

**BEFORE**  
**THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

<b>In the Matter of the Application of Ohio</b>	)	
<b>Power Company for Authority to Establish</b>	)	
<b>a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to R.C.</b>	)	<b>Case No. 13-2385-EL-SSO</b>
<b>4928.143, in the Form of an Electric</b>	)	
<b>Security Plan.</b>	)	

<b>In the Matter of the Application of Ohio</b>	)	
<b>Power Company for Approval of Certain</b>	)	<b>Case No. 13-2386-EL-AAM</b>
<b>Accounting Authority.</b>	)	

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF STEPHEN E. BENNETT**  
**ON BEHALF OF**  
**THE RETAIL ENERGY SUPPLY ASSOCIATION**

**May 6, 2014**

1   **Q1.   Please state your name and business address.**

2   **A1.**   My name is Stephen E. Bennett. My business address is Two North Ninth Street  
3           (GENPL8), Allentown, PA 18101-1179.

4   **Q2.   By whom are you employed and in what capacity?**

5   **A2.**   I am employed by PPL EnergyPlus, LLC as Senior Manager, Markets & Regulatory  
6           Policy.

7   **Q3.   How long have you been employed in your current position?**

8   **A3.**   I have been in my present position for 14 months.

9   **Q4.   Please explain the job responsibilities and duties in your current position.**

10   **A4.**   In this role, I am responsible for analyzing and implementing regulatory and legislative  
11           policies for PPL EnergyPlus' retail markets. My regulatory policy assignment includes  
12           the State of Ohio.

13   **Q5.   Please describe your educational background and relevant work experience.**

14   **A5.**   I earned a Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering from the University of Maryland-  
15           College Park in 1996. I have 15 years of experience in the competitive wholesale and  
16           retail energy industry with a focus on retail market policy and structure, compliance, and  
17           Regional Transmission Organization/Independent System Operator ("RTO/ISO") market  
18           rules and settlements. In my previous position, I was Retail Policy Manager – East for  
19           Exelon Energy responsible for directing and implementing Exelon Energy's regulatory

1 policies for the competitive retail market in Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Michigan, New  
2 Jersey, and Maryland. Prior to joining Exelon, I worked for The Structure Group,  
3 providing software and consulting services focused on RTO/ISO market rules and  
4 settlements in PJM and ISO New England.

5 **Q6. Please describe the Retail Energy Supply Association (“RESA”).**

6 **A6.** RESA is a broad and diverse group of retail energy suppliers who share the common  
7 vision that competitive energy retail markets deliver a more efficient, customer-oriented  
8 outcome than regulated utility structure. Several RESA members are certificated as  
9 Competitive Retail Electric Service (“CRES”) providers and are active in the Ohio retail  
10 market. The testimony that I am presenting represents the position of RESA as an  
11 organization, but may not represent the views of any particular RESA member. RESA’s  
12 members include: AEP Energy, Inc.; Champion Energy Services, LLC; ConEdison  
13 *Solutions*; Constellation NewEnergy, Inc.; Direct Energy Services, LLC; GDF SUEZ  
14 Energy Resources NA, Inc.; Homefield Energy; IDT Energy, Inc.; Integrys Energy  
15 Services, Inc.; Interstate Gas Supply, Inc. dba IGS Energy; Just Energy; Liberty Power;  
16 MC Squared Energy Services, LLC; Mint Energy, LLC; NextEra Energy Services; Noble  
17 Americas Energy Solutions LLC; NRG Energy, Inc.; PPL EnergyPlus, LLC; Stream  
18 Energy; TransCanada Power Marketing Ltd. and TriEagle Energy, L.P.

19 **Q7. Have you ever testified before a regulatory agency?**

1   **A7.**   Yes, I have testified before the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (“Commission”) in  
2           The Dayton Power and Light Company’s second electric security plan proceedings (Case  
3           Nos. 12-426-EL-SSO et al.) and in the FirstEnergy utilities’ second electric security plan  
4           proceeding (Case No. 12-1230-El-SSO). I was also asked by the Commission to  
5           participate in the Retail Electric Market Investigation (Case No. 12-3151-EL-COI) in a  
6           panel discussion before the Commissioners, which I did in December 2013.

