

**THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF  
MORaine WIND LLC FOR  
CERTIFICATION AS AN ELIGIBLE OHIO  
RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCE  
GENERATING FACILITY.**

**CASE NO. 21-516-EL-REN**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF  
RUGBY WIND LLC FOR CERTIFICATION  
AS AN ELIGIBLE OHIO RENEWABLE  
ENERGY RESOURCE GENERATING  
FACILITY.**

**CASE NO. 21-517-EL-REN**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF  
ELM CREEK II FOR CERTIFICATION AS AN  
ELIGIBLE OHIO RENEWABLE ENERGY  
RESOURCE GENERATING FACILITY.**

**CASE NO. 21-531-EL-REN**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF  
BUFFALO RIDGE II FOR CERTIFICATION  
AS AN ELIGIBLE OHIO RENEWABLE  
ENERGY RESOURCE GENERATING  
FACILITY.**

**CASE NO. 21-532-EL-REN**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF  
BARTON WINDPOWER 1 FOR  
CERTIFICATION AS AN ELIGIBLE OHIO  
RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCE  
GENERATING FACILITY**

**CASE NO. 21-544-EL-REN**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF  
BARTON WINDPOWER, LLC FOR  
CERTIFICATION AS AN ELIGIBLE OHIO  
RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCE  
GENERATING FACILITY.**

**CASE NO. 22-380-EL-REN**

**ENTRY**

Entered in the Journal on September 1, 2022

{¶ 1} In this Entry, the attorney examiner orders that Carbon Solutions Group, LLC (Carbon Solutions) provide discovery responses within seven days, defers the

Applicants' motion for sanctions, grants Carbon Solutions' motion to compel, and reschedules the hearing to take place on December 5, 2022.

{¶ 2} On various dates, Moraine Wind LLC, Rugby Wind LLC, Elm Creek II Wind LLC, Buffalo Ridge II Wind LLC, Avangrid Renewables LLC, and Barton Windpower LLC (Applicants) filed their applications pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-40-04(D), for the certification of each named facility as an eligible Ohio renewable energy resource generating facility as defined in R.C. 4928.01.

{¶ 3} The attorney examiner suspended the automated approval process for the applications pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-40-04(D), which provides that upon good cause shown, the Commission may suspend the certification of an application to allow the Commission and its Staff to further review the application.

{¶ 4} Prehearing conferences were conducted on various days in July and August 2021.

{¶ 5} Staff filed its review and recommendation in each respective docket. In each report, Staff recommended the application be approved. Specifically, Staff determined that each facility satisfies the Commission's requirements for certification as a renewable energy facility.

{¶ 6} On May 7, 2021, Carbon Solutions filed motions to intervene, motions to consolidate, and motions to establish a procedural schedule.

{¶ 7} On August 3, 2021, Avangrid Renewables, LLC, the owner of Applicants, filed a motion to consolidate the cases. On August 6, 2021, Applicants, rather than their parent company, filed an amended joint motion to consolidate.

{¶ 8} On April 5, 2022, the attorney examiner consolidated Case Nos. 21-516-EL-REN, 21-517-EL-REN, 21-531-EL-REN, 21-532-EL-REN, and 21-544-EL-REN and granted the motions to intervene filed by Blue Delta Energy, LLC, 3Degrees Group, Inc., Carbon

Solutions, and Northern Indiana Public Service Company LLC. The Entry also set a procedural schedule, scheduled an evidentiary hearing to take place on September 12, 2022, granted Applicants' motion to compel, and ordered that Carbon Solutions provide substantive responses within two weeks.

{¶ 9} On April 13, 2022, Barton Windpower, LLC filed an application pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-40-04(D), for certification as an eligible Ohio renewable energy resource generating facility as defined in R.C. 4928.01, which was assigned Case No. 22-380-EL-REN. The attorney examiner suspended the automated approval process for the application pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-40-04(D) on May 2, 2022.

{¶ 10} On May 3, 2022, Carbon Solutions filed a motion for leave to intervene and motion to consolidate Case No. 22-380-EL-REN with the previously consolidated cases. On May 18, 2022, Applicants filed a memorandum contra. On May 20, 2022, Carbon Solutions filed a reply. On June 24, 2022, Applicants filed a notice of withdrawal of their memorandum contra the motion to consolidate.

