BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company for Authority to Provide for a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to R.C. § 4928.143 in the Form of an Electric Security Plan	))))))))	Case No. 25-0092-EL-SSO

APPLICATION

Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company (the "Companies") request Commission approval of the Companies' sixth Electric Security Plan ("ESP VI") for the period beginning with the date that the Companies' new base distribution rates go into effect in their currently pending base rate case ("2024 Base Rate Case")[1] through May 31, 2028. ESP VI is modeled after the programs, recovery mechanisms, and auction process that the Commission recently approved in the Companies' fifth Electric Security Plan ("ESP V"),[2] aligned with the proposed term of ESP VI, with limited adjustments to the distribution-related riders. Proposed changes from the ESP V Opinion & Order[3] ("ESP V Order") include:

- **Rider DCR** - Defined for the full term of ESP VI with annual cap increases of approximately 2.3%-2.6% of proposed base distribution revenue.
- **Rider SCR** - Defined for the full term of ESP VI, with revenue caps and carrying costs at the weighted average cost of debt, and to include recovery of the ESP V balance.
- **Rider VMC** - Defined for the full term of ESP VI with revenue caps based on the Companies' proposed enhanced vegetation management program.

---

[1] Case No. 24-0468-EL-AIR, *et al*.
[2] Case No. 23-301-EL-SSO. On December 18, 2024, the Commission approved the Companies' withdrawal of ESP V; the Companies will revert to their prior ESP IV effective February 1, 2025.
[3] Case No. 23-301-EL-SSO, Opinion and Order (May 15, 2024).

- **Rider EEC** – Includes carrying costs at the weighted average cost of debt.

The result is an ESP that supports a diverse array of interests, embodies the Companies' commitment to positively impact their customers and the communities they serve, and is familiar to parties who participated in ESP V.

Like ESP V, ESP VI includes terms and conditions which promote reliability, affordability, and stewardship. Regarding reliability, the Companies propose to continue or re-establish provisions authorized in ESP V that support capital investments in the Companies' distribution system and important maintenance activities, as well as their continued demand response program for commercial and industrial customers. To promote affordability, ESP VI will continue to procure Standard Service Offer ("SSO") generation supply through a competitive bidding process ("CBP"), including the CBP enhancements that were approved in ESP V, which are designed to increase supplier participation and reduce risk. The Companies have also included rate design and cost recovery proposals to mitigate bill impacts on customers. In addition, the Companies are proposing a portfolio of the residential energy efficiency ("EE") programs that were approved in ESP V to help customers save money on their electric bills.

With regard to stewardship, the Companies are privileged to serve over two million customers. The Companies are in a unique position to positively impact their customers, communities, and other stakeholders. The proposed portfolio of EE programs will help customers save money on their electric bills and protect the environment. In addition, the Companies are proposing to spend $6.5 million annually over the term of ESP VI to support low-income and senior citizen customers and other initiatives to enhance the customer experience, which will not be recovered from customers.

For these reasons, and as explained further below, the Companies respectfully request that the Commission approve the proposed ESP VI without modification, including all necessary accounting authority; issue a procedural schedule that allows ESP VI to begin on the effective date of the Companies' new base distribution rates in the 2024 Base Rate Case; enables the Companies to conduct ESP VI SSO auctions consistent with their proposed auction schedule;[4] and grant such other relief as necessary to approve ESP VI.

I. Introduction — the Companies' Electric Security Plan

1. The Companies request authority to provide an SSO pursuant to R.C. 4928.141. As their SSO, and in accordance with R.C. 4928.143 and Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-35, the Companies propose to implement this ESP VI to continue providing, among other things, generation service to non-shopping customers through May 31, 2028.

2. ESP VI proposes to continue providing generation supply to non-shopping customers through a CBP under the same terms and conditions that were approved by the Commission in ESP V and in the Companies' return to ESP IV. This approach has produced competitive market-based prices for SSO customers and uses a descending clock auction format, as well as a staggered and laddered schedule of procurements and a mix of products designed to smooth out generation prices. The process is designed to provide customers competitive pricing for generation service and mitigate price volatility. ESP VI includes the CBP modifications that were approved in ESP V, which will enhance the process's benefits for customers by encouraging supplier participation, reducing risk premiums, and minimizing risk of supplier default.

[4] *See* Attachment RJL-9 to the Direct Testimony of Robert J. Lee.

