

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. 14-1297-EL-SSO

---

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF**

**MARYBETH SMIALEK**

**ON BEHALF OF**

**OHIO EDISON COMPANY  
THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY  
THE TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY**

---

**AUGUST 4, 2014**

1 **INTRODUCTION**

2 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, POSITION AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.**

3 A. My name is Marybeth Smialek. I am Manager – Customer Service Systems and Power  
4 Billing for FirstEnergy Service Company. My business address is 76 South Main Street,  
5 Akron, Ohio 44308.

6 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND**  
7 **PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS.**

8 A. I received a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration from Edinboro  
9 University and a Master's degree in Business Administration from The Behrend College  
10 at The Pennsylvania State University, Erie.

11 I have 30 years of experience in the electric utility industry. I began my career with  
12 Pennsylvania Electric Company ("Penelec") (now one of FirstEnergy Corp.'s operating  
13 companies) in 1984 as a customer assistance representative. From 1995 to 2001, I was an  
14 energy service consultant. Following the merger of FirstEnergy Corp. and GPU, Inc.  
15 (Penelec's former parent company) in 2001, I was named Metropolitan Edison Company's  
16 area manager for the City of York, Pennsylvania.

17 In 2008, I became Manager, Compliance and Human Services at FirstEnergy Service  
18 Company. In that position, I was responsible for managing and resolving customer  
19 complaints received through regulatory agencies as well as directing the company's low  
20 income customer assistance and energy efficiency programs. I was named to my current  
21 position in 2013.

1   **Q.   WHAT ARE YOUR CURRENT JOB DUTIES AND AREAS OF**  
2   **RESPONSIBILITY?**

3   A.   My current position is Manager, Customer Service Systems and Power Billing and my  
4   responsibilities include relationship management with competitive retail electric service  
5   (“CRES”) providers. This entails: (1) processing customer enrollments and drops; (2)  
6   responding to CRES inquiries; (3) complaint resolution; (4) development and execution of  
7   regulatory programs; and (5) CRES-related reporting. I manage the processing and billing  
8   of FirstEnergy Corp.’s operating companies’ largest power accounts including customers  
9   of Ohio Edison Company (“Ohio Edison”), The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company  
10   (“CEI”) and The Toledo Edison Company (“Toledo Edison”) (collectively, “the  
11   Companies”). I also have responsibility for some internal controls and validation of  
12   revenue from kWh sales for compliance with Sarbanes Oxley.

13   **Q.   WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?**

14   A.   The purpose of my testimony in this proceeding is to identify and provide support for  
15   certain retail market related initiatives the Companies are proposing in their fourth electric  
16   security plan entitled Powering Ohio’s Progress (also referred to as “ESP IV”). I also  
17   address certain proposed changes to the Companies’ electric service regulations and  
18   Supplier Tariff related to CRES.

1 **RETAIL MARKET INVESTIGATION (“RMI”)**

2 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE RMI PROCESS.**

3 A. In December 2012, the Commission began an investigation into the health, strength, and  
4 vitality of Ohio’s CRES market. From approximately December 2012 until January 2014,  
5 the Commission held a series of workshops and meetings led by Commission Staff  
6 members to discuss issues related to the CRES market, CRES providers, electric  
7 distribution utilities (“EDUs”), and customers. I regularly participated in the extensive  
8 discussions that occurred as a part of the workshops and subgroup meetings.

9 As a result of that investigation, the Commission ordered the Companies, along with the  
10 other EDUs, to undertake a number of activities to further develop the CRES market. (I  
11 will discuss three specific activities below.) In addition, the Commission ordered a  
12 continuing Market Development Working Group (“MDWG”) to discuss further  
13 improvements to the CRES market. The Companies continue to participate in those  
14 discussions.

15 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ASPECTS OF THE COMMISSION’S RMI ORDER**  
16 **THAT YOU ADDRESS IN YOUR TESTIMONY.**

17 A. My testimony addresses the Companies’ proposals related to the Commission’s RMI Order  
18 relating to: (1) establishing a supplier web portal; (2) implementing changes to the  
19 Companies’ bills related to CRES provider logos; and (3) revising the price to compare  
20 language appearing on the bill.

1 **SUPPLIER WEB PORTAL**

2 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE SUPPLIER WEB PORTAL BEING PROPOSED BY**  
3 **THE COMPANIES.**

4 A. Through the RMI, a desire was expressed for the Companies to develop and implement a  
5 web-based system to provide customer information to CRES providers. In the March 26,  
6 2014 RMI Order, the Commission also directed Staff and the EDUs to continue to work  
7 together regarding the development of a website registration system that would ensure  
8 customer protections on a utility-by-utility basis. Accordingly, in response, the Companies  
9 in this proceeding propose a supplier web portal that will be a secure, web-based system  
10 available to CRES providers. The supplier web portal will provide defined customer  
11 information. This supplier web portal is also intended to advance the state policy to further  
12 effective competition in the CRES market and to satisfy the Commission's directive in the  
13 RMI.

