BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

- - -

In the Matter of the
Complaint of:
:

Michael S. Roote,

Complainant,

vs. : Case No. 21-11-EL-CSS

The Cleveland Electric : Illuminating Company, :

Respondent. :

PROCEEDINGS

before Mr. Matthew Sandor, Attorney Examiner, at the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, via Webex, called at 10:00 a.m. on Monday, December 20, 2021.

VOLUME II

VOLUME II

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.
222 East Town Street, Second Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201
(614) 224-9481

- - -

```
263
 1
     APPEARANCES:
 2
            Mr. Michael S. Roote
 3
                  On his own behalf.
            Benesch, Friedlander, Coplan & Aronoff, LLP
 4
            By Mr. Christopher Rogers
 5
            200 Public Square, Suite 2300
            Cleveland, Ohio 43215
 6
                 On behalf of the Respondent.
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

		\neg
	264	1
1	INDEX	
2		
3	WITNESS	
4	Bret Ingram	
5	Direct Examination by Mr. Rogers 272 Cross-Examination by Mr. Roote 275	
6	Redirect Examination by Mr. Rogers 376 Recross-Examination by Mr. Roote 377	
7	Michael S. Roote	
8	Direct Examination 381 Cross-Examination by Mr. Rogers 383	
9		
10	STAFF EXHIBIT IDENTIFIED ADMITTED	
11	1 Direct Testimony of Bret Ingram 272 380	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

265 1 Monday Morning Session, 2 December 20, 2021. 3 EXAMINER SANDOR: Let's go on the record. 4 5 At this time we'll go back on the record. 6 Good morning, everyone. Today is Monday, 7 December 20, 2021. It is the second day of the hearing in Case No. 21-11-EL-CSS. We will dispense 8 9 taking appearances today. 10 So, CEI, please proceed with Mr. Ingram. 11 MR. ROGERS: Thank you, your Honor. 12 MR. ROOTE: Your Honor, before we begin, 13 excuse me. 14 EXAMINER SANDOR: Yes. 15 MR. ROOTE: Before we begin I had a 16 couple of motions I wanted to put forward. 17 EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay. Go ahead. 18 MR. ROOTE: Thank you. I have a motion 19 to supplement my testimony regarding my experience. 20 During my examination, I remembered my work on the 2.1 BART System, automatic reclosing system, and that 22 caused me to recall another significant project 23 involving utilities in the form of rail transport. 24 And I would like to introduce that to supplement my 25 work history.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Oh, on -- on the stand, okay.

Mr. Rogers?

2.1

MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, I don't believe that was ever disclosed in the work history that we asked him to describe in his interrogatories which I will have to pull up to confirm. So that would be completely new information to us and was not disclosed when we asked him specifically for his work history on this subject.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay. Well, in the meantime, while you look for that, let's -- since I would prefer starting today with Mr. Ingram, I think we can defer ruling on the motion until after he is off the stand.

MR. ROGERS: Very good, your Honor.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Anything else,

Mr. Roote, before we move on to the witness?

MR. ROOTE: Yes. A motion requesting that the testimony of -- my testimony in response to Mr. Rogers' FU question be stricken from the record as well as his question. It was irrelevant. It was unnecessary and in my opinion falls in the category a cheap trick and reflects poorly on Mr. Rogers' profession and poorly on the Commission.

EXAMINER SANDOR: You'll -- Mr. Rogers, if you would like to respond.

2.1

MR. ROGERS: I mean, your Honor, that was in response to the first phone call that he made to the CEI to report the wire down. It is relevant and I wanted to see why he said fuck you to an automated commuter system and it goes to his frame of mind as well as any ulterior motives he has for this case.

MR. ROOTE: And I would argue attempt to embarrass me and that was the sole purpose for asking the question, your Honor.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Well, what -- what I am going to do is, Mr. Roote, I am going to deny the motion because you did clarify your response after he asked the question.

MR. ROOTE: Actually I'm not upset with that, your Honor. It's more embarrassing for him than it is for me.

All right. One more motion, your Honor. EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay.

MR. ROOTE: I have a motion for a mistrial based on the fact that I was denied the opportunity to present a witness as we talked about off the record at the last hearing. I requested the address of Mr. Robert Allen directly of Mr. Rogers.

He never responded. And as you know from the record, I attempted to secure that subpoena via another route, although that was as you ruled incorrectly delivered, but that doesn't change the fact that I was denied the fact -- denied the opportunity to hear a witness. And I realize that the PUCO rules nor the civil -- civic rules in Ohio speak about -- speak of mistrials, but I believe that means we defer to common law, and you have the inherent right to declare a mistrial.

2.1

EXAMINER SANDOR: Mr. Rogers.

MR. ROGERS: Mr. Allen's testimony is completely irrelevant to this matter. Mr. Allen went to Mr. Roote's premises after the power had been turned off, after Mr. Roote restored -- repaired his service conduit and the attachment point, and that's all he did was turn the power back on. It has absolutely nothing to do with CEI's action before that date.

MR. ROOTE: Your Honor, I believe both of Mr. -- it occurred to me to subpoena Mr. Allen after reading the expert testimony supplied by CEI of Mr. Ingram and Mr. Kozak. They both refer to Mr. Allen and his visit on December 8.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay. So my ruling on

this is I am going to deny the motion. A few things, the subpoena rules, which if I remember correctly from what you are asking, Mr. Roote, was asking for an expedited -- it was an expedited motion for issuance of a subpoena for Mr. Allen. You requested it via electronic means, via e-mail. However, the Commission rules do require an expedited motion to be provided in person. I did advise you to try to seek the address from Mr. Rogers and then file a revised subpoena.

2.1

I understand that you were waiting for Mr. Rogers' response for an address. However, when we are getting even nearer to the hearing, it is incumbent upon the Complainant to then file a motion requesting that such address be -- be provided and that was not filed.

On top of that I did allow leeway in questioning of Mr. Henry with regard to I believe it was pictures of reinstallation of the meter, and I believe a question or two acknowledging that you did not receive this address, so I did provide you a little bit of leeway with that earlier. And -- okay. And that is my ruling.

MR. ROOTE: All right. Well, I will for the record state my objection to your ruling. I

```
1
    respect it. And while we are on that subject, I want
2
    to make sure that the record clearly reflects my
    objection to your rulings on allowing some other
 3
    evidence into -- some of my other exhibits into
 4
 5
    evidence, specifically my evidence on the Public
 6
    Utilities records request, my Exhibits A, AP, AQ, and
7
    AN.
                 EXAMINER SANDOR: You said AN or AM?
8
9
                 MR. ROOTE: AN as in Nancy.
10
                 EXAMINER SANDOR:
                                   Okay.
11
                 MR. ROOTE: I also -- I'll -- also my
12
    request to enter into Exhibit -- into evidence
13
    Exhibit P, the NFPA report and my request to enter
14
    into evidence Exhibits BE and BD. That's Baker
15
    Edward, Baker David, Allstate versus CEI.
16
                 EXAMINER SANDOR: Those objections are
17
    noted.
18
                 MR. ROOTE: Thank you.
19
                 EXAMINER SANDOR: Noted for the record.
20
    Okay. Anything further, Mr. Roote?
2.1
                 MR. ROOTE: No, sir.
22
                 EXAMINER SANDOR: Thank you.
23
                 MR. ROGERS: And, your Honor, for the
```

record to -- regarding his initial motion, I do not

see anywhere in his discovery responses where he

24

```
1 | mentioned working on the train system.
```

EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay. Okay. Either way I hear both your responses. I will rule on that after Mr. Ingram comes down. Just it seems a more appropriate time to have Mr. Ingram come up and down, and then I'll issue a ruling.

7 MR. ROGERS: Okay. Thank you, your 8 Honor.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay. Please proceed,
Mr. Rogers.

MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, at this time the Company would like to call Mr. Brent Ingram to the stand.

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Ingram, you have been promoted. If you can enable your audio and video.

EXAMINER SANDOR: I think we are just waiting for your video, Mr. Ingram. I think you're muted still.

MR. INGRAM: Can you hear me now?

EXAMINER SANDOR: Yes, I can. Can you

raise your right hand, please.

(Witness sworn.)

EXAMINER SANDOR: Thank you.

	272
1	BRET INGRAM
2	being first duly sworn, as prescribed by law, was
3	examined and testified as follows:
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	By Mr. Rogers:
6	Q. Good morning, Mr. Ingram. Thank you for
7	taking your time out today to continue with this
8	hearing. Can you please state and spell your full
9	name for the record.
10	A. Yes. First name is Bret, B-R-E-T; last
11	name is Ingram, I-N-G-R-A-M.
12	Q. Who are you currently employed by?
13	A. I'm employed by the Illuminating Company,
14	part of the FirstEnergy family.
15	Q. And what capacity are you employed?
16	A. I'm the Manager of Operation Services for
17	Concord and Middlefield line shops.
18	MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, at this time I
19	would like to mark Company Exhibit 1 for the record.
20	It is the direct prefiled testimony of Mr. Ingram.
21	EXAMINER SANDOR: So marked.
22	(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
23	Q. (By Mr. Rogers) Mr. Ingram, do you have a
24	copy of what has been marked as Company Exhibit 1,

your prefiled testimony?

1 A. Yes, I do.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

- Q. Do you recognize this document?
- A. Yes, I do.
 - Q. What is it?
- A. It's testimony provided by myself in this matter.
- Q. And did you prepare this document or cause it to be prepared at your direction?
 - A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. If you were asked the same questions that are in this document today, would your answers be the same?
 - A. Yes, they would.

MR. ROGERS: And, your Honor, at this time I would like to have permission to do some additional direct examination based on some of the topics that came up last week in the hearing.

EXAMINER SANDOR: I'll grant that because I did mention in my ruling on -- Mr. Roote's ruling on expert testimony that I would allow you some leeway with the experts.

MR. ROGERS: Thank you, your Honor.

Q. (By Mr. Rogers) Mr. Ingram, you sat through testimony last week on December 14; is that accurate?

- A. That's correct. With the exception I did not hear Bob Kozak's testimony.
- Q. Understandable. But you heard the testimony of Mr. Tyler Henry.
- 5 A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

15

- Q. Do you recall Mr. -- allegations that Mr. Henry was not trained in the National Electric Safety Code, the NESC?
- A. Yes, I do.
- 10 Q. Does CEI follow the NESC?
- 11 A. Yes, they do.
- Q. Does CEI train its employees to follow the NESC?
- 14 A. Yes, we do.
 - Q. And which department is responsible for that training and ensuring compliance with the NESC?
- A. There are multiple departments. We have
 an Engineering Standards Department. We have a
 Workforce Development Department. We have Corporate
 Engineering as well as Corporate Safety.
- MR. ROGERS: Thank you, Mr. Ingram.
- Your Honor, at this time I have no further questions.
- 24 EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay. Mr. Roote,
- 25 please go ahead.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

By Mr. Roote:

2.1

Q. Well, first, in response to the additional testimony that Mr. Rogers just elicited, ask Mr. Ingram, he heard Mr. Henry's responses, did it seem to you that he was familiar with the NESC?

MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor. It calls for speculation.

A. No, he did not seem like he had knowledge of it, no.

MR. ROOTE: Thank you. As far as redirect, your Honor, that would conclude that.

Q. (By Mr. Roote) All right. Thank you again, Mr. Ingram. I didn't start by thanking you for being here today and thank you for being here last Tuesday, making yourself available.

And as -- I'm going to take a few minutes to do some background things, if it's all right with you, Mr. Ingram. We had a considerable number of objections on Tuesday regarding lack of background, so if everyone will bear with me for just a moment, I would like to establish some background before I begin.

So you are presenting yourself today as an expert. You are providing expert testimony; is that correct?

A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

- Q. Thank you. Are you an expert in everything CEI does?
 - A. No, I am not.
- Q. Please identify some of the areas where you do consider yourself to be an expert.
- A. From the line operations standpoint I have multiple years of hands-on experience both in the field and in the office, metering as well, so I have considerable knowledge.
- Q. Okay. So do you consider yourself an expert on the advanced meters?
- A. No, no. I am not an expert in advanced metering.
 - Q. Are you familiar with advanced meters?
 - A. I am familiar, yes, familiar.
 - Q. And does your operations maintain records or have access to where -- which residences are -- have advanced meters installed?
 - A. Yes, we do.
- Q. Does the -- does the -- FirstEnergy
 Illuminating Company, do they maintain a SCADA

- system? Are you familiar with the term?
- 2 A. Yes, we do. Uh-huh.

1

3

4

5

8

- Q. And are the advanced meters fulfilling the role of a -- what's referred to as an RTU as part of the SCADA system?
- A. That would be beyond my capacity. I don't know.
 - Q. Are you knowledgeable about electrical fires?
- 10 A. Electrical fires?
- 11 Q. Fires created by electricity.
- A. Have I seen fires created by electricity, yes.
- Q. Okay. Have you studied about how fires are created by electricity?
- A. Studied, no.
- Q. Are you responsible for being aware of
 when events involving your employees result in a fire
 or they respond to an event that was the result -that resulted in a fire?
- A. I'm sorry. Repeat that question again, please.
- Q. Are part of your responsibilities to be
 aware of when fire is the end result of a problem
 with your distribution lines?

- A. If you are asking am I aware of when a line causes an incident or is potentially causing an incident, yes, I am made aware of it.
- Q. Thank you. Are you knowledgeable about -- knowledgeable about arc flash?

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

- A. I understand the premise behind arc flash, yes.
 - Q. Have you yourself taken the NESC training?
 - A. I have been involved in multiple training sessions that the Company has provided, yes.
- Q. As you testified, the basis of those trainings is the NESC?
 - A. Amongst other institutions, yes.
 - Q. Are your employees required to wear a certain type of clothing that are -- are arc flash resistant?
 - A. Yes, they are.
 - Q. Do you equip them with additional equipment for when they en -- when they work on situations where they might encounter arc flash?
 - A. Personal protective equipment, yes.
- Q. Yes. Thank you. And you have a -- your education is in finance and a Master's in business; is that correct?

A. That's correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. Did that course of study include a lot of courses in statistics?
 - A. Yes, it did.
- Q. So -- all right. You stated you never testified at a PUCO -- PUCO hearing; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Have you ever been questioned by a member of the PUCO?
- 10 A. I get questions often from PUC Staff,
 11 yes.
- Q. Okay. And you supply answers for PUCO investigations?
 - A. I don't know if they resulted in investigation or not. Sometimes it's an informal or formal complaint that the PUCO follows, and they ask questions of our organization.
 - Q. When did you first become aware of my complaint?
 - A. The exact date I don't know.
- Q. When you became -- became -- when you became aware of my complaint, was it -- was it the formal complaint or the preliminary complaint investigation conducted by the PUCO?
- 25 A. No. I recall getting an e-mail from the

- PUC asking questions. I don't know if it was in a formal capacity at that time or not.
- Q. Okay. Do you recall what those questions were?
 - A. Verbatim, no, I do not.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

18

19

20

2.1

22

- Q. They don't have to be verbatim. In a general --
- A. They were questions -- I'm sorry. Go ahead, please.
- Q. Well, in a general way, what were the questions?
- A. There was a question about -- again, I
 don't recall exactly. I am trying to think back to
 the question. It was a number of questions that were
 just asked of how we were routed to a job during a
 storm and did we have any knowledge of you contacting
 the office.
 - Q. By the office --
 - A. Very high level questions.
 - Q. Okay. So you are aware that the PUCO conducted their own investigation of my issue before I filed my formal complaint.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Were you ever shown -
 MR. ROOTE: Your Honor, would you clarify

whether my Exhibit A was ever admitted into evidence, or was it disallowed?

EXAMINER SANDOR: It was disallowed.

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) Have you ever seen a summary of the PUCO investigation that they conducted?
 - A. A summary, no, I have not.

MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, I would like to object. What's the relevance of this line of questioning?

MR. ROOTE: Well, as I have stated, your Honor, I am trying to establish that background familiarity Mr. Ingram has with my case and familiarity of the operations of CEI.

EXAMINER SANDOR: I will let you proceed for now with the questioning as long as we begin moving on to the more -- the formal complaint side of things here shortly.

MR. ROOTE: Okay. Thank you, your Honor.

Q. (By Mr. Roote) I think you have already answered this, but I will state it because it's stated a little different way, before being asked to help with my complaint, were you aware the PUCO investigates customer complaints?

A. Yes.

2.1

- Q. Okay. And again, from your testimony already I think you've answered this, have you ever met anyone from the PUCO personally?
 - A. No, I have not.
- Q. So your communications with the PUCO have been via e-mail and/or telephone. You never met anyone in person.
 - A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- Q. Okay. Thank you. Thank you for the clarification. Thank you. All right. Move on to another area we're on. CEI disclosed that you and Mr. Kozak assisted with the preparations of Mr. Rogers' discoveries; is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q. Are you aware that CEI provided answers as to a previous request for discovery in March of 2021?
- 18 A. No, I am not familiar with that, no.
- MR. ROOTE: Your Honor, I would like to admit my Exhibit AW.
- EXAMINER SANDOR: One moment. You would like to mark it and present it now; is that what you are saying?
- MR. ROOTE: Yes, sir.
- 25 EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay. Let me bring it