3. In addition to providing for the competitive supply of generation, ESP VI includes other provisions, comprising an overall package that addresses the broad range of issues contemplated within the scope of Am. Sub. S.B. 221.

4. The Companies have a strong track record of delivering reliable service. ESP VI also includes provisions to support the Companies' ability to maintain reliability and continue the path to a modern and more reliable and resilient delivery system. The Companies propose to continue their capital investment riders, consistent with rate design and other modifications authorized in ESP V, reintroduce an enhanced vegetation management program, and reinstate riders for storm response and vegetation management expenses that were previously approved as part of ESP V. These programs will support the Companies' delivery system through continued capital investment and maintenance.

5. In addition, the Companies are proposing the same portfolio of residential EE initiatives that were approved in ESP V to help customers control their energy costs and protect the environment. The Companies also propose to continue their existing demand response program for commercial and industrial customers, through Rider ELR, with the modifications authorized by the Commission in ESP V, to provide a resource to curtail load during emergency events.

6. While ESP VI supports reliability and stewardship, it is also focused on maintaining customer affordability. In addition to incorporating the CBP enhancements approved in ESP V, the Companies' proposals in ESP VI include important measures to mitigate bill impacts, including cost caps, delayed cost recovery of storm expenses, and the phase-down of credits to demand response participating customers that was approved by the Commission in ESP V.

7. ESP VI also seeks to streamline the Companies' tariffs and improve their clarity for customers by proposing to eliminate several inactive riders and related tariff provisions, as approved in ESP V.

8. ESP VI also includes the Companies' commitment to contribute $6.5 million annually during the term of ESP VI, without cost recovery from customers, for bill payment assistance to low-income and senior citizen customers, and to support customers in their decision to adopt electric vehicles. The Companies' Application incorporates by reference the testimony of the following witnesses (which testimony is being filed concurrently with this Application):

Witness	**Topic(s)**
Santino Fanelli	• ESP VI overview, including rates and tariffs • Stewardship initiatives without cost recovery • Projected financial statements for ESP VI • ESP vs. MRO "More Favorable in the Aggregate" test • How ESP VI supports state policies
Gregory Gawlik	• Potential change to the Companies' Ohio tangible personal property tax obligations
Robert Lee	• SSO CBP and associated documents
Andrew Lubich	• Companies' storm restoration and support for Rider SCR • Companies' reliability performance, alignment with customer expectations, emphasis on and dedication of resources to reliability, and support for distribution riders
Brandon McMillen	• Continuation of and proposed changes to the Delivery Capital Recovery Rider ("Rider DCR"), Advanced Metering Infrastructure / Modern Grid Rider ("Rider AMI"), Non-Market Based Services Rider ("Rider NMB") Pilot Program, Economic Load Response Program Rider ("Rider ELR"), and Economic Development Rider ("Rider EDR") • Proposal to re-establish the Energy Efficiency Cost Recovery Rider ("Rider EEC")

Edward Miller	• Proposal to re-establish residential energy efficiency programs
Dhara Patel	• SSO retail rates • Estimated customer impacts of ESP VI
Courtney Urbancic	• Proposal to eliminate inactive riders • Proposal to re-establish the Storm Cost Recovery Rider (“Rider SCR”) • Proposal to re-establish the Vegetation Management Cost Recovery Rider (“Rider VMC”)
Tyler Woody	• Companies’ vegetation management practices • Proposal for an enhanced vegetation management program

9. A proposed Legal Notice is attached as Attachment 1 to this Application, as required by Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-35-04(B).

10. The testimony filed supports the conclusion that ESP VI in the aggregate is more favorable as compared to the expected results that would otherwise apply under a Market Rate Offer.

11. Accordingly, the Companies request approval of ESP VI, as described further below and in the Companies’ witnesses’ testimony. In Section IX of this Application, the Companies have proposed a procedural schedule. This schedule allows intervenors to prepare for hearing and affords the Commission time to issue an Opinion and Order within the timeframe contemplated by R.C. 4928.143.

Following are the proposed terms of ESP VI.

II. Generation

12. The Companies propose to continue acquiring generation to serve SSO customers through May 31, 2028 using the same CBP approved in ESP V and in the Companies’ return to ESP IV. Specifically, to encourage supplier participation, decrease

risk premiums, and reduce the risk of supplier default, the Companies propose to continue the elimination of 36-month contracts from the SSO supply portfolio, the application of the modified collateral requirements for winning SSO suppliers, and the use of a streamlined bidding process and documents, as approved in ESP V.[5] The testimony of CRA Vice President Robert J. Lee describes the Companies' proposed descending-clock format CBP and auction schedule.

