## BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

- - -

In the Matter of the :
Review of the Distribution:
Modernization Rider of :

Ohio Edison, The Cleveland: Case No. 17-2474-EL-RDR

Electric Illuminating : Company, and The Toledo : Edison Company. :

- - -

## PREHEARING CONFERENCE

before Mr. Gregory Price, Ms. Megan Addison, and Ms. Jacky St. John Werman, Attorney Examiners, at the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad Street, via Webex, called at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, January 7, 2022.

\_ \_ \_

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

\_ \_ \_

	2
1	APPEARANCES:
2	FirstEnergy Service Company By Mr. Brian Knipe 76 South Main Street
4	Akron, Ohio 44308
5	Jones Day By Mr. Michael Gladman
6	325 John H. McConnell Boulevard, Suite 600
7	Columbus, Ohio 43215
8	Jones Day By Mr. Ryan A. Doringo
9	901 Lakeside Avenue Cleveland, Ohio 44114
10	On behalf of the Ohio Edison Company, The
11	Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company.
12	Bruce J. Weston, Ohio Consumers' Counsel By Ms. Maureen R. Willis,
13	Senior Counsel Mr. John Finnigan
14	and Mr. William Michael, Assistant Consumers' Counsel
15	65 East State Street, 7th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215
16	On behalf of the Residential Customers of
17	the Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The
18	Toledo Edison Company.
19	Kegler, Brown, Hill & Ritter Co., LPA By Mr. Robert Dove
20	65 East State Street, Suite 1800 Columbus, Ohio 43215
21	On habalf of the Ohio Doutness for
22	On behalf of the Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy.
23	
24	
25	

		3
1	APPEARANCES: (Continued)	
2	Carpenter Lipps & Leland LLP By Mr. Thomas V. Donadio	
3	280 North High Street 280 Plaza, Suite 1300 Columbus, Ohio 43215	
5	On behalf of the Ohio Manufacturers'	
5 6	Association Energy Group.	
0	McNees, Wallace & Nurick LLC	
7	By Mr. Matthew Pritchard 21 East State Street, 17th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215	
9	On behalf of the Industrial Energy Users of Ohio.	
10	of onlo.	
11	Bricker & Eckler, LLP By Ms. Rachael Mains and Mr. Devin Parram	
12	100 South Third Street Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291	
13		
14	On behalf of the Ohio Hospital Association.	
15	Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry By Mr. Michael Kurtz	
16	and Ms. Jody Kyler Cohn 36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510	
17	Cincinnati, Ohio 45202	
18	On behalf of the Ohio Energy Group.	
19	Environmental Law & Policy Center	
20	By Ms. Janean Weber 21 West Broad Street, 8th Floor	
21	Columbus, Ohio 43215	
22	On behalf of the Environmental Law & Policy Center.	
23		
24		
25		

```
4
 1
     APPEARANCES: (Continued)
 2
            Dave Yost, Ohio Attorney General
            By Mr. Thomas Lindgren,
 3
            Mr. Werner L. Margard, III,
            and Ms. Kyle Kern,
 4
            Assistant Attorneys General
            Public Utilities Section
            30 East Broad Street, 26th Floor
 5
            Columbus, Ohio 43215
 6
                 On behalf of the Staff of the PUCO.
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Friday Morning Session,
January 7, 2022.

- -

2.1

EXAMINER ST. JOHN: The Public Utilities
Commission of Ohio calls for a prehearing conference
at this time and place Case No. 17-2474-EL-RDR being
in the Matter of the Review of the Distribution
Modernization Rider of Ohio Edison Company, The
Cleveland Electric illuminating Company, and The
Toledo Edison Company.

My name is Jacky St. John, and with me are Gregory Price and Megan Addison. And we are the Attorney Examiners assigned to preside over this prehearing conference.

Let's begin by taking appearances starting with the Companies.

MR. KNIPE: Good morning, your Honors.

Appearing on behalf of Ohio Edison, The Cleveland

Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison

Company, I am Brian Knipe, 76 South Main Street,

Akron, Ohio 44308.

Also appearing on behalf of the Companies from the Jones Day law firm are Michael Gladman, 325

John H. McConnell Boulevard, Columbus, Ohio 43215 and Ryan Doringo, North Point, 901 Lakeside Avenue,