7   **Q8.**   **What is the purpose of your testimony?**

8   **A8.**   On behalf of RESA, my testimony will focus on (a) Ohio Power’s proposed purchase of  
9           receivables (“POR”) program with a bad debt tracker; (b) other billing and collection  
10          concerns; (c) Ohio Power’s reservation of a unilateral right to terminate its electric  
11          security plan (“ESP”) III early, at the end of the second year (May 2017); and (d) provide  
12          RESA’s objection to Rider PPA as drafted.

13   **Purchase of Receivables**

14   **Q9.**   **What is a POR program and how does it work?**

15   **A9.**   Currently, in Ohio Power’s service territory, when a customer under contract with a  
16          CRES provider consumes power, an account receivable is created that is associated with  
17          that customer in an amount equal to the amount the customer owes the CRES provider  
18          for the power consumed. The CRES provider has the collection risk associated with  
19          whether the customer will pay the amount owed to the CRES provider. Consideration for

1 the risk that the customer may not pay their bill is a factor that goes into the price  
2 ultimately offered by the CRES provider and accepted by the customer.

3 Most shopping customers prefer to receive a consolidated bill that has all of their  
4 electric service expenses – wires service, capacity and energy – in a single invoice. This  
5 is especially true of residential and small commercial customers who make use of budget  
6 billing. Ohio Power, in accordance with the Commission's rules, does provide  
7 consolidated billing in which the utility reads the meters, invoices the customer, and  
8 collects the bill. If the customer has budget billing, the invoice is adjusted accordingly.

9 When the customer does not pay the amounts owed in full, the customer must  
10 deal separately with the utility and the CRES provider for collection of unpaid amounts,  
11 even though the CRES provider's charges may appear on a single consolidated utility  
12 bill. The practical problem with this system is that the CRES provider who has limited  
13 billing and payment information and no control over the invoice is simply not in a  
14 position to efficiently or effectively collect bad debts. Meanwhile, a customer who has  
15 been issued a single bill must now deal with two separate entities and work through why  
16 one was paid while the other was not. To further complicate matters, a customer after  
17 being dropped from supplier service for non-payment may pay a utility to avoid  
18 disconnection while not realizing they are still being placed into collections with their  
19 supplier who received none of the payment to the utility.

1 Under Ohio Power's proposed POR program, it will enter into an agreement to  
2 purchase a CRES provider's accounts receivable for accounts under consolidated billing.  
3 Ohio Power will then pay the CRES provider the total amount billed for CRES,  
4 regardless of what the customer pays. Ohio Power would then take on collection for the  
5 entire bill, creating a single entity to work with the customer on payment.

6 **Q10. What is RESA's position on Ohio Power's proposed POR program with a bad debt**  
7 **tracker?**

8  
9 **A10.** RESA has long advocated for a uniform POR program in the Ohio CRES market that is  
10 similar to the POR program in place for all of Ohio's major natural gas utilities and Duke  
11 Energy Ohio, Inc. ("Duke"). Ohio Power has crafted a POR program that is consistent  
12 with the Commission-approved POR program in Duke's territory. RESA in general  
13 supports the Ohio Power proposal, though much of the detail as to the mechanics must  
14 still be worked out in order to efficiently implement the program.

15 **Q11. Can you give me an example of the detail that stills needs to be addressed in order to**  
16 **have an efficient implementation?**

17  
18 **A11.** Yes, since Ohio Power is requiring consolidated billing as a condition for POR, thus  
19 RESA anticipates that many dual billed accounts will be converted to consolidated  
20 billing at the start of the program. To meet this need, a streamline process must be set up  
21 to accommodate the change. RESA suggests that CRES providers be allowed to transfer  
22 any dual-billed customers they desire to consolidated billing as soon as the program is  
23 operational. To prevent collection issues, any arrearage over 30 days at the time of the

1 move would remain with the CRES provider. That would require some modification to  
2 the existing tariffs.