{¶ 11} On June 28, 2022, the attorney consolidated all the above-captioned cases and ruled that the procedural schedule already established will apply to all the consolidated cases. The attorney examiner also adjusted the procedural schedule, determining that parties supporting certification should file testimony by August 12, 2022.

{¶ 12} On July 11, 2022, Applicants filed a motion for sanctions against Carbon Solutions, arguing that Carbon Solutions refused to comply with a Commission directive to answer and produce discovery. Applicants explain that on April 5, 2022, the Commission granted Applicants' motion to compel and directed Carbon Solutions to respond to discovery requests within two weeks. Applicants state that Carbon Solutions provided supplemental responses, but some of those responses were insufficient. Specifically, Applicants state that they have received insufficient responses to the following discovery requests: INT-01-017, INT-01-018, INT-01-019, INT-01-024, INT01-025, RFP-01-011, RFP-01-012, RFP-01-013, and RFP-01-014. Applicants argue that Carbon Solutions attempted to raise

new objections in its supplemental responses, but it cannot do so now because the objections were not raised within the required 20 days after service of the requests, citing Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-19(A) and 4901-1-20(C). Applicants add that Carbon Solutions objected to the relevance of certain discovery requests even though the attorney examiner already ruled on that issue. As to Carbon Solutions' statement "that it is unable to speak for its counsel," Applicants argue that counsel speaks on behalf of its client in all pleadings, and Carbon Solutions is responsible for every pleading filed in its name. Applicants aver that they tried to resolve the issue informally with Carbon Solutions but were unsuccessful. Applicants point out that their counsel has spent many hours in good-faith efforts to resolve the dispute. Applicants are concerned that Carbon Solutions will seek to introduce surprise evidence at hearing or will have no evidence at hearing, which would cause the Applicants to waste time and money preparing for the hearing. Applicants emphasize that Carbon Solutions has yet to articulate how the Commission's application of the deliverability test outlined in the *Koda* case is flawed, citing *In re Koda Energy LLC*, Case No. 09-0555-EL-REN (*Koda*), Finding and Order (Mar. 23, 2011). Applicants assert that the Commission may impose sanctions on a party that disobeys an order compelling discovery, citing Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-23. Applicants request that the Commission prohibit Carbon Solutions from further participation in the proceedings or, alternatively, limit Carbon Solutions' participation in this proceeding to the information contained in the applications and the Applicants' expert report.

{¶ 13} On July 13, 2022, Carbon Solutions filed a memorandum contra stating that the April 5, 2022 Entry resolved Carbon Solutions' initial uncertainties regarding whether Carbon Solutions would be granted intervention and whether a hearing would be scheduled but did not discuss the relevance of each specific discovery request, "opine on objections that had not been made," or offer an opinion on the expected content of responses. Carbon Solutions states that it served supplemental answers to the interrogatories and further supplemented its discovery after the parties finalized a protective agreement. Because Carbon Solutions supplemented its responses, it asserts that there is no sanctionable

conduct. Carbon Solutions asserts that if Applicants were not satisfied with the discovery responses, they should have filed another motion to compel. Because Applicants did not seek a motion to compel, Carbon Solutions asserts that the motion for sanctions is improper and baseless.

{¶ 14} On July 20, 2022, Applicants filed a reply, arguing that Carbon Solutions misinterprets the April 5, 2022 Entry, as the Entry ordered Carbon Solutions to “answer the interrogatories and provide the requested documents within two weeks.” Applicants state that Carbon Solutions ignores the basic legal principle that a party waives an objection when it fails to raise the objection in a timely manner. Applicants also point out that the April 5, 2022 Entry disposed of the only two objections that Carbon Solutions had timely raised. Applicants state that they have clearly explained the deficiencies, and they have already filed a motion to compel, which was granted on April 5, 2022. They state that Carbon Solutions’ suggestion that the Applicants file another motion to compel would waste time and resources, and it is a bad faith delay tactic. Applicants state that another Commission order compelling responses would not cure the delays that Carbon Solutions have created. Applicants also point out that they still don’t know what Carbon Solutions’ position is or what documentation Carbon Solutions has to support its position.

