FILE

48

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
2008 OCT 31 AM 9:23
PUCO

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Co. For Approval of its Electric Security Plan Including Related Accounting Authority; an Amendment to its Corporate Separation Plan; and the Sale or Transfer of Certain Generating Assets.)	Case No. 08-917-EL-SSO
In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Co. for Approval of its Electric Security Plan Including Related Accounting Authority; and an Amendment to Its Corporate Separation Plan.)	Case No. 08-918-EL-SSO

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF BARBARA R. ALEXANDER
ON BEHALF OF OHIO PARTNERS FOR AFFORDABLE ENERGY

David C. Rinebolt
Trial Attorney
Colleen L. Mooney
Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy
231 West Lima Street
P.O. Box 1793
Findlay, OH 45839-1793
Telephone: (419) 425-8860
FAX: (419) 425-8862
e-mail: drinebolt@aol.com
cmooney2@columbus.rr.com

October 31, 2008

Counsel for Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Co. For Approval of its Electric Security Plan Including Related Accounting Authority; an Amendment to its Corporate Separation Plan; and the Sale or Transfer of Certain Generating Assets.)	Case No. 08-917-EL-SSO
In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Co. for Approval of its Electric Security Plan Including Related Accounting Authority; and an Amendment to Its Corporate Separation Plan.)	Case No. 08-918-EL-SSO

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF BARBARA R. ALEXANDER ON BEHALF OF OHIO PARTNERS FOR AFFORDABLE ENERGY

INDEX

Page No.

I. INTRODUCTION

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, TITLE, AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Barbara R. Alexander. I use the title of Consumer Affairs Consultant. My address is 83 Wedgewood Dr., Winthrop, ME 04364. I appear in this case as a witness on behalf of Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy (OPAE).

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS FOR YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING.

A. I opened my consulting practice in March 1996, after nearly ten years as the Director of the Consumer Assistance Division of the Maine Public Utilities Commission. While there, I testified as an expert witness on consumer protection, customer service and low-income issues in rate cases and other investigations before the Commission. My consulting practice is directed to consumer protection, customer service and low-income programs and policies relating to the regulation of the electric, natural gas and telephone industries. In particular, I have focused on the changes in policies and procedures required by state regulation in the transition to retail competition. My recent clients include the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate, New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate, Maine Office of Public Advocate, Illinois Citizens Utility Board, and AARP (in Montana, New Jersey, Maine, Illinois, Mississippi, Maryland, and the District of Columbia). Among my publications are: Retail Electric Competition: A Blueprint for Consumer Protection, (U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, October, 1998). Most recently, I have focused attention on

Default Service issues relating to the transition to retail competition for both electric and natural gas industries. I have published several papers on Default Electric Service,[1] and have recently published a paper on state regulatory policies to dampen price volatility in the provision of natural gas supply service.[2] In addition to papers and publications, I have filed testimony and assisted in the preparation of comments on Default Service policies in Pennsylvania, Maine, New Jersey, Montana, Maryland, Texas, and the District of Columbia. I have also provided testimony on behalf of AARP concerning the need for Integrated Resource Planning policies applicable to Mississippi's electric utilities and testified on behalf of AARP before the Virginia Legislature on the need for Integrated Resource Planning policies in Virginia statutes.

I am also an attorney, and a graduate of the University of Michigan (1968) and the University of Maine School Of Law (1976).

I attach my resume listing my testimony and publications as BA-Exhibit 1.

Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THE OHIO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION ("PUCO" or "Commission")?

---

1 My April 2002 paper is available at http://www.ncat.org/liheap/pubs/barbadefault3.doc . An update on that paper, "Managing Default Service to Provide Consumer Benefits in Restructured States: Avoiding Short Term Price Volatility" (2003), is also available at http://www.neaap.ncat.org experts index.