```
283
     up. And what is the title of this exhibit, please,
 1
 2
     for marking purposes?
 3
                 MR. ROOTE: The Cleveland Illuminating
     Company's responses to Complainant's discovery
 4
 5
     requests.
 6
                 EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay.
 7
                 MR. ROGERS: And, your Honor, we would
 8
     object to the hearsay court -- out-of-court
9
     statement.
10
                 EXAMINER SANDOR: Mr. Roote, are you
11
     going to be pointing to a specific response within?
12
                 MR. ROOTE: That was my intention, your
13
    Honor.
14
                 EXAMINER SANDOR: I'm sorry. What did
15
     you say?
16
                 MR. ROOTE: That was my intention, your
17
    Honor. Excuse me.
18
                 EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay. I will allow you
19
    what -- what part are you pointing to, are you going
20
    to point to?
2.1
                 MR. ROOTE: The response to one of the
22
     interrogatories.
23
                 EXAMINER SANDOR: Can you go ahead and
24
     give me that point just so we can --
25
                 MR. ROOTE: Give me a moment, your Honor,
```

- 1 and I will.
- 2 EXAMINER SANDOR: Sure.
- MR. ROOTE: Okay. I'm sorry, your Honor.
- 4 | It should be in Request for Production of Documents
- 5 and that would be request No. 1.
- 6 EXAMINER SANDOR: I'm sorry. Can you
- 7 | give me a page number on that?
- MR. ROOTE: Certainly. The pages aren't
- 9 | numbered. Sorry, sir. The pages aren't numbered.
- 10 It's about --
- MR. ROGERS: I believe it's page 6 on the
- 12 PDF, your Honor.
- MR. ROOTE: Yes, page 6.
- 14 EXAMINER SANDOR: Page 6. And that
- 15 | number again? I'm sorry.
- MR. ROOTE: Request No. 1.
- 17 EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay. I will allow him
- 18 to ask the witness about this.
- MR. ROOTE: Has Mr. Ingram been provided
- 20 a copy of this, your Honor?
- 21 EXAMINER SANDOR: Oh, Mr. Rogers. If you
- 22 | could forward him this exhibit.
- MR. ROGERS: Bret, do you have access to
- 24 this?
- 25 THE WITNESS: What exhibit is it?

1 MR. ROGERS: Exhibit Roote Exhibit AW.

THE WITNESS: AW. Bear with me a second,

3 please.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

Okay. I have it in front of me.

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) That page 6, Mr. Ingram, is what we are referring to.
 - A. 6, okay.
- Q. As you can see there in response to request No. 1, the answer was "See documents previously produced by CEI on March 18, 2021." Is that an accurate --
- MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor. Your
 Honor, the request for production are not required to
 be verified or reviewed by the verifying witness.

 These are generally responses drafted by counsel in
 terms of requests for production, not an
 interrogatory.
- EXAMINER SANDOR: Mr. Roote, I do agree
 with Mr. Rogers.
- MR. ROOTE: All right, your Honor.
- Q. (By Mr. Roote) So, Mr. Ingram -- if you will allow, your Honor -- did you review the documents that -- that are referred to in request No. 1?
- 25 A. This is the first time I am seeing this

- document. I don't know what it pertains to.
- Q. Okay. So -- you've already answered you weren't aware of them so. Did you suggest any of the questions then asked and answered in your direct testimony?
 - A. I'm sorry. I don't understand that.
 - Q. Well, you were asked if you responded to a number of questions in your direct testimony that was introduced earlier this morning.
 - A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

20

2.1

- Q. In -- were those questions offered to you at your suggestion?
- MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor. That
 calls for -- to delve into attorney-client privilege,
 communications between counsel and the client.
- 16 EXAMINER SANDOR: I'll allow him to ask
 17 if he prepared his testimony.
- A. Did I prepare the entire testimony? No.

 19 Did we talk about questions? Yes.
 - Q. Thank you. Moving on to a new topic, on December 1, 2020, what was the cause of the area power outage that occurred along Rockhaven Road?
- A. We had a considerable snowstorm at that time.
- 25 Q. Okay. And --

- A. Primary lines in front of your house, I believe.
 - Q. What was the cause of the primary lines in front of my house coming down?
 - A. Primary lines, trees.
 - Q. And who is responsible for the vegetation control on Rockhaven Road?
 - A. CEI.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

- Q. And a few houses away were the primary wires interacting with another tree?
 - A. I believe they were, yes.
- Q. Thank you. That doesn't mean that CEI is responsible for the power outage, does it?
- 14 A. No, it does not.
- MR. ROOTE: Your Honor, we have already entered into the record Exhibit R.
- EXAMINER SANDOR: Yes. Well, actually double-check. I am pretty sure we have but let me double-check. Yes.
- MR. ROOTE: All right. Does Mr. Ingram
 have access to Exhibit R?
- 22 EXAMINER SANDOR: Once you have it up,
- 23 Mr. Ingram, let us know.
- 24 THE WITNESS: I do have it.
- Q. (By Mr. Roote) Do you see the entry dated

- December 4 by Ms. Crystal Brady on the bottom of page 3?
 - A. I do, yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

- Q. Do you see where that continues on -- EXAMINER SANDOR: One moment.
- Q. -- the bottom of page 1?

 EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay. Thank you.

 MR. ROOTE: Thank you, your Honor.
- Q. (By Mr. Roote) I'm on page 1, the entry by Ms. Brady. Do you see that continues onto page 2?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Now, reading her entry does this appear to be her entry requesting repair service?
 - A. The entry reads customer-owned equipment, replace same size service, mast, service cable, FE to disconnect/reconnect.
- Q. So that seems to be her indicating that there is -- I've requested service to repair my service entry.
- 20 MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor, to 21 his testifying.
- Q. (By Mr. Roote) What is your interpretation of what she's written there,
- 24 Mr. Ingram?
- 25 A. That's -- it's what she gathered from the

phone call, I assume.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

- And what is your assessment of what she Q. gathered from the phone call?
- Α. Well, obviously she -- there is some request for disconnect at your property.
- Thank you. Can you read the second to Ο. last line of her entry, please.
- Second to last line where it says Α. "Confirmation e-mail sent to partner e-mail address."
- That's exactly, yes, sir. Thank you. Q. You testified you had an MBA. In a business context what is a business partner?
- 13 Α. Partner would be someone within your organization. 14
 - Ο. So her reference to this partner is an indication to you it's another group or division within CEI?
 - Α. I don't know. I'm not familiar with their systems.
 - Ο. So you don't know if the partner she is referring to is owned by CEI or FirstEnergy or not.
- No, because actually on line 4 above it Α. says "Partner E-mail," and it lists your e-mail 23 address now that I am looking at it.
- 25 Q. It lists whose e-mail address?

- A. M_roote@yahoo.com. It says "Partner E-mail" address. So partner e-mail would have been sent back to you, confirmation.
- Q. Why would she consider me to be a partner with CEI?
 - A. I can't answer that.

- Q. Is the company that does and handles CEI construction owned by CEI?
 - A. I'm not sure I follow your question.
- Q. Well, as directed by Crystal, the services I required for my property were to be done by the construction people rather than your people who do repair. So my question is is the group that performs construction for CEI part of CEI, or are they a separate company?
 - A. No. They are one and the same.
- MR. ROOTE: Thank you. That concludes my opening questions, your Honor. I am going to move on to questions specifically regarding CEI Exhibit 1, Mr. Ingram's testimony.
- 21 EXAMINER SANDOR: Please proceed.
- Q. (By Mr. Roote) So referring to your
 testimony, page 1, line 15, you state "In my current
 position I oversee all the distribution line crews
 for the region that includes Chesterland, Ohio." Is

that an accurate reading?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

2.1

- A. That is correct.
 - Q. Approximately how many people is that?
- A. I have two line shops, approximately 65 people.
- Q. Are they all employees and/or does this number include contractors?
 - A. No, employees only.
 - Q. And Mr. Tyler Henry reports up to you, not directly but up to you through a supervisor.
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Turning to page 2, you state on line 7 continuing onto line 8 "I also reviewed some of the exhibits filed by Mr. Roote, including the Affidavit of Jeffrey Roote"; is that a correct reading?
- 16 A. Yes.
 - Q. Did what Mr. Roote stated in his affidavit appear to be -- to you to be the correct steps to replace a conduit?
 - A. I would have to go back and review it. I don't remember exactly what he said.
- Q. Your Honor didn't allow that into
 evidence. I can't ask you to look at it. So I am
 going to have to depend on your memory. In your
 memory did anything in Jeffrey's affidavit appear

- incorrect or not professional as far as --
- 2 A. I can't answer without reviewing it.
 - Q. Okay. That's why I wanted it entered into evidence. But you heard his testimony, and we can speak to that. You listened to Jeffrey Roote's testimony yesterday?
 - A. Yes, I did.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

- Q. Did anything he said sound like he performed something that would have been inappropriate in repairing a conduit?
- 11 A. Again, I don't remember the details of 12 his testimony.
 - Q. Do you remember him saying that he had to reattach the neutral wire?
 - A. I do recall that, yes.
 - Q. Did he -- did he violate any -- as far as your understanding of the tariff, any of the tariff rules by connecting the neutral wire?
 - A. Not to my knowledge, no.
 - Q. Thank you. Looking at line 18, you make a reference to -- in that line you make a reference to the -- to "crew." And just as a clarification --
 - A. Sorry. What page are we on?
- Q. It's on page 2, line -- line 18, sir.
- 25 You included the word "crew." I just wanted to

clarify, as we heard in Mr. -- I believe you heard in Mr. Kozak's testimony that CEI has two groups that they refer to as crews. One is hazard. He talked about the hazard crew that comes out and -- and tours the probable site where a problem might be in the distribution service and then the repair crews that then follow up on hazard crews and do the actual repairs. So my own question is simply in your use of the word crew, are you referring in this case to the repair crew or the hazard crew?

- A. Just let me read this.
- Q. Certainly.

2.1

2.2

- A. In this regard this would be a hazard crew.
 - Q. Thank you. And then on that same line it reads "After customers report outages, a regional dispatcher then sends a crew to the probable trouble location." Is that a correct reading?
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q. So along -- when customers report outages, do they also sometimes include reports of wires down?
 - A. Yes, they do.
- Q. When the regional dispatcher -- excuse
 me. Does the regional dispatcher take into account

- when deciding where to send crews to customers reports of wires down?
- A. I don't know how they rack and stack those orders. I am not familiar enough with that side of the business.
- Q. But these are -- but it is the dispatchers that are issuing the orders for your crews to respond to, correct?
 - A. Correct.

2.1

- Q. I guess it's asked and answered so. I am trying to rephrase it. So your -- you just stated you're not really aware of how the dispatchers reached the decision as to where to send crews. Did I understand you correctly?
 - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. Do customers sometimes -- I believe it was recommended by CEI also contact first responders by dialing 911 in the case of wires down?
 - A. Do they? Yes, they do.
- Q. I don't -- well, let's see, you said you had limited knowledge of what the dispatcher's decision is. Are you aware of whether when the dispatchers advise hazards crews to go to a location, whether they differentiate between primary, secondary, and service drop wires when they report

wires down?

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

- A. I can't answer that. I don't know.
- Q. So to your knowledge, the hazard crews are dispatched to investigate reports of power outage. They have no knowledge that wires are also down.
- 7 A. I don't know if they have knowledge or 8 not.
 - Q. So to your knowledge, the reports I made of wires down on my property was not transmitted to the hazard crew.
- A. I can't answer that. I don't know if it was provided to them or not.
 - Q. All right. To your knowledge, you don't know if they were provided that or not.
 - A. I don't know.
 - Q. All right. We'll move on. Moving on to page 3, line 22, you state that "the fuses will melt almost instantly"; is that correct?
 - A. Yes, that's what it says here.
- Q. By "almost instantly," do you mean to say
 that if I were holding the wire when it was
 energized, I would not receive an -- an electric
 shock?
- A. I can't say you would or would not.

- Q. So you haven't personally tested that theory, have you?
 - A. No, I have not.
 - Q. Would you?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

24

25

A. Would I? No, I would not.

MR. ROOTE: Your Honor, if I would be allowed, this is a public hearing. And in the interest of safety, I would like to let anyone who might be hearing know they should never attempt to be holding a down power wire assuming that the fuses will protect them from electrocution.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay.

MR. ROOTE: Thank you.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Thank you, Mr. Roote.

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) You stated that the -- I'm on line 17 now, going backwards here a little bit, but at the -- the answer to the question on line 16 "What does a closed fuse indicate," your response is "That the line is operating within its parameters"; is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. Which parameters did you include in that reference?
 - A. Meaning there is no fault indication.
 - Q. By "no fault," what -- what parameters

would be out of range that a fuse would detect?

- A. If the voltage went to ground, it would trip the fuse.
- Q. Then that would be a result of the current and -- exceeding the capacity of the wire and the fuse and that's why the fuse melts?
 - A. That's one possibility, yes.
- Q. Yeah. Thank you. So if a fuse holds, is that an assurance there are no issues with the connections of the wires?
 - A. Not necessarily, no.
- Q. Pardon me?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

2.1

- A. Not necessarily, no.
- Q. Thank you. And by -- and by -- and by
 wires, that would include service wires, service drop
 wires, service entrance wires?
 - A. What do you mean by "service drop" and "service entrance wires"? I am not sure.
 - Q. We just covered the fact a fuse will not necessarily guarantee there are no issues with a wire and/or its connections, and I am just --
- A. The fuse indicates that it is indicating properly.
- Q. Properly meaning the parameters of current that the conductor is rated for have not been

exceeded.

2.1

- A. That is one indication, yes.
- Q. Why else would a fuse blow?
- A. Again, if the voltage went to ground, the fuse would blow.
- Q. Doesn't the voltage going to ground result in the current and the conductor exceeding the setting of the fuse?
 - A. Not necessarily.
- Q. So your testimony is that a fuse can detect problems with the voltage.
- A. It would pick up an overage of voltage, or it can pick up a phase-to-phase grounding.
- Q. I'm going to refer to your testimony how a fuse operates on page 3, line 19 -- well, the question is on line 18, "How does a fuse work?" Your answer on line 19 is "In general, a fuse has a metal element designed to only carry a limited electrical current. When a short circuit or voltage overload occurs, the excess heat melts the metal element, creating an air gap in the circuit that electricity can't pass through." What generates the heat in the metal element?
 - A. A short, circuit board overload.
 - Q. So when you say it's designed only to

carry a limited electrical current, the implication is a short circuit results in excessive current. A fuse only responds and melts under excessive current; is that correct or is it incorrect?

2.1

2.2

- A. No. A fuse -- a short circuit could be a grounding as well. If closed the circuit, you have blown the fuse.
- Q. Okay. I accept your testimony. I may have asked a similar question, but I think you have already said that the fuse not blowing is not a certainty that there are not other issues with the wire and/or connections of that wire; is that your testimony?
 - A. I believe it is; yes, it is.
- Q. Thank you. Turning to page 4 in the answer beginning on line 1 which reads "When performing storm restoration during a wide-spread outage like the one that occurred on December 1, 2020, do crews walk each individual customer's service drop before energizing the service?" And first -- first two sentences of your answer reads "No. That would be impossible"; is that correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. How many customers lost power as a result of the primary wire being down on Rockhaven Road?

- A. I believe there is approximately 420 to 30 customers.
- Q. Okay. And how many of those customers reported damages to their service drop?
 - A. I don't know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

- Q. So to your knowledge, you know one, correct?
 - A. If you are referring to you, yes.
- Q. Yeah. Would 420 customers lose power because of problems with my service drop?
- 11 A. No, they would not.
 - Q. And did you also hear in testimony isolating one customer's service drop would take approximately 10 minutes?
 - A. If I recall correctly, yes.
 - Q. So to your knowledge, it would have taken 10 minutes to inspect the one service drop that you are aware of that reported damage; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And from your experience, when 420 customers lose power that's associated with one primary wire, how many of those customers would typically also experience damage to their service drop?
- 25 A. I have no idea. I have no way of

knowing.

2.1

- Q. You can't even estimate a percentage because it would take you -- you agree it would take a separate incident at each customer's property to result in damage to their service entry.
 - A. Are you --
- Q. Well, we've already established that a single customer service entry damage will not result in multiple customers losing power; do you agree with that?
- A. Yes. Well, I should rephrase. Let me rephrase. If you are asking me if one service drop being pulled down could affect more than one customer, yes, it could.
- Q. Can you explain that because we heard testimony from Mr. Kozak that can't happen.
- A. Well, if you have a fuse that goes to more than one location, then more than one service drop -- more than one customer could be affected by that. In your instance you have a fuse at the street that provides your secondary, a single fuse. It does not provide service to any other customer. If that fuse was not there, then it would go back to the next device, and any customers associated with service from that device would be affected.

- Q. Is my property also equipped with fuses at the pole that -- where the transformer is you mounted?
 - A. Yes, it is.

2.1

- Q. Did any of the fuses associated with my service drop ever blow?
 - A. No, they have not.
- Q. I know you can't estimate it, but I will give you some numbers to guess at. Of the 420 customers -- well, of the 420 customers that lost power due to the primary wire, do you have any estimate of how many of those customers might have also experienced damage to their service drop?

MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor.

Asked and answered.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Sustained. I believe he said he does not know. He only knew of yours.

Q. We've also testified that the hazard crews that -- to your knowledge, the hazard crews that are sent out aren't even aware of who has reported a power damage -- damage to their service drop or not; is that correct?

MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor. I believe that misstates his prior testimony. He said he didn't know what information was provided, not

that it wasn't provided.

2.1

MR. ROOTE: All right.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Mr. Roote, if you could rephrase.

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) So you've provided testimony previously that you are unaware of whether the hazard crews are advised as to whether damage -- any customer has reported damage to their service entrance.
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Thank you. All right. So I'm -- based on all of that, you stated that it -- it would take an unreasonable amount of time -- I'm sorry. Turning again to page 4, line 5 and 6, "To do so would add an unreasonable amount of time to the restoration of the system." Wouldn't that depend on how many people reported that its service drop was down?

MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor. I don't believe that is referring to the service drop itself or reports of service drops.

MR. ROOTE: Well, the question -- it says in the question, your Honor, "Do crews walk each individual customer's service drop."

EXAMINER SANDOR: I will allow -- I will allow the question, and then Mr. Ingram can qualify

his answer as he sees fit.

- A. Could you repeat the question again for me, please?
- Q. Well, in your answer to the question, you said it would add an unreasonable amount of time to the restoration of the system, but you also stated --we've also clarified that you don't know, and it's not reported to the hazard crews how many properties have reported a damaged service drop. So you can't -- so you -- the question was since you don't know how many people would have a service drop or have reported a service drop down, can you say -- can you say that it would be -- isolating those service drops would require an unreasonable amount of time? That was a very poorly stated question. You want me to restate it? Give it another try? All right. Let me do that.
- 18 EXAMINER SANDOR: Please do.
- MR. ROOTE: I see your Honor's smile on his face up there. Thank you.
- Q. (By Mr. Roote) So we've established that --
- 23 MR. ROOTE: Can I ask the recorder to
 24 repeat the question I originally asked for me? I am
 25 having difficulty recovering my question.

(Record read.)

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) Can you answer that,

 Mr. Ingram?
 - A. Yes, I do.

1

4

7

8

- 5 Q. That's the question I would like you to 6 answer.
 - A. I have no idea how much time it would take. It would be -- I mean, I can't estimate the time it would take. I have no idea.
- Q. All right. Well, we've agreed that 10 minutes is a reasonable amount of time to disconnect a customer's service.
- MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor. I
 don't think we have agreed. That's previous
 testimony.
- 16 MR. ROOTE: Yeah. The previous testimony 17 is, and I thought it was an agreement between 18 Mr. Rogers and I when he was examining me that 10 19 minutes was a reasonable amount of time to allow for 20 disconnection of a customer's service drop. So my 2.1 question is if that's a reasonable amount of time and 22 it's a limited number of people that have reported 23 damage to their service drop, is it impossible to 24 examine each customer's service drop before 25 energizing the circuit?

- A. Again, based on what I know of the storm at the time, I don't know. I can't answer that question.
- Q. So you don't know if it's impossible or not.
 - A. I can't answer it. I don't have the statistics to back up.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. This is further down
 the page on page 4, you referred -- you state rather
 "it was hanging low because the mast anchor was
 pulled from the house and the mast conduit was bent."
 And that "hanging low" is in reference to my service
 drop; is that correct?
- EXAMINER SANDOR: That's line 18, correct?
- MR. ROOTE: Yes, line 18 on page 4.

 Thank you, your Honor.
- 18 A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. On line 19 you state that "This is all customer owned equipment" referring to the hanging low wires, the mast anchor, and the mast conduit; is that correct?
- 23 A. Correct.

1

2

3

6

7

Q. Just for clarification of the property
listed -- of the equipment listed on line 18, is that

```
all customer-owned equipment?
```

A. Well --

2.1

MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor. I believe that question is vague.

MR. ROOTE: Well, we've clarified that the hanging low reference was a reference to the service drop, so by my reading the sentence on line 18 makes reference to the service drop, the mast anchor, and the mast conduit. Those are the three listed.

MR. ROGERS: He is misleading based on what that statement actually says.

MR. ROOTE: Well, your Honor, I will leave it to you, your Honor. Am I misstating?

MR. ROGERS: I don't believe it refers to the service wires themself. It says the mast anchor and the mast conduit.

MR. ROOTE: Your Honor, I just asked him if the hanging low reference was a reference to the service drop wires.

EXAMINER SANDOR: I will allow him to answer the question with the clarification that he added the wires that he is referring to, that Mr. Roote is referring to. And if you need that repeated, Mr. Ingram, we can repeat that.

- THE WITNESS: Yes, please.
- 2 EXAMINER SANDOR: Karen, if you could
- 3 repeat his last question.
- 4 (Record read.)
- 5 EXAMINER SANDOR: I will allow Mr. Ingram
- 6 | to answer if that's what he was referring to on line
- 7 | 18.
- 8 A. Yes, that is customer owned.
- 9 Q. So it's your testimony the service drop
- 10 | is customer owned.
- 11 A. Correct.
- 12 MR. ROOTE: All right. I would like to
- 13 refer again to Exhibit BA, your Honor.
- 14 EXAMINER SANDOR: One moment. BA, okay.
- MR. ROOTE: It says "CEI Customer Guide
- 16 | for Electric Service."
- 17 EXAMINER SANDOR: Yes. I believe that's
- 18 been admitted already. So, Mr. Ingram, if you could
- 19 bring up Exhibit BA.
- THE WITNESS: B as in boy?
- 21 EXAMINER SANDOR: Yes, by as in boy, A as
- 22 in apple.
- THE WITNESS: Okay.
- 24 EXAMINER SANDOR: When you are ready, let
- 25 us know.

- THE WITNESS: Yep. I'm ready.
- 2 Q. (By Mr. Roote) I'll refer you to page --
- 3 | Exhibit 1 in that document. It should be after page
- 4 | 33.

1

- 5 A. Exhibit 1, where it says "Overhead
- 6 | Service," list of materials?
 - Q. Yes.
- 8 A. Okay.
- 9 EXAMINER SANDOR: One moment. Let me get
- 10 there too.
- Okay. Go ahead.
- 12 Q. (By Mr. Roote) Under service drop with
- connectors, supplied by and installed by, what is
- 14 listed there?
- 15 A. "Supplied by company. Installed by
- 16 | company."
- 17 Q. Okay. Those are reference of -- if it's
- 18 | supplied by the company, installed by the Company, is
- 19 | it owned by the company?
- 20 A. That would be correct.
- 21 Q. So when you stated previously it was
- 22 owned by the customer, that was incorrect.
- A. Well, you indicated the mast, the anchor,
- 24 and the conduit.
- Q. No, no. I believe my question is

- directly -- was directly -- included the word service drop.
- A. Well, again, we reference back -- I mean, I'm sorry. Maybe I am a little confused here. When you indicated those three items, those three items are owned by the customer.
- Q. Well, the three items listed are the service drop, the conduit, and the anchor.
 - A. That is the service entrance. The service drop itself would be the wire that leads from the can to the weather head.
- Q. So was the service entrance wire hanging low?
 - A. The service entrance wire -- no. The service drop wire was hanging low.
 - Q. Correct. So the reference to hanging low was the service drop wire, so the three items are service drop wire, mast anchor, and mast conduit.

 Are those all customer-owned property?
 - A. No, they are not.
 - Q. Okay. So you are correcting your previous testimony they were as a result of your confusion as to which wires I was referring to; is that correct?
- 25 A. Yes.

2.1

Q. Thank you. All right. In your answer to the question starting on line 21, "Does CEI have a record of the calls Roote made to CEI between December 1, 2020, and December 8, 2020," the response was "It does."

MR. ROOTE: Sorry, your Honor. I attempted this question earlier.

2.1

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) Have you listened to those calls?
- A. I have listened to calls that were provided during this hearing, yes.
 - Q. Okay. Does that include all the calls?
- A. I don't know if I have listened to all.

 I listened during the testimony provided.
 - Q. Did you listen to the call where I -- where I -- where I used -- where I used the phrase fuck you since your Honor has allowed that's okay?
 - A. Yes, I heard that during the testimony.
 - Q. That wasn't played during the testimony,
 I don't believe. Are you sure you heard that during
 the testimony? You heard reference to it but --
- A. Maybe it was reference. I have not heard of it myself, no.
 - Q. And then you go on to say "the relevant portions of the Customer Contact History attached as

Exhibit A." Now, that's a reference to the exhibit attached to your testimony not -- but that -- is Exhibit A that you reference in your testimony the same as or is it exactly the exhibit that we have entered into the -- as evidence, Exhibit R?

- A. Give me a second here.
- Q. Yeah.

2.1

- A. Yes, it is.
- Q. Thank you. Turning to Exhibit A $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$ R then, do you see this $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$
- MR. ROGERS: Are you referring to Exhibit
 A and Exhibit R or Exhibit AR?

MR. ROOTE: No. I am referring to the court's record of Exhibit R which in your attachment to his testimony you've listed as Exhibit A. And we just clarified that they are one and the same reference. I will try not to use them interchangeably and instead refer to Exhibit R since that's the one that has been entered into evidence officially.

Q. Do you see there where it says in Exhibit R "Wire down to structure"? If you want me to tell you exactly where that shows up, I have got to get Exhibit R open again. Just give me a minute.

There it is. Okay. It's on 12-1 on page

- 2. There is an entry at 12-1-2020 at 16:29 by Crystal G. Brady saying "No Lights-Wire Down to Structure." Do you see that?
 - A. I do.

2.1

- Q. Thank you. Would you agree that the reference to structure -- that the reference to structure is a reference to my house?
 - A. I would agree.
- Q. Could that reference to the wire to my structure possibly be the primary wire on Rockhaven Road?
 - A. No. I would assume not.
- Q. So this record that CEI has clearly identifies that I reported the wire down to my structure and with -- and that would -- that would not be a reference to the primary wires out on the street. It would be a reference to the service drop from the pole to the structure.
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And in that -- in that same entry about -- further down, do you see where it says "Please pull meter so he can repair the damage and will call"?
 - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. And again, on the line below another

- reference to "line down from pole to structure."

 Would pulling the meter isolate my service entrance
 wires from the primary?
- A. Pulling the meter would disconnect the service to your panel.
- Q. Yes. But my question was will it isolate my service entrance wires from the primary?
 - A. Isolate, no.
- Q. So -- all right. Thank you. Would my requesting that CEI pull the meter indicate to you I understood the meter was CEI's property?
- 12 A. No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

2.1

- Q. Well, why would I ask you to pull the meter?
- MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor, speculation.
- 17 EXAMINER SANDOR: Sustained. Please 18 rephrase.
- Q. (By Mr. Roote) In this entry, this entry indicates that I requested CEI pull a meter.
 - A. Is that a question?
- Q. Yes. Does this entry -- does "Please

 pull the meter so he can repair the damage and will

 call," does that indicate to you I am requesting CEI

 pull the meter?

- A. From this notification, yes.
- Q. Thank you. Does CEI utilize any other method to prevent customers from removing their meters?
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

- Q. Can you describe what that is?
- A. We have a lock, and we also have a tag.
- Q. Okay. So in previous testimony we referred to those as the wire tag, as the wire meter tag. And the lock you are referring to we've referred to as the meter box clasp.
- A. No, that's incorrect. We have a second -- a barrel lock -- we can attach to a meter box.
 - Q. Do you normally depend on just the wire tag, or do you -- or most installations include this barrel lock?
 - A. Mostly just the tag.
 - Q. Thank you. You've heard testimony that when my power was restored by Mr. Robert Allen, that there was no wire tag installed on the meter box.
 - A. Yes, I recall hearing that.
- Q. Is it CEI policy that your repair crews after reinstalling a meter reinstall a wire tag?
 - A. That is policy.

Q. Do you have any reason to doubt the testimony there is no wire tag installed?

2.1

- A. I can't speculate on that, no.
- Q. Do you have any reason to doubt the testimony offered that there is no wire tag installed?

MR. ROOTE: Your Honor, did you ever make a ruling on my exhibit BT?

EXAMINER SANDOR: Yes. It was -- we allowed the photo in but -- and I will have to refer back to the record of what exactly the ruling is I made, but it was limited purely for the purpose of identifying that the object in the image was a FirstEnergy tag. I believe that was -- it was allowed for that purpose only.

MR. ROOTE: Well, I'm sorry, your Honor.

I think you might be confusing the picture of the service tag and the photo of the meter box.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Oh. Oh, okay. It was the same ruling. I was actually looking -- I made the same ruling on that, that we allowed that in for a limited purpose.

MR. ROOTE: Thank you, your Honor.

Q. (By Mr. Roote) All right. Is the intention of installing the meter tag -- is part of

its intent to be a reminder to the customer they shouldn't be opening the door to the meter box?

- A. My understanding is the purpose of the tag is to identify that meter box has been opened.
- Q. All right. Fair enough. And a meter box cannot be opened without removing that tag; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.

2.1

- Q. And without opening the door, is it possible to remove the meter?
- 11 A. It would be based on the manufacturer of the meter pan.
 - Q. Of the meter panels approved by CEI for use with their meters, is it possible to remove the meter without removing the meter -- without opening the door?
 - A. Again, it would be based on because some meter pans do not have doors.
 - Q. Oh, okay. Then excluding those, the ones that are equipped with doors, is it possible --
 - A. If it's equipped with a door, you would need to remove the seal in order to remove the door in order to remove the meter.
 - Q. Thank you. All right. Referring now to page 5 of your testimony on line 12, actually

beginning on line 11 -- well, on line 12, "The crew noted that one span of primary wire was down at pole No. 171275, which is located in front of 12935 Rockhaven Road"; is that a correct reading?

A. Yes, it is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

- Q. We've already covered the fact that that primary wire was pulled down by a tree. And in your experience when a wire pulls down -- when a tree pulls down a wire, excuse me, have you ever experienced the tree catching fire as a result of coming in contact with the primary wire?
 - A. It has occurred, yes.
- Q. And in your previous testimony, you indicated that -- would that indicate that the fuse had to remain intact long enough to set the tree on fire?
 - A. I can't speculate on that. I don't know.
 - Q. Well, the primary wire is fused, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. So if a tree caught fire, can't we -can't we reason that it caught fire in spite of the
 fuse?
- MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor.
- 24 | Asked and answered.
- MR. ROOTE: I don't think he answered the

question, your Honor. I think he said he didn't have -- he couldn't speculate on it.

EXAMINER SANDOR: I will -- I will allow the question, and he can -- the witness may qualify his answer as he sees fit. Could you repeat the question, please?

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) We've established that a tree can catch fire when coming in contact with a primary wire in spite of the fuse being present. Or another way to say a fuse will not prevent a tree from catching fire when it comes into contact with the primary wire.
- EXAMINER SANDOR: Is there a question in there, Mr. Roote?
- MR. ROOTE: Yes.

2.1

2.2

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) Is that correct? Will a fuse prevent a tree from catching fire?
 - A. No. We cannot guarantee that.
 - Q. Thank you. In the same way, a fuse could not protect a person from being electrocuted that came in contact with a primary wire; is that correct?
 - A. I can't say it would prevent, no.
 - Q. Well, if the fuse will not prevent a tree from catching fire, is it reasonable to presume that it would not prevent a person from catching fire?

1 EXAMINER SANDOR: You cut out, Mr. 2 Ingram, for a second. If you could repeat your 3 answer. THE WITNESS: Can you hear me okay? 4 5 EXAMINER SANDOR: Yeah. 6 THE WITNESS: Okay. I cannot quarantee 7 that a fuse would prevent an electric shock to an individual. 8 9 O. (By Mr. Roote) Thank you. Referring to 10 what you've attached in your document and you called 11 Exhibit B, look at that again. I think that's been 12 entered into evidence as well with a different 13 reference. I guess I'll just collect everybody's help to figure out which one that is. 14

EXAMINER SANDOR: Mr. Roote, I actually looked at this beforehand. It was introduced -- I think it was Exhibit U., but I don't think it was formally moved into evidence.

MR. ROOTE: All right.

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

EXAMINER SANDOR: So -- or no. It was not introduced. I'm sorry. So --

MR. ROOTE: Well, then I would like to introduce into evidence Exhibit U., your Honor, for the same purposes as before, so we can all be referring to the same references.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Let's check to see if
Exhibit U matches this Exhibit B because I would
prefer if they are the same document, just to keep it
as the Company has marked it, if that makes sense.

2.1

MR. ROOTE: Well, won't that cause confusion, your Honor, because they have marked it as Exhibit B, and we already have Exhibit B probably somewhere in the record.

MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, I have also marked it as Exhibit 1.B on my -- extracted in our previous filings and included it in his testimony.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay. So -- so we will refer to it -- Mr. Roote, the way we can differentiate in the record is it will be referred to as Exhibit -- Company Exhibit 1.B.

MR. ROOTE: Okay. And it's a copy of the hazard report.

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) So, Mr. Ingram, if you could refer to Exhibit 1.B, 1.B, and I'll try and catch up.
 - A. I have it in front of me.
- Q. You will have to forgive me. Some of this may -- may have been ground we've already covered, and I am trying to review my question to eliminate as much of it as possible.

EXAMINER SANDOR: I appreciate that since we are on the second day. Any time you can eliminate something we have already covered, it would be greatly appreciated.

MR. ROOTE: Give me a moment. I will abbreviate some of this because you've already ruled some of it out, your Honor, and some of it is also redundant.

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) So I would just ask that we note for the record and by asking Mr. Ingram under the entry under 12-1-2020 at 16:30, this is another reference to "Wire down to structure." Do you see that, Mr. Ingram?
 - A. Yes, I do.

2.1

- Q. And looking at the comments at the bottom of that exhibit, there is another reference to the primary wire being down to the southeast and in an abbreviated form so -- and once again, Mr. Ingram, do those two references reference two different wires?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Thank you. I'll move on. And referring to line 10 on page 5, you've clarified that it was a hazard crew that was first assigned to investigate the report, Mr. Roote's report of a wire down. But is there any evidence that they were informed as to

which wire I reported down?

A. Yes.

2.1

2.2

Q. I think the previous testimony is pretty well established the hazard crew is not notified of which wires are down.

MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor, misstates prior testimony.

MR. ROOTE: I don't think it does, your Honor. I think we established that the hazard crew -- as far as Mr. Ingram knows, hazard crews are not notified about what wires are down. They are dispatched to research an area where power outages are reported.

MR. ROGERS: I believe his testimony was he doesn't -- he doesn't know.

EXAMINER SANDOR: I do believe Mr. Ingram's testimony was he didn't know.

Q. (By Mr. Roote) Okay. But here it states that the hazard crew was assigned to investigate Mr. Roote's report of a wire down. So I guess my question is do you wish to change your testimony that the -- that the hazard crew was not aware -- or you are not aware that the hazard crew was notified that a wire was down, specifically my report of a wire being down?

A. I can't answer whether the crew knew your wire was down or not.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- Q. Okay. So your statement then the crew was assigned to investigate Mr. Roote's report of a wire down is not correct; is that true?
- A. Again, I can't -- I can't say whether they were or were not instructed as to whether you had a wire down on your property.
- Q. Here you're apparently assuming they were informed. It seems apparent to a reasonable mind that you -- at this point you are assuming they were informed.
- MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor, argumentative.
- MR. ROOTE: All right. The testimony stands, your Honor.
- EXAMINER SANDOR: Please proceed,

 Mr. Roote.
- MR. ROOTE: Turn to page 6 and a
 reference to Exhibit C, same issue, your Honor. I
 assume you want to enter this as 1C because it's a
 replication of one of the other documents?
- EXAMINER SANDOR: Well, this one is -- I

 believe matched Complainant Exhibit X which has been

 admitted, so I -- unless there is a preference on the

Company's point, I think we can just understand and cross-reference that Exhibit C matches the already admitted Complainant Exhibit X, subject to check, if anyone wants to check first.

2.1

MR. ROGERS: And the Company does prefer to use reference -- for their documents references to their exhibits, but I do believe it is the same document.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay. Let's do this, think here for a second. Karen, is there a way to cross-reference in the record if one was admitted earlier it can be mentioned that Exhibit -- Company Exhibit C with a -- I will rephrase the proper title, can that be mentioned next to Complainant Exhibit X or no? Do you just report the one title?

COURT REPORTER: I just report the one. In the index I can show that they match.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay. Is that fair, Mr. Rogers?