3 **Q12. Why does RESA generally support Ohio Power's proposed POR program with a**  
4 **bad debt tracker?**

5  
6 **A12.** RESA generally support's Ohio Power's proposed POR program with a bad debt tracker  
7 because there are a number of benefits that will be derived therefrom, including the  
8 following:

- 9 (1) The POR program will be a significant step to encourage more CRES  
10 providers to enter into Ohio Power's service territory – particularly for  
11 those who wish to serve residential customers.  
12
- 13 (2) POR lowers the hurdle for market entry in Ohio Power's service territory  
14 and thus should increase competition, which in turn should bring more  
15 competitive prices and product offers.  
16
- 17 (3) POR simplifies the debt and collection process. POR program will create  
18 a single collection point for customers with the entity that has the  
19 complete data on payments received and processed.  
20
- 21 (4) POR permits one budget for both energy and wire service, and one budget  
22 plan.  
23
- 24 (5) The proposed POR program will reduce the uncollectible risk for the  
25 CRES provider by leveling the playing field between the utility and the  
26 CRES provider.  
27
- 28 (6) The proposed POR program removes the need for Ohio Power to provide  
29 data to CRES providers on the total amount paid by the customer and how  
30 it was applied to the bill.  
31
- 32 (7) The POR program will make it easier for the CRES providers to verify  
33 that payments are accurate.

34 **Q13. Have any electric distribution utilities offered POR programs?**

1   **A13.** Yes, in Ohio today, Duke has a POR plan for the electric side of its business that is  
2       modeled off the gas program in Ohio. POR programs are also offered in other  
3       competitive states such as Illinois, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Maryland.  
4       POR programs in other electric utility service territories have led to significant increases  
5       in the number of competitive suppliers and competitive offers to mass market customers.

6   **Q14. Since Ohio Power does not have a POR plan, how are payments from a consolidated**  
7   **bill currently allocated between the utility and the CRES provider?**

8   **A14.** In 2003, a settlement was entered between certain CRES suppliers and FirstEnergy to  
9       create a four-point payment priority plan whereby the CRES provider's past due amounts  
10      were paid first, followed second by the utility's past due amounts, then the utility's  
11      present invoice, and then the CRES' present invoice. The Commission later put the four-  
12      point payment priority into rules, which applied to all utilities. While on its face the four-  
13      point system seems balanced, it does not comport with the reality of how past due  
14      collections take place.

15   **Q15. What are the shortcomings of the current collection process for consolidated**  
16   **billing?**

17   **A15.** Today, under utility-consolidated billing, while a customer is current, only the utility  
18      does the billing and ages the accounts. When a customer falls behind, though, the  
19      amount owed is then allocated under the four-point plan, and the customer faces  
20      collection efforts from both the utility for the past due wire service and the CRES for the  
21      past due power. Once a CRES provider is forced to drop a customer for past due  
22      amounts, the charges only remain on the utility bill for a limited time. Depending on  
23      when the customer submits their final payment that amount may not be applied to the  
24      CRES provider charges and instead could remain with the utility. The customer has not  
25      been making payments to the CRES provider, so the customer is often unaware that it has



1 to make payments to the CRES providers for past due power which the utility had billed.  
2 Further, the dual collection efforts on a consolidated bill means two sets of books and  
3 constant data exchange between the utility and the CRES provider so that the customer is  
4 correctly billed for its past due wire and power obligations. This data is lacking crucial  
5 details for collection which include how much the customer has paid to the utility each  
6 billing cycle. Without the total amount paid a CRES provider has no path to determine if  
7 the payment priority was appropriately followed and the customer did pay CRES charges  
8 or if they did not. From a customer perspective they may be showing checks paid to the  
9 utility and using that as proof of payment to a collection agency without fully  
10 understanding how that payment was sent to a CRES provider or why payment is still  
11 due.

12 During the Commission's Investigation of the Retail Electric Market (Case No.  
13 12-3151-EL-COI), the Commission Staff recognized the customer confusion created by  
14 dual, simultaneous collections efforts and the complications created when the CRES  
15 provider is forced to rely on the EDU for data and information on customer payments and  
16 how they have been applied. As a result, the Commission Staff advocated for a uniform  
17 POR program for all Ohio electric utilities. The Commission, in its Opinion and Order,  
18 seemed to endorse the concept of POR for consolidated billing, but was concerned about  
19 the need to customize the POR to fit the different IT and collection systems of the four  
20 major utility systems, and suggested that POR be approached on a utility by utility basis.

21 **Q16. Would POR resolve the dual collection efforts for a single bill issue?**

22 **A16.** Yes. The customer would only have to make arrangements with the utility who, all  
23 along, has been the party collecting the bill and maintaining the account.