2 "Natural Gas Price Volatility: Regulatory Policies to Assure Affordable and Stable Gas Supply Prices for Residential Customers," (2004), available at http://www.ncat.org/liheap/news/Feb04/gaspricevol.htm

A. Yes. I provided testimony on behalf of OPAE in Case No. 08-936-EL-SSO concerning FirstEnergy's proposed Market Rate Offer (MRO) and Case No. 08-935-EL-SSO concerning FirstEnergy's proposed Electric Security Plan (ESP).

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY.

A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide a recommendation to the Commission concerning the application of Columbus Southern Power Co. (CSP) and Ohio Power Co. (OP) (collectively, "AEP" or "the Companies") to provide a Standard Service Offer (SSO) pursuant to an Electric Security Plan (ESP). Under the Ohio law, the SSO operates as a default service for customers who have not selected an alternative generation supply provider. My testimony is primarily directed to the operation of the proposed ESP and its impacts on residential customers. I have not addressed all the issues raised by AEP's proposal. Rather, I have focused on those aspects of the proposal that I have identified below. My testimony should not be interpreted as approving those aspects of the AEP ESP filing that are not specifically addressed in my testimony.

II. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

A. I recommend that the Commission find that AEP's ESP proposal is deficient and fails to conform to certain provisions of S.B. 221. Specifically, I offer the following conclusions:

- AEP's proposed generation supply price is not based on any evidence or analysis that reflects an evaluation of alternatives or an integrated procurement plan and so fails to demonstrate that it will result in the least cost SSO for residential customers over the three year term of the plan.
- AEP has failed to support its proposed enhanced reliability proposals with evidence that its proposed level of expenditures will result in any improvement in reliability and distribution service performance.
- The proposed implementation of gridSMART should be rejected with respect to that aspect of this program that includes the installation of smart or advanced meters for residential customers and its accompanying Home Area Network because the filing fails to allow for a full and detailed exploration of costs and benefits of system-wide advanced metering and subsequent pricing options for residential customers. The proposal for enhancing distribution automation and "smart grid" technologies should be approved.
- AEP has not proposed any evidence in support of the proper level of spending or the type of energy efficiency programs that should be implemented to comply with S.B. 221. The programs that AEP has proposed to implement prior to the completion and review of its Market Potential Study appear reasonable, but should not be implemented without a more detailed analysis of costs and benefits for residential customers for each Ohio utility, as well as a detailed measurement and evaluation plan.

- AEP's proposals to rely on a collaborative to design energy efficiency programs, particularly those targeted to low income customers, is a welcome development, but certain implementation criteria should be attached to this proposal.

III. DESCRIPTION OF AEP'S ESP PROPOSAL

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE AEP'S PROPOSED ESP.

A. AEP proposes a three-year ESP. The proposed generation supply price reflects a non-fuel or base generation component, a Fuel Adjustment Clause (FAC), and an additional FAC expense deferral. The base generation charge reflects current prices plus carrying costs associated with capitalized investments made between 2001-2008 for environmental requirements, an increase for CSP customers of 7% and OP customers of 18%. An additional 3% increase per year for CSP and 7% per year for OP is imposed to cover costs associated with capitalized investments in 2009 through 2011. The FAC will be recovered in a rider that captures projected FAC costs for 2009 and purchased power, including costs associated with the renewable energy mandate. A deferral mechanism will operate as a means to assure that the total bill should not increase more than 15% per year. AEP also proposes increases to distribution rates, including a Enhanced Reliability program that is estimated to cost $201.4 million for CSP and $244.6 million for OP and a gridSmart project that is estimated to cost $108.9 million to CSP's customers as part of a system-wide phase-in of smart grid technologies for the distribution system and advanced metering with two-way communication for all customers. The result is a proposed 7% increase in distribution rates for CSP (approximately 2.94% for gridSmart Phase I and 4.06% for reliability programs[3]) and 6.5% for OP.

AEP proposes a non-bypassable Provider of Last Resort charge for all customers to compensate AEP for the risk of customer migration, shopping, and return to SSO equal to an average 5.28% increase in customer bills for CSP and OP customers in 2009 ($93 million).