13. The pricing resulting from the outcome of the CBP will continue to be recovered through the Generation Service Rider ("Rider GEN"), with reconciliation through the Generation Cost Reconciliation Rider ("Rider GCR"). The testimony of Rates Analyst Dhara Patel explains the Companies' proposal to continue their SSO recovery mechanisms with no changes.

14. The Companies will separately purchase renewable energy credits to meet the renewable energy resource requirements of R.C. 4928.64 through December 31, 2026, at which time the requirements end. They propose to continue recovering all costs related to the procurement of RECs through the Alternative Energy Resource Rider ("Rider AER"). Ms. Patel's testimony describes Rider AER and the processes of updating and auditing the Rider.

III. Distribution

15. The Companies propose to continue their Delivery Capital Recovery Rider ("Rider DCR"), with modification, during the period of ESP VI. Through Rider DCR, which was first established in ESP II and continued in ESPs III, IV, and V, the Companies have the opportunity to earn a return of and on plant-in-service that was not included in the

[5] As approved in Case No. 23-0781-EL-UNC, the Companies will also continue the use of a capacity proxy price, when needed, to help manage the risk of potential disruptions in the wholesale capacity auctions.

rate base in the Companies' last distribution rate case. The Companies' ESP VI proposal incorporates modifications approved by the Commission in ESP V, which will help to standardize the Companies with their peer utilities, including: limiting Rider DCR to FERC Accounts 360-374; using actual plant balances; changing the timing of the filings; modifying the rate design based on a percentage of base distribution revenue; and instituting "hard" annual revenue caps that are dependent on the Companies' reliability performance. During the term of ESP VI, the Companies seek to increase their annual Rider DCR revenue caps by approximately 2.3% - 2.6% of their proposed base distribution revenue to better align with similar mechanisms of other utilities in Ohio. The Companies are also seeking a one-time increase to the Rider DCR caps during the term of ESP VI if the Companies' tangible personal property tax expense increases despite the Companies' efforts to limit such an increase through appeals to the Ohio Tax Commissioner, as further described in the testimonies of Assistant Controller, Tax Gregory Gawlik and Manager of Rates and Regulatory Affairs Brandon McMillen.

16. Rider DCR supports system reliability through capital investment in the Companies' delivery systems. Director of Operations Andrew Lubich's testimony explains how the Companies are placing sufficient emphasis on and dedicating sufficient resources to reliability and demonstrates how the Companies' and customers' expectations align. Manager of Ohio Rates and Regulatory Affairs Brandon McMillen's testimony explains Rider DCR, the proposed changes to Rider DCR's terms and conditions, the Companies' proposed annual increases in revenue caps, and the processes for updating and auditing the Rider, as well as the Companies' proposal to base the level of annual aggregate revenue cap increases on the Companies' reliability performance.

17. During the term of ESP VI, the Companies also propose to continue their Advanced Metering Infrastructure / Modern Grid Rider ("Rider AMI"), under the same terms and conditions approved in ESP V. Rider AMI recovers the costs of approved grid modernization programs, with the terms and conditions for cost recovery authorized by the Commission in the respective grid modernization cases.[6] These initiatives further the development of a reliable and resilient distribution grid, enable customers to make informed decisions about their energy usage that control costs and result in carbon reductions, and enhance a robust marketplace in which third-party providers can offer customers innovative products and services using interval data. Mr. McMillen's testimony explains Rider AMI and the processes for updating and auditing the Rider.

18. Pursuant to R.C. 4928.143(B)(2)(h), the Companies propose to re-implement their Storm Cost Recovery Rider ("Rider SCR"). In ESP VI, Rider SCR would be implemented under the terms and conditions approved in ESP V, but with modifications to establish revenue caps and apply carrying charges. Rider SCR will return to customers, or recover from customers, the Companies' incremental storm expenses compared to levels recovered in base rates, subject to reconciliation and carrying charges. In ESP VI, the Companies also seek to recover the Rider SCR balances deferred under ESP V. Rider SCR will help ensure that recovery of the Companies' major storm expense better aligns with the timing of storm restoration work and the service benefits realized. The testimony of Rates Analyst Courtney Urbancic explains Rider SCR, the processes for updating and auditing the Rider, and proposed revenue caps, and Mr. Lubich's testimony describes how Rider SCR will support the Companies' storm practices.