1 **Q17. Would implementation of a POR program provide any other benefits?**

2 **A17.** Yes. Currently, a utility with an uncollectible rider but no POR program must split the  
3 rider into distribution and generation. Customers who switch to a CRES provider no  
4 longer pay the generation-related uncollectible rider. Over time, as the scenarios  
5 described above continue, CRES providers will return slow-paying or poor-paying  
6 customers to the utility leaving the “good” payers with CRES provider. The result is a  
7 smaller pool of customers to cover the utility uncollectible expense related to generation  
8 potentially increasing that pool of bad debt as those who remain to pay it are also those  
9 who are creating the bad debt. Under POR, the Commission can choose to follow the  
10 Ohio gas utility and Duke electric utility approach to POR, which would require any  
11 customer under a POR program to pay both the generation and distribution uncollectible  
12 rider. Suppliers would no longer be incented to keep only the paying customers and the  
13 utility/social balance for bad debt for generation remains balanced as all customers would  
14 pay into the uncollectible rider.

15 **Other Billing and Collection Concerns**

16 **Q18. What are RESA’s other billing and collection concerns?**

17 **A18.** There are three other billing and collection concerns. First, Ohio Power should be  
18 required to provide to CRES providers all payment and collection information for the  
19 EDU-consolidated billing accounts until the POR program is completely established. The  
20 Commission Staff recently concluded that CRES providers need to know all payment and  
21 collection information for the EDU-consolidated billing accounts. Staff Market  
22 Development Work Plan at 17, Case No. 12-3151-EL-COI.

1           Second, Ohio Power should remove language in two tariff provisions that permits  
2           Ohio Power to terminate a CRES agreement. In Tariff Sheets 103-20D and 103-41D, the  
3           following language should be removed: “At the Company’s discretion, any customer  
4           receiving Company consolidated billing with a CRES Provider billing arrearage of more  
5           than 60 days may be switched back to the Company’s Standard Offer Service and will  
6           not be permitted to select a new CRES Provider until the arrearage is paid.” This  
7           language is an unreasonable barrier and is anticompetitive.

#### 8   **Unilateral Early Termination**

9   **Q19. What is RESA’s position regarding Ohio Power’s reservation of the ability to**  
10 **terminate the ESP III one year early, if AEP so decided?**

11  
12 **A19.** RESA opposes the opportunity for Ohio Power to unilaterally terminate the ESP III early.  
13       The Application proposes an ESP term of 3 years – June 2015 through May 2008. The  
14       existence of ESP’s and the re-writing of the market every 3 years historically create  
15       significant uncertainty. A supplier committing to Ohio must anticipate the risk that an  
16       ESP could be used to create barriers to competition. Suppliers who have entered Ohio  
17       Power territory over the past several years have done so on faith that the Commission  
18       will protect the rights of customers who switch to a supplier and ensure true options exist.  
19       Suppliers must still however build products to provide value over the limited term of the  
20       ESP. This means a supplier will likely build their offerings within the 3 year span of this  
21       proposed ESP. If the ESP is terminated mid-way there will be additional risk and  
22       uncertainty added to products should a new ESP skew the market. The one and only  
23       good thing about the ESP process is that it gives a limited time of certainty to underlying

1 utility market structure. Without even that limited period Ohio would be thrown into  
2 chaos because ESP's do not cover only default service they include a Christmas tree of  
3 items that impact all aspects of supply. AEP must commit to a term for their ESP and not  
4 be allowed to change the rules of the game at their sole discretion.

5 **Q20. Why should the Commission reject the early termination proposal?**

6 **A20.** The early termination proposal is not good public policy for three reasons. First, Ohio  
7 Power's "reservation" of the ability to terminate the ESP III one year early could make  
8 the ESP proposal a two-year proposition. Second, the possibility of early termination  
9 creates uncertainty. Neither customers nor suppliers would know what the ESP would be  
10 in the third year, so planning for the June 2017 to May 2018 would be difficult. Finally,  
11 there were no criteria given for the termination right other than Ohio Power's decision  
12 that it is in the best interest of the utility to have an early termination. Early termination  
13 may be appropriate if there was a pending change on the horizon that would significantly  
14 change the ESP as approved, such as a federal law change. However, that should not be  
15 the unilateral decision of the utility without Commission review and approval. It is  
16 possible that the early termination, if unilaterally exercised by the utility, would harm the  
17 public. Certainly, the Commission should not surrender its authority by allowing Ohio  
18 Power to unilaterally terminate the ESP III early without knowing if it puts the public at  
19 risk. Ohio Power is certainly free at any time during the term of the ESP III to petition  
20 the Commission to terminate or amend the electric security plan if that is in the public's  
21 interest. RESA believes the decision for early termination should be made by the  
22 Commission after it has been presented with the reasons for an early termination and  
23 heard from all the parties who are affected.