```
Cleveland, Ohio 44114.
 1
 2
                 EXAMINER ST. JOHN: Thank you.
 3
                 Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
                 MS. WILLIS: Thank you, your Honor.
 4
                                                       On
 5
     behalf of the residential customers of the
 6
     FirstEnergy utilities, Bruce Weston, Consumers'
 7
     Counsel, represented by Maureen Willis, William
     Michael, and John Finnigan, 65 East State Street,
 8
9
     Suite 700, Columbus, Ohio 43215. Thank you.
10
                 EXAMINER ST. JOHN: Thank you.
11
                 Ohio Energy Group.
12
                 MS. COHN: Good morning, your Honor.
13
     behalf of Ohio Energy Group, Jody Cohn, Michael Kurtz
14
     from the law firm of Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry, 36 East
15
     Seventh Street, Suite 1510, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.
                 EXAMINER ST. JOHN: Thank you. Ohio
16
17
     Partners for Affordable Energy.
18
                 MR. DOVE: Good morning, your Honor. On
19
    behalf of Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy, this
20
     is Robert Dove with the law firm Kegler, Brown, Hill
2.1
     & Ritter, 65 East State Street, Suite 1800, Columbus,
2.2
     Ohio 43215.
23
                 EXAMINER ST. JOHN: Thank you.
```

Environmental Law & Policy Center.

MS. WEBER: Good morning, your Honor.

24

25