AEP proposes an Energy Efficiency and Peak Demand Rider that AEP estimates will result in costs of $13.5 million in 2009, $14.8 million in 2010, and $9.5 million in 2011. However, the implementation of most programs will not occur until AEP completes and submits a Market Potential Study for energy efficiency and peak load demand reduction programs. A collaborative facilitated by Battelle will provide input on the implementation of programs identified and explored in more detail in this Market Potential Study. AEP intends to use third party contractors to implement programs and include performance guarantee requirements in such contracts. In the interim, AEP proposes to implement several programs identified as Residential Standard Offer Programs, a Targeted Energy Efficiency Weatherization Program ($12 million; 10,000 participants) , a Low Income Weatherization Program ($5.7 million; 2,600 participants), and a

[3] Response to OCC, Set 3-94.

Residential CFL program. Other programs include an Energy Star New Home Construction and Energy Star Home Appliance Program, as well as other programs targeted to commercial and industrial customers. For example, the total residential budget proposed for these programs would be $10.7 million in 2009 for OP, but over half of these budgeted costs are labeled as "administrative costs."[4] AEP did not provide any cost benefit analysis for these initial programs.

AEP has also proposed a shareholder contribution of $75 million ($25 million for three years) to support programs that benefit low income customers, economic developments, and energy efficiency and renewable programs. It is my understanding based on information provided by counsel that AEP has already begun the process of collaborative meetings to implement this commitment. I do not address this proposal in my testimony.

AEP is also seeking approval of the transfer of generating assets and an amendment to its Corporate Separation Plan and to be able to sell power under contract to the distribution utilities from generation resources they do not own. There is no net-back of the proceeds from either the transfer of assets or power sales to customers of the distribution utilities.

Q. DID AEP PROVIDE ANY ANALYSIS OF ITS PROPOSED ESP WITH RESPECT TO THE STATE POLICIES REFLECTED IN SECTION 4928.02 OF THE REVISED CODE?

[4] Exhibit KLS-2, pages 23-27.

A. No. AEP's filing does not contain any comprehensive discussion of the relationship between its ESP filing and these important state policies.[5] Section 4928.02 (A) of the Revised Code states that it is the State's policy to "ensure adequate, reliable, safe, sufficient, nondiscriminatory and reasonably priced retail electric service." At no point has AEP provided any factual evidence that such policies will be met by its ESP, particularly that related to the requirement to ensure "reasonably priced" electric service. AEP's assertions that its proposed 15% annual rate increase complies with these policies and that its deferral of even higher charges beyond 2011 is designed to reflect the policy concerning "reasonable" rates should be rejected because the actual increase is far more than 15% in each year absent the deferral – paying a bill later does not make the cost any smaller or meet the requirement that rates be reasonable. Furthermore, the filing does not include any discussion of which state policies its proposed ESP supports and which policies are not otherwise met by its proposal. Finally, the application fails to specifically mention or address the state policy and the Commission's rule that requires utilities and their proposals to take into account the impact of its proposals on "at risk" populations.

---

[5] AEP's witness Mr. Hamrock states that the phase-in of rate increases responds to the "reasonable priced" policy in Sec. 4928.02 (A) and that the rider to recover costs associated with economic development and job retention activities advances the policy of Sec. 4928.02 (N) to facilitate the State's role in the global economy. Direct Testimony at 11 and 12.

IV. AEP'S PROPOSED GENERATION SUPPLY PRICES SHOULD BE REJECTED OR, AT A MINIMUM, AEP SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO CONDUCT AND SUBMIT A LEAST COST PROCUREMENT PLAN TO JUSTIFY RECOVERY BASE GENERATION INCREASES AND FUEL COSTS

Q. PLEASE DISCUSS YOUR OPINION OF AEP'S PROPOSED GENERATION SUPPLY PRICE FOR SSO.

A. AEP has proposed prices for a three-year period for generation supply service to its customers without any justification or analysis of the basis for its proposed prices. Instead of a fixed price SSO, AEP has proposed a "base" generation charge with proposed increases above current rates and a new FAC rider that will vary by actual costs incurred by the Companies. AEP has not submitted an analysis of its generation supply options or procurement plans for fuel and purchased power that would allow the Commission to determine whether its has chosen the least cost approach to assuring generation supply for its customers for the next three years.[6] In fact, AEP's response to OCC Set 3-92 admits that its proposed annual percentage increases to the non-fuel components of the proposed generation rate "reflect judgmental estimates of the appropriate increase during the three-year ESP." (Attachment BA-2.)