---

[6] *See, e.g.*, Case No. 22-704-EL-UNC, phase two of the Companies' distribution grid modernization plan ("Grid Mod II"), which was approved by the Commission on December 18, 2024.

19. Pursuant to R.C. 4928.143(B)(2)(h), the Companies also propose to reinstate the Vegetation Management Cost Recovery Rider ("Rider VMC"). In ESP VI, Rider VMC would be implemented under the terms and conditions approved in ESP V, but with modifications to the proposed revenue caps. Rider VMC would recover incremental vegetation management operation and maintenance ("O&M") expenses compared to baseline levels in the test year in the Companies' last base distribution rate case. Rider VMC would ensure that customers are paying for the Companies' actual vegetation management expenses, subject to revenue caps, reconciliation, and audits. Ms. Urbancic's testimony explains Rider VMC, the processes for reconciling and auditing the Rider, and proposed revenue caps.

20. Rider VMC will also support the Companies' proposed enhanced vegetation management program. Under this program, described in the testimony of General Manager, Distribution Vegetation Management, Tyler Woody, the Companies will accelerate removal of trees and brush, mitigating the Companies' most frequent cause of outages and improving reliability.

IV. Transmission

21. For the term of ESP VI, the Companies propose to continue their Non-Marked Based Services Rider ("Rider NMB") under the same terms and conditions that were approved in ESP V. Rider NMB recovers non-market-based transmission related charges which are imposed on the Companies by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or any regional transmission organization, such as PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. ("PJM").

In addition, in ESP VI, the Companies propose to continue their Rider NMB Pilot Program under the same terms and conditions authorized in ESP V. The Rider NMB Pilot Program, which was first approved in the Companies' ESP IV, provides an opportunity for certain customers to shop for transmission services – similar to shopping for generation service. The Companies are proposing in ESP VI to re-open the expansion of the Pilot, as was approved in ESP V, as explained in Mr. McMillen's testimony.

V. Energy Efficiency, Economic Development, and Job Retention

22. The Companies fully support energy efficiency and recognize the numerous benefits of providing energy efficiency programs to their customers. In ESP VI, the Companies propose a portfolio of residential energy efficiency programs approved by the Commission in ESP V, specifically: a smart thermostat rebate program, energy education, and a low-income energy efficiency program. As discussed in the testimony of Manager of Energy Efficiency Compliance & Development Edward Miller, these programs will help customers use electricity more efficiently and save on their electric bills while reducing carbon emissions. These programs are estimated to provide significant benefits to customers.

23. As part of its energy efficiency proposal, the Companies propose to continue the Community Connections program with increased funding, as approved in ESP V. This program was originally approved in the Companies' previous base distribution rate case and subsequent ESPs. The Community Connections program is designed to assist low-income customers through installation of a variety of energy efficiency projects.

24. To recover the costs of these energy efficiency programs, and pursuant to R.C. 4928.143(B)(2)(h) and (i) and R.C. 4905.70, the Companies propose to re-instate the

Energy Efficiency Cost Recovery Rider ("Rider EEC"). In ESP VI, Rider EEC would be implemented under the terms and conditions approved in ESP V, but with a proposed modification to apply carrying charges monthly to any over- or under-recovered Rider EEC balances at the Companies' current approved cost of debt, as further discussed in Mr. McMillen's testimony.

25. The Companies propose to continue their Economic Load Response Program Rider ("Rider ELR") pursuant to the same terms and conditions that were approved in ESP V. Specifically, customers will have the option of directly participating in PJM Capacity Market Demand Response programs. Also, the Companies will gradually scale down credits to participating customers through Rider ELR and the Economic Development Rider ("Rider EDR") provision "b" to balance rate impacts to participating and non-participating customers. Consistent with the ESP V Order, Rider ELR participants may reset their firm service levels annually, and they will be subject to annual performance testing by the Companies or PJM. The penalty for non-compliance will be modified to eliminate the ECE charge. Mr. McMillen's testimony discusses the Companies' Rider ELR proposal and recovery of Rider ELR credits through Rider EDR.

