

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

- - -

In the Matter of the :  
Application of the Ohio :  
Department of Development :  
for an Order Approving :  
Adjustments to the : Case No. 22-556-EL-USF  
Universal Service Fund :  
Rider of Jurisdictional :  
Ohio Electric Distribution:  
Utilities. :

- - -

PROCEEDINGS

before Ms. Greta See and Ms. Isabel Marcelletti,  
Attorney Examiners, at the Public Utilities  
Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad Street, Room 11-C,  
Columbus, Ohio, called at 10:02 a.m. on Wednesday,  
November 30, 2022.

- - -

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.  
222 East Town Street, Second Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201  
(614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481

- - -

APPEARANCES:

Bricker & Eckler, LLP  
By Mr. Dane Stinson  
100 South Third Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

On behalf of the Ohio Department of  
Development.

Baker & Hostetler LLP  
By Mr. Ali I. Haque  
200 Civic Center Drive, Suite 1200  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

On behalf of the Industrial Energy  
Users-Ohio.

Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry  
By Ms. Jody Kyler Cohn,  
36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

On behalf of the Ohio Energy Group.

AES Ohio  
By Mr. Christopher C. Hollon  
1065 Woodman Drive  
Dayton, Ohio 45432

On behalf of the Dayton Power and Light  
d/b/a AES Ohio.

AEP Service Corporation  
By Mr. Michael J. Schuler  
1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

On behalf of the Ohio Power Company.

Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.  
By Ms. Elyse H. Akhbari  
139 East Fourth Street  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

On behalf of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.

- - -

APPEARANCES: (Continued)

Benesch, Friedlander, Coplan & Aronoff, LLP  
By Mr. John W. Breig  
200 Public Square, Suite 2300  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

On behalf of The Toledo Edison Company,  
Ohio Edison Company, and The Cleveland  
Electric Illuminating Company.

Bruce J. Weston, Ohio Consumers' Counsel  
By Ms. Amy Botschner O'Brien,  
Assistant Consumers' Counsel  
65 East State Street, Suite 700  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

On behalf of the Residential Utility  
Consumers of Ohio.

Dave Yost, Ohio Attorney General  
John H. Jones, Section Chief  
Public Utilities Section  
By Mr. Steven Logan Beeler  
and Ms. Sarah Feldkamp,  
Assistant Attorneys General  
30 East Broad Street, 26th Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

On behalf of the Staff of the PUCO.

- - -

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

INDEX

- - -

WITNESS	PAGE
Megan Meadows	
Direct Examination by Mr. Stinson	7
Cross-Examination by Ms. Botschner O'Brien	13
Examination by Examiner See	51
James D. Williams	
Direct Examination by Ms. Botschner O'Brien	57

- - -

ODOD EXHIBIT	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
1 Application	8	56
2 Testimony of Megan Meadows	8	56
3 Amended Application	8	56
4 Supplemental Testimony of Megan Meadows	8	56
5 Testimony in Support of Joint Stipulation by Megan Meadows	8	56
6 E-mails	10	56

- - -

OCC EXHIBIT	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
1 Testimony of James D. Williams	62	71

- - -

JOINT EXHIBIT	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
1 Joint Stipulation and Recommendation	8	56

- - -

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Wednesday Morning Session,  
November 30, 2022.

- - -

EXAMINER MARCELLETTI: Good morning. The Commission has set for hearing at this time and place Case No. 22-556-EL-USF which is titled in the Matter of the Application of the Ohio Department of Development for an Order Approving the Adjustments to the Universal Service Fund Rider of Jurisdictional Ohio Electric Distribution Utilities.

I am Isabel Marcelletti, and with me is Greta See. We are assigned by the Commission to hear this case.

So we will begin with appearances of the parties and why don't we start with the Department of Development and then we will kind of work our way around if that works well.

MR. STINSON: Thank you, your Honor. On behalf of the Ohio Department of Development, the law firm Bricker & Eckler by Dane Stinson, 100 South Third Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

MR. SCHULER: Good morning, your Honors. On behalf of the Ohio Power Company, Michael Schuler.

MR. HOLLON: Good morning. On behalf of the Dayton Power and Light Company, Christopher

1 Hollon.

2 MS. AKHBARI: Good morning. On behalf of  
3 Duke Energy Ohio, Elyse Akhbari.

4 MR. BREIG: Good morning. On behalf of  
5 the FirstEnergy companies, John Breig of Benesch  
6 Friedlander.

7 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Good morning. On  
8 behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel,  
9 Bruce Weston, Consumers' Counsel, Amy Botschner  
10 O'Brien, 65 East State Street, Suite 700, Columbus,  
11 Ohio 43215.

12 MR. HAQUE: On behalf of IEU-Ohio, this  
13 is Ali Haque from Baker Hostetler.

14 MS. FELDKAMP: On behalf of the Public  
15 Utilities Commission of Ohio, Dave Yost, Ohio  
16 Attorney General, John H. Jones, Section Chief,  
17 Public Utilities Section, by Assistant Attorneys  
18 General Sarah Feldkamp and Steve Beeler, 30 East  
19 Broad Street, 26th Floor, Columbus, Ohio.

20 MS. COHN: Good morning. On behalf of  
21 the Ohio Energy Group, Jody Kyler Cohn.

22 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Stinson.

23 MR. STINSON: Yes, your Honor. I would  
24 like to call as our witness Megan Meadows. If I  
25 could approach, your Honor, I will bring some

1 exhibits.

2 EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

3 MR. STINSON: These are all prefiled in  
4 the docket. The parties already have them. I will  
5 give one to the reporter and Bench.

6 EXAMINER SEE: You have at least one copy  
7 for the Bench?

8 MR. STINSON: Absolutely.

9 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Meadows, if you would  
10 raise your right hand.

11 (Witness sworn.)

12 EXAMINER SEE: Have a seat.

13 (EXHIBITS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

14 - - -

15 MEGAN MEADOWS

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

18 DIRECT EXAMINATION

19 By Mr. Stinson:

20 Q. Ms. Meadows, would you please state your  
21 full name and business address for the record.

22 A. Megan Meadows, Ohio Department of  
23 Development, 77 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio.

24 Q. And by whom are you employed?

25 A. Ohio Department of Development.

1 Q. And what's your position there?

2 A. I am the Chief of the Community Services  
3 Division.

4 Q. I have handed you a stack of documents.  
5 Those have been premarked as exhibits. I would just  
6 like to go through each one and have you identify  
7 starting with Development Exhibit No. 1.

8 A. Exhibit No. 1 is the application.

9 Q. And Development Exhibit No. 2.

10 A. The -- my testimony on behalf of the Ohio  
11 Department of Development.

12 Q. And that would be in support of the  
13 application?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. And Development Exhibit No. 3.

16 A. It is the amended application.

17 Q. And Development Exhibit No. 4.

18 A. Supplemental testimony -- my supplemental  
19 testimony on behalf of the Ohio Department of  
20 Development.

21 Q. And Development Exhibit No. 5.

22 A. It's testimony in support of the Joint  
23 Stipulation.

24 Q. And finally Joint Exhibit 1.

25 A. It's Joint -- the Joint Stipulation and



1 Recommendation.

2 Q. And are each of those true and accurate  
3 copies of the original?

4 A. Yes, they are.

5 Q. If I were to ask you -- well, first of  
6 all, do you have any corrections or additions to your  
7 testimonies in this case? I think it's Exhibits 2,  
8 4, and 5. I'm sorry, yes, 2, 4, and 5.

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Do you have additions or corrections to  
11 that testimony?

12 A. Yes -- or, no, I'm sorry.

13 Q. If I were to ask you those same  
14 questions, would your answers be the same?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Thank you. In your testimony in support  
17 of the Stipulation, you reserve the right to address  
18 any testimony in opposition to the Stipulation,  
19 correct?

20 A. Correct.

21 Q. I just want to ask you a few questions  
22 about Mr. Williams' testimony on behalf of OCC filed  
23 in this matter. Have you had a chance to review that  
24 testimony?

25 A. Yes, I have.

1           Q.    And do you recall in his testimony where  
2 he stated quote that the Stipulation -- well, not  
3 quote yet but where he stated the Stipulation filed  
4 in this proceeding was "agreed to without any  
5 settlement meetings or settlement negotiations"?

6           A.    Yes.

7           MR. STINSON:  If I could approach, your  
8 Honor.

9           EXAMINER SEE:  You may.

10          Q.    (By Mr. Stinson) Ms. Meadows, I've handed  
11 you what's been marked as Development No. 6.  Could  
12 you identify that, please.

13          A.    Yes.  It is communication with interested  
14 parties regarding the opportunity to negotiate.

15          Q.    And are you included on the distribution  
16 list?

17          A.    Yes, I am.

18          Q.    Thank you.  And do you recall if there  
19 was a meeting held on November 21 of 2022 to consider  
20 the objection to the application?

21          A.    Yes, I believe there was.

22          Q.    And after that meeting, was there a draft  
23 Stipulation circulated to the parties?

24          A.    Yes.

25          Q.    Were you on that draft distribution list?

1 A. Yes, I was.

2 Q. And was the Office of the Consumers'  
3 Counsel?

4 A. Yes, they were.

5 Q. Were there any revisions to the  
6 Stipulation among the parties after that draft was  
7 circulated?

8 A. Yes, there were.

9 Q. Referring again to Mr. Williams'  
10 testimony, do you recall that he indicated there was  
11 a lack of diversity of interest to the Stipulation?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Whose interests does Development  
14 represent in this USF proceeding?