[6] AEP sought a waiver to submit certain materials required for an SSO filing, but its request for a waiver was denied by the Attorney Examiner on September 19,2008. On October 16, 2008, AEP submitted what it described as information that "brings AEP Ohio's applications into substantial compliance with the tentative rules." This supplemental information included statements and descriptions of AEP's fuel purchasing policies, but AEP did not submit a procurement plan as such. Furthermore, AEP's submission of materials at such a late date prior to the deadline for testimony in this proceeding has not allowed for a thorough review.

Q. HOW SHOULD THE COMMISSION ORDER AEP TO REVISE ITS PROPOSED ESP?

A. The Commission should require AEP to evaluate a variety of options to assure generation supply service to its customer classes. This analysis may and should vary by customer class. The risk of customer migration for residential customers is very small except through governmental aggregations and should be reflected in the analysis and recommendations. Any analysis should start from an examination of its current and future load and load shapes for each customer class. AEP's filing should include a resource plan that identifies a range of demand forecasts and the assumptions for econometric and/or end use variables that would be considered in the range of outcomes that complement the long term forecasts of demand and consumption during the term of the plan. AEP should then evaluate how it can "manage" this load shape and meet its needs under a variety of potential scenarios that would evaluate how much cost-effective energy efficiency and demand response products and services could be provided compared to purchasing traditional generation supply. Cost-competitive renewable energy supplies equal to or exceeding the requirements of SB 221, must be included as well. The Commission should require AEP to conduct this needs analysis from the "bottom up," identifying the least cost and most cost effective means to provide the needed energy and capacity to provide a SSO over a period of years to its customers. Such an approach would require AEP to manage its load shape as well as utilizing the generation owned by the distribution companies and managing various supply contracts with its affiliates or other entities. While the use of a FAC is allowed under S.B. 221 as part of an ESP, the lack of any portfolio analysis and procurement planning information would result in delegating to AEP complete discretion in the planning and acquisition of fuel, generation, and purchased power over the term of the plan. There is no evidence that AEP has or will undertake a long term least cost approach to acquiring fuel and generation resources necessary to meet the needs of its customers.

Q. HOW CAN THE SSO PROVIDER EVALUATE AND DETERMINE THE MOST REASONABLE PRICE FOR RESIDENTIAL AND SMALL COMMERCIAL CUSTOMERS IN AN ESP?

A. The purpose of SSO, whether provided pursuant to an ESP or an MRO, should be to ensure stable, reasonable, and affordable rates for residential and small commercial customers who are not served by a competitive electricity supplier. This can only occur with an explicit portfolio plan and a determination of the best mix of energy efficiency, demand response and generation resources, including renewable energy, to provide the lowest and most stable price over the term of the plan. In addition, because the responsibility to achieve energy efficiency and demand response goals, as well as meet the advanced energy portfolio requirements extends beyond the timeframe of the ESP, the analysis and evaluation should reflect these long-term statutory requirements.

Q. HAS AEP JUSTIFIED ITS PROPOSED PURCHASED POWER COSTS OR OTHER CAPACITY PURCHASES WITH AN INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLAN?

A. There is no basis in the Companies' application for justifying new capacity purchases to meet its SSO obligation. Any suggestion that new capacity should be needed to meet the Companies' load should be documented in a long term resource adequacy plan and analysis of options that would provide the most cost effective solution for customers.