{¶ 15} It is important to first note that a motion to compel discovery of the requests at issue was granted on April 5, 2022.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, “[t]he party upon whom the interrogatories have been served shall serve a copy of the answers or objections upon the party submitting the interrogatories and all other parties within twenty days.” Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-19(A). Objections or responses are also due within twenty days for requests for production. *See* Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-20(C). Carbon Solutions had twenty days to file its objections to discovery requests, and those objections were considered and rejected by the attorney examiner. The attorney examiner clearly ordered Carbon Solutions to “answer the interrogatories and provide the requested documents within two weeks”

---

<sup>1</sup> No party filed an interlocutory appeal of that ruling.

(Entry (Apr. 5, 2022) at ¶ 27). Carbon Solutions does not get another bite at the apple by making additional objections after their first round of objections were rejected. To allow Carbon Solutions to do so would contradict Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-19(A) and 4901-1-20(C) and would lengthen what is already proving to be a contentious discovery period. If Carbon Solutions had additional objections to the discovery requests, it should have made them within twenty days of receiving those requests. As to Carbon Solutions' position that the April 5, 2022 Entry was deficient because it did not "opine on objections that had not been made," the attorney examiner notes that there is no obligation to issue rulings on objections that the parties have not raised. The attorney examiners work for the Commission and not the parties. For the reasons articulated above, the attorney examiner finds that Carbon Solutions should provide substantive answers and documents in response to the pending discovery requests within seven days of this Entry. Additionally, the motion for sanctions should be deferred at this time. Should Carbon Solutions fail to follow the attorney examiner's directive to provide answers and documents yet again, the attorney examiner invites Applicants to renew their motion for sanctions, at which time the attorney examiner may look upon the motion more favorably.

{¶ 16} On July 18, 2022, Carbon Solutions filed a motion to compel discovery. Specifically, Carbon Solutions seeks to compel discovery for Interrogatory Nos. 2, 3, 7, 8, and 9; and Request for Production (RFP) Nos. 7 through 10 and 14<sup>2</sup>. Carbon Solutions argues that each interrogatory seeks information about the physical or operating characteristics of Applicants' facilities, which Carbon Solutions states has a direct nexus to whether the electricity is physically deliverable into Ohio and is therefore relevant. Carbon Solutions also argues that, in order to succeed in its objection, Applicants must show more specifically how the information requested is not relevant. As to the confidentiality objection, Carbon Solutions argues that a protective order is in place, so the objection is inapplicable. Carbon Solutions also states that privileged material was not intended to be

---

<sup>2</sup> Carbon Solutions also discusses RFP Nos. 1-4 but states that its motion to compel is limited to the specific documents in RFP Nos. 7-10 and 14.

in the scope of its discovery requests, so those objections are unnecessary, but that Applicants should have provided a privilege log. Carbon Solutions also disputes the objection that the materials are already within its custody or that Carbon Solutions can easily obtain, stating that it is simply not true. Carbon Solutions also notes that this objection directly contradicts the privilege objection. As to Applicants' response that the information is available on the docket and/or the expert report, Carbon Solutions argues that additional information is needed to specify which information is referenced. Additionally, Carbon Solutions argues that discovery answers must be signed by a party rather than counsel, so each Applicant must designate a representative to sign the discovery answers. As to the RFPs at issue, Carbon Solutions states that the requests ask for information about the physical and operating characteristics of the Applicants' facilities, which is directly relevant to determine if electricity from these facilities is physically deliverable to Ohio.

{¶ 17} On August 1, 2022, Applicants filed a memorandum contra. Applicants state that they do not possess certain requested information, and they asked Carbon Solutions for its alternate theory of deliverability so the Applicants could produce the documents that are relevant to the proceeding, but Carbon Solutions did not respond. Applicants first argue that Carbon Solutions did not explain how the requested information is relevant, as the Applicants have already demonstrated that they meet the certification requirements, including the delivery test established in *Koda*. Applicants aver that Carbon Solutions has requested information that does not relate to the Commission's requirements or the deliverability test. In support of that claim, Applicants state that the Commission requires a demonstration of delivery through a power flow study but not to the extent of requiring signed contracts, citing *In re Comm. Review of its Rules for Alternative and Renewable Energy Technology, Resources, and Climate Regulations*, Case No. 08-888-EL-ORD, Opinion and Order (Apr. 15, 2009) at 28; *In re Comm. Review of its Rules for Alternative Energy Portfolio Standard*, Case Nos. 12-2156-EL-ORD, et al., Finding and Order (Dec. 19, 2018) at ¶ 181. Applicants assert that the relevant information is the power flow studies, which have been filed in the docket. Applicants also defend their other objections, stating that they have no duty to