1 **Rider PPA**

2 **Q21. What is RESA's position regarding Ohio Power's proposed Rider PPA?**

3  
4 **A21.** RESA opposes the Rider PPA described in the application. Ohio statutes and the  
5 Commission's rules establish a paradigm in which all competitive services are supplied  
6 by the competitive market and non-competitive services are supplied by the utility at  
7 regulated prices. My counsel has advised me that the Ohio General Assembly has  
8 declared generation to be a competitive service. Generation assets should be owned and  
9 the electricity they produce should be sold by competitive wholesale suppliers, not  
10 regulated utilities. Further, with corporate separation and the establishment of a truly  
11 competitive market for generation, the risk of owning generation is no longer a risk borne  
12 by utility rate payers. This is especially true of rate payers who shop. Having a regulated  
13 utility own generation assets, which are backed up with a pricing guarantee secured by  
14 the ability to charge all ratepayers, is fundamentally at odds with a competitive energy  
15 market. The Commission should simply reject Rider PPA as proposed.

16 **Q22. If the Commission rejects Rider PPA, how should Ohio Power's share of the Ohio**  
17 **Valley Electric Company's generation be addressed when the current ESP ends?**

18  
19 **A22.** OVEC presents a transition issue. RESA is aware that, despite Ohio Power's efforts thus  
20 far, it has not been able to divest the OVEC generation as called for in the ESP II Opinion  
21 and Order because the OVEC partners have objected. Further, for the time being, Ohio  
22 Power has been authorized by the Commission to sell the OVEC power into the PJM  
23 market. RESA believes that this should be treated as an anomaly that should exist only  
24 as long as it takes Ohio Power to secure the right from its OVEC partners to transfer the  
25 OVEC generation assets to its non-regulated affiliate. Hopefully, this will be  
26 accomplished before the start of the ESP III in June of 2015.

1           If Ohio Power is not able to transfer its OVEC generation assets by June 2015,  
2           then RESA does not oppose continuation of the order allowing Ohio Power to sell the  
3           OVEC power into the PJM markets. This alternative limits the distortion to the local  
4           wholesale and retail power market of having ratepayer-subsidized power in a competitive  
5           market. However, Ohio Power should be restricted to directly or indirectly supplying  
6           competitive services – in this case generation – only in very limited, exigent  
7           circumstances. In this particular case, if a rider is needed because the OVEC generation  
8           is uneconomic to run, the rider should be paid for by standard service offer customers  
9           only. Such a policy allows customers to bypass the OVEC units if they choose to. That  
10          is in keeping with the adoption of a competitive energy market, the risk of owing  
11          generation should no longer be a rate payers risk.

12   **Conclusion**

13   **Q23. Does this conclude your testimony?**

14   **A23.** Yes, but I respectfully reserve the right to present any additional testimony if necessary.

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing document has been served upon the persons below via electronic mail this 6<sup>th</sup> day of May 2014.



---

M. Howard Petricoff

Steven T. Nourse  
Matthew J. Satterwhite  
American Electric Power Corporation  
1 Riverside Plaza, 29<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215-2373  
[stnourse@aep.com](mailto:stnourse@aep.com)  
[mjsatterwhite@aep.com](mailto:mjsatterwhite@aep.com)

Daniel R. Conway  
Porter Wright Morris & Arthur  
Huntington Center  
41 South High Street  
Columbus, OH 43215  
[dconway@porterwright.com](mailto:dconway@porterwright.com)

David F. Boehm  
Michael L. Kurtz  
Jody Kyler Cohn  
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry  
36 E. Seventh St., Suite 1510  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
[dboehm@bkllawfirm.com](mailto:dboehm@bkllawfirm.com)  
[mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com](mailto:mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com)  
[jkylercohn@bkllawfirm.com](mailto:jkylercohn@bkllawfirm.com)

Philip B. Sineneng  
THOMPSON HINE LLP  
41 South High Street, Suite 1700  
Columbus, OH 43215  
[philip.sineneng@thompsonhine.com](mailto:philip.sineneng@thompsonhine.com)

Richard L. Sites  
General Counsel & Senior Director of Health  
Policy  
Ohio Hospital Association  
155 East Broad Street, 15th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215-3620  
[ricks@ohanet.org](mailto:ricks@ohanet.org)

Thomas J. O'Brien  
Dylan F. Borchers  
Bricker & Eckler LLP  
100 South Third Street  
Columbus, OH 43215-4291  
[tobrien@bricker.com](mailto:tobrien@bricker.com)  
[dborchers@bricker.com](mailto:dborchers@bricker.com)

Devin Parram  
Katherine Johnson  
Werner Margard  
Attorney General's Section  
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio  
180 E. Broad St., 6th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
[devin.parram@puc.state.oh.us](mailto:devin.parram@puc.state.oh.us)  
[katherine.johnson@puc.state.oh.us](mailto:katherine.johnson@puc.state.oh.us)  
[werner.margard@puc.state.oh.us](mailto:werner.margard@puc.state.oh.us)

Maureen R. Grady  
Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel  
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800  
Columbus, OH 43215-3485  
[grady@occ.state.oh.us](mailto:grady@occ.state.oh.us)

Samuel C. Randazzo  
Frank P. Darr  
Matthew R. Pritchard  
McNees Wallace & Nurick  
21 East State Street, 17th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
[sam@mwncmh.com](mailto:sam@mwncmh.com)  
[fdarr@mwncmh.com](mailto:fdarr@mwncmh.com)  
[mpritchard@mwncmh.com](mailto:mpritchard@mwncmh.com)

Mark A. Hayden  
Jacob A. McDermott  
Scott J. Casto  
FirstEnergy Service Company  
76 S. Main Street  
Akron, OH 44308  
[haydenm@firstenergycorp.com](mailto:haydenm@firstenergycorp.com)  
[jmcdermott@firstenergycorp.com](mailto:jmcdermott@firstenergycorp.com)  
[scasto@firstenergycorp.com](mailto:scasto@firstenergycorp.com)

David I. Fein  
Vice President, State Gov. Affairs – East  
Exelon Corporation  
10 South Dearborn Street, 47<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, IL 60603  
[david.fein@exeloncorp.com](mailto:david.fein@exeloncorp.com)

Cynthia Fonner Brady  
Assistant General Counsel  
Exelon Business Services Company  
4300 Winfield Road  
Warrenville, IL 60555  
[cynthia.brady@constellation.com](mailto:cynthia.brady@constellation.com)

Lael Campbell  
Exelon  
101 Constitution Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20001  
[Lael.Campbell@constellation.com](mailto:Lael.Campbell@constellation.com)

Barth E. Royer  
Bell & Royer Co., LPA  
33 South Grant Avenue  
Columbus, OH 43215-3927  
[barthroyer@aol.com](mailto:barthroyer@aol.com)

Gary A. Jeffries  
Assistant General Counsel  
Dominion Resources Services, Inc.  
501 Martindale Street, Suite 400  
Pittsburgh, PA 15212-5817  
[gary.a.jeffries@dom.com](mailto:gary.a.jeffries@dom.com)

Kimberly W. Bojko  
Mallory M. Mohler  
Carpenter Lipps & Leland LLP  
280 Plaza, Suite 1300  
280 North High Street  
Columbus OH 43215  
[bojko@carpenterlipps.com](mailto:bojko@carpenterlipps.com)  
[mohler@carpenterlipps.com](mailto:mohler@carpenterlipps.com)

Mark A. Whitt  
Andrew J. Campbell  
Gregory L. Williams  
Whitt Sturtevant LLP  
88 East Broad Street, Suite 1590  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
[whitt@whitt-sturtevant.com](mailto:whitt@whitt-sturtevant.com)  
[campbell@whitt-sturtevant.com](mailto:campbell@whitt-sturtevant.com)  
[williams@whitt-sturtevant.com](mailto:williams@whitt-sturtevant.com)

Vincent Parisi  
Lawrence Friedeman  
Matthew White  
Interstate Gas Supply, Inc.  
6100 Emerald Parkway  
Dublin, Ohio 43016  
[vparisi@igsenergy.com](mailto:vparisi@igsenergy.com)  
[lfriedeman@igsenergy.com](mailto:lfriedeman@igsenergy.com)  
[mwhite@igsenergy.com](mailto:mwhite@igsenergy.com)