15 A. We represent the interest of the PIPP  
16 customers and the ratepayers of Ohio.

17 Q. And also do you recall Mr. Williams'  
18 testimony that "customers and the public interest  
19 would not benefit from the Stipulation"?

20 A. Yes, I do.

21 Q. Now, would you agree in this Stipulation  
22 it's based on a template in several other  
23 Stipulations that preceded this in prior years?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Is there anything different in this

1 Stipulation?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. What would that be?

4 A. The language was modified to allow an  
5 opportunity should rates decrease that we could amend  
6 the revenue requirement to the utilities to reduce  
7 the cost.

8 Q. And would that provide any benefit to  
9 customers or in the public interest?

10 A. Yes, it would.

11 Q. And what benefit would that be?

12 A. It would decrease the overall rider  
13 costs.

14 MR. STINSON: At this time I would have  
15 no other questions, your Honor, and I will tender the  
16 witness for cross.

17 EXAMINER SEE: Any cross-examination for  
18 this witness, Mr. Haque?

19 MR. HAQUE: No, your Honor.

20 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Feldkamp?

21 MS. FELDKAMP: No, your Honor.

22 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Kyler Cohn?

23 MS. COHN: No, your Honor.

24 EXAMINER SEE: Thank you.

25 Mr. Schuler?

1 MR. SCHULER: No, your Honor.

2 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Hollon?

3 MR. HOLLON: No, your Honor.

4 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Akhbari?

5 MS. AKHBARI: No, your Honor.

6 EXAMINER SEE: Counsel for FirstEnergy?

7 MR. BREIG: Mr. Breig. And, no, your  
8 Honor.

9 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. O'Brien?

10 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: That leaves me.

11 EXAMINER SEE: Yes.

12 - - -

13 CROSS-EXAMINATION

14 By Ms. Botschner O'Brien:

15 Q. Good morning, Ms. Meadows.

16 A. Good morning.

17 MR. STINSON: I am going to interrupt.

18 If I could have people use microphones because I am  
19 way back here and they are way up there including  
20 Ms. Meadows.

21 EXAMINER SEE: You will probably have to  
22 move it closer to you, Ms. Meadows.

23 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Good morning,  
24 Ms. Meadows.

25 A. Good morning.

1           Q.    I just want to follow up with something  
2           your counsel asked in his direct exam. Can you cite  
3           any -- any rule or statute indicating that ODOD  
4           represents the interests of residential ratepayers?

5                   MR. STINSON: Objection, your Honor, for  
6           the fact she is not an attorney but she can answer if  
7           she can.

8           Q.    (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) To the best of  
9           your understanding.

10           A.    A specific rule I cannot cite.

11           Q.    Thank you. Ms. Meadows, turning to your  
12           supplemental testimony supporting the amended  
13           application that you filed last week, the November 21  
14           testimony, turning to page 4, line 6 to 11. You  
15           discuss the effect replacing the September '21 data,  
16           which was from the October application, with the  
17           actual data for September '22, the effect that would  
18           have on adjustments for PUCO-approved changes to EDU  
19           tariff rates. Do you see that?

20           A.    Yes.

21           Q.    Okay. You state that compared to the  
22           original application, and by that I am assuming you  
23           mean the application filed October 31, 2022, you  
24           state that the PUCO-approved adjustments to the  
25           tariffed rates in the amended application caused the

1 adjusted test period cost of PIPP to increase for  
2 Ohio Power, AES, Duke, Ohio Edison, and Toledo  
3 Edison; is that correct?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. On page 5, lines 4 to 11, you state that  
6 the overall effect on the adjusted test period cost  
7 of PIPP once actual September of '22 data was  
8 substituted for the September 2021 data, the adjusted  
9 test year cost of PIPP increased from  
10 \$329,246,200.05 -- 200, excuse me, to 358,924,849,  
11 correct?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. So just doing the subtraction of those  
14 two numbers, this represents a 29,678,649 cost of  
15 PIPP increase using actual data from the month of  
16 September of '22 alone; am I reading that correct?

17 A. I can't do that math in my head right  
18 there, but if that math is correct, then yes.

19 Q. Okay. Then going back, turning to page 3  
20 of this supplemental testimony, lines 9 to 11, you  
21 state that "An increase in an EDU rate element widens  
22 the gap between the cost of electricity delivered to  
23 PIPP customers and the amount paid by PIPP customers,  
24 thereby increasing the cost of PIPP." Do you see  
25 that?

1 A. Uh-huh.

2 Q. With the cost of the PIPP generation gap  
3 widening, as you say, from the original application,  
4 just using the data from September '22 --  
5 September 2022 that the November amended application  
6 uses, is there a concern how the USF rates will be  
7 impacted?

8 MR. SCHULER: Objection, vague.

9 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) I'll clarify.  
10 Is there any concern of potentially needing to amend  
11 the application and/or the Stipulation in the future  
12 due to the -- these higher PIPP rates?

13 MR. STINSON: Same objection, your Honor.

14 MR. SCHULER: I will also add calls for  
15 speculation, your Honor.

16 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Well, let me  
17 clarify.

18 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Is this  
19 what -- you have the Joint Stipulation with you,  
20 correct?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. Is this what the Joint Stipulation was  
23 attempting to address on page 5 in paragraph 9 where  
24 it reads "Development in its sole discretion may,  
25 after consulting Signatory Parties, commence a



1 separate proceeding to address any potential changes  
2 in residential rates or to the cost to supply  
3 electricity to PIPP customers during the 2023  
4 collection period"?

5 A. The language sort of speaks for itself in  
6 that we were wanting to make sure that if an  
7 adjustment needed to be made based on rate changes,  
8 that we would have the opportunity to do so.

9 Q. This could be a rate increase or rate  
10 decrease; is that correct?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Okay. Thank you. Is ODOD -- is ODOD  
13 expecting or anticipating that they will need to  
14 adjust the proposed USF Rider rates again sometime in  
15 2023 because of the magnitude of these electric rate  
16 increases?

17 MR. STINSON: Objection, calls for  
18 speculation as well.

19 MR. SCHULER: Also lack of foundation.

20 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Well, the  
21 foundation would be that I am referring to the  
22 Settlement, the Stipulation paragraph 9 that she is  
23 sponsoring where it states "Development in its sole  
24 discretion may...commence a separate proceeding to  
25 address any potential changes in residential rates."

1 And I am just trying to get at what that means.

2 EXAMINER SEE: Karen, read the question  
3 back for me, please.

4 (Record read.)

5 MR. SCHULER: Your Honor, it's the  
6 magnitude of electric rate increases that there is no  
7 foundation for, and I believe it also speaks to the  
8 vagueness that Mr. Stinson raised.

9 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: I can rephrase  
10 the question, your Honor.

11 EXAMINER SEE: You can try again. Go  
12 ahead.

13 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Sure.

14 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Is ODOD  
15 expecting that they will need to adjust -- just given  
16 the reading of paragraph 9 here in the Settlement, is  
17 ODOD expecting or anticipating they will need to  
18 adjust the USF rates again sometime in 2023?

19 A. At this point I don't know.

20 Q. Okay. Thank you. In an effort to reduce  
21 the USF rate for residential electric customers, were  
22 there any discussions within ODOD to aggregate the  
23 PIPP customers into the lower Standard Service Offer  
24 rate as far as you know?

25 MR. STINSON: Objection, your Honor. It

1 was an issue raised in the NOI proceeding. That  
2 issue has been ruled beyond the scope of this  
3 proceeding. There is no reason to relitigate this  
4 issue here. Same case, same parties, same issue, res  
5 judicata.

6 EXAMINER SEE: Would you like to respond?

7 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Sure. Given the  
8 large increase in the cost of PIPP just evidenced  
9 from using actual data from September of 2022 alone,  
10 so since the last hearing that we've had, has there  
11 been any discussions or recommendation to the ODOD  
12 Director to review the feasibility of aggregating  
13 PIPP customers. This is since the last hearing.

14 EXAMINER SEE: The objection is  
15 sustained.

16 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Was there any  
17 discussion with ODOD's staff on how the amended  
18 application you just filed last week will impact all  
19 residential customers' bills during these tough  
20 economic times given that consumers are receiving  
21 higher bills than in the past?

22 MR. STINSON: Objection, compound.

23 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Was there any  
24 discussion with ODOD's staff on how the amended  
25 application just filed last week would impact

1 residential consumers' bills?

2 A. No.

3 Q. Have there been any discussions within  
4 ODOD since the time of your amended application --  
5 actually since the time of your application or the  
6 amended application at all in how to deal with the  
7 high PIPP rates in relation to the standard offer  
8 going forward?

9 MR. STINSON: Objection. Again, res  
10 judicata, your Honor.

11 EXAMINER SEE: What was the last part of  
12 that, Mr. Stinson?

13 MR. STINSON: Res judicata. It's the  
14 same issues. She's getting into the fact that --  
15 what we litigated in the NOI proceeding, that PIPP  
16 generation rates cannot be greater than an SSO  
17 generation rate. That was found to be outside this  
18 proceeding. Same case, same parties, same issue.

19 MS. AKHBARI: Your Honor, I would also  
20 join just in that if Ms. O'Brien is asking for the  
21 divulgence of any attorney-client confidential  
22 information, she should be precluded from doing so.

23 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Your Honor, may I  
24 respond?

25 EXAMINER SEE: If you are responding to

1 the objections, yes.

2 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Yes, of course.  
 3 The issue of res judicata doesn't really apply  
 4 because this case is still pending. We have an  
 5 application for rehearing out there, No. 1. And that  
 6 goes to Mr. Stinson's objection. And to the other  
 7 objection, I really -- I'm speaking of the time --  
 8 not at the NOI phase. I am speaking of the time of  
 9 the application, the October application, and now the  
 10 November application. And, of course, we are not  
 11 trying to get into privileged communications in any  
 12 way. But in her position at ODOD, is she aware of  
 13 any discussions that she was maybe a part of on how  
 14 to deal with these high PIPP rates.

15 MR. STINSON: Again, as Ms. Akhbari  
 16 stated, Ms. Meadows can answer to the extent it  
 17 doesn't involve any advice or discussion with  
 18 counsel.

19 EXAMINER SEE: You may answer the  
 20 question.

21 A. No.

22 Q. Thank you. Referring to page 5,  
 23 paragraph 10a of the amended application where you  
 24 are discussing the 12-month test period, January 2022  
 25 through December, and you have --

1 EXAMINER SEE: What page was that again,  
2 please?

3 MS. BOTSCHNER-O'BRIEN: That is page 5,  
4 your Honor, of the amended application, paragraph 10a  
5 at the bottom.

6 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Where you are  
7 discussing the 12-month test period January 2022  
8 through December and you say "202," but I believe  
9 you -- that's supposed to be 2022, correct?

10 A. That's correct.

11 Q. Okay. Isn't it true that the 12-month  
12 test period includes actual data for January 2022  
13 through September of 2022 and estimates for October  
14 through December of 2022?

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. What adjustments were made in the October  
17 through December 2022 estimates to reflect changes in  
18 the cost of PIPP?

19 A. I'm sorry. Can you clarify your  
20 question? I am not understanding what you are  
21 asking.

22 Q. Sure. We know that the January 2022  
23 through September 2022 is using actual data, and this  
24 amended application filed in December reflects only  
25 September 2022 actual data, correct?

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. Do we have any adjustments or have there  
3 been adjustments made for -- what we have now is  
4 October, November, and December 2022, so far those  
5 are just estimates.

6 A. Correct.

7 Q. Are there adjustments that are made, that  
8 have been made, are going to be made, to reflect  
9 those changes in the cost of PIPP?

10 A. No.

11 Q. Referring back to your supplemental  
12 testimony on page 5, lines 4 to 11, are you there?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Okay. Thank you. Where you explain the  
15 increase in the aggregate revenue requirement from  
16 the original application associated with the adjusted  
17 test period cost of PIPP. Do you see that?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. As we discussed earlier, that difference  
20 is -- just doing the subtraction for September is  
21 29,678,649 and that is due to the use of actual  
22 September 2022 data; is that correct?

23 MR. SCHULER: Objection, asked and  
24 answered.

25 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: I'm beginning a

1 line of questioning here. I am just confirming that.

2 MR. SCHULER: I think she already asked  
3 Ms. Meadows to do math on the stand, and she said she  
4 was not able to. Take another crack at it.

5 EXAMINER SEE: You can answer the  
6 question, Ms. Meadows. I will allow some leeway here  
7 so you can go into this line of questioning.

8 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: The numbers are  
9 in her testimony; so, I mean, it's right here from  
10 page 5 of your testimony, but okay. Thank you, your  
11 Honor.

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. In the original application that was --  
14 you filed in October, end of October, that was based  
15 on estimated costs for September 2022, what was the  
16 projected increase in costs of PIPP that was  
17 reflected in the aggregate revenue requirement?

18 MR. STINSON: I am not sure I understand  
19 the question. The aggregate increase where? In the  
20 October application? The amended application?

21 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: The original  
22 application, the October 31 original application that  
23 was based on estimated costs for September 2022. I  
24 am referring to line -- page 5, line 11.

25 MR. STINSON: Of what document?



1 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: This is her  
2 testimony, supplemental testimony.

3 A. The original application was the  
4 329,246,200.05.

5 Q. Why -- why was there such a substantial  
6 increase from the 329 million to the 358,924,000  
7 number?

8 A. There are multiple factors that go into  
9 the changes but including one of those using the most  
10 recent data available as I testified.

11 Q. Okay. Clarify for me, why wasn't that  
12 calculated in the original number?

13 MR. STINSON: Objection. I don't  
14 understand what that means.

15 EXAMINER SEE: Yeah. Try again,  
16 Ms. O'Brien.

17 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) The increase,  
18 why wasn't that calculated in the original  
19 application, that increase?

20 A. The original application was based on the  
21 data available at the time and those were the  
22 calculations conducted.

23 Q. What is the estimated cost of PIPP for  
24 October, November, and December of 2022 that is  
25 reflected in the aggregate revenue requirement?

1 MR. SCHULER: Objection, vague. A lot of  
2 words in there. I am not sure what we are referring  
3 to.

4 EXAMINER SEE: Ms. Meadows, do you  
5 understand the question?

6 THE WITNESS: Not completely.

7 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Okay. What is  
8 the -- okay. October, November, December are based  
9 on estimated costs at this point for 2022. What are  
10 those estimated costs?

11 A. I don't have the specific dollar amount  
12 offhand.

13 Q. Do you know if those numbers were updated  
14 to reflect that same kind of increase that we see in  
15 the September actuals?

16 MR. SCHULER: Objection, foundation,  
17 vague. There's no foundation for there being an  
18 increase in the subsequent months.

19 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Well --

20 EXAMINER SEE: You can respond.

21 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: -- we already  
22 know that September went up by -- the witness  
23 established, it's in her testimony, September went up  
24 by 29 million. I'm simply asking what -- does she  
25 expect that the actuals for October, November,

1 December to go up by a similar amount.

2 MR. STINSON: Objection, calls for  
3 speculation, your Honor. We have updated the  
4 September amounts based upon actual data that are  
5 currently in. It is speculative as to what October  
6 through December will show.

7 EXAMINER SEE: The objection is  
8 sustained.

9 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Do you have an  
10 estimated cost of PIPP for October, November,  
11 December 2022?

12 A. No.

13 Q. Given the magnitude of the increase in  
14 the aggregate revenue requirement that occurred just  
15 when using actual September 2022 data which is over  
16 29 million, has ODOD performed any calculations of  
17 what the aggregate cost of the PIPP revenue  
18 requirement would be if similar cost increases were  
19 to occur when actual data becomes available --  
20 becomes available for October 2022, November 2022,  
21 and December '22?

22 A. No.

23 MR. SCHULER: Objection, incomplete  
24 hypothetical. It's based on the assumption there  
25 will be. Also vague that there will be some sort of

1 increase in October, November, and December like that  
2 of September, and we haven't even defined what that  
3 is.

4 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: The -- well, we  
5 have the number for September.

6 EXAMINER SEE: I'm sorry. You both can  
7 stop there. Did I hear the witness answer the  
8 question --

9 THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.

10 EXAMINER SEE: -- with a no?

11 Move on.

12 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Is it because  
13 you haven't gotten to it yet or why not? You  
14 answered "no." Why would that be? You just haven't  
15 gotten to that stage yet or?

16 A. I don't have a specific reason.

17 Q. Okay. Would you accept, just using back  
18 of the hand math, that assuming using the same  
19 approximate number for October, November, and  
20 December 2022 numbers, that increase in the cost of  
21 PIPP would go up an additional 87 million?

22 MR. STINSON: Objection, speculative  
23 again, your Honor. The actual numbers for October  
24 through December aren't in, and she is speculating  
25 what they will be.

1 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: I'm just using  
2 the -- her testimony, and if we know September is --  
3 the increase has gone up by 29 million, is there any  
4 reason to think that October, November, December  
5 would be any different. And I am simply multiplying  
6 29 times 3.

7 EXAMINER SEE: The objection is  
8 sustained.

9 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) And just to  
10 follow up, Ms. Meadows, in response to Mr. Stinson's  
11 question where you indicated you are representing --  
12 your agency is representing residential consumers,  
13 you've testified you haven't looked at the impact  
14 though at this point; is that correct?

15 MR. STINSON: Objection, asked and  
16 answered.

17 EXAMINER SEE: Overruled.

18 A. As I testified, that's correct.

19 EXAMINER SEE: Please speak up,  
20 Ms. Meadows.

21 A. As I testified, that's correct.

22 Q. Thank you. Referring back to the  
23 provision in the Joint Stipulation, and we are on  
24 page 5, paragraph 9, where it states "Development in  
25 its sole discretion may, after consulting Signatory

Parties, commence a separate proceeding to address any potential changes in residential rates or to the costs to supply electricity to PIPP customers during the 2023 collection period." And then it goes on to state "The Signatory Parties may oppose any proposals made by Development in such a proceeding." Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. Are you aware of any USF settlement in the past that included this provision?

A. I don't recall specifically.

Q. Do you recall in this cases, was it ODOD or any other signatory parties that were advocating for this provision during the settlement?