produce information that is already filed in the docket, and no privilege log is required by the Ohio Adm.Code. Applicants also state that they have no obligation to produce documents that were shared as part of confidential settlement discussions, and settlement discussions have occurred with parties other than Carbon Solutions. Applicants add that competitively sensitive and proprietary information, as well as trade secrets, are different than confidential information, so the fact that there is a protective agreement doesn't require Applicants to produce all information. Further, Applicants assert that the motion is improper because Carbon Solutions did not try to resolve the discovery dispute in good faith, as required by Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-23(C). Applicants also dispute Carbon Solutions' assertion that a party representative, rather than counsel, must sign the discovery responses, pointing out that Carbon Solutions cited no law or precedent to support its assertion.

{¶ 18} On August 8, 2022, Carbon Solutions filed a reply. Carbon Solutions argues that the *Koda* test is not necessarily the only relevant test to deliverability, so the *Koda* test should not define the scope of discovery. Carbon Solutions asserts that the physical or operating characteristics of the facilities would enable the Commission to evaluate whether energy generated by these facilities is physically deliverable to Ohio, so its discovery requests are proper. Carbon Solutions argues that they do not have the burden of proving an alternative theory of deliverability, rather "Carbon Solutions must respond to the Applicants' case." Further, to the extent that Applicants are not producing documents pursuant to claims of privilege, Carbon Solutions argues that Applicants must provide information sufficient for such privilege claims to be evaluated. Carbon Solutions also disputes Applicants' claim that they should not be required to produce proprietary information pursuant to a protective agreement. As to Applicants' assertion that the motion to compel is procedurally improper, Carbon Solutions states that it did make a good-faith effort to resolve the dispute by sending a letter to Applicants' counsel on July 1, 2022, in which Carbon Solutions offered a compromise on some of the discovery requests.



{¶ 19} With respect to the motion to compel filed by Carbon Solutions, the attorney examiner finds that it should be granted, consistent with the terms outlined in this Entry. As an initial matter, the attorney examiner notes that while the motion to compel identifies deficiencies with RFP Nos. 1, 2, 7 through 10, and 14, Carbon Solutions later states that, “this motion to compel is limited to the specific documents described in RFP Nos. 7 through 10 and 14” (Carbon Solutions Motion to Compel at 10). The attorney examiner, therefore, will take Carbon Solutions at its written word and will only evaluate the motion to compel with respect to production requests for RFP Nos. 7 through 10 and 14. The attorney examiner also notes that the RFPs propounded on Applicants contain two requests identified as RFP No. 14, which Applicants pointed out in their objections to both requests. In its motion to compel, Carbon Solutions states in a footnote that “Request for Production 14 should have been labelled 11.” While the attorney examiner is uncertain that this resolves the confusion (as to which of the two RFP No. 14s should have been labelled 11), the objections to both RFP Nos. 14 are identical and, therefore, the attorney examiner’s rulings outlined below will apply to whichever RFP is, in fact, RFP No. 14.

{¶ 20} Applicants assert that Carbon Solutions failed to exhaust all reasonable means of resolving differences before filing a motion to compel, as required by Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-23(C). While the attorney examiner agrees that a single letter concerning discovery deficiencies, along with a snarky reply email response to Applicants’ own letter, may not be comprehensive, the attorney examiner also agrees with Carbon Solutions that it did contact Applicants to resolve the dispute. Additionally, the attorney examiner suspects that further correspondence on these issues would have been futile. The history of these proceedings and the correspondence between the parties attached to pleadings attest to the unlikelihood of Applicants and Carbon Solutions working together to resolve these issues absent intervention by the attorney examiner.