As pointed out in comments to the Commission by the Ohio Consumer and Environmental Advocates[7] in response to the proposed Long Term Forecast Reports and planning rules, utilities should rely on Integrated Resource Planning principles whether proposing an ESP or an MRO, particularly where, as here, the utility is proposing to require customers to pay for new capacity investments. An integrated resource plan should be linked to the state's energy policies, as the OCEA recommended in its comments with respect to the Commission's proposed rules governing integrated resource plans:

> (L) "Integrated resource plan" means the plan PROPOSED BY THE ELECTRIC UTILITY ~~or program, established by a person subject to the requirements of this chapter,~~ to furnish RETAIL electric energy service~~s~~ THAT WILL ASSURE ADEQUATE, RELIABLE, SAFE, SUFFICIENT, NONDISCRIMINATORY AND LEAST-COST, LEAST RISK SERVICE OVER THE TERM OF THE PLAN. THE PLAN SHALL REFLECT A FULL AND FAIR CONSIDERATION OF COST EFFECTIVE DEMAND SIDE AND SUPPLY SIDE

[7] Comments of the Ohio Consumer and Environmental Advocates, Case No. 08-888-EL-ORD, at p. 71. (September 9, 2008).

> OPTIONS, AND SHALL INCLUDE BUT NOT BE LIMITED TO CONSIDERATION OF RESOURCES, CONTRACTS, AND FACILITIES THAT, TAKEN TOGETHER, WILL MEET THE UTILITY'S PROJECTED DEMAND AND ENERGY REQUIREMENTS IN THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE MANNER POSSIBLE OVER THE TERM OF THE INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLAN. THE UTILITY'S PLAN AND REPORT SHALL PROPOSE A PORTFOLIO OF DEMAND AND SUPPLY-SIDE RESOURCES THAT BEST MEET THE IDENTIFIED OBJECTIVES WHILE BALANCING THE OUTCOME OF EXPECTED IMPACTS AND RISKS FOR CUSTOMERS OVER THE TERM OF THE PLAN in a cost-effective and reasonable manner AND THAT ACCOUNTS FOR FUTURE RISKS AND PROJECTED COSTS.~~, consistent with the provision of adequate and~~ reliable ~~service, which gives appropriate consideration to supply- and demand-side resources and transmission or distribution investments for meeting the person's projected demand and energy requirements.~~

V. AEP'S PROPOSAL TO INCREASE DISTRIBUTION RATES FOR AN ENHANCED RELIABILITY PROGRAM SHOULD BE REJECTED.

Q. DOESN'T S.B. 221 AUTHORIZE A UTILITY TO SEEK RECOVERY FOR DISTRIBUTION MODERNIZATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN AS PART OF AN ESP FILING?

A. Yes. S.B. 221 enacted Section 4928.143 of the Revised Code to govern the provisions with respect to an ESP. Subsection (B)(2)(h) allows a utility to propose a "long term energy delivery infrastructure modernization plan…" As part of its evaluation of such a proposal, the Commission is required to "examine the reliability of the electric distribution utility's distribution system and ensure that customers' and the electric distribution utility's expectations are aligned and that the electric distribution utility is placing sufficient emphasis on and dedicating sufficient resources to the reliability of its distribution system." This analysis should also reflect the state policy adopted in Sec. 4928.02 (E), in which S.B. 211 specifically added a policy to promote "the development of performance standards and targets for service quality for all consumers, including annual achievement reports written in plain language." However, AEP's filing for cost recovery for an "enhanced reliability" program was not accompanied by any long term plan as set forth in the statute. Rather, AEP submitted a list of categories of proposed spending without any analysis of alternatives considered and cost effective investments that would be tied to actual performance results. Nor did the filing include any means by which customer service and reliability would be tracked and monitored for improvement as a result of its proposals to increase distribution rates for both Companies by an average of 4.06%. In fact, recent news reports have pointed to AEP's lower maintenance goals and documented that its reliability performance is poorer than other Ohio utilities.[8] AEP's performance is below average as reflected in the IEEE surveys on utility reliability