MR. STINSON: Objection, your Honor, confidential settlement discussions.

MR. HOLLON: AES Ohio joins that objection.

MR. SCHULER: Ohio Power joins.

MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: If you --

EXAMINER SEE: Were you going to respond?

MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: I can.

EXAMINER SEE: Go ahead.

MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: I can respond. What I am just trying to get at is what was the

1 overall intent of including this provision in the  
2 Settlement.

3 EXAMINER SEE: So are you changing --  
4 withdrawing the prior question?

5 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: I will withdraw  
6 the other question.

7 EXAMINER SEE: Okay. You can ask a new  
8 one.

9 MR. STINSON: Same objection. It still  
10 goes to the confidentiality of the settlement  
11 discussions. As to the intent of the provision, it  
12 speaks for itself.

13 MR. SCHULER: AEP Ohio joins.

14 MR. HOLLON: AES Ohio joins.

15 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: I'm just trying  
16 to kind of probe to the extent this witness knows,  
17 she is sponsoring this Settlement, what -- what was  
18 the reason for including this provision in the  
19 Settlement.

20 MR. STINSON: Same objection, your Honor.

21 EXAMINER SEE: Sustained.

22 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) We touched on  
23 this earlier, but can you explain what -- what are  
24 the "residential rates" that are referred to in this  
25 paragraph? In other words, is the Joint Stipulation

1 referring to changes in SSO rates, PIPP rates, USF  
2 first block rates? What does the term "residential  
3 rates" mean in this paragraph?

4 A. I believe we are referring to the PIPP  
5 rates.

6 Q. Okay. So you are saying that the  
7 residential rates you mean PIPP rates; is that  
8 correct?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Is there a reason as far as you know why  
11 it doesn't specify PIPP rates; it just says  
12 residential?

13 A. I am not aware of a reason.

14 Q. Referring to the separate proceeding that  
15 is referenced in paragraph 9, to the best of your  
16 knowledge, would this be a request in the form of an  
17 application made to the PUCO to adjust the 2023 USF  
18 revenue requirements and USF rates?

19 MR. STINSON: Objection. To the extent  
20 it calls for a legal conclusion, Ms. Meadows is not  
21 an attorney.

22 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Well, to the  
23 extent it doesn't call for a legal conclusion, what  
24 is her understanding of separate proceeding.

25 EXAMINER SEE: You can answer the



1 question.

2 A. My understanding is it would be a  
3 separate proceeding. I am not sure on the specifics.

4 Q. Would there be modifications to the rate  
5 design in that kind of proceeding?

6 A. I don't believe so.

7 Q. Would the PUCO have to approve whatever  
8 that rate is? Is that what that is envisioning?

9 MR. STINSON: Again, same objection to  
10 the extent she is not an attorney. She can answer to  
11 the extent she can.

12 EXAMINER SEE: With that understanding,  
13 you can answer as best you can, Ms. Meadows.

14 A. My understanding is, yes, the PUCO would  
15 need to approve the rates.

16 Q. What are the reasons that -- the reasons  
17 why Development might in "its sole discretion"  
18 commence such a separate proceeding as far as you can  
19 know?

20 MR. STINSON: Objection, speculation  
21 again.

22 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: May I respond,  
23 your Honor?

24 EXAMINER SEE: Yes.

25 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Really not asking

1 her to speculate. I mean, what -- I am just trying  
2 to get at what -- what was she envisioning? What was  
3 the concept behind this? We talk about its sole  
4 discretion. What would be some of the reasons why  
5 this -- why such a proceeding would begin?

6 MR. HAQUE: Objection. Paragraph 9  
7 speaks for itself.

8 MR. SCHULER: AEP Ohio would join.

9 EXAMINER SEE: Any others?

10 Did you want to respond to that,  
11 Ms. O'Brien?

12 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: I don't think  
13 anything further than what I have already said. I am  
14 just trying to get an understanding of what that  
15 paragraph means.

16 EXAMINER SEE: The objection is  
17 sustained.

18 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Would such a  
19 proceeding be, in your understanding, subject to a  
20 review by PBAB?

21 EXAMINER SEE: Please define PBAB.

22 Q. Public Benefits Advisory Board, capital  
23 P, capital B, capital A, capital B, prior to the time  
24 ODOD commences a separate proceeding.

25 A. I'm not sure if it would or not.

1           Q.    Is ODOD prepared to potentially amend the  
2 rates in 2023?

3           A.    Yes.

4           Q.    Is ODOD expecting that it may need to  
5 adjust the proposed USF rates again sometime in 2023  
6 because of these increases?

7           MR. STINSON:  Objection, your Honor.  
8 Assumes there would be increases.  That's speculative  
9 as well.

10           MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN:  Your Honor,  
11 rephrase.

12           Q.    (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Is ODOD now  
13 fully expecting it will need to adjust the proposed  
14 USF rates again sometime in 2023?

15           MR. SCHULER:  Objection, asked and  
16 answered.  This was asked earlier on in the  
17 cross-examination, your Honor, this very same  
18 question, I believe.

19           MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN:  I am not sure we  
20 got an answer.

21           EXAMINER SEE:  You didn't get an answer  
22 because I haven't ruled on the objection.  I am not  
23 sure that I recall this exact question, so I am going  
24 to overrule the objection.  The witness can answer.

25           A.    I'm sorry.  Can you repeat the question?

1 Q. Certainly.

2 EXAMINER SEE: Would you like to have it  
3 read back?

4 THE WITNESS: That's fine.

5 (Record read.)

6 A. At this time I am not sure.

7 Q. Why is ODOD only consulting with  
8 signatory parties prior to commencing a separate  
9 proceeding to address potential changes in  
10 residential rates?

11 MR. STINSON: Objection, confidentiality  
12 of settlement negotiations.

13 MR. SCHULER: AEP Ohio joins.

14 MR. HOLLON: AES Ohio joins.

15 EXAMINER SEE: Sustained.

16 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Can you  
17 identify which of the signatory parties represent  
18 residential consumers and the rates that are charged  
19 to residential customers for this USF? And those  
20 signatures can be found on pages 8 and 9.

21 A. I see them listed on 8 and 9, yes.

22 Q. Can you identify which of those signatory  
23 parties represent residential consumers and the rates  
24 that are charged to residential customers for the  
25 USF?

1           A.    As I mentioned previously, Development is  
2 listed, and we represent consumers.

3           Q.    Okay. But we have already established  
4 that we don't know of any rule or statute empowering  
5 the agency with that kind of representation, and  
6 we've already established that ODOD didn't really  
7 consider to the best of your knowledge the impact of  
8 upcoming rates on residential customers.

9           MR. STINSON: Objection, argumentative,  
10 and move to strike. I don't think there is a  
11 question there anyway.

12           MS. AKHBARI: Also misstates prior  
13 testimony, your Honor.

14           MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: I think that sort  
15 of summarizes the testimony, but okay.

16           EXAMINER SEE: Sustained.

17           Move on, Ms. O'Brien.

18           Q.    (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Referring to  
19 paragraph 8 of the Joint Stipulation, are there  
20 reasons why consumers are not being informed about  
21 the purpose of the USF and the magnitude of a rate  
22 increase from 2021 to 2022?

23           MR. SCHULER: Sorry. Could I have that  
24 question reread.

25           (Record read.)

1 MS. AKHBARI: I would object for lack of  
2 foundation, misstating paragraph 8.

3 MR. SCHULER: I would join in that  
4 objection, and I would also add to the extent this  
5 calls for Settlement communications, it would be an  
6 improper request.

7 MR. STINSON: And I would join in those  
8 as well and state the question is compound.

9 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Your Honor, may I  
10 respond?

11 EXAMINER SEE: Yes.

12 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Paragraph 8  
13 discusses a notice, and it does discuss the EDUs  
14 shall notify customers of the adjustments, but it  
15 doesn't seem to require any -- any additional  
16 substantive explanation about the increase.

17 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) And I am just  
18 trying to understand just is there any reason why  
19 consumers -- you know, since you have indicated that  
20 you represent residential consumers, are there any  
21 reasons why consumers are not being informed about  
22 the purpose of the USF and the magnitude of the rate  
23 increase as they will all be experiencing the rate  
24 increase?

25 MR. STINSON: Objection, your Honor. It

1 just assumes facts that really aren't in evidence or  
2 even in the Stipulation. I don't know where the  
3 question is coming from.

4 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: May I respond?

5 EXAMINER SEE: It might be best if you  
6 rephrase the question and started over. Initially I  
7 think you said "2021 to '22 rates" so let's start  
8 there.

9 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Okay. So I am  
10 directing the witness's attention to the last  
11 sentence of paragraph 8 of the Stipulation where it  
12 says "The EDUs shall notify customers of the  
13 adjustments to their respective USF riders by means  
14 of the customer notice." The customer notice doesn't  
15 seem to address information about the purpose of the  
16 USF and the magnitude of the rate increase or the  
17 rate increase at all. Is there any reason to the  
18 best of your knowledge why that is the case?

19 MR. SCHULER: Objection, assumes facts  
20 not in evidence. It also is based upon counsel's  
21 personal characterization of words that are attached  
22 to the Stipulation; therefore, it's also compound.

23 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: And let me -- let  
24 me make a correction, your Honor. It's the rate  
25 increase from 2022 to 2023. I did misstate, and I

1 think you caught that. It's 2022 to 2023.

2 EXAMINER SEE: Was there a further  
3 response to the objection, Ms. O'Brien?

4 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: I am trying to  
5 get --

6 EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

7 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: I didn't think it  
8 was compound. It was just a reason why the consumers  
9 are not being informed about the purpose of the USF  
10 and reasons for the rate increase. It discusses the  
11 notice.

12 EXAMINER SEE: The objection is  
13 sustained.

14 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Turning to  
15 your supplemental testimony, MM-25, line 21, you  
16 state that the annual cost to consumers using 975  
17 kilowatt-hours per month is 15.78.

18 EXAMINER SEE: I'm sorry. You said --  
19 give me the reference to Ms. Meadows' supplemental  
20 testimony again, please.

21 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: This is -- this  
22 is Ms. Meadows' supplemental testimony filed  
23 November 21, 2022. This is MM-25.

24 EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

25 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) And I am



1 looking specifically right now at line 21. It states  
2 that the annual cost to consumers using 975 kilowatt  
3 per month is \$15.78; is that correct?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. But based on the first block AEP rate  
6 .0053667, and that is found on line 18 and also at  
7 the very top of that page, that number times 975  
8 kilowatt-hours times 12, the actual cost to consumers  
9 annually appears to be \$62.79. Can you explain why  
10 there is a difference?

11 MR. SCHULER: Objection. Assumes facts  
12 not in evidence. It's asking the witness to do  
13 compound math on the stand. It is also a compound  
14 question.

15 MR. STINSON: I would object also, your  
16 Honor. I believe it gets into the methodology for  
17 rate design that was decided in the NOI case of this  
18 proceeding.

19 EXAMINER SEE: Do you want to respond?

20 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: I mean, I suppose  
21 there is a certain amount of math involved, yes.

22 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Does the  
23 amended application or your testimony provide the  
24 annual impact for a customer paying the block one  
25 rates on the proposed USF?

1           A.    No.

2           Q.    Still referring to line 21 of MM-25, is  
3   the 975 kilowatt-hour per month an error given that  
4   you used 1008.50 in that calculation?  In other  
5   words, should the 975 kilowatt read 1008.50  
6   kilowatt-hour?

7           MR. STINSON:  Objection to the fact that  
8   she's required to do math on the stand like this.

9           MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN:  No.  This one  
10   isn't math at all.  This is just -- this is -- this  
11   one is not math.

12          MR. STINSON:  Well, can I have the  
13   question reread because I don't understand it.

14          EXAMINER SEE:  Okay.

15          Q.    (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Okay.  
16   Referring to line 21 of MM-25, is the -- is the 978  
17   kilowatt-hour per month an error given that you used  
18   1008.50 in the calculation?  This is not math.  This  
19   is just saying which number is correct is actually  
20   all I am getting at.

21          EXAMINER SEE:  And the witness can answer  
22   the question.

23          A.    I'm not sure.

24          Q.    Okay.  Okay.  I can shorten this up  
25   probably a lot, Ms. Meadows, if you just confirm for

1 me again, I believe -- because I was going to go  
2 through this with actually each of the riders, AES  
3 and I was going to Duke, CEI, Ohio Edison. But just  
4 to confirm for me, MM-25 through MM-30, the amended  
5 application or your testimony, it's not providing the  
6 annual impact for a customer paying the block one  
7 rates on the proposed USF. I believe you testified  
8 no.

9 MR. STINSON: Can I have the question  
10 reread, please.

11 (Record read.)

12 A. Line 21 is calculating the annual cost to  
13 consumers.

14 Q. On MM-26 -- MM-26, line 21, you state  
15 that the annual cost to AES consumers using 1010  
16 kilowatt-hours per month is \$6.97, correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. But based on the first block AES rate of  
19 .0035110, which is found at the top of the page and  
20 then also on line 18, that times 1010 times 12, the  
21 actual cost to consumers appears to be \$42.55. Can  
22 you explain why there is a difference?

23 MR. SCHULER: Same objection as on MM-25.  
24 Assumes facts not in evidence. It is asking the  
25 witness to do compound math on the stand, and it is a

1 compound question.

2 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Would you  
3 accept, subject to check, that -- that AES rate of  
4 .0035110, which is found at the top here and on line  
5 18, times the 1010 kilowatt-hours that you have  
6 listed times the 12 months, that is \$42.55?

7 A. Without verifying, sure.

8 Q. On MM-27, line 21, you state that the  
9 annual cost to Duke consumers using 1046  
10 kilowatt-hours per month is \$3.96. Do you see that?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. But based on the first block Duke rate of  
13 .0021270 found at the top of the page and also on  
14 line 18 times the 1046 kilowatt-hours times 12 months  
15 in a year, the actual cost to consumers appears to be  
16 \$26.70. Will you accept that subject to check?

17 MR. STINSON: I am going to renew my  
18 objection too, your Honor, to the fact this is going  
19 to the rate design that was approved in the NOI phase  
20 of this proceeding.

21 MS. AKHBARI: I will also just say, your  
22 Honor, if Ms. O'Brien's own witness knows this  
23 information and has done this math, she doesn't  
24 necessarily need Ms. Meadows to calculate and confirm  
25 all the numbers she is attempting to put into

1 evidence.

2 MS. COHN: OEG joins that objection.

3 MR. HOLLON: AES Ohio joins that  
4 objection.

5 MR. HAQUE: IEU-Ohio joins Mr. Stinson in  
6 his objection.

7 MR. SCHULER: AEP Ohio joins both.

8 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Of course. We  
9 don't have another opportunity to try to explore the  
10 difference. This is our only opportunity to be able  
11 to do this. We are just trying to understand why  
12 there is this difference. The MM -- line 21 says one  
13 number, but when you do the actual math, it says  
14 another number, so I am just -- we are just trying to  
15 explore the differences because -- why there is a  
16 difference because we have no other opportunity to do  
17 so through discovery or. This is -- the way I  
18 understand it this is sort of it.

19 EXAMINER SEE: This appears to have been  
20 an issue that could have been explored directly  
21 with -- between OCC and the other parties including  
22 ODOD once the information was filed in the docket.  
23 It is not a fact -- it is not a fact that because  
24 there was not an approval of your motion that you did  
25 not have an opportunity to explore the calculations

1 which is part of this phase of the proceeding.

2 Nonetheless, you've made your point as to AES and

3 Duke, and we can move on.

4 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: And just -- thank  
5 you, your Honor. I just -- although the motion may  
6 have been uncrafftly worded --

7 EXAMINER SEE: Thank you. You can move  
8 on to your next question.

9 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Thank you. Can I  
10 talk about MM-29?

11 EXAMINER SEE: Do you have a question?

12 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: I do.

13 EXAMINER SEE: Other than the same  
14 calculation?

15 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Yeah.

16 EXAMINER SEE: Go ahead.

17 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Also referring  
18 to MM-25 through MM-30, what was the source of the  
19 usage that was used in calculating that annual cost  
20 to consumers?

21 A. I don't recall offhand.

22 Q. Turning to your testimony in support of  
23 the Stipulation, on page 4 --

24 EXAMINER SEE: Just a moment. Just a  
25 moment. Page 4.

1 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Page 4.

2 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) And looking  
3 towards -- it's not numbered, but I am looking  
4 towards the bottom of the page, and you reference the  
5 Joint Stipulation approved in Case No. 21-659-EL-USF.  
6 Do you see that?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Can you explain how that Joint  
9 Stipulation is relevant to this proceeding or  
10 specifically why was that referenced here?

11 A. The question was does OCC filing an  
12 application for a rehearing affect the testimony, and  
13 it was referenced because the response was no.

14 Q. But -- yes, that's part of your answer  
15 but then you followed up with you reference the Joint  
16 Stipulation approved in the prior case. And how --  
17 what was the reason for referencing that in your  
18 testimony?

19 A. Because it notes that "Development is  
20 required to 'conform its 2022 USF Rider adjustment.'"

21 Q. Also on page 4 you reference OCC's  
22 application for rehearing of the NOI order. Have you  
23 personally reviewed the OCC AFR in this proceeding?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Turning to the Stipulation paragraph 12,

1 and that is found on page 8. Do you have it?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Okay. Could you -- could you just read  
4 paragraph 12 for me really fast.

5 MR. STINSON: Objection, your Honor. It  
6 speaks for itself.

7 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Paragraph 12  
8 appears to discuss a working group; is that correct?

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. Okay. And it -- the paragraph states  
11 that in -- "The Signatory Parties agree to the  
12 continuation of the USF Rider Working Group formed  
13 pursuant to the stipulation approved by the PUCO in  
14 Case No. 03-2049-EL-UNC." Since you've been at ODOD,  
15 and I think you testified to this in the earlier  
16 phase of this proceeding, when did you start at ODOD?

17 A. I started in 2016.

18 Q. So since you have been at ODOD in 2016,  
19 have there been any meetings scheduled for the  
20 working group?

21 A. Yes, I believe so.

22 Q. And do you know when that would have  
23 been?

24 A. I don't memorize those specific dates.

25 Q. Do you recall, has it been within the



1 last couple years maybe or three years or what kind  
2 of time frame?

3 A. I don't have specific dates.

4 Q. Who is -- who was -- who is on the  
5 working group?

6 A. The signatory parties are included.

7 Q. Whose responsibility is it to schedule a  
8 meeting of the working group?

9 A. I believe it would be Development.

10 Q. When do you anticipate the working group  
11 will next meet?

12 A. I don't have a specific schedule right  
13 now.

14 Q. And would you have to be a signatory  
15 party to participate in this working group?

16 A. I'm not sure on that one.

17 Q. Turning to paragraph 9 of the amended  
18 application, this is the November 21 application, you  
19 state that -- the application states that based on  
20 the methodology approved in the PUCO October 5, '22,  
21 NOI order, ODOD has determined that, on an aggregated  
22 basis, the 2023 revenue requirement will be more than  
23 the 2021 revenue requirement, by "some \$180,773,590"  
24 during the 2023 collection period. This is just --  
25 this is really a clarification question, Ms. Meadows,

1 because I am also looking at the table that you  
2 reference. You say "more than the 2021 revenue  
3 requirement." Was that a typo and you mean to say  
4 2022?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Should that be a correction?

7 A. It should say 2022.

8 Q. Okay. So the sentence should read ODOD  
9 has determined that, on an aggregated basis, the 2023  
10 revenue requirement will be more than the 2022  
11 revenue requirement, by "some 180,773,590" during the  
12 2023 collection period; would that be correct?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Paragraph 9 goes on to state that on an  
15 EDU-specific basis, ODOD's analysis shows that the  
16 2023 revenue requirement of all the EDUs, Ohio Power,  
17 AES, Duke, CEI, Ohio Edison, and Toledo Edison, would  
18 increase over their 2022 revenue requirement?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Is that correct?

21 A. Yes, that's what it states.

22 Q. Okay. Given the significant increases  
23 that we see in Table 1 of the amended application,  
24 given the significant increases in the USF rates in  
25 this proceeding and projected future increases, does

1 ODOD have any plans to mitigate the costs of PIPP  
2 other than to simply pass them through in higher USF  
3 rates?

4 MR. STINSON: Objection. No evidence of  
5 projections -- projected future increases.

6 EXAMINER SEE: Sustained. The objection  
7 is sustained.

8 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: I believe that's  
9 all I have for the witness.

10 EXAMINER SEE: Any redirect, Mr. Stinson?

11 MR. STINSON: If I could have just --  
12 sorry. If I could have just a minute, your Honor.

13 EXAMINER SEE: Okay. Let's go off the  
14 record.

15 (Discussion off the record.)

16 EXAMINER SEE: Let's go back on the  
17 record.

18 Mr. Stinson.

19 MR. STINSON: We have no further  
20 questions, your Honor.

21 - - -

22 EXAMINATION

23 By Examiner See:

24 Q. Ms. Meadows, you have Joint Exhibit 1,  
25 the Joint Stipulation and Recommendation, in front of

1 you?

2 A. I do.

3 Q. Please look at the footnote on page 1.  
4 Take an opportunity to read it to yourself. Is -- is  
5 there some correction that needs to be made to that  
6 footnote in light of the parties that are signatories  
7 or nonopposing parties of Joint Exhibit 1?

8 A. I'm sorry. I'm not sure.

9 Q. Okay. Ms. O'Brien asked you some  
10 questions about MM-25, line 21; MM-25, one of the  
11 attachments to ODOD Exhibit 4.

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. At the bottom of the page on line 21.

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Initially it states that the cost to  
16 consumers, AEP consumers, using 975 kilowatt-hours  
17 and continues.

18 A. Uh-huh.

19 Q. And then there's a reference to a 1008.5.  
20 Do you see that reference?

21 A. I do.

22 Q. Can you determine looking at the other MM  
23 exhibits, MM-25 through 30, whether or not you are  
24 using 975 kilowatt-hours or 1008.5 kilowatt-hours in  
25 that calculation?

1           A.    Without doing the math, I do believe it  
2   is using the 1008.5 as matching the other lines in  
3   the other exhibits, but I would need to do the math  
4   to confirm.

5           Q.    Do you need to take some time to confirm  
6   that?

7           A.    No.

8           Q.    So are you confirming that it is actually  
9   based on 1008.5 kilowatt-hours?

10          A.    I believe it is, yes.

11          Q.    You believe it is, or do you need to take  
12   some time to confirm that it is?

13          A.    Yeah, I wouldn't be able to do it without  
14   confirming for sure.

15          Q.    So do you need to take some time to do  
16   so?

17          A.    Yes, we can.

18          Q.    I will give you that time in just a  
19   moment. You also talked a bit about -- as part of  
20   the Joint Stipulation, there was some discussion  
21   about paragraph 9 on page 5.

22          A.    I'm there.

23          Q.    Okay. Do you recall some discussion  
24   about that particular paragraph of the Stipulation?

25          A.    Yes, I do.

1           Q.    And you said that your understanding is  
2   that the reference in the first sentence to  
3   residential rates is a reference to the PIPP rate?

4           A.    I believe so, yes.

5           Q.    Okay.  You also said it is after  
6   consulting signatory parties.  Would ODOD object to  
7   including others, consulting other parties to this  
8   proceeding, whether it be the Commission Staff or  
9   OCC?

10          A.    No, I don't think we would object to  
11   that.

12          Q.    Now turning to page 12 -- paragraph 12 of  
13   the Joint Stipulation and Recommendation on page 8,  
14   and I believe you were discussing with Ms. O'Brien  
15   the USF Rider Working Group --

16          A.    Yes.

17          Q.    -- correct?  When is the last time you  
18   recall participating in a meeting of that group?

19          A.    I don't recall the specific date.

20          Q.    But you do recall having some USF Rider  
21   Working Group meeting?

22          A.    Yes, I do.

23          Q.    During the pandemic?

24          A.    No, I don't believe it was during the  
25   pandemic.

1 Q. Within the past year?

2 A. No, not specifically.

3 Q. So with that in mind, it's been at least  
4 2019 since a meeting of that group was held.

5 A. That I participated in, yes.

6 Q. Okay. Would there be someone else within  
7 ODOD that would be participating?

8 A. Not that I am aware of, no.

9 Q. So it would be you or your designee.

10 A. Correct.

11 Q. Would ODOD object to a meeting being set  
12 as a part of this Stipulation?

13 A. No.

14 Q. Okay.

15 MR. STINSON: Can I have that question  
16 and answer reread, please? I am having a hard time.

17 EXAMINER SEE: Would ODOD object to a  
18 meeting of the USF Rider Working Group being  
19 scheduled?

20 MR. STINSON: Thank you, your Honor.

21 EXAMINER SEE: And the answer was "no."

22 With that, thank you, Ms. Meadows.

23 Mr. Stinson.

24 MR. STINSON: Yes, your Honor. At this  
25 time I would move for the admission of Development

1 Exhibits 1 through 6 and Joint Exhibit 1.

2 EXAMINER SEE: Are there any objections  
3 to the admission of ODOD Exhibits 1 through 6 and  
4 Joint Exhibit 1?

5 Hearing none, ODOD Exhibits 1 through 6  
6 and Joint Exhibit 1 are admitted into the record.

7 (EXHIBITS ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

8 EXAMINER SEE: You may step down.

9 There is an outstanding issue. Did you  
10 need a moment to confirm the kilowatt-hours used?

11 THE WITNESS: We confirmed it's the 1000.

12 EXAMINER SEE: 1008.5 kilowatt-hours?

13 THE WITNESS: Yes.

14 EXAMINER SEE: Thank you.

15 With that, let's take a brief recess for  
16 10 minutes. We'll resume at 11:40.

17 (Recess taken.)

18 EXAMINER SEE: Let's go back on the  
19 record.

20 Mr. Stinson, does that conclude ODOD's  
21 presentation of its case? Does that conclude ODOD's  
22 presentation of its case?

23 MR. STINSON: Yes, it does, your Honor.  
24 Thank you.

25 EXAMINER SEE: Thank you.



In light of my request of Ms. Meadows regarding footnote 1 on the Stipulation, I recognize that the only party not to have signed the Stipulation as a signatory or a nonopposing party is Staff. Mr. Beeler or Ms. Feldkamp, what is Staff's position in this matter?

MR. BEELER: Staff is not an opposing party, neither supports nor opposes the Stipulation.

EXAMINER SEE: Thank you.

With that, Ms. O'Brien, your witness.

MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Yes. I would like to call James D. Williams.

EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Williams, if you would  
raise your right hand.

(Witness sworn.)

EXAMINER SEE: Have a seat.

Go ahead, Ms. O'Brien.

MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Thank you.

— — —

JAMES D. WILLIAMS

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

DIRECT EXAMINATION

By Ms. Botschner O'Brien:

Q. Good afternoon.

1 MR. STINSON: Your Honor, at some point,  
2 I don't know when, after he's presented for cross,  
3 but I do have a motion to strike portions of the  
4 testimony.

5 EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

6 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Can you please  
7 state your name and address.

8 A. Yes. My name is James Williams. My  
9 address is 65 East State Street, 7th Floor, Columbus,  
10 43215.

11 Q. By whom are you employed and in what  
12 capacity?

13 A. I'm employed by Sterling Employment  
14 Services working on behalf of the OCC as a Senior  
15 Utility Consumer Policy Analyst.