14 **Q. WHAT TYPES OF INFORMATION WILL BE AVAILABLE ON THE PROPOSED**  
15 **SUPPLIER WEB PORTAL?**

16 A. The following types of information will be available on the supplier web portal:

- 17 • 20 digit EDI enrollment number;
- 18 • Account number;
- 19 • Meter number;
- 20 • Customer name;
- 21 • Customer address, including Zip Code;
- 22 • Billing address, including Zip Code;

- Email address (if available);
- Meter reading cycle dates;
- Meter type;
- Interval meter indicator;
- Rate code indicator;
- Load profile segment indicator;
- Peak Load Contribution (“PLC”) and Network Service Peak Load (“NSPL”) Values;
- 12 months of consumption data (in kWh) by billing period;
- 12 months of demand data (in kW);
- 12 months of interval data (if applicable);
- SSO customer indicator;
- Budget billing plan indicator;
- Future PLC and NSPL values;
- Smart meter indicator;
- Interval data for interval metered customers;
- Net metering indicator; and
- Service voltage.

**Q. HOW WILL THE COMPANIES’ PROPOSED SUPPLIER WEB PORTAL BE DIFFERENT FROM THE CURRENT WEB-BASED SYSTEM?**

A. Currently, CRES providers have access to customer eligibility lists via a website, which are updated on a quarterly basis. These lists do not provide Electronic Data Interchange

1 (“EDI”) enrollment information. While the customer eligibility lists will continue to be  
2 available to CRES providers to use as a marketing tool, the proposed supplier web portal  
3 will enhance the process by making available “real-time” information to CRES providers.  
4 In addition, the proposed supplier web portal will include EDI enrollment information for  
5 customers who have authorized the release of this information. A CRES provider having  
6 a customer’s authorization and account number will be able to access a secure website and  
7 immediately obtain a customer’s current usage data and EDI enrollment information. This  
8 proposed enhancement will allow for quicker and easier access to customer information  
9 that is necessary to complete enrollment by the CRES provider.

10 **Q. WHAT CUSTOMER PROTECTIONS WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO THE**  
11 **SUPPLIER WEB PORTAL?**

12 A. Supplier web portal access will be only granted to those certified CRES providers that  
13 complete and submit authorization forms electronically to the Companies. Once submitted  
14 and reviewed, the CRES provider will be granted password-protected access to the supplier  
15 web portal. Even with this access, customer account and EDI enrollment information will  
16 not be released until the CRES provider verifies and submits customer authorization for  
17 release of information in accordance with Rule 4901:1-10-24, Ohio Administrative Code.  
18 The authorization forms will be retained for three years.

1 **Q. HOW WILL THE COMPANIES RECOVER THE COSTS FOR THE**  
2 **DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED SUPPLIER**  
3 **WEB PORTAL?**

4 A. The Companies propose to recover costs through the proposed Government Directives  
5 Recovery Rider (“Rider GDR”) as discussed in the testimonies of Company witnesses  
6 McMillen and Mikkelsen.

7 **Q. WHAT IS THE EXPECTED TIMING FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE**  
8 **PROPOSED SUPPLIER WEB PORTAL?**

9 A. Subject to Commission approval of ESP IV, the Companies propose to implement the  
10 supplier web portal, and have it available for use by CRES providers no later than June 1,  
11 2016 – the commencement date of proposed ESP IV.

12 **INCLUSION OF CRES PROVIDER LOGOS ON EDU CONSOLIDATED BILLS**

13 **Q. WERE THE COMPANIES ORDERED TO PROVIDE CRES PROVIDERS WITH**  
14 **THE OPTION OF INCLUDING THEIR LOGOS ON EDU CONSOLIDATED**  
15 **BILLS?**

16 A. Yes. EDUs are now required to provide CRES providers with the option of including their  
17 logos on utility consolidated bills. The Commission articulated this requirement in the  
18 March 26, 2014 RMI Order.

19 **Q. WHERE WILL THE CRES PROVIDER LOGO APPEAR ON THE EDU**  
20 **CONSOLIDATED BILL?**

21 A. Per the March 26, 2014 RMI Order, the placement of a CRES provider’s logo on the bill  
22 will be in the area where supply charges are displayed. At the option of the CRES provider,



1 the name of the CRES provider may be displayed in lieu of a logo. Attached as Attachment  
2 MBS-1 is a mock-up of a proposed bill format to implement this requirement of the  
3 Commission's RMI Order.