{¶ 21} The objections made by Applicants in response to both the interrogatories and the RFPs propounded by Carbon Solutions are similar across each discovery request and can be summarized as a group. First, Applicants provide 12 general objections, which

generically state objections to each discovery request. These general objections are then referenced in responses to specific discovery requests. The following objections are at least partially restated in each discovery response at issue: objection as to relevance and/or the request not: reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; objection to requests seeking information or documents exempt from discovery under trial preparation doctrine, work product doctrine/ and/or attorney client privilege; objection that the information sought is already publicly available or easily obtainable by Carbon Solutions; and, objection that requested information seeks production or disclosure of competitively sensitive information, proprietary business information, or trade secrets.

{¶ 22} Applicants' objections on grounds of privilege<sup>3</sup> are reasonable and timely made; however, without any description of the information and/or documents being withheld as privileged, it is impossible for opposing parties or the attorney examiner to determine whether the objections are valid as to the specific requests. While Applicants are correct that Ohio Adm.Code Chapter 4901-1 does not explicitly require a privilege log, the production of a privilege log is common practice in response to a motion to compel. *Ohio Edison Co., The Cleveland Elec. Illum. Co., and The Toledo Edison Co.*, Case No. 10-176-EL-ATA, Order (Jan. 27, 2011) at ¶ 19. As the privilege objections made by Applicants have now been challenged by Carbon Solutions' filing of the motion to compel, Applicants should prepare a document which identifies information and/or documents being withheld as privileged and provide enough information for such claims to be evaluated by other parties and, if necessary, the attorney examiner. Similarly, with respect to Applicants' objections on grounds of requests seeking competitively sensitive, proprietary, or trade secret information, the attorney examiner lacks sufficient information to evaluate the validity of the objections. Carbon Solutions argues that such objections are "spurious" because the parties entered into a protective agreement to allow the exchange of confidential

---

<sup>3</sup> Applicants make privilege objections based upon the trial preparation doctrine, work product doctrine, attorney client privilege, and confidential settlement discussions. The ruling made in this paragraph applies to all privilege objections asserted by Applicants.

information and documents in discovery without fear of such information being disclosed by other parties. Applicants counter that the competitively sensitive information that it seeks to withhold is not covered by the protective agreement and that Carbon Solutions is not entitled to such proprietary information. Without information beyond what is included in the pleadings, the attorney examiner is unable to determine the validity of these objections. The attorney examiner finds it appropriate that Applicants provide some type of description of the information and documents being withheld as proprietary or sensitive such that a determination of the validity of the objections can be evaluated. It is, therefore, ordered that such logs or documents with respect to the objections discussed in this paragraph be provided by Applicants to Carbon Solutions within 14 days of the issuance of this Entry.

{¶ 23} Applicants also object to every discovery request at issue in Carbon Solutions' motion to compel on grounds of relevance. Applicants argue that each discovery request inquires into matters that are not relevant to the proceeding and are not "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence," as required under Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-16(B). R.C. 4903.082 ensures "ample rights of discovery" and Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-16(B) requires information to be produced "if the information sought appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." The attorney examiner is persuaded that the discovery requests at issue in Carbon Solutions' motion to compel meet the lenient threshold of being reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Accordingly, Applicants should produce any answers to Interrogatory Nos. 2, 3, 7, 8, and 9, and/or documents in response RFP Nos. 7 through 10 and 14<sup>4</sup>, that they initially withheld on grounds of objections as to relevance.

{¶ 24} Applicants' objections as to discovery requests seeking information or documents that are publicly available or already within Carbon Solutions' knowledge,

---

<sup>4</sup> For any section of this Entry which directs a response to RFP No. 14, it is assumed that additional clarity as to the correct RFP No. 14 will be provided by Carbon Solutions to Applicants.

possession, custody, or control, or that can be easily obtained, are contemplated by Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-19(C) and Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-20(D), provided that a party complies with the entirety of both rules. Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-19(C) and Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-20(D) require, essentially, that where an answer to an interrogatory or in response to a request for production can be answered by information or a document previously furnished or publicly filed, the responding party must specify the location of the information or document or the circumstances under which the responsive material was furnished to the requesting party. In the case of Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-19(C), the rule requires a responding party to specify the title of the document, the location of the document, or the circumstances under which it was furnished to the submitting party, as well as the page or pages from which the answer may be ascertained. While the attorney examiner acknowledges that Applicants' response to Interrogatory No. 3 identifies a particular file in the case dockets where information can be obtained, none of the responses to the requests at issue in which Applicants make this objection contain the specificity contemplated by Commission rules. Applicants are, therefore, directed to provide more specific identification as to the location of documents where such responsive material can be found. This information should be furnished to Carbon Solutions within 14 days of the date of this Entry.