16 EXAMINER SEE: Mr. Williams, I am going  
17 to need you to use the microphone or speak up.

18 THE WITNESS: I'll go with the  
19 microphone, your Honor.

20 EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

21 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) And did you  
22 file testimony in this docket on November 23, 2022?

23 A. Yes, I did.

24 Q. And was that testimony prepared by you or  
25 under your direction?

1           A.    Yes, it was.

2           Q.    And do you have any changes, additions,  
3 or corrections that you would like to go over with  
4 this testimony?

5           A.    I do have some edits.

6           Q.    Okay.

7           A.    The first edit is on page 2, line 11, and  
8 I've removed Ohio Energy Group as being represented  
9 as a signatory party. I've also corrected footnote 2  
10 to reflect that.

11          Q.    Okay.

12          A.    I've also on page 3, line 13, inserted  
13 the word "application" after "September '22."

14          Q.    Okay.

15          A.    And I also have changed footnote 3, 9,  
16 and 10 instead of being "JDW-01," they are just  
17 replaced with "Williams."

18               EXAMINER SEE: And that was footnotes 3?

19               THE WITNESS: That was footnote 3, 9, and  
20 10 --

21               EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

22               THE WITNESS: -- where it had "JDW-01."

23          A.    On page 4, line 7, after "2023," I've  
24 removed the word "that."

25               And then on page 8 after -- I have added

1 a new sentence after line -- line 9, and the new  
2 sentence would read "The Settlement even includes  
3 specific provisions where changes can be made in  
4 residential rates or costs to supply PIPP customers  
5 in 2023 apparently without OCC involvement."

6 EXAMINER SEE: Okay. Try that again.

7 THE WITNESS: The new sentence would read  
8 "The Settlement even includes specific provisions  
9 where changes can be made in residential rates or  
10 costs to supply PIPP customers in 2023 apparently  
11 without OCC involvement." And that's my only  
12 changes.

13 EXAMINER SEE: No. Hold on. You are  
14 going to go for a third time. "The settlement even  
15 includes specific provisions or costs to supply PIPP  
16 customers," after that.

17 THE WITNESS: "Costs to supply PIPP  
18 customers in 2023 apparently without OCC  
19 involvement."

20 EXAMINER SEE: Okay. You may continue.

21 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Your Honor, may I  
22 approach my witness?

23 EXAMINER SEE: Uh-huh.

24 A. And then there was also a change to be  
25 made on page 7, line 6, and it removes the word

1 "any."

2 EXAMINER SEE: It just deleted the word  
3 "any"?

4 THE WITNESS: Yes. It would be  
5 "settlement meetings or settlement negotiations."

6 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: May I approach?

7 A. Yes. There was another slight correction  
8 on that is that it would be "Two days later with  
9 limited settlement meetings or settlement  
10 negotiations."

11 EXAMINER SEE: Are those your only  
12 revisions?

13 THE WITNESS: It is.

14 EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

15 A. That was all.

16 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Okay. May I  
17 approach one more time?

18 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) All right.  
19 Mr. Williams --

20 EXAMINER SEE: Have we marked  
21 Mr. Williams' testimony?

22 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: I have not marked  
23 it yet. Well, actually I did mark it, but I have not  
24 distributed it. I've marked for the record OCC  
25 Exhibit 4. I have just called it No. 4 because we

1 have an OCC Exhibit 1, 2, and 3 from the earlier  
2 hearing.

3 EXAMINER SEE: Let's go off the record.  
4 (Discussion off the record.)

5 EXAMINER SEE: Let's go back on the  
6 record.

7 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

8 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: I am handing the  
9 court reporter and the Examiners what has been marked  
10 as OCC Exhibit 1.

11 Q. (By Ms. Botschner O'Brien) Thank you,  
12 Mr. Williams. With those changes, if I were to ask  
13 you the same questions today under oath, would your  
14 answers be the same?

15 A. Yes.

16 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Okay. I believe  
17 that's all the corrections we have -- questions I  
18 have, your Honor. I would like to move for the  
19 admission of OCC Exhibit 1, subject to cross. Thank  
20 you.

21 EXAMINER SEE: Okay. Any -- Mr. Stinson,  
22 there was --

23 MR. STINSON: Yes, your Honor. Thank  
24 you. I have a series of motions to strike  
25 Mr. Williams' testimony, or portions of his

1 testimony. I would like to begin on page 2, page 2,  
2 line 16, through page 3, line 2. And the basis for  
3 these objections, your Honor, is this is a two-phase  
4 proceeding. We had the notice of intent phase that  
5 has concluded. There has been an Opinion and Order  
6 issued and in that order the Commission found that  
7 the comparison of PIPP generation prices with SSO  
8 prices was beyond the scope of this proceeding. I  
9 move to strike that referenced section of the  
10 testimony because it does compare the PIPP price with  
11 the SSO rates that the PUCO found were outside the  
12 scope of this proceeding.

13 EXAMINER SEE: And, Mr. Stinson, that was  
14 page 2, line 16, through page 3, line?

15 MR. STINSON: 2. And then the same would  
16 hold true for page 3, line 12, beginning with "Not  
17 surprisingly" through page 4, line 8. I can go  
18 through the whole testimony, or we can stop there and  
19 take each section separately, your Honor, whatever  
20 you would desire.

21 EXAMINER SEE: Do you want to -- it  
22 doesn't matter, so you can go either way. Are they  
23 all on the same basis?

24 MR. STINSON: They are except for --

25 EXAMINER SEE: Okay. Let's go through

1 all the ones that are on the same basis then.

2 MR. STINSON: You want the ones on the  
3 same basis? Then we would go to it would be question  
4 and answer 9 on page 8 through question and answer 10  
5 to page -- at the end of page 9, so question and  
6 answer 10.

7 EXAMINER SEE: So --

8 MR. STINSON: Answer 9 and 10.

9 EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

10 MR. STINSON: And question and answer 9,  
11 the basis for that is the OCC -- the testimony claims  
12 that the Stipulation is unreasonable because of the  
13 increase in prices, and those increase in prices are  
14 related to the difference between the PIPP and the  
15 generation -- PIPP generation and SSO rates.  
16 Question and answer 10 goes to the legal arguments  
17 around 4928.542 that were adjudicated in the NOI  
18 proceeding.

19 MR. SCHULER: Your Honor, AEP Ohio will  
20 join ODOD's motion to strike as outlined by  
21 Mr. Stinson.

22 MR. HOLLON: AES Ohio joins.

23 MS. AKHBARI: Duke Energy Ohio joins.

24 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Your Honor, may I  
25 respond?



1 EXAMINER SEE: I am going to give you an  
2 opportunity to respond. Hold on for just a second.

3 Go ahead, Ms. O'Brien.

4 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: The testimony is  
5 attempting to -- it ties into the previous testimony  
6 in the sense that the full -- the full magnitude of  
7 the actual increases on the USF would not be known  
8 until ODOD filed its application to increase rates in  
9 October of 2022 and then the update in November of  
10 2022. And that's what Mr. Williams is explaining in  
11 the part -- page 2 part that Mr. Stinson requests  
12 stricken.

13 He explains further how the \$180 million  
14 increase in the aggregate USF revenue requirement,  
15 which was not known before, how it's primarily  
16 attributed to the higher rates charged to PIPP  
17 consumers and that's identified on page 4, the part  
18 Mr. Stinson wants stricken. And he -- Mr. Williams  
19 explains in answer 9 -- again, the testimony is just  
20 addressing the magnitude of the increases which were  
21 all things we did not know -- we simply did not know  
22 until November, until last week essentially really,  
23 the magnitude of what these increases were going to  
24 be and that's what Mr. Williams is addressing in  
25 answer 9.

1                   That's my response.

2                   EXAMINER SEE: And that's your response  
3 to all three of the requests to strike, correct?

4                   MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: I'm sorry. What?

5                   EXAMINER SEE: That's in full to each  
6 aspect of the motion to strike, correct?

7                   MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: I believe so, if  
8 I've caught them all. His -- his testimony is -- is  
9 going toward the significant rate increases in the  
10 single rider over one month. It's addressing the  
11 magnitude of the rate increases.

12                  EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

13                  MR. STINSON: And if I could just  
14 continue, your Honor, it goes to the methodology that  
15 was approved in the NOI phase. This phase, the  
16 application phase of the USF proceeding, merely takes  
17 the data, the test year data, and applies it to that  
18 methodology.

19                  MR. SCHULER: Your Honor, I would also  
20 add that Ms. Botschner O'Brien's response essentially  
21 leans into Mr. Stinson's motion to strike by saying  
22 that it was information OCC did not know at the time  
23 of filing Mr. Williams' testimony in the NOI phase of  
24 this case. So it is transparently an attempt to  
25 boost the record in a decision that has already been

1 rendered by the Commission.

2 MR. STINSON: And I would correct it as  
3 well, your Honor, the fact that the application was  
4 filed October 31, 2022, and the increase had been  
5 noted there.

6 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: But the  
7 application was updated in November.

8 EXAMINER SEE: Did you have other aspects  
9 of Mr. Williams' testimony that you wish to make  
10 motions to strike, Mr. Stinson?

11 MR. STINSON: Could I have that question  
12 reread, please?

13 EXAMINER SEE: I need to speak up? Were  
14 there other aspects of Mr. Williams' testimony that  
15 you had motions to -- that you were going to make  
16 motions to strike?