26. In addition, over the term of ESP VI, the Companies will contribute $6.5 million annually, without recovery from customers, to promote stewardship in the Companies' service territories. Director of Rates and Regulatory Affairs Santino Fanelli discusses the Companies' ESP VI stewardship proposals in his testimony. This commitment includes the following programs that were approved in ESP V:

a. $4.5 million annually to support low-income customers through bill payment assistance, including $2 million annually targeted to senior citizen customers at risk of disconnection. Customers under 300% of federal income guidelines will be eligible for these ESP VI bill payment assistance programs, consistent with ESP V, and any unused amounts in a given year of ESP VI, including incremental administrative costs, will increase the amount available in the next year.

b. $2 million annually to help customers in their decision to adopt electric vehicles and understand how to maximize the benefits of their investment.

VI. Tariffs, Riders, and Deferrals

27. In ESP VI, the Companies seek to streamline and clarify their tariffs, including by reducing the number of riders and relevant tariff provisions to heighten customer understanding. The Companies propose to re-establish three riders, modify existing riders, and eliminate 18 riders and tariff provisions. Mr. Fanelli's testimony includes a list of the Companies' riders and relevant tariff provisions, divided into four categories: (1) Continue, No Changes; (2) Continue, With Changes; (3) Eliminate, Remove; and (4) New Tariff. The proposed changes to Riders AMI, DCR, DSE, EDR and ELR, and the re-establishment of Rider EEC are more fully described in the testimony of Mr. McMillen. The re-establishment of Riders VMC and SCR is discussed in the testimony of Ms. Urbancic.

VII. State Policies under R.C. 4928.02

28. ESP VI is more favorable in the aggregate to customers as compared to the expected results that would otherwise occur under an MRO alternative, and it provides

substantial customer benefits. Mr. Fanelli's testimony explains the relative benefits of ESP VI compared to an MRO.

29. The Companies' service territories have experienced high levels of shopping. Many shopping customers in the Companies' territories have participated in governmental aggregation programs. ESP VI presents no changes that would adversely affect governmental aggregation in the Companies' territories.

30. The policies of this state, as expressed in R.C. 4928.02, generally seek to promote, among other things: (1) reliable, reasonably priced electric service; (2) vigorous retail electric competition; and (3) reliable and cost-effective distribution and transmission service. ESP VI furthers these policies by providing for affordable distribution rates, while allowing for recovery of capital investments and important maintenance activities to maintain reliable service. ESP VI also provides non-shopping customers with competitively priced retail generation service, while allowing for active retail electric competition.

31. Mr. Fanelli's testimony further discusses state policies set forth under R.C. 4928.02.

VIII. Regulatory Requirements

32. Pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-35-03(B)(2), the Companies have provided justification for their proposed CBP plan. Mr. Lee's testimony supports the proposed ESP VI CBP, which is the same as the CBP approved by the Commission in ESP V and the CBP the Companies will be using during their return to ESP IV.

33. Pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-35-03(C)(2), the Companies have included pro forma financial projections of the effect of the ESP's implementation upon

the electric utility for the duration of the ESP. Mr. Fanelli's testimony discusses this information.

34. Pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-35-03(C)(3), the Companies have included projected rate impacts by customer class/rate schedules for the duration of the ESP, including post-ESP impacts of deferrals, if any, associated with their proposed ESP VI. Ms. Patel's testimony discusses this information.

35. Pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-35-03(B)(3) and (C)(4), the Companies state that their corporate separation plan is publicly available as filed in Case No. 09-462-EL-UNC and approved in Case No. 10-388-EL-SSO. The Companies have obtained no waivers related to their approved corporate separation plan. Further, in accordance with Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-35-03(E), the Companies' corporate separation plan is compliant with R.C. 4928.17, Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-37, and is consistent with the policies contained in R.C. 4928.02. On September 3, 2024, the Companies filed an application to amend their corporate separation plan, which is pending in Case No. 24-867-EL-UNC. The Companies' amended plan incorporates the recommendations of the Commission's auditor in the audit report filed on September 13, 2021 in Case No. 17-974-EL-UNC. The Companies' amended corporate separation plan is compliant with R.C. 4928.17, Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-37, and is consistent with the policies contained in R.C. 4928.02

36. Further, pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-35-03(C)(5), the Companies' operational support plan has been implemented, and the Companies are not aware of any outstanding problems with the implementation of their operational support plan.

37. Pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-35-03(B)(4) and (C)(6), the Companies' ESP VI will not affect governmental aggregation programs or implementation of R.C. 4928.20(I), (J) and (K).

38. If this ESP VI application is inconsistent with the Commission's rules, the Companies request waivers of those rules to the extent that the Commission deems necessary to approve and implement this Plan.