{¶ 25} With respect to Carbon Solutions argument that answers to interrogatories must be signed by the person making them, and objections separately signed by the attorney or person making the objections, the attorney examiner agrees that it is appropriate for the individual representative of each company answering interrogatories to verify the responses. This is common litigation practice and consistent with cases before the Commission. When Applicants provide updated responses consistent with this Entry, Applicants should also have a representative from each Applicant sign and verify the responses.

{¶ 26} On August 30, 2022, Carbon Solutions filed a motion for subpoena duces tecum. In its motion, Carbon Solutions seeks to subpoena Aaron Berner, Transmission Planning Manager for PJM Interconnection, LLC (PJM) to testify at the hearing. Carbon

Solutions also asks Mr. Berner to provide all documents relating to DFAX studies provided by PJM to the Commission since January 1, 2022. The address provided for service to Mr. Berner is listed as Audubon, Pennsylvania. Any memoranda contra this motion should be filed by September 14, 2022.

{¶ 27} At this time, the attorney examiner finds it appropriate to reschedule the evidentiary hearing and extend the procedural schedule to allow time for the above issues to be resolved. As currently scheduled, Applicants' discovery responses would be due after the hearing commences. For this reason, any supplemental testimony of Applicants and intervenors in support of certification should be filed by November 14, 2022. Supplemental testimony of other intervenors and Staff should be filed by November 21, 2022. The evidentiary hearing shall be rescheduled to commence at 10:00 a.m. on December 5, 2022, at the offices of the Commission, 180 East Broad Street, 11th Floor, Hearing Room 11-A, Columbus, Ohio 43215. The parties should register at the lobby desk and then proceed to the 11th floor to participate in the hearing. Any other procedural deadlines, such as the service of discovery, remain the same deadlines as set forth in the April 5, 2022 Entry.

{¶ 28} Any accommodations necessary to ensure availability of social distancing and plexiglass dividers should be made in advance of the hearing. As pandemic restrictions are evolving, additional instructions regarding further safety requirements or accommodations for the hearing room will be forthcoming, either posted on the Commission's website or communicated to the parties.

{¶ 29} It is, therefore,

{¶ 30} ORDERED, That Carbon Solutions provide substantive responses to the pending discovery requests within seven days, as set forth in Paragraph 15. It is, further,

{¶ 31} ORDERED, That Applicants' motion for sanctions be deferred at this time. It is, further,

{¶ 32} ORDERED, That Carbon Solutions' motion to compel be granted, as set forth in Paragraph 19. It is, further,

{¶ 33} ORDERED, That the procedural schedule be extended in accordance with Paragraph 27. It is, further,

{¶ 34} ORDERED, That the evidentiary hearing be rescheduled to commence on December 5, 2022, at the Commission offices. It is, further,

{¶ 35} ORDERED, That a copy of this Entry be served upon all parties of record.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

/s/ Jacky Werman St. John

By: Jacky Werman St. John  
Attorney Examiner

MLW/mef

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

**9/1/2022 11:49:46 AM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 21-0516-EL-REN, 21-0517-EL-REN, 21-0531-EL-REN, 21-0532-EL-REN, 21-0544-EL-REN, 22-0380-EL-REN**

Summary: Attorney Examiner Entry ordering that Carbon Solutions Group, LLC provide discovery responses within seven days, defers the Applicants' motion for sanctions, grants Carbon Solutions' motion to compel, and reschedules the hearing to take place on December 5, 2022 at the Commission offices Hearing Rm 11-A. electronically filed by Ms. Mary E. Fischer on behalf of Jacky Werman St. John, Attorney Examiner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio