- (b) Discovery requests, except for notices of deposition, should be served by November 13, 2018.

- (c) Testimony on behalf of intervenors should be filed by November 21, 2018.
- (d) A prehearing conference will occur on November 26, 2018, at 10:00 a.m., in Hearing Room 11-A, at the offices of the Commission, 180 East Broad Street, 11th Floor, Columbus, Ohio 43215.
- (e) Testimony on behalf of Staff should be filed by November 27, 2018.
- (f) The hearing shall commence on December 4, 2018, at 10:00 a.m., in Hearing Room 11-A, at the offices of the Commission, 180 East Broad Street, 11th Floor, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

{¶ 34} The attorney examiner requires that, in the event that any motion is made prior to the issuance of the Commission's order, any memorandum contra shall be filed within five business days after the service of such motion, and a reply memorandum to any memorandum contra shall be filed within three business days. Parties shall provide service of pleadings via hand delivery, facsimile, or e-mail.

{¶ 35} In addition, the attorney examiner finds that the response time for discovery shall be shortened to seven calendar days. Unless otherwise agreed to by the parties, discovery requests and replies shall be served by hand delivery, facsimile, or e-mail. An attorney serving a discovery request shall attempt to contact, in advance, the attorney upon whom the discovery request will be served to advise him/her that a request will be forthcoming.

{¶ 36} AEP Ohio should cause the following notice to be published once, not less than 15 days nor more than 30 days prior to December 4, 2018, in at least one newspaper of general circulation in each county of the Company's service territory.

## LEGAL NOTICE

The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio has scheduled a public hearing in Case No. 18-501-EL-FOR, et al., to review the 2018 long-term forecast report filed by Ohio Power Company d/b/a AEP Ohio. The company's long-term forecast report includes information regarding annual energy demand and projected loads, as well as the company's plan to demonstrate the need for at least 900 megawatts of renewable energy generation resources in Ohio. The public hearing will begin at 10:00 a.m., on December 4, 2018, at the offices of the Commission, 180 East Broad Street, 11th Floor, Hearing Room 11-A, Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793.

Persons wishing to review copies of the company's long-term forecast report may do so by contacting the company at: [Appropriate contact information to be inserted].

The Commission will give any interested member of the public the opportunity to be heard at the public hearing. Further information may be obtained by contacting the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793, viewing the Commission's web page at <http://www.puc.state.oh.us>, or contacting the Commission's hotline at 1-800-686-7826 or, for hearing or speech impaired customers, 7-1-1.

{¶ 37} As a final matter, the attorney examiner notes that the hearing schedule for the consideration of AEP Ohio's application in the *Tariff Cases* will be established by future entry.

### III. ORDER

{¶ 38} It is, therefore,

{¶ 39} ORDERED, That OMAEG's motion to strike be granted to the extent set forth in this Entry. It is, further,

{¶ 40} ORDERED, That AEP Ohio's motion to consolidate the *LTFR Case* and the *Tariff Cases* be granted to the extent set forth in this Entry. It is, further,

{¶ 41} ORDERED, That Staff's request for a hearing on AEP Ohio's LTFR amendment be granted, consistent with this Entry. It is, further,

{¶ 42} ORDERED, That the procedural schedule set forth in Paragraph 33 be adopted. It is, further,

{¶ 43} ORDERED, That the parties adhere to the processes established in Paragraphs 34 and 35. It is, further,

{¶ 44} ORDERED, That AEP Ohio cause notice of the public hearing to be published as set forth in Paragraph 36. It is, further,

{¶ 45} ORDERED, That a copy of this Entry be served upon all parties and other interested persons of record.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

s/Sarah Parrot

---

By: Sarah J. Parrot  
Attorney Examiner

JRJ/sc

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

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**10/22/2018 3:47:47 PM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 18-0501-EL-FOR, 18-1392-EL-RDR, 18-1393-EL-ATA**

Summary: Attorney Examiner Entry granting OMAEG's motion to strike, granting AEP Ohio's motion to consolidate the LTFR Case and the Tariff Cases, granting Staff's request for a hearing on AEP Ohio's LTFR amendment, setting a procedural schedule indicated in Paragraph 33, directing the parties to adhere to the processes established in Paragraphs 34 and 35, and directing AEP Ohio cause notice of the public hearing to be published as set forth in Paragraph 36 - electronically filed by Sandra Coffey on behalf of Sarah Parrot, Attorney Examiner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio