

Volume 12, Issue 51 • December 29, 2023

This Summary Contains Confidential and Privileged Information Pursuant to a Confidentiality Agreement and the Attorney-Client Privilege.
DO NOT DISTRIBUTE OR SHARE WITH NON-MEMBERS.

Statewide

Administrative Law Judges (ALJs) Reconsider Confidential Treatment of Ohio Valley Electric Corporation (OVEC) Documents (Case No. 21-477-EL-RDR)

Summary: In the wake of media coverage on Duke Energy Ohio, AEP Ohio, and the Dayton Power and Light Company's efforts to conceal certain information that they claimed was trade secret – even though that information is publicly available elsewhere – the ALJs established a procedure to reconsider what information is truly confidential and needs to be protected, and what information can be released to the public.

AEP Ohio

OMAEG Submits Reply Brief in AEP's Electric Security Plan V (ESP V) Case (Case Nos. 23-23-EL-SSO, et al.)

Summary: The OMAEG and 11 other parties rebutted the arguments made by the few parties opposing the settlement and once more urged the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (PUCO) to adopt the settlement that was signed by the majority of parties.

Among other benefits, the settlement significantly reduces the more than \$4 billion in new and increased charges to customers that AEP initially proposed and expands participation for both the BTCR Pilot and the IRP-E.

Additionally, the settlement significantly reduces the amounts that AEP can recover through various riders (i.e., Distribution Investment Rider caps decreased to \$1.022 billion from \$2.712 billion and Enhanced Service Reliability Rider caps decreased to \$244 million from \$539 million), removes a number of costly programs, withdraws several new riders, and decreases AEP's return on equity to 9.70% from 10.65%.

Read OMAEG's reply brief [here](#).

(Continued)

**Cooperative Electric Utility, Buckeye Power Files Comments in Amazon Data Services' Reasonable Arrangement (RA) Case
(Case No. 23-0858-EL-AEC)**

Summary: Buckeye Power (Buckeye) submitted comments asserting that the proposed RA between Amazon and AEP may significantly shift transmission costs to Buckeye's member cooperatives and their members during the term of the proposed arrangement. Buckeye requested that Amazon and AEP provide assurances – similar to those that have been provided to AEP's own residential customers – the costs of this arrangement will not be shifted to Buckeye customers. Alternatively, Buckeye asked that the Commission conduct a study or obtain a third-party audit to confirm that the application of the BTCR Pilot construct in this arrangement does not result in cost shifting to other Ohio residential consumers. Amazon and AEP both opposed Buckeye, arguing Buckeye's concern is beyond the scope and unrelated to the merits of the proceeding, and its cost-shifting concerns are wholly speculative and relate to how wholesale transmission costs are allocated pursuant to a FERC-jurisdictional tariff.

**Centerpoint Energy (formerly Vectren)
Centerpoint Decreases Default Standard Choice Offer (SCO) Rate**

Summary: Based on recent competitive auctions, the default service rate for Centerpoint decreased to \$0.38023/ccf from \$0.38950/ccf, effective Jan. 1, 2024.

**FirstEnergy
OMAEG Rebutts FirstEnergy and the Ohio Energy Group's Arguments on Increasing or Modifying FirstEnergy's Delivery Capital Recovery Rider (Rider DCR) in ESP V
(Case No. 23-301-EL-SSO)**

Summary: The OMAEG, the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel (OCC), and the Northwest Ohio Aggregation Coalition (NOAC) [responded](#) to both the Ohio Energy Group (OEG) and FirstEnergy's opposition (on the same grounds) to staying the re-approval, increases, or modifications to Rider DCR (which has apparent ties to the corrupt House Bill 6 and former PUCO Chair Samuel Randazzo's illicit dealings with FirstEnergy) as part of FirstEnergy's ESP V. The OMAEG, OCC, and NOAC pointed out the flaws in OEG and FirstEnergy's speculative arguments that the stay would have negative financial impacts on FirstEnergy. The coalition also explained it is imperative the PUCO determine whether customers have wrongly paid for the illegal HB 6 activities and bribes to Randazzo to settle the prior ESP cases, including the establishment of distribution riders that have collected hundreds of millions of dollars from customers.