MR. ROGERS: I believe so, your Honor.

Q. (By Mr. Roote) All right. So turning to Exhibit 1.C, in the entry of 12-1 22:59, the work description now reads "No lights-wire down pole to pole." Do you see that, Mr. Ingram?

A. Yes, I do.

- Q. But in a previous Exhibit B, 1.B, 1.B, it read "Wire down to structure."
 - A. Correct.

2.1

- Q. So between order created on 12-1 at 16:30 which is Exhibit 1.B and the order created on 12-3 15:29, reported as Exhibit 1.C, the work description changed from "wire down to structure," the "wire down to pole"; would you agree with that?
 - A. These are two separate orders.
- Q. All right. So it's your understanding one order had nothing to do with the other order?
- A. The first order, 1.B, references your point it has one customer affected. The second order has 429 customers affected.
- Q. And that would be further evidence that one service drop entry will not take 420 customers, that they have to be addressed as two separate issues?
 - A. I'm not sure I follow your questioning.
- Q. Well, you say the work order for one the wire -- the primary wire being down affected 420 customers. The -- I thought your testimony was the order 1.B "wire down to structure" affected only one customer.
- A. 1.B does affect one customer. The hazard

crew that was dispatched indicated that there was -they had a primary down which then rolled into these
larger customer orders.

2.1

- Q. All right. And it appears that the hazard crew was dispatched to investigate the wire down to structure and came across the wire down pole to pole.
 - A. That's what 1.B indicates, yes.
 - Q. So that's a reasonable conclusion.
- A. Based on the notes evidenced by the hazard crew, yes.

MR. ROOTE: Again, your Honor, this goes to my attempt to interject Exhibit A where it goes directly to that one. I know you've already ruled on it but this is the problem I have with that ruling.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay. Your objection has been noted.

MR. ROOTE: Thank you.

Q. (By Mr. Roote) So at the bottom of page 6, line 21, "Had the hazard crew identified Mr. Roote's service drop to be hazardous, it would have reported the condition in its report." My interpretation of that sentence assumes the service crew inspected my service drop; is that correct? Do you agree with that interpretation?

- A. I can't say they did or did not.
- Q. All right. So you couldn't be sure that they would have reported that condition in the report if you don't know whether they looked at it or not, could you?
- A. If they had looked at it, they would have reported it.
- Q. Well, again, your sentence implies they did look at it, but they didn't identify it as being hazardous. Otherwise, they would have reported it. But your testimony, and correct me if I am wrong, don't let me put words in your mouth, your testimony appears to be you have no knowledge that they ever inspected the service drop; is that correct?
- A. I can't speak to the mindset of the crew on-site at the time. If they had deemed it was hazardous, they would have produced something in the report to indicate so.
- Q. But in order to deem it was hazardous, they would have had to have inspected it; isn't that true?
 - A. I would assume, yes.
- Q. Thank you.

2.1

MR. ROOTE: Again, your Honor, some of this may be repetitious, so I am trying -- I am trying to make sure I don't waste -- waste the court's time here.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

15

16

17

18

19

20

EXAMINER SANDOR: Thank you.

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) All right. The primary wire that we are referring to, the one that was pulled down in front of my house, do you know where that primary wire originates?
- 8 MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, we may have just 9 lost connection with Bret.
- EXAMINER SANDOR: Oh, yes. Let's go off
 the record for a second.
- 12 (Discussion off the record.)
- EXAMINER SANDOR: Let's go back on the record.
 - After a brief hiatus, we resolved
 Mr. Ingram's technology issues. Karen, if you could
 please read back Mr. Roote's question.

(Record read.)

- A. Where it originates, it's part of our grid. It's fed from State Route 322.
- Q. All right. Thank you, Mr. Ingram. I
 meant to have you walk through the path that that
 wire follows. I think I can shortcut that
 questioning if we can just agree that that wire runs
 in a loop that services 420 homes.

A. That's correct.

2.1

2.2

- Q. Thank you. So I'll ask the question.

 You can decide whether you are qualified to answer or not. If I am the dispatcher and the system is reporting outages along the route of my primary wire, all along the route of my primary wire, can I deduce that the primary is down somewhere along that route?
- A. If it were that large of an outage, yes, there would be an interruption of some sort. It does not mean that the primary wire itself is down. It could be the main fuses connecting your circuit are down.
- Q. And if instead the dispatcher only has reports of two customers being without power along that same route, can he deduce it's not a problem with the primary wires?
- A. No. He would have to check the mapping and determine whether or not those customers are say at the end of a radial line which means that something occurred and the last two customers are down because the primary is down. There's numerous different scenarios there.
- Q. Okay. Does CEI depend on the customers' reports of outages alone to deduce where the problems are, what the problems might be in order to dispatch

crews?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

- A. No, we do not.
- Q. Okay. Do you depend on the -- on the reporting from the advanced meters?
 - A. Not at this time.
- Q. So you still need or are dependent upon callers informing you via the internet or by phone call by the 1-800 number that they have outages to help you determine where the problems are or know where to dispatch crews.
 - A. Yes, yes, we do.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. I'm on page 7, your Honor -- or Mr. Ingram. Yes. On line 7 you state -- this is in reference to the fuses on the primary disconnect and the secondary fuse. I will just read that line starting with line 6 then, "Here, both the primary disconnect and the secondary fuse leading directly to Mr. Roote's residence held. This indicated that there was no further damage or fault on that line to be addressed." Is that a correct -- accurate reading?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. In your opinion, would the fuse blow if the neutral wire inside the meter were disconnected?
- A. No, not necessarily.

- Q. Would the fuse blow if a hot wire inside the meter box were disconnected?
 - A. With the assumption it made contact, yes.
- Q. But if it did not make contact, it was just removed from its terminal, would the fuse blow?
 - A. No, not necessarily.

2.1

- Q. If the hot wire momentarily came in contact and then disconnected from the neutral wire or from the neutral connection or any other grounded portion of the meter box, could that generate arc flash?
 - A. Inside the cabinet, potentially, yes.
- Q. Would you consider a neutral wire pulled out of its connector unrestrained, unrestrained with the -- with the bare part of the wire that's been -- well, I should do some foundational questions. Do you know if the neutral wire on my customer service wires was insulated or not?
- A. The neutral wire on a triplex is normally not insulated.
- Q. Okay. But the portion of the neutral wire that goes into the connection, in order to make a connection, would have to be stripped bare of any insulation if it were present?
- A. Correct.

- Q. Once the neutral wire pulled out of the connector, is there anything to restrain it from moving around inside the meter box?
 - A. No, there is not.
- Q. And you've already testified that if it were to come in contact momentarily with a hot wire, that might generate arc flash.
 - A. Correct.

2.1

- Q. And you've already testified that arc flash might cause a fire. Or did you testify to that?
 - A. There's a potential.
- Q. There is a potential. So would you consider a neutral wire pulled out of its connector with its bare wire unrestrained in close proximity to hot wires a danger?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Thank you. The next question was -- I think already covered, your Honor.

All right. I'm on page 8. And to the question on line 5, "Was Mr. Roote's low hanging wire a safety issue," you responded "All electrical lines should be treated with caution and be considered dangerous, even standard household -- household extension cords." You have looked at the photos of

my damaged service drop and my conduit, correct?

A. I have, yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. Do you know -- do you know the diameter of the conduit?
 - A. No, I do not.
- Q. Can you characterize the conduit as to what it's made out of and its -- and -- what it's made out of?
- A. Without going back and looking at the pictures, I don't recall what it was.
- Q. All right. Is it -- is it the typical service mast rigid steel conduit? We could look --
- A. Some are. Some aren't. Again, I would have to look at the picture.
- MR. ROOTE: All right. Can we call up
 the picture, your Honor, the photographs? They have
 already been entered.
- 18 EXAMINER SANDOR: You may.
- MR. ROOTE: I think those were early exhibits.
- Q. (By Mr. Roote) Exhibit B is a good one.

 Now I can't find it. Okay. I don't know if you have

 zoom capabilities or not, but it might be helpful to

 zoom in a little bit.
- 25 A. I do.

- Q. All right. So now that you can see the photograph, does that appear to be to you what is referred to as rigid steel conduit?
 - A. Yes, it does.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

20

2.1

- Q. Do you have any idea of the force required to create that kind of a bend as a piece of rigid steel conduit?
 - A. No, I do not.
 - Q. Would you believe it to be considerable?
- A. Again, I don't know what would be considered considerable.
- Q. Could you bend a piece of rigid steel conduit with your bare hands?
 - A. No. Not necessarily, no.
- 15 Q. In addition to the damage on there of the
 16 rigid steel conduit being bent, I think you can also
 17 see that the anchor that the neutral wire was
 18 attached to that was once on the house has been
 19 pulled out. Do you see that?
 - A. I can see a house knob that's in the siding of the house which I'm assuming is porcelain.
- Q. Yeah. But if you look further along the service line there, I think you can identify the one --
- 25 A. The strap, you mean?

- Q. No. I think if you look at the wires extending out in the weather head, follow that line out. Follow that line down. I think you can see that there is an attachment with a screw hanging out of it what -- the screw is part of it?
 - A. I can't see it that clearly, no.
- Q. Okay. Maybe Exhibit C would give us a better representation. Let's take a look at C. Yeah. It's a little better there. Yeah, I think you can make that out. Do you have a copy of Exhibit C?
 - A. Yes, I see that now.

2.1

- Q. Okay. And so that -- you know, in your experience and would it be your estimation that it took, I am going to use the word considerable, I think it's fair, considerable force to pull out both that anchor from the siding on my house and bending the rigid steel conduit to the extent that conduit is bent?
- A. Again, it would require a force, yes. Was the anchor in soft wood? I can't comment on that. I don't know what the force would be.
- Q. All right. Okay. All right. You've already testified that it's unlikely a single human being could bend that conduit or pull that anchor out of the siding of the -- well, you said the conduit.

Could a human -- one human being yanking on that cord pull that anchor out of the side of the house?

- A. I would assume, yes.
- Q. You think one person could do that. Then how does that anchor meet CEI's requirement of a substantial attachment to the house if it could be pulled out by one person? Because per the -- that's your approved anchor, is it not?
 - A. I assume, yes, it is. It looks like it.
- 10 Q. Go ahead.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

- 11 A. No. Go ahead. It is our anchor, yes.
- Q. Okay. And per the tariff the customer is required to supply a substantial anchor.
- MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor. I am not sure that's in the tariff.
 - MR. ROOTE: I'm sorry, in the Customer Guide to Installation published by CEI which is largely based on the tariff. We could take time to go look it up, your Honor, if we have to.
 - EXAMINER SANDOR: I will allow the witness to answer if he knows with the clarification that it's the consumer guide.
- A. I do not know what the standard is, no.
- Q. All right. Can we open the consumers quide, your Honor?

EXAMINER SANDOR: Bring it up.

MR. ROOTE: I think it would be under

Section 5, but I don't have -- I don't immediately

4 know the reference. I'll take a look.

5 EXAMINER SANDOR: Which? Is it Exhibit 6 BA, I believe?

MR. ROOTE: Yes, it's Exhibit BA.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay. Yes, if you could please find the specific cite you are referring to.

11 MR. ROOTE: Yes. I'm looking. There it
12 is, your Honor, in Section 5.1, second paragraph.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Please go ahead.

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) "The customer shall provide and maintain a safe, substantial support for the Company's" overlead service conduct -- I mean "overhead service conductors." Do you see that, Mr. Ingram?
- A. I do.

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Q. All right. So this is an interpretation thing but I think reasonable people might agree that a substantial support meant to -- meant to hold up to 150 feet of fairly heavy wire could not be pulled out of the side of a house by one person. Do you agree with that?

- A. No. I can't agree with that.
- Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- A. Substantial to me, there is no number here supporting what that substantial support is nor can I speak to the size of the individual or the strength that they have nor the length and distance of wire. There's too many different variables here.
- Q. Okay. But it is meant to hold up the service drop, is it not?
- A. Yes. And it had up until the tree landed on it.
- Q. Yes, it did. How substantial would it have to be to hold up the service drop?
- A. I don't know. I can't answer that question.
- Q. Well, what is the weight of the service drop? And it would have to accommodate the largest -- the longer service drop, wouldn't it?
- A. At times we put two, three house knobs in to hold up that service drop, also straps on that pole.
- Q. I understand. It needs to be substantial. I rec -- I agree with that.
- MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor. He's testifying.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Mr. Roote, please continue.

MR. ROOTE: All right.

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) Okay. If the wire -- would you -- where did the force come from to create that damage?
- 7 A. I would assume the tree falling on the 8 wire.
 - Q. And then subsequently the wire pulling on the anchor mount and then pulling on the conduit.
 - A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

- Q. Now we go back to your comparison with the extension cord. If the wire that had been used to -- if the wire had been -- that had been used to pull that anchor out of the side of the house and bend the conduit been an extension cord, would you use that extension cord without inspecting it?
 - A. I don't know.
- Q. Would a reasonable person use an extension cord that had been subjected to that kind of force?
- A. A reasonable person wouldn't have put an extension cord in the air.
- Q. Would you reuse that service drop without an inspection?

- A. We would test the service drop if necessary. We would look at where the tree landed. If there were burn marks on that location, we would splice the wire. If there were no burn marks, we would move on.
- Q. Okay. But you wouldn't reuse it without inspecting it; is that your testimony?
- A. I just said we would inspect the wire to see if it was damaged.
 - Q. Okay.

2.1

- A. We would inspect the ends of the wire to see if it was damaged.
 - Q. Would you inspect the splices which are subjected to the same force between service drop wires and the customer's service entrance wires?
 - A. There were no service splices.
 - Q. How are the -- how is the service drop connected to the customer's service entrance wires?
 - A. On the loop, yes, there are splices there but not in the loop itself, from the drop itself.
 - Q. Well, the loop can be part of the drop --
 - A. If you could clarify, please. Are you talking mid-span splicing or splicing where the weather head meets?
 - Q. Yeah. I am talking about the splicing

- 1 where the weather head is at.
- A. Okay.

3

6

7

8

9

2.1

- O. There are --
- A. Inspection, we would do a visual inspection.
 - Q. Okay. Before applying power was a visual inspection done for those connections before power was applied?
 - A. I don't know.
- Q. Is there any evidence there was a visual inspection done?
- 12 A. Not to my knowledge, no.
- Q. Would that have appeared in the record kept by CEI if such an inspection had occurred?
- 15 A. Not necessarily.
- Q. Where are the other ends of the service supply wires attached, service drop wires? Where are they attached?
- A. One side is attached to the weather head.

 The other is attached to the primary.
 - Q. To the primary.
- A. Well, to the can that feeds from the primary, yes.
- Q. By can you are making a reference to the transformer?

A. Yes, I am.

- Q. Any evidence that the connections on that wire were inspected?
 - A. I don't know if they were or not.
- Q. To your knowledge there is no evidence that they were inspected.
- A. I was not present. I don't know whether they were inspected or not.
- Q. Well, if we look at Mr. Henry's report, if we look at Mr. Henry's report, I am not sure what exhibit that would be, your Honor. Take a minute. But I think you recall his testimony where he said I was unable to access the pole because of snow and branches being down, et cetera.
 - A. I do recall that, yes.
- Q. Okay. Would there be any way for

 Mr. Henry to have inspected those connections if he
 had no access to the pole?
 - A. Other than visually, no.
- Q. Well, visually from what distance? If
 you can't access the pole, how many feet away was -you certainly would be several feet away from those
 connections because aren't they mounted well up the
 pole?
- 25 A. Yes.

At least 15 feet or so? Okay. So 1 Ο. 2 without access and able to bring his truck and his bucket elevator over there, there is no way he could 3 have inspected those wires, is there? 4 5 MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor, 6 argumentative. 7 MR. ROOTE: Okay. EXAMINER SANDOR: I believe he answered. 8 9 Ο. (By Mr. Roote) All right. Okay. 10 while we are talking about the can, the transformer, 11 you described for us in your testimony the basic 12 operating principles of a fuse. As a matter of fact, 13 you did a good job of doing that succinctly. Can you do the same for a transformer? 14 15 MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor, 16 relevance. 17 EXAMINER SANDOR: Mr. Roote? 18 MR. ROOTE: It's relevant, your Honor, 19 because Mr. Ingram has given testimony that, in fact, 20 in his description of a fuse that the electricity 2.1 cannot cross an air gap. EXAMINER SANDOR: And how is that 22 23 relevant to? 24 MR. ROOTE: Well, if you understand how a