Colleen L. Mooney  
Cathryn N. Loucas  
Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy  
231 W. Lima Street  
Findlay, OH 45839  
[cmooney@ohiopartners.org](mailto:cmooney@ohiopartners.org)  
[cloucas@ohiopartners.org](mailto:cloucas@ohiopartners.org)

Judi L. Sobecki  
The Dayton Power and Light Company  
1065 Woodman Drive  
Dayton, OH 45432  
[judi.sobecki@aes.com](mailto:judi.sobecki@aes.com)

John Finnigan  
Senior Regulatory Attorney  
Environmental Defense Fund  
128 Winding Brook Lane  
Terrace Park, OH 45174  
[jfinnigan@edf.org](mailto:jfinnigan@edf.org)

Joseph M. Clark  
Direct Energy  
21 East State Street, 19th Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
[joseph.clark@directenergy.com](mailto:joseph.clark@directenergy.com)

Nicholas McDaniel  
Environmental Law & Policy Center  
1207 Grandview Avenue, Suite 201  
Columbus, OH 43212  
[NMcDaniel@elpc.org](mailto:NMcDaniel@elpc.org)

Trent Dougherty  
Ohio Environmental Council  
1207 Grandview Avenue, Suite 201  
Columbus, OH 43215-3449  
[trent@theOEC.org](mailto:trent@theOEC.org)

Rocco D'Ascenzo  
Elizabeth Watts  
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.  
139 E. Fourth Street, 1303-Main  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
[rocco.dascenzo@duke-energy.com](mailto:rocco.dascenzo@duke-energy.com)  
[elizabeth.watts@duke-energy.com](mailto:elizabeth.watts@duke-energy.com)

Mark S. Yurick  
Zachary D. Kravitz  
Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP  
65 E. State St., Suite 1000  
Columbus, OH 43215  
[myurick@taftlaw.com](mailto:myurick@taftlaw.com)  
[zkravitz@taftlaw.com](mailto:zkravitz@taftlaw.com)

Michael R. Smalz  
Ohio Poverty Law Center  
555 Buttles Avenue  
Columbus, OH 3215-1137  
[msmalz@ohiopovertylaw.org](mailto:msmalz@ohiopovertylaw.org)

Peggy P. Lee  
Southeastern Ohio Legal Services  
964 E. State Street  
Athens, Ohio 45701  
[plee@oslsa.org](mailto:plee@oslsa.org)

Gregory J. Poulos  
EnerNOC, Inc.  
471 East Broad Street, Suite 1520  
Columbus, OH 43215  
[gpoulos@enernoc.com](mailto:gpoulos@enernoc.com)

J. Thomas Siwo  
Bricker & Eckeler LLP  
100 South Third Street  
Columbus, OH 43215-4291  
[tsiwo@bricker.com](mailto:tsiwo@bricker.com)

Lisa M. Hawrot  
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC  
Century Centre Building  
1233 Main Street, Suite 4000  
Wheeling, WV 26003  
[lhawrot@spilmanlaw.com](mailto:lhawrot@spilmanlaw.com)

Derrick Price Williamson  
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC  
1100 Bent Creek Blvd., Suite 101  
Mechanicsburg, PA 17050  
[dwilliamson@spilmanlaw.com](mailto:dwilliamson@spilmanlaw.com)

Kevin R. Schmidt  
Counsel for the Energy Professionals of Ohio  
88 E. Broad St., Suite 1770  
Columbus, OH 43215  
[schmidt@sppgrp.com](mailto:schmidt@sppgrp.com)

Samantha Williams  
Natural Resources Defense Council  
20 N Wacker Drive, Suite 1600  
Chicago, IL 60606  
[swilliams@nrdc.org](mailto:swilliams@nrdc.org)

Stephanie M. Chmiel  
Thompson Hine LLP  
41 S. High Street, Suite 1700  
Columbus, OH 43215  
[stephanie.chmiel@thompsonhine.com](mailto:stephanie.chmiel@thompsonhine.com)

Tai C. Shadrick  
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC  
300 Kanawha Blvd. East  
Charleston, WV 25301  
[tshadrick@spilmanlaw.com](mailto:tshadrick@spilmanlaw.com)

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

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**5/6/2014 4:39:29 PM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 13-2385-EL-SSO, 13-2386-EL-AAM**

Summary: Testimony Direct Testimony of Stephen E. Bennett electronically filed by M  
HOWARD PETRICOFF on behalf of Retail Energy Supply Association