4 **Q. HOW WILL THE COMPANIES IMPLEMENT THIS PART OF THE RMI**  
5 **ORDER?**

6 A. All CRES providers registered in the Companies' service territory will be requested to  
7 provide an electronic file of their logo to the Companies by a specified date. The logos  
8 that are received by the specified date will be uploaded to the Companies' bill print system.  
9 Thereafter, CRES provider logos received by the Companies will be uploaded to the  
10 Companies' bill print system on a monthly basis. Therefore, if a CRES provider missed  
11 the initial deadline, its logo will be uploaded into the bill print system upon receipt as part  
12 of the monthly update process. New CRES providers will be able to submit their logo as  
13 part of the registration process, which will be uploaded on a monthly basis. The process  
14 on how to submit the logos will be provided on the Companies' supplier website as well.

15 **Q. HOW WILL THE COMPANIES RECOVER THE COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH**  
16 **CRES PROVIDER LOGOS?**

17 A. In the RMI Order, the Commission authorized EDUs to defer these costs for recovery in  
18 the next distribution case. As discussed by Company witness Mikkelsen, the Companies  
19 will, per Commission directive, defer these costs for future recovery but are seeking to  
20 recover these costs in proposed Rider GDR rather than in a future distribution case.

1 **Q. WHEN DO THE COMPANIES PROPOSE TO IMPLEMENT CRES PROVIDER**  
2 **LOGOS?**

3 A. In the March 26, 2014 RMI Order, the Commission required the Companies to file an  
4 application to change their bill format by November 26, 2014. In this proceeding, the  
5 Companies request approval of the bill format, attached as Attachment MBS-1, and  
6 propose an implementation date for the CRES provider logos of no later than June 30,  
7 2015.

8 **Q. ARE THERE OTHER CHANGES ARISING FROM THE COMMISSION'S RMI**  
9 **ORDER?**

10 A. Yes. The Companies are proposing to modify the existing price-to-compare language for  
11 residential customer bills in their bill format to conform to the language required for price-  
12 to-compare by the Commission's March 26 Order in the RMI. The Companies seek  
13 approval of the bill format, attached as Attachment MBS-1, for implementation no later  
14 than June 30, 2015.

15 **ELECTRIC SERVICE REGULATIONS**

16 **Q. WHAT CHANGES ARE THE COMPANIES PROPOSING TO THEIR ELECTRIC**  
17 **SERVICE REGULATIONS RELATED TO CRES?**

18 A. Attachment 3 to the Application is a red-lined version of the electric service regulations  
19 contained in the Companies' tariffs. I will address changes proposed for Section XIII –  
20 Return to Standard Offer Supply and Section XIV – Certified Suppliers – Billing and  
21 Payment.

1 The Companies are proposing changes to those provisions to enhance the retail market and  
2 to reflect better the Companies' current practices. These changes include removing: (1)  
3 existing language referring to minimum stays; (2) minimum notice requirements for  
4 returning to the Companies' standard service offer; and (3) references to time requirements  
5 for selecting a new CRES provider. The Companies also propose to provide a reference to  
6 the Companies' website for information related to partial payment priority.

7 **Q. WHY ARE THE COMPANIES REMOVING THE MINIMUM STAY AND**  
8 **NOTICE REQUIREMENTS FROM THE ELECTRIC SERVICE**  
9 **REGULATIONS?**

10 A. Removing the minimum stay and time requirements should help prevent and remove any  
11 perceived barriers to a customers' selection of a CRES provider due to those requirements.  
12 This should further enhance the competitive retail electric market in the Companies'  
13 service territories.

14 **SUPPLIER TARIFF**

15 **Q. WHAT CHANGES ARE THE COMPANIES PROPOSING TO THEIR SUPPLIER**  
16 **TARIFF?**

17 A. Attachment 5 to the Application contains a red-lined version of the Companies' supplier  
18 tariff. Company witness Stein will discuss the changes in the supplier tariff related to  
19 wholesale activities. The Companies are also proposing changes in the Supplier tariff that  
20 relate to the retail market. These changes generally include:

- 21 • updating the list of items included on the Customer Information List
- 22 currently in the tariff;

- removing references to the Companies' Electric Service Regulations regarding minimum stay or minimum notice requirements (consistent with the proposed changes to these sections previously discussed in my testimony);
- adding a reference to the Companies' website for information related to partial payment priority; and
- as it relates to CRES provider logos, adding a section requiring CRES providers to comply with the applicable process and procedures provided on the Companies' website. This change was required by the Commission's March 26 Order in the RMI proceeding, and is consistent with my earlier testimony regarding the provision of a CRES provider logo on the Companies' bills.

### **CONCLUSION**

**Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

A. Yes. I reserve the right to supplement my testimony.



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

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**8/4/2014 4:11:42 PM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 14-1297-EL-SSO**

Summary: Testimony (Direct) of Marybeth Smialek electronically filed by Ms. Tamera J Singleton on behalf of Ohio Edison Company and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and The Toledo Edison Company