transformer works, you will know why I am asking the

1 | question.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

2 EXAMINER SANDOR: I will allow the 3 question.

- A. I'm sorry. What is the question?
- Q. Well, you gave a description of how a fuse works. Can you give the same kind of description on the basic operating principles of a transformer?
- A. Yes. A transformer has a -- what they call a high side bushing which attaches to the primary. It continues through a coil inside the can or transformer itself which then reduces the voltage down to another nominal voltage that's used on the lower side terminal. Inside that can would be impedence like oil or fluids of some sort in order to avoid overheating of that coil.
- Q. All right. Thank you. And was the first coil you referred to the primary coil?
 - A. The primary bushing, yes.
- Q. Okay. And is the second coil you referred to commonly referred to as the secondary coil?
- A. Secondary bushing. The coil is inside the can itself.
- Q. Yes. That's what I am referring to is

- the coils inside the can itself. So are we talking about the primary coil and the secondary coil; is that correct?
- A. No. There is one coil. It's a single-phase can.
 - Q. How does it reduce the voltage?
- A. The number of windings dissipates the voltage.
 - Q. Is the primary bushing directly connected to the secondary bushing?
- 11 A. No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

19

20

2.1

22

23

- Q. So how does the electricity flow from the primary bushing to the secondary bushing?
- A. Through the fluids. It's my
 understanding. Again, I am not an expert. I am not
 an electrical engineer.
- MR. ROOTE: All right. Well, we'll let his testimony stand, your Honor.
 - Q. (By Mr. Roote) Back to your testimony you indicated on line 7 of page 8, probably do page first but probably with me, "However, because service drops connect to residences, they are insulated to prevent accidental electrocution." How many conductors make up a service drop?
- A. There are three wires, two hot, one

1 neutral.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

17

- Q. And how many of those -- those wires are insulated?
 - A. Two of them.
- Q. Can the third wire conduct electricity, and isn't it there to conduct electricity?
 - A. It can conduct electricity, yes.
- Q. And, in fact, it does conduct electricity, does it not?
- 10 A. During a fault, yes.
- Q. And its purpose is to return -- complete
 the connection back to the source, isn't it, which is
 the transformer?
 - A. That's correct, uh-huh.
 - Q. So it is a current carrying conductor.

Sorry. You have answered that. On line

16 A. Can carry current, yes.

Q.

- 18 12 you testify that "I understand Mr. Roote's
 19 complaint to be that CEI reenergized the line without
- 20 disconnecting his meter." Is that still your
- 21 understanding of my complaint after hearing the
- 22 testimony from Tuesday and discussions we've had
- 23 today?
- A. At the time this testimony was prepared,
- 25 that's what my understanding was.

- Q. All right. Has your understanding changed?
 - A. No. I don't think so.
- Q. Would disconnecting the meter isolate my service drop, my service entry wires, and my meter box from the primary?
 - A. No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

- Q. And on my phone call, thinking back, of April 1, did you or did you not hear me say two or three times you need to disconnect your service and pull your meter so I can do repairs to my damaged conduit? If we can after -- we can replay the phone call.
- A. You reference April 1. I don't know what that reference is for.
 - Q. I'm sorry. Did I say April 1? I meant December.
 - A. Yes, you did.
 - Q. Excuse me for that. I am referring to the second call that occurred at some time around --
- A. Yes. Based around the comment from the customer notes, you asked for the meter to be pulled and bear with me a second. I can't find it. I'm sorry. I am referencing --
- 25 Q. It's okay.

A. "Please pull the meter so he can repair the damage. Needs power turned off so he can make repairs," yes, correct.

2.1

- Q. "Needs power turned off so he can make repairs." Okay. Thank you. You saved us from having to listen to those recordings again. So would your understanding now be that in addition to having my meter disconnected, I requested that the service be disconnected as well?
- A. On the 8th, yes. Not on the 1st. The 1st you asked for the meter to be pulled. On the 8th, you asked for the meter to be turned off.

MR. ROOTE: Your Honor, I guess we will have to listen to the phone calls to clarify this issue.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Mr. Roote, I don't think we are going to be replaying the calls. It stands on the record that you know what was played.

MR. ROOTE: All right.

EXAMINER SANDOR: So you are free to reference it if you need to in your brief.

MR. ROOTE: Yeah. Well, Mr. Ko -Mr. Ingram is not recollecting them, and I thought to
refresh his memory would be in order to play them
again, but if we can refer to the record -- well, you

will be able to refer to the record when you do your adjudication so that should be sufficient.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Right.

2.1

2.2

Q. (By Mr. Roote) All right. This has been asked and answered, I think, your Honor, but on page 9, the response to the question at line 1 "Was there a fire hazard from a low hanging wire with a disconnected neutral at the meter box, as Mr. Roote asserts?" And his testimony was "even if the neutral wire were disconnected, there would not necessarily be a fire hazard."

But in the previous questioning, he has testified that there -- and this would indicate the same thing really. It doesn't change his testimony that there is the possibility of a fire being created if that neutral wire comes in contact with a hot wire.

MR. ROGERS: Objection, argumentative and asked and answered to the extent there is a question.

MR. ROOTE: Asked and answered. I was just wanting recognition that that question has been asked and answered.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Sustained. And we can look back at the record to clarify his testimony and his -- the prefiled testimony and the testimony he

has provided today.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

MR. ROOTE: Thank you.

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) Line 9, your Honor, question "Was Mr. Roote required to wait for CEI to disconnect his power before making repairs?" The testimony is "The service line is 120/240-volt insulated line, so a qualified electrician is able to work on the line, even while energized." Is that a correct reading of your testimony?
 - A. Yes, it is.
- Q. Are customers permitted to make their own repairs?
- A. Yes, if they act as their own and provide inspections.
 - Q. Were inspections required?
- A. Based on your locality, no, I do not believe they are.
- Q. Are all CEI customers qualified electricians?
- 20 A. No.
- Q. Based on the testimony of myself and
 Mr. Jeffrey Roote -- well, let me ask this question
 first, what's your definition of a qualified
 electrician?
- 25 A. Qualified electrician for me is someone

- that understands the principles and has some knowledge or past history of doing the work.
- Q. Thank you. How is that different than a licensed electrician?
- A. A licensed electrician would be bonded, probably have a business, insurance.
- Q. Understood. Based on the testimony of myself and Jeffrey Roote, would you consider either one of us or both of us to be qualified electricians?
 - A. You are able to do the work?
- 11 Q. Yes?

2.1

- A. I would say yes, if you are able and you had done it in the past.
 - Q. Well, that's what I am referring to.

 You've heard the testimony of our qualifications and our work experience. So in your estimation would we qualify -- would we be qualified electricians?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Thank you. On page 9, the bottom of that page, line 22, and then continuing onto page 10, "The Company's records show he called to request a disconnect to replace his service mast and service cable," and this is ground we've already covered, I think, your Honor. He's already testified it was not just to remove the meter but also to disconnect

- power. I guess I would have to ask that question.

 When you say the Company record shows he called to request a disconnect, that's a reference to the -- to
- A. Yes, that would be my understanding of it.

the -- to disconnecting the power from CEI.

- Q. Okay. Thank you. Line 4, page 10, in answer -- well, line 3, in answer to the question "What did CEI do with this information," his response includes "Nothing in his call indicated that the need for repairs were urgent." It is -- and we listened to that call as well. That would have been the call on the 8th -- or on the 4th, excuse me, on the 4th, December 4 call I made to CEI, and I know -- it was -- and on that call do you remember hearing me say it was lucky I didn't burn my house down?
 - A. I remember you saying that. I don't know in what call it was, yes.
- Q. All right. Thank you. Your Honor can verify which call it was. Would that be an indication I was concerned that what you had done by reconnecting my power was a danger?
 - A. Yes.

2.1

Q. Thank you. Line 4 on page 11 -- we've covered that, your Honor. That was -- I think. Give

me a minute. I think that's been asked and answered,
your Honor. Line -- in response to that same
question which was "What did CEI do next," and
that -- I guess -- are we all following along here?
We can -- we can all understand what CEI did next is
a guestion?

EXAMINER SANDOR: I think you can proceed with your question.

MR. ROOTE: Thank you.

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) On line 8 and 9, "Because of the condition of Mr. Roote's driveway and the cars and trees in the way, Mr. Henry was not able to drive to the -- up to the residence and did not report that he disconnected Mr. Roote's meter. Had he disconnected the meter, it would have been in his report." Is that still your testimony, Mr. Ingram?
 - A. Yes, it is.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

- Q. Do you recall Mr. Henry's testimony regarding the removal of meters?
 - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Did he or did he not state that he is not required to report the disconnecting of the meter if it doesn't leave the premises?
- A. No, I don't recall that.
- Q. Okay. We can check the record.

MR. ROOTE: Your Honor, can we have Karen read back Mr. Henry's testimony?

EXAMINER SANDOR: No. I think we have -- like you mentioned, we can refer back to the record so you can --

MR. ROOTE: Well, I am asking -- my next question was, you know -- you know, will Mr. Ingram stand behind his statement that had he disconnected the meter, it would have been in his report.

- A. Yes. If Mr. Henry had disconnected that meter, he would have indicated so by a read and a meter number in the report.
- Q. Whether the meter was intended to leave the premises or not.
 - A. Regardless.
 - Q. I'm sorry?
- A. Regardless.
 - Q. All right. So if he did not report it, that testimony that he may have pulled the meter -- we've had three people make testimony that -- I --
- 21 MR. ROGERS: Objection, argumentative.
- MR. ROOTE: Excuse me, your Honor.
- 23 | Forget that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

EXAMINER SANDOR: Please refrain from summarizing prior testimony unless it's leading to

the question.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

2 MR. ROOTE: I understand. Thank you, 3 your Honor.

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) All right. Well, then referring to number -- to line 18, there was no mention of reinstalling Mr. Roote's meter which would have been included in -- had it been done by CEI; is that still your testimony?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. So you have trained all of your crew that whenever they uninstall a motor -- a meter or reinstall a meter, that they remove it from the premises or not or whether it was still at the premises when they got there, they are required to include that in the report.
 - A. That's correct.
- 17 Q. Okay. Sounds like some training is in 18 order. Page 12. I guess we have to start a little 19 bit on page 11 just to get the guestion. Line 21 on 20 page 11, "Did CEI employees remove the meter?" Asked 2.1 and answered. Thank you. Don't need to go over it. 22 In answer to the question on line 12, "Why would CEI state that an inspection was not required?" As part 23 24 of your reply on line 18, you say "An inspection 25 generally would have been required if there was an

issue with the neutral connection to the meter, as that deals with the actual wiring." I think we've clarified through your testimony that in my case even though as qualified electricians, you did deal with the connection, the neutral connection to the meter, there was no inspection required. You say it generally would be required, but in my case it was not required. I think you've testified to that already.

MR. ROGERS: Objection, argumentative.

MR. ROOTE: Well, I am just asking him to clarify the discrepancies. He says an inspection is generally required, but he testified previously that in my instance an inspection was not required. I am just asking him to clarify the two statements.

A. That's correct.

2.1

Q. Thank you. All right. Question 20 on page -- on page 12, question on line 20 on page 12, "Do you know whether the neutral was pulled from the meter box," on line 23 beginning onto line 24, state "The Company's records show that Mr. Roote never reported an issue with his neutral wire at his meter base in his customer service calls." Is that a fair

- 1 reading of your testimony?
- 2 A. Yes, it is.

3

4

5

- Q. When is the neutral wire inside the meter box visible?
- A. Depends on the meter box.
- 6 Q. You've seen a picture of my meter box.

7 MR. ROOTE: Is that in evidence

8 yesterday, your Honor?

EXAMINER SANDOR: If you are referring to

Exhibit BT, yes. It was limited just to show it's a

picture of your meter box.

12 MR. ROOTE: All right.

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) So do we want to take a look at Exhibit BT? That is a picture of a meter box.
- 16 A. Correct.
- Q. Can you see the neutral wire connection?

 18 Is that visible?
- 19 A. No, we cannot.
- Q. Okay. So given that the meter box was not opened until December 8, is there any way for anyone to have known that the neutral wire was disconnected prior to that?
- 24 A. No.
- 25 Q. So that would explain why there was no

reports by me of an issue with the neutral wire.

A. Correct.

2.1

Q. Thank you. All right. Referring to line 5 and 6, this would include the connection as well so beginning on line 4, to put some context to it, your Honor, Mr. Ingram, you testified "His reports to customer service specifically noted that the meter base was undamaged. This would include the connections as well."

But under the same logic that we just used that there was no way for me to know the neutral had been pulled out prior to December 8, there was no way to know the condition of the connection inside the meter box until December 8. So since -- and after 10 o'clock in the morning on December 8. And I had only one phone -- and -- well, I can't testify, so I would just ask the question. So using the same reasoning before, is there any way I could have known the condition of the connections prior to pulling the meter on December 8?

- A. No.
- Q. Thank you. So my reports to CEI that I was unaware of any damage to my meter base would have been correct to my knowledge at that point.
- MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor,

misstates prior testimony. He never stated he was unaware of any damage. The report states that meter base was undamaged.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

2.1

22

25

Q. (By Mr. Roote) Is there any way I could have reported damage to my meter base if I had not been able to inspect the wires in my meter base? Let me rephrase that question. I will withdraw that.

Your testimony involves a conclusion that I could not have possibly reported that my meter base was undamaged -- again, I will have to rephrase, your Honor. Well, any reports I made to CEI as to the condition of my meter would not have involved the connections because those would have been unknown to me at the time.

MR. ROGERS: Objection, argumentative.

MR. ROOTE: Your Honor.

17 EXAMINER SANDOR: Mr. Roote -- Mr. Roote,

I'm sorry. I will allow the question.

Mr. Ingram, if you could answer to the best of your knowledge of.

- A. Can you repeat the question, please?
- Q. I was afraid you would ask that.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Let's have Karen repeat the question real quick.

MR. ROOTE: Thank you.

(Record read.)

2.1

- A. My assumption is that's correct.
- Q. Thank you. In the answer to the question on line 13, the question is "Whose responsibility is it to maintain the height of the service drop?" And you've answered "It is the customer's responsibility." Who attaches the service drop to the home?
 - A. The Company does.
- Q. So we -- you've testified to the fact that one end of the service drop is supported by attachment of the super -- service neutral to the customer's house by way of the neutral anchor; would you agree?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And we've already -- you've already testified that the other end of the service drop is connected to the transformer or the pole that supports the transformer; is that correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Who's responsible for maintaining the attachment of the service drop at the pole?
 - A. The Company is.
- Q. So if the end of the service drop detaches from the pole or the transformer, is it

possible for the customer to maintain the height of the service drop?

2.1

- A. I'm sorry. I don't follow your question.
- Q. Can the customer maintain the height of the service drop if the service drop comes -- becomes disconnected from its connection to the -- to the CEI pole or transformer?
- A. If it's disconnected at the pole, then it would drop to the ground.
- Q. Thank you. So is it entirely -- so in order to maintain the height of the service drop, doesn't it require CEI to maintain their connection at the transformer and the service pole?
- A. On one side, yes. On the second side your house mast would determine that height as well.
- Q. That's correct. You know, your testimony was it's the customer's responsibility.
 - A. To maintain the height of the mast at the house providing enough clearance.
 - Q. The answer -- the question was asked who is responsible to maintain the height of the service drop.
- MR. ROGERS: Objection, argumentative and asked and answered.
- 25 EXAMINER SANDOR: Sustained, Mr. Roote.