17 MR. STINSON: Yes, your Honor, there was  
18 one more. It's really on the -- a similar basis. It  
19 doesn't go to the comparison of PIPP generation  
20 versus SSO prices and the increase, but it does go to  
21 the NOI proceeding and the fact that issues are  
22 raised out of that. It's the same case, the same  
23 parties, the same issues where at question and answer  
24 8 on page 7 carrying over to page 8, line 9, that --  
25 where the diversity of interests is at issue, and the

1 Commission held in the NOI proceeding that that was  
2 not an issue to be considered in this proceeding.

3 MR. SCHULER: AEP Ohio will also join  
4 that motion to strike.

5 EXAMINER SEE: Hold on just a second,  
6 Mr. Schuler. You say question -- all of question --

7 MR. STINSON: Question and answer 8, page  
8 7, to line 9 of page 8.

9 EXAMINER SEE: So are you intending to  
10 exclude the addition to Mr. Williams' testimony?

11 MR. STINSON: No. The sentence he added,  
12 I didn't include that. I assume that's somewhere  
13 between line 10 we will call that.

14 EXAMINER SEE: Okay. Okay.

15 Mr. Schuler.

16 MR. SCHULER: Sorry, your Honor. Yeah.  
17 AEP Ohio would join Mr. Stinson's motion to strike  
18 the question and answer No. 8 as he just described.

19 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: May I respond,  
20 your Honor?

21 EXAMINER SEE: Were any other parties  
22 joining?

23 Yes, you may respond, Ms. O'Brien.

24 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Regarding  
25 question and answer 8, that's -- that's regarding

1 this -- this particular Stipulation that was entered  
2 into a week ago, so it's -- it's regarding this phase  
3 of the case and the limited negotiations that went  
4 on. It wasn't regarding the previous phase of the  
5 case.

6 EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

7 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: So that's what  
8 that question is trying to address.

9 EXAMINER SEE: Okay. Is -- that  
10 concludes the portions -- the sections of  
11 Mr. Williams' testimony that you wish to strike?

12 MR. STINSON: That does conclude my  
13 motions to strike, your Honor.

14 EXAMINER SEE: Okay. The Bench is going  
15 to take some time to confer, and we will be back on  
16 the record shortly.

17 Let's go off the record.

18 (Discussion off the record.)

19 EXAMINER SEE: Let's go back on the  
20 record.

21 After considering the arguments made to  
22 strike portions of Mr. Williams' testimony and the  
23 response by counsel for OCC, the Bench has determined  
24 that we will grant the motion to strike as to page 2,  
25 line 16, through page 3, line 2.

1 Further, we'll grant the motion to strike  
2 as to page 3 commencing on line 12, beginning with  
3 "Not surprisingly" through page 4, line 8.

4 The motion to strike question 8 in its  
5 entirety including the amended sentence -- the  
6 supplemented added sentence is denied.

7 The motion to strike question and answer  
8 9 is likewise denied.

9 As to question and answer 10, the motion  
10 to strike is granted but only granted as to lines 12  
11 through 21 beginning "In addition, the Settlement  
12 contradicts Ohio law" and that continues through line  
13 21 and ends at "regulatory principles."

14 No parties should use any aspect of the  
15 testimony that has been stricken in your briefs.

16 MR. STINSON: Thank you, your Honor.

17 EXAMINER SEE: With that, is there any  
18 cross-examination for this witness? Let's start with  
19 Mr. Haque.

20 MR. HAQUE: No, your Honor.

21 EXAMINER SEE: On behalf of Staff?

22 MS. FELDKAMP: No, your Honor.

23 EXAMINER SEE: On behalf of OEG?

24 MS. COHN: No, your Honor.

25 EXAMINER SEE: On behalf of AEP Ohio?

1 MR. SCHULER: No, your Honor.

2 EXAMINER SEE: On behalf of AES Ohio?

3 MR. HOLLON: No, your Honor.

4 EXAMINER SEE: On behalf of Duke Energy?

5 MS. AKHBARI: No, your Honor.

6 EXAMINER SEE: On behalf of FirstEnergy  
7 operating companies?

8 MR. BREIG: No, your Honor.

9 EXAMINER SEE: Okay.

10 MR. STINSON: And Development has no  
11 cross either, your Honor.

12 EXAMINER SEE: Any redirect, Ms. O'Brien?

13 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: No redirect, your  
14 Honor.

15 EXAMINER SEE: Give the Bench a moment.

16 And the Bench doesn't have any questions  
17 for this witness. And I believe Ms. O'Brien has  
18 already moved for the admission of OCC Exhibit 1, the  
19 testimony of James Williams. Are there any  
20 objections to the admission of OCC Exhibit 1?

21 Hearing none, OCC Exhibit 1 is admitted  
22 into the record.

23 (EXHIBIT ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE.)

24 EXAMINER SEE: Let's go off the record  
25 for a second.

1 (Discussion off the record.)

2 EXAMINER SEE: Let's go back on the  
3 record.

4 Thank you, Mr. Williams.

5 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

6 EXAMINER SEE: Do we need a briefing  
7 schedule?

8 I am going to take from the silence that  
9 the parties are willing to submit for the  
10 Commission's consideration the record as it stands  
11 without briefing.

12 Is that true, Mr. Haque?

13 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: I think -- I  
14 think our office would want -- would want -- I was  
15 basically looking at the testimony. I think our  
16 office would like some kind of a briefing if that is  
17 being offered, yeah.

18 EXAMINER SEE: You need to make -- you  
19 wish to have a briefing schedule; is that correct?

20 MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: Yes.

21 EXAMINER SEE: And what -- let's go off  
22 the record.

23 (Discussion off the record.)

24 EXAMINER SEE: Let's go back on the  
25 record.



1           After some discussion, counsel for OCC  
2       has represented that it will pay for an expedited  
3       transcript -- one-day transcript so the transcript is  
4       filed by close of business tomorrow, December 1; is  
5       that correct, Ms. O'Brien?

6           MS. BOTSCHNER O'BRIEN: That's correct.

7           EXAMINER SEE: With that, there has been  
8       extensive discussion by the parties attempting to  
9       come to an agreement on the briefing schedule. In  
10      light of this short turnaround time given that these  
11      rate -- the new USF rates need to be in effect on a  
12      bill-rendered basis for bills issued January 1, 2023,  
13      in consideration that the Opinion and Order in this  
14      phase of the proceeding needs to be put before the  
15      Commission, the parties have agreed to keep their  
16      briefs under 15 pages, double spaced, at least  
17      12-point type; and after considering the parties'  
18      proposals, initial briefs will be due by noon --  
19      let's switch that, by close of business December 6,  
20      and replies will be due by noon December 8.

21           All parties are to serve their brief and  
22      initial -- initial brief and reply brief on all  
23      parties to this proceeding via e-mail in addition to  
24      filing it with docketing which means you will serve a  
25      courtesy copy to myself and Ms. Marcelletti.

1 Is there anything further? Does anyone  
2 need the e-mail addresses of the AEs assigned?

3 MR. STINSON: Yes.

4 EXAMINER SEE: Greta, G-R-E-T-A, dot  
5 S-E-E @PUC -- PUCO.Ohio, spelled out, dot gov. I  
6 think that's right. All the parties should have my  
7 e-mail address.

8 EXAMINER MARCELLETTI: Isabel,  
9 I-S-A-B-E-L, dot Marcelletti, M-A-R-C-E-L-L-E-T-T-I,  
10 same old shebang.

11 MR. STINSON: L-E --

12 EXAMINER MARCELLETTI: I'm sorry?

13 MR. STINSON: L-L-E-T-T-I?

14 EXAMINER MARCELLETTI: Yes. It's a long  
15 Italian thing.

16 MR. SCHULER: You said  
17 M-A-R-C-E-L-L-E-T-T-I?

18 EXAMINER MARCELLETTI: Yes.

19 MR. SCHULER: I-S-A-B-E-L?

20 EXAMINER MARCELLETTI: Yes.

21 EXAMINER SEE: And I will forward a  
22 confirmation of this so that everyone has the proper  
23 e-mail addresses.

24 Is there anything further? Any aspect  
25 about the briefing schedule that is not clear?

1                   Mr. Stinson.

2                   MR. STINSON:  Nothing further, your  
3 Honor.  Thank you.

4                   EXAMINER SEE:  Thank you all.  Hearing is  
5 adjourned.

6                   (Thereupon, at 12:51 p.m., the hearing  
7 was adjourned.)

8                                   - - -

9                                   CERTIFICATE

10                   I do hereby certify that the foregoing is  
11 a true and correct transcript of the proceedings  
12 taken by me in this matter on Wednesday, November 30,  
13 2022, and carefully compared with my original  
14 stenographic notes.

15

16

17                                   \_\_\_\_\_  
18                                   Karen Sue Gibson, Registered  
                                 Merit Reporter.

18

19                   (KSG-7377)

20

21

22

23

24

25

- - -

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

**12/1/2022 11:18:04 AM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 22-0556-EL-USF**

Summary: Transcript November 30th 2022 In the Matter of the Application of the Ohio Department of Development for an Order Approving Adjustments to the Universal Service Fund Rider of Jurisdictional Ohio Electric Distribution Utilities. electronically filed by Mr. Ken Spencer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Gibson, Karen Sue Mrs.