39. As required by Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-35-03(G), workpapers are included with the filing of the Application in this proceeding.

IX. Procedural Schedule

40. The Companies recommend the following procedural schedule, which will provide intervening parties an adequate opportunity for discovery and preparation for hearing while still providing the Commission with a reasonable amount of time to render a decision within the 275-day time frame provided in R.C. 4928.143. While this proposed schedule is more accelerated than the schedule adopted for ESP V, in light of the substantial similarities between ESP V as approved and ESP VI as proposed, a lengthy procedural schedule should not be necessary in this case. A shorter procedural schedule will also facilitate alignment of the beginning of ESP VI with the effective date of the Companies' new base distribution rates in the 2024 Base Rate Case. To facilitate this proposed schedule, the Companies will not oppose motions for intervention in ESP VI filed by any ESP V party.

Application filed	January 31, 2025
Technical Conference	February 21, 2025
Motions to intervene due	March 3, 2025

Intervenor testimony due	April 30, 2025
Discovery requests cutoff except deposition notices	May 16, 2025
Staff testimony due	June 13, 2025
Procedural Conference	June 20, 2025
Evidentiary Hearing	July 7, 2025

41. The Companies request that, based upon the foregoing procedural schedule, the Commission render a decision approving this Application that would comply with the statutory approval time limit of 275 days and allow for ESP VI to become effective on the same date as new base distribution rates.

42. The term of ESP VI is the period during which the standard service offer provided by it is in effect, *i.e.*, from the date that the Companies' new base distribution rates go into effect in the 2024 Base Rate Case through May 31, 2028, but ESP VI shall remain in effect until the effective date of the Companies' next electric security plan, except that certain provisions will continue after May 31, 2028 to the extent such provisions are necessary to carry out the terms and conditions of ESP VI.

43. For the foregoing reasons, the Companies respectfully request that:

i. The Commission find that the Companies' proposed ESP VI is more favorable in the aggregate as compared to the expected results that would otherwise apply under R.C. 4928.142;

ii. The Commission approve the proposed ESP VI without modification, including all proposed riders and tariffs, as well all necessary accounting authority; and

iii. The Commission grant such further relief as necessary to approve ESP VI.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this has been filed this 31st day of January, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine E. Watchorn (0075919)
Counsel of Record
Zachary E. Woltz (0096669)
Megan Luby (0101213)
FirstEnergy Service Company
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 1170
Columbus, Ohio 43215
(614) 437-0183
cwatchorn@firstenergycorp.com
mailto:zwoltz@firstenergycorp.com
mluby@firstenergycorp.com

(Will accept service via email)

/s/ Christine E. Watchorn
N. Trevor Alexander (0080713)
Mark T. Keaney (0095318)
Kari D. Hehmeyer (0096284)
Samantha R. Meng (0103524)
Benesch, Friedlander, Coplan & Aronoff LLP
41 South High Street, Suite 2600
Columbus, Ohio 43215-6164
(614) 223-9300
talexander@beneschlaw.com
mkeaney@beneschlaw.com
khehmeyer@beneschlaw.com
smeng@beneschlaw.com

Attorneys for Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company

Application Attachment 1

LEGAL NOTICE

Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company (collectively "The Companies") are subsidiary electric utility operating companies of FirstEnergy Corp. in Ohio. The Companies have filed with the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("PUCO") Case No. 25-0092-EL-SSO, *In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and The Toledo Edison Company for Authority to Provide for a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to R.C. § 4928.143 in the Form of an Electric Security Plan*. In this case, the Commission will consider The Companies' request for approval of an Electric Security Plan ("ESP") that includes its standard service offer ("SSO"), that will become effective on the effective of new base distribution rates and continue through May 31, 2028. The ESP, which includes the SSO pricing for generation, also addresses provisions regarding distribution service, alternative energy resource requirements, energy efficiency requirements, and other matters. Estimated average rate impacts to standard residential non-shopping customers of the Companies that use 750 kWh per month are 2.7% in the initial year of ESP VI, with average annual impacts of 1.7% over the ESP's term. The impacts on individual customers will vary. The Companies' ESP is subject to changes, including changes as to amount and form, by the PUCO.

Any person may request to become a party to the proceeding.

Further information, such as requesting a copy of the filing, may be obtained by contacting the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793, viewing the Commission's web page at http://www.puc.state.oh.us, or contacting the Commission's call center at 1-800-686-7826.