```
I think we have established what he means by his answer in response to that question.
```

2.1

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) Okay. In -- on line 17,

 "The service drop support shall be installed in such
 a manner to maintain the clearance specified in
 Section 5.2 and Exhibit 2." That's a reference again
 to the customer for installation which is Exhibit BA
 as I recall. So looking at Exhibit BA, "Section 5.2
 Clearances."
- EXAMINER SANDOR: Page 14, correct?

 MR. ROOTE: Yes. Give me a moment, your

 Honor, please.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Take a moment.

Q. (By Mr. Roote) So looking at the last sentence of paragraph 1, I will read that, "The Company shall provide, own, install, maintain the service drop conductors from the overhead distribution system to the point of service."

MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor. I am not sure what he is referencing.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Mr. Roote, you might be on a different page. I don't see that either.

MR. ROOTE: Okay. I'm at page 14 of the customer service guide. That is Exhibit BA. Did I mix up the exhibits?

EXAMINER SANDOR: No. BA is correct. I just -- at least at the -- the last sentence of Section 5.2 of the first paragraph I don't believe says that.

2.1

MR. ROOTE: Section 5.1, your Honor. I'm sorry.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay.

MR. ROOTE: First paragraph of section
5.1 "The Company shall provide, own, install,
maintain service drop conductors from the overhead
distribution system to the point of service." Okay.

MR. ROGERS: Is there a question pending?

MR. ROOTE: Yeah. Your Honor, I am just checking my records. I may move on here in just a moment. I need another moment.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay.

MR. ROOTE: Your Honor, I will hold on.

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) Mr. Ingram, what is the drip loop?
- A. The drip loop was on the secondary, would be the lowest point of that line above the ground.
- Q. Wouldn't the lowest point in a service drop be midway between the connections at the house and the pole?
- 25 A. Not necessarily, depends on the height of

both sides.

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

25

- Q. Where is the drip loop located?
- A. At the lowest point.

MR. ROOTE: All right. Your Honor, if we could refer to Exhibit probably 5 or 6 in the same document. Give me a moment.

7 EXAMINER SANDOR: Within Exhibit BA you 8 are saying?

MR. ROOTE: Yes. Exhibit 6.

EXAMINER SANDOR: What page is that or?

MR. ROOTE: Well, it's Exhibit 6, so it's at the end after -- after all the pages. It's not a numbered page. It's an exhibit. So after page 33 at the end, that's where the text ends, I think.

- A. I apologize. You are referring to the connection drip loop.
 - Q. Yes.
- A. Okay.
- Q. That's correct. I'm sorry if I confused you, yes. You see, Mr. Ingram, yes, I am referring to the -- yeah, the drip -- it's only described as a drip loop on the drawing on Exhibit 6, but yes.

 Where it points to the drip loop, that's the point I am referring to.
 - A. Okay.

Q. All right. Thank you for bearing with me on that. What is the purpose of that drip loop?

2.1

- A. Well, to keep condensation away from the crimps or the connection points.
- MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, I am going to object. What's the relevance of this line of questioning?
- MR. ROOTE: As to the connections inside the meter box, your Honor.
 - MR. ROGERS: These are the above the meter box. I do not see the connection between the meter box and the drip loop connection.
- Q. (By Mr. Roote) Mr. Ingram, is it possible for water to travel --
 - EXAMINER SANDOR: One moment. I will allow the question as soon as we can connect it to.

 MR. ROOTE: Okay.
 - Q. (By Mr. Roote) Mr. Ingram, is it possible for water to travel down the service loop and make its way into the conduit and isn't that one of the purposes of the drip loop, to prevent that from happening?
 - A. Yes. The weather head and drip loop both prevent moisture or water to get down there, yes.
 - Q. Now, why is it important to keep water

- from entering the customer's mast?
- 2 A. A number of reasons, corrosion --
 - Q. Connections inside the meter box?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Because -- and isn't that because degradation of those connections could result in a safety issue?
 - A. It could.
 - MR. ROGERS: Objection, argumentative.
- 10 EXAMINER SANDOR: Sorry. He answered the
- 11 question.
- MR. ROOTE: All right. Thank you, your
- 13 Honor.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

- 14 All right. Just a few more questions.
- 15 | Again, some of these have been asked and answered so
- 16 give me a minute.
- 17 EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay.
- 18 Q. (By Mr. Roote) Have I -- question I think
- 19 I have asked you about the danger that arc flash
- 20 presents.
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Are you familiar with arc fault circuit
- 23 interruptors?
- 24 A. I am.
- Q. Now, what is their purpose?

- A. It opens the circuit, ceases the power to that circuit.
 - Q. And if there is a presence of arc flash?
- A. If there was a preference of any grounding.
- Q. Okay. Does arc flash occur only between the live wire and ground?
 - A. No.

2.1

Q. Thank you. To your knowledge does CEI purchase any arc flash -- any products from Rockwell Automation that have arc flash protection?

MR. ROGERS: Objection, relevance.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Mr. Roote?

MR. ROOTE: I am asking whether -- you know, part of the issue is the danger created by arc flash. And I am asking if they -- if he is aware of them purchasing any products that prevent arc flash or detect arc flash.

- A. I don't know if Rockwell Automation is one of our vendors or not, and I'm not sure what type of device he is speaking about from the CEI side.
- Q. All right. Are you aware that the NFPA 70E covers arc flashing calculations?

	369
1	A. No.
2	EXAMINER SANDOR: Mr. Roote, what is
3	NFPA?
4	MR. ROOTE: Oh, National Fire Prevention
5	Association, your Honor. Mr. Ingram seemed to
6	understand the relevance, so I'll move on.
7	Q. (By Mr. Roote) Are you aware Rockwell
8	Automation offers training courses covering NFPA 73?
9	MR. ROGERS: Objection, relevance.
10	EXAMINER SANDOR: Mr. Roote, I am going
11	to sustain that.
12	MR. ROOTE: All right. Okay. Your
13	Honor, some of this may be redundant. Give me a
14	moment. Hang on. This expands on some earlier
15	testimony, your Honor, but it is an expansion.
16	Q. (By Mr. Roote) Again, Exhibit BA I
17	mean yes, Exhibit BA, at this time what they
18	referred to in that document as Exhibit 8,
19	Mr. Ingram
20	MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, this deals with
21	underground installation which is not what Mr. Roote
22	had.
23	MR. ROOTE: I'm making specific reference
24	to the drawings in the top left-hand corner. I think

Mr. Ingram can testify to the fact that aboveground

- or underground, those are the typical connections inside of a meter box.
- 3 EXAMINER SANDOR: I will allow the question if he knows if that's the case or not.
- 5 A. Yes, I'm familiar with these two 6 pictures.
 - Q. All right. And would you agree that's a fair representation of the connections inside of a meter box?
- 10 A. Yes.

7

8

9

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

- Q. Of those three wires labeled as source in the drawing, could you identify what would be the neutral?
- A. The one in the center going to the center terminal.
- Q. Okay. And the ones to either side of it, what would be connected to those?
 - A. Those would be hot legs.
 - Q. Thank you. Some of this is already entered into evidence, your Honor. Just a minute.

 Just could verify if that neutral wire between those two hot wires is pulled from its connector, is there anything else in the drawing that indicates that neutral wire is otherwise restrained?
- MR. ROGERS: Objection, asked and

- 1 answered.
- 2 MR. ROOTE: All right.
- 3 EXAMINER SANDOR: Sustained.
- 4 MR. ROOTE: Your memory is better than
- 5 | mine.
- I think that's also asked and answered.
- 7 All right. Move on. I am near the end, your Honor.
- 8 | Just a moment.
- 9 Q. (By Mr. Roote) You listened to a -- with
- 10 us a number of the automated phone calls that I made
- 11 | to CEI; is that correct?
- 12 A. Correct.
- Q. On any of those calls, did you hear the
- 14 | system announce the option of being transferred to a
- 15 | live agent?
- MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor,
- 17 relevance. That's outside the scope of his
- 18 | complaint.
- 19 MR. ROOTE: Your Honor, I supplied when
- 20 asked under discovery what topics I would be
- 21 | covering. I included this topic.
- MR. ROGERS: I do not believe he did,
- 23 | your Honor. If he could reference the actual code
- 24 | violation again, it's outside the scope of his
- 25 | complaint.

EXAMINER SANDOR: I think I have -- to be consistent with my prior ruling, if I remember correctly, is I would defer to ruling on the scope of these questions, I believe, if the parties would like to brief them. I will allow the question but let's keep this range of questioning brief, please.

MR. ROOTE: It is brief.

2.1

- Q. (By Mr. Roote) So, Mr. Ingram, do you need to hear the question again?
- A. No. I understand the question. And, no, I don't recall whether or not one of the options was for an associate or not.
- Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the stop, look, and live campaign that CEI is running?
- A. I know there is a public campaign, but I'm not real familiar with it, no.
- Q. You haven't heard any of those advertisements?
- A. I don't get to watch much T.V., and I am usually here when storms are rolling through.
- Q. Well, they are pretty ubiquitous. If you have never heard them, I can't ask you to tell me what's in them. Are you aware somewhat of what's in them from other than hearing them or seeing them?

 Either poster boards mounted around your facilities

- with those -- with those brochures on it?
- 2 A. No.

1

5

6

7

8

- 3 MR. ROGERS: Objection, irrelevant.
- 4 MR. ROOTE: All right.
 - Q. (By Mr. Roote) Do you recall any instance in your work experience where damage to a service entrance resulted in a fire?
 - A. No, not to my recollection, no.
 - Q. And you were working with CEI in 2005?
- 10 A. CEI, no. I was over in Pennsylvania at the time.
- Q. That's at the Penelec meter division as you testified?
- 14 A. Correct.
- Q. Are they owned -- are they owned by FirstEnergy?
- 17 A. Yes, one of two operating companies.
- 18 Q. Okay. How about in 2008?
- A. Again, I was in Pennsylvania at that time.
- Q. Penelec, okay. Thank you. Does CEI keep track of cases where fire results from a downed wire?
- A. Yes. We have a Claims Department that would handle that.
- Q. Do you know of any instance where a

person was electrocuted by a downed wire?

2.1

A. I've heard of it in the news, yes.

MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor.

What's the relevance to this line of questioning?

EXAMINER SANDOR: Mr. Roote?

MR. ROOTE: We are talking about the risks of CEI wires, and I am asking if he's heard of instances where people have been -- or property have been damaged or been injured as a result of downed wires.

MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, this is outside the scope of the specific one at issue here.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Mr. Roote, I would agree. I think if we could wrap up the questioning here now, wrap up with the line of questioning.

Q. (By Mr. Roote) Let me move on. We were discussing your experience at Penelec. Was Penelec ever engaged in investigating the cause of a meter suffering fire damage?

MR. ROGERS: Objection, your Honor, relevance.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Mr. Roote, yeah. I think this falls in line with the previous lines of questioning, the previous line of questioning you just discussed so.