```
This is Janean Weber with the Environmental Law & Policy Center, 21 West Broad Street, 8th Floor, Columbus, Ohio 43215.
```

EXAMINER ST. JOHN: Thank you.

Ohio Manufacturers' Association Energy

6 Group.

2.1

MR. DONADIO: Good morning, your Honor.

Thomas Donadio appearing on behalf of the Ohio

Manufacturers' Association Energy Group with the law

firm of Carpenter Lipps & Leland located at 280 North

High Street, Suite 1300, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

EXAMINER ST. JOHN: Thank you.

Industrial Energy Users - Ohio.

MR. PRITCHARD: On behalf of IEU-Ohio,
Matt Pritchard with the law firm of McNees, Wallace &
Nurick, 21 East State Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

EXAMINER ST. JOHN: Thank you.

Citizens Utility Board of Ohio. Ohio Hospital Association.

MS. MAINS: Good morning, your Honors.

On behalf of the Ohio Hospital Association, Rachael

Mains and Devin Parram of the law firm Bricker &

Eckler located at 100 South Third Street, Columbus,

Ohio 43215. Thank you.

EXAMINER ST. JOHN: Thanks.

And last on behalf of Staff.

2.1

MR. LINDGREN: Thank you, your Honor. On behalf of the Staff, Ohio Attorney General Dave Yost by Thomas Lindgren and Werner Margard and Kyle Kern at 30 East Broad Street, 26th Floor, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

EXAMINER ST. JOHN: Thank you very much.

Now I would like to address a few issues before turning things over to Judge Price. First of all, the Ohio Hospital Association has filed a motion for leave to file out of time to intervene. That was filed on May 28 of 2021. I'll note that no memoranda contra were filed. In its motion the Ohio Hospital Association stated that it has a substantial interest in the proceeding because some of its members are in FirstEnergy territory and paid the Rider DMR charges.

So at this time we find the Motion to Intervene is reasonable and should be granted.

Next, I would like to address the motion for protective order that was filed by FirstEnergy utilities on June 14 of 2019. By entry issued November 16 of 2019, the Attorney Examiners denied the motion in part to the extent that FirstEnergy no longer wished to pursue protective treatment.

And the Attorney Examiners directed

FirstEnergy to file a response in regards to the remaining portion of the motion to compel.

2.1

FirstEnergy filed that correspondence on November 19 of 2021 stating that they to longer need to pursue protective treatment for the remaining portion.

So in order to make the record clear, the remaining portion of that motion for protective order will be denied.

And now at this time I will go ahead and turn things over to Judge Price.

EXAMINER PRICE: Thank you.

We just have a few more housekeeping matters to clean up and then hopefully won't take too much of everybody's time. The next issue we have is on September 24, 2021, OCC filed a motion for subpoena against FirstEnergy Corp. As we indicated in the prehearing conference in another case this week, you know, the Bench is not a party to what happens after the subpoena has been issued. We either get a motion to quash or assume the subpoena is being complied with.

So we did ask the other day for an update from OCC and FirstEnergy Corporation, and they were able to give us an update that some 230,000 pages of documents have been produced. We are just going to

ask if there is anything to add to that update which is particularly relevant to this particular proceeding.

2.1

MS. WILLIS: No, your Honor. As we indicated in the -- our prehearing conference earlier this week, the motion for a subpoena was filed in both cases, and it was resolved by FE Corporation agreeing to produce the information that it has produced to other parties in the various civil suits against it. So the same -- you know, the same update is -- is given that was given earlier this week is that our motion for subpoena need not be ruled upon because we have been able to reach agreement with FirstEnergy Corp. Thank you.

EXAMINER PRICE: Just to clarify,

Ms. Willis, I think we actually did grant the

subpoena. There has just been no motion to quash.

MS. WILLIS: Okay. Thank you, your Honor. Thank you.

EXAMINER PRICE: Maybe I'm wrong, but I think that's the current status. We've had a lot of subpoenas in these cases.

Speaking of which we have two more subpoenas that are pending motions. A motion for subpoena for Oxford Advisors related to the alleged

draft final report was filed by OCC October 20, 2021.

Memo contra was filed by the Staff on November 4,

2021. OCC filed its reply on November 12, 2021. In

addition a motion for subpoena for Oxford Advisors —

to conduct a deposition of Oxford Advisors related to

the midterm report they have filed was filed by OCC

on December 10, 2021. Memo contra was filed

December 27, '21. And then a reply was filed on

January 3, 2022.

2.1

We'll continue to defer ruling on both motions until after the filing of the final audit report in this case by Staff. That report is scheduled to be filed on January 14, 2022, barring any further extensions. It simply makes sense to the Bench to defer ruling, see if any of these questions have been answered by the final report prepared by Staff. Otherwise, we will proceed by ruling on the motions for subpoena at a later date.

Report, we will set the comment period by entry so all parties have notice to it, but just so counsel is aware for planning purposes, assume that the comments will be due about 30 days after the audit report is filed assuming -- which would be mid-February if there is no further extensions. Reply comments will

then be due as usual 15 days after the initial comments.

2.1

Excuse me. The last issue we have is a request for discovery update from the parties. A motion to compel was granted to OCC on its second set of discovery on this case on April 8, 2021. We've heard nothing from the parties whether there are any issues, but we just wanted to close the loop and make sure all the production under the motion to compel has been completed, and we can -- we can put this one to bed.

Ms. Willis.

MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, in -- in preparing for this prehearing, I have apparently missed that -- that motion. I know you advised us to look. I was looking over the documents and looking over the -- the docket card. I did miss that. You know, I can certainly give you an update through a letter, but I would believe had -- because OCC has not raised issues or pursued issues with regard to that, that these matters have been resolved.

We generally do follow up on discovery disputes which are not resolved, so I'm assuming that it was resolved, but I can certainly double-check and next week file a letter confirming that the issues

have been resolved.

2.1

2.2

EXAMINER PRICE: Thank you.

Mr. Gladman, anything to add?

MR. GLADMAN: I'll defer to Mr. Doringo on this discovery issue, if that's okay, your Honor.

EXAMINER PRICE: Sure.

MR. DORINGO: Yes, your Honor, I can add a little more color to that. After the last prehearing conference which was amazingly in April of last year, we -- we negotiated -- well, you had actually put the onus on us to move for a protective order if we had continuing objections to any of OCC's requests, and I believe it was its second set of discovery.

We negotiated those issues with OCC.

Some requests were withdrawn by OCC, but we answered all of the other ones. And in my view there is no remaining dispute on that discovery set.

We -- actually just today in preparation for this prehearing conference and in your orders from the corporate separation conference on Tuesday, we reviewed to make sure we were all caught up, realized there were some documents that were inadvertently not produced yet.

We fixed that issue this morning, and

with that production made to OCC this morning, we believe that -- that every issue addressed in that initial prehearing conference has been resolved.

EXAMINER PRICE: Thank you. That's very helpful.

Are there any other issues the parties have that they want to bring to the Bench's attention?

Hearing none, very good. Thank you all for your time and attendance in this prehearing conference. I think its useful in these cases to eliminate as many housekeeping matters as we can and without spending too much time on it. So I expect that the two -- two prehearing conferences scheduled for next week will be similar to this in length and productivity. So thank you all.

With that we are adjourned. We are off the record.

(Thereupon, at 10:14 a.m., the prehearing conference was adjourned.)

CERTIFICATE I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings taken by me in this matter on Friday, January 7, 2022, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes. Karen Sue Gibson, Registered Merit Reporter. (KSG-7210) 

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

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on** 

1/14/2022 9:50:14 AM

in

Case No(s). 17-2474-EL-RDR

Summary: Transcript January 7th 2022 In the Matter of the Review of the Distribution Modernization Rider of Ohio Edison, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company. electronically filed by Mr. Ken Spencer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Gibson, Karen Sue Mrs.