```
MR. ROOTE: Well, your Honor, we've
 1
 2
     had -- we've had a lot of testimony about the meter
 3
    boxes and the potential damage that can result and
     the fires that might occur as a result of that
 4
 5
     damage. I am asking in his experience working at a
 6
     meter company is he aware of meters being returned
 7
     and investigated as to their -- as to the cause of
 8
     the fire damage. I guess --
9
                 MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, it's irrelevant.
10
                 MR. ROOTE: All right. All right.
11
     Again, this may be asked and answered. It's been a
12
     long day.
13
            Q.
                 (By Mr. Roote) Would only pulling the
14
    meter have isolated my service drop?
15
                 MR. ROGERS: Objection, asked and
16
     answered.
17
                 EXAMINER SANDOR: Sustained. It was,
18
    Mr. Roote. It was answered.
19
                 MR. ROOTE: Thank you. Thank you. One
20
     last -- okay. That concludes my questions, your
2.1
     Honor.
22
                 EXAMINER SANDOR: Thank you, Mr. Roote.
23
                 Any redirect for Mr. Rogers?
24
                              I believe so. Can we take a
                 MR. ROGERS:
25
     5- to 10-minute break so I can gather all my notes
```

376 together? 1 2 EXAMINER SANDOR: Yes. Let's take a 3 10-minute break. Actually let's go back at 1:40. (Recess taken.) 4 5 EXAMINER SANDOR: Let's go back on the 6 record. 7 Any redirect for Mr. Rogers? 8 MR. ROGERS: Yes. I do have a few 9 redirect questions. 10 11 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 12 By Mr. Rogers: 13 Q. Mr. Ingram, you testified that you 14 believe that in your opinion Mr. Roote was -- was considered a qualified electrician; is that correct? 15 16 Α. Yes. 17 Were you aware of any of his Q. 18 qualifications prior to this hearing? 19 Α. No, I was not. 20 Ο. We also heard a lot of testimony 2.1 regarding arc flashing; is that accurate? 2.2 Α. Yes. Was there any evidence of arc flashing on 23 Q. 24 Mr. Roote's residence?

A. No, there is not.

- Q. And what evidence would you be looking for?
- A. Burn, scorch marks on the side of the building and the meter pan, marks on the meter pan itself, possible damage to the meter, cloudy glass, smoke filled glass.

7 MR. ROGERS: Thank you, your Honor. I 8 have no further questions.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Thank you.

Mr. Roote, any recross within that very limited redirect scope? You're on mute, Mr. Roote.

MR. ROOTE: Your Honor, good job.

13

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

15 By Mr. Roote:

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

14

16

17

18

- Q. Regarding the arc flash, did anybody inspect any of my equipment for the presence of arc flash?
- A. I'm sorry. Is the question --
- Q. Did anyone from CEI inspect my service
 entrance, my meter box for the presence or absence of
 arc flash?
- A. I can't answer that on behalf of the troubleman, no.
- Q. I'm sorry. I missed the last part of

```
your answer.
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

- A. I can't answer that on behalf of the troubleman that came to your residence.
- Q. So you have no knowledge that anybody has looked at my -- or whether there is or is not presence of arc flash damage on my equipment, do you?
- 7 A. They are trained individuals to look for 8 things like that.

MR. ROOTE: All right. Thank you.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Thank you, Mr. Roote.

Anything, Mr. Rogers, follow-up?

MR. ROGERS: Nothing to follow up with,

13 your Honor.

14 EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay. All right.

15 Thank you.

Mr. Ingram, thank you very much for your

17 | time today. You are excused.

MR. ROOTE: Thank you, Mr. Ingram.

19 EXAMINER SANDOR: Happy holidays.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, everyone. Merry

21 Christmas.

22 EXAMINER SANDOR: I will note that it

23 looks like I think the only new exhibit that

24 Mr. Roote attempted to introduce was the AW which was

25 the request for production of documents, and we

```
allowed him to -- I allowed him to mark it, but we are not going to be admitting it per the prior objection and ruling.
```

So that leads us to --

5 MR. ROOTE: Am I on the record objecting 6 to that ruling, your Honor?

EXAMINER SANDOR: Did you object right -I believe you are but feel free to object at the
moment.

MR. ROOTE: My objection, thank you, your
Honor.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Thank you. Okay. So,

Mr. Rogers, if you would like to --

MR. ROGERS: Your Honor, Company

15 | Exhibit 1 to be moved into evidence.

16 EXAMINER SANDOR: Any objections from

17 Mr. Roote?

1

2

3

4

7

8

9

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

18 MR. ROOTE: No, your Honor.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay. So I will note right before I admit it that I do believe we had referenced -- so there are a few exhibits inclusive of Company Exhibit 1 and those would be Company Exhibit 1.A, 1.B, 1.C, 1.D, 1.E, 1.F, and 1.G which are named within the testimony. And let me just mention that to dovetail with our cross-reference

numbering convention that we referenced earlier we've 1 2 covered Exhibits 1.A through 1.C in that cross-referencing, but I will note that Exhibit 1.D 3 matches Complainant Exhibit Y which has already been 4 5 admitted. And Complainant's Exhibit -- I'm sorry, 6 Company Exhibit 1.E matches Complainant Exhibit AA 7 which is already admitted. And Company Exhibit 1.F 8 matches Complainant Exhibit AB which is already 9 admitted. And Company Exhibit 1.G does not have a 10 corresponding Complainant exhibit. 11 Given all that, all of those exhibits, 12 Company Exhibit 1 and the inclusive exhibits just 13 mentioned, are admitted into the record 14 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.) 15 EXAMINER SANDOR: I believe at this point 16 then we just have the motion -- the deferred motion 17 that -- Mr. Roote to supplement his testimony. I 18 want to ask first, Mr. Roote, do you still intend to 19 follow through with that after the testimony provided 20 today?

MR. ROOTE: Yes. It would only take a very few minutes, your Honor.

2.1

22

23

24

25

EXAMINER SANDOR: Okay. I'll note -- I have already noted -- or we've already noted

Mr. Rogers' objection to this. I am going to allow

Mr. Roote to be recalled for the very limited purpose of just mentioning this piece of his history, and the Commission will give it the weight that it deserves.

MR. ROOTE: Thank you, your Honor.

EXAMINER SANDOR: So, Mr. Roote, I will go ahead and do it just in case.

(Witness sworn.)

EXAMINER SANDOR: Thank you. Please go ahead.

2.1

MICHAEL S. ROOTE

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

Automation, I previously testified that I worked on the -- I served as a project manager. One project I neglected to mention is a project done for United Streetcar. I was a project manager for that project. It was for the city of Portland where railroad streetcar -- I will just give you a brief description and scope of supply. The power was supplied to the car by 740 -- 750 volt DC overhead wire. Our scope of supply on that project included four 700 horsepower variable frequency drives powering the

wheel AC traction drivers on the streetcar. And for ventilation and air conditioning systems on the streetcar, the main programmable application controller which ran the -- controlled the doors and other equipment on the car, two safety programmable live application controllers, two low voltage power supplies, and one human machine interface reference to the panel.

I was responsible for all technical -final decisions on all technical decisions, final
decision, and all the commercial and financial
decisions on that project. Some of the technical
issues that were involved were the groundings of our
equipment, the dielectric strength of all of our
connectors and cable systems that we supplied, which,
of course, would include iPod testing of all -- of
all of those elements. The -- the Rockwell was a
very high profile project which I was highly
complimented for my work on that project and that's
all I wanted to mention, your Honor.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Thank you.

Mr. Rogers, do you have any questions?

MR. ROGERS: Yes, your Honor.

- - -

2.1

CROSS-EXAMINATION

By Mr. Rogers:

2.1

- Q. Did you have any direct involvement on the actual installation of the overhead wires?
 - A. No.
- Q. You said you were responsible for the technical aspects of it. What do you mean by that?
- A. Well, to put variable frequency drives on a street car requires a huge amount of technical considerations regarding the wiring, the programming, the powering. You mentioned the overhead wires, the interface of the overhead wires. You want to see a demonstration of arc flash, watch a streetcar travel down the road with -- powered by electricity, and you will get a very good example of arc flash.

So all of those issues, many of which were relevant to this -- this hearing, were addressed and I made all the final technical decisions regarding all of those issues, and I did travel to the site. I attended test sessions of dielectric strengths. I tested over current testing of the equipment and many of the other issues involved with it.

Q. Do you recall responding to discovery requests submitted by CEI?

- A. I listed my work history with Rockwell Automation.
 - Q. Did you list this specific project?
- A. Not this one, no, because -- frankly, its relevance to utilities didn't occur to me at the time until you were examining me and my other experience with a utility of which I testified to when you asked me of the Bay Area Rapid Transit and the programming I did for the automatic reclosing systems. That's what got me thinking about what other railroad or transit programs I have worked on involving the public in particular and that's one I wanted to supplement my testimony.

MR. ROGERS: And we will move to strike this entire testimony as it was not disclosed during discovery in response to an interrogatory.

EXAMINER SANDOR: Thank you, Mr. Rogers. In light of my previous ruling, I will deny the motion, but the clarification and objection are noted, and the Commission will give the weight of the testimony he just provided, this specific testimony, the weight it deserves.

MR. ROOTE: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. ROGERS: No further questions, your

25 Honor.

2.1

385 1 EXAMINER SANDOR: Thank you. 2 Okay. With that let's go off the record. 3 (Discussion off the record.) EXAMINER SANDOR: Let's go back on the 4 5 record. After a brief discussion with the 6 7 parties, initial briefs for this case will be due on 8 February 16, 2022, and reply briefs will be due by March 9, 2022. 9 10 Is there anything else from the parties 11 before we adjourn for the day? 12 MR. ROOTE: I would just like to thank 13 the stenographer and Mr. Schmidt for their efforts 14 today in helping with the hearing and thank 15 Mr. Rogers as well and, of course, your Honor. 16 EXAMINER SANDOR: Thank you everybody 17 else as well, Mr. Schmidt, Karen, Mr. Rogers, and 18 Mr. Roote. 19 Happy holidays. The case is now 20 adjourned and is submitted on the record. Thank you. 2.1 (Thereupon, at 1:56 p.m., the hearing was 22 adjourned.) 23

24

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, December 20, 2021, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes. Karen Sue Gibson, Registered Merit Reporter. (KSG-7205)

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

1/5/2022 12:20:58 PM

in

Case No(s). 21-0011-EL-CSS

Summary: Transcript December 20th 2021 In the Matter of the Complaint of: Michael S. Roote, Complainant, vs. The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Respondent. electronically filed by Mr. Ken Spencer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Gibson, Karen Sue Mrs.