[8] "More to outages than wind? AEP's lower maintenance goals, outdated system made bad situation worse, critics say," Columbus Dispatch (September 28, 2008). According to the authors, AEP has scaled back on the number of miles in which trees were trimmed in the past two years and more than 40% of all customer complaints to the PUCO in the past five years about service problems have come from AEP customers. This article also stated that AEP had underspent its allowed reliability budgets for both CSP and OP between 1992 and 2001. As a result of PUCO investigation, a settlement was reached in which AEP agreed to pay a $10 million fine to be used for tree-trimming. These events and the use of the $10 million fine were not discussed in AEP's ESP filing or its request for additional distribution revenues for "reliability" expenditures.

performance.[9] AEP's filing did not include any enforceable promises or standards by which these additional funds would result in improved reliability performance.[10] As a result, I recommend that the Commission not approve any increase in distribution rates for the "reliability enhancement" program proposed by AEP until or unless the Companies submit a long term plan with specific linkages to its proposed expenditures with measurable improvements in reliability performance. Furthermore, I recommend that the Commission shift any risk of noncompliance with such commitments from customers and ratepayers to shareholders by creating a penalty program that would reduce AEP's profits and return credits to all customers for the failure to achieve enforceable performance standards linked to the promises of reliability improvement.

VI. AEP'S PROPOSED ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS AND SPENDING LEVELS DO NOT REFLECT ANY LONG TERM INTEGRATED PLAN OR COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS AND ITS PROPOSED COLLABORATIVE TO IMPLEMENT SUCH PROGRAMS NEEDS IMPROVEMENT.

[9] According to AEP's response to OCC Set 3-36, the IEEE survey shows that the CAIDI, SAIDI, and SAIFI performance for CSP and OP fall into the third or fourth Quartile compared to other utilities.

[10] AEP's response to Staff 4-2 stated that measurable improvement in SAIFI and CAIDI would result from the system reliability program, but its application did not propose any commitment to achieve improvements in these reliability indicators. Even in this response, the Companies "hedge" their estimates of reliability improvement. I attach this data response to my testimony as **Exhibit BA-3**.

Q. DID AEP FILE AN INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLAN TO IDENTIFY THE MOST COST EFFECTIVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAMS THAT WILL BE FUNDED THROUGH ITS PROPOSED RIDER?

A. No. AEP is preparing a Market Potential Study that will be submitted or made public later this fall. In the meantime, AEP proposes a number of programs which it claims are effective and appropriate based on the experience of AEP companies in other states, but has not conducted a cost-effectiveness analysis of these programs for Ohio.[11] AEP has proposed an Energy Efficiency and Peak Demand Reduction Cost Recovery Rider and seeks recovery of costs based on the estimated costs of these initial programs. These costs total $178 million for both operating companies over three years, $30 million in 2009, $64 million in 2010, and $84 million in 2011.

Q. WITH RESPECT TO THE RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS PROPOSED BY AEP TO IMPLEMENT IN 2009 AND FOR WHICH COST RECOVERY IS SOUGHT THROUGH THE PROPOSED RIDER, HAS AEP RECOMMENDED PROGRAMS FOR LOW INCOME AND MODERATE INCOME CUSTOMERS?

A. Yes. AEP has proposed a number of residential weatherization and energy efficiency programs targeted to customers with household income between 125% and 200% of federal poverty guidelines and an additional program targeted to low income customers with household income below 125% of poverty. While

---

[11] AEP Response to Staff Set 5-16.

AEP has not provided the basis for its proposed program design or level of expenditure, these initiatives appear reasonable as an "interim" set of programs for these vulnerable customers.

Q. DO YOU HAVE RECOMMENDATIONS WITH RESPECT TO OTHER RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS PROPOSED BY AEP?

A. I do not offer testimony or opinion on the design of the residential programs. However, I do note that the total costs of the residential programs appear to reflect very high administrative costs. Exhibit KLS-2 contains details with respect to each program and summarizes the proposed budgets and costs for CSP and OP. For example, in 2009, AEP estimates that OP customers would incur $10.9 million in costs for energy efficiency, of which half are categorized as administrative costs. Only slightly lower percentage ratios are projected for 2010 and 2011. This is not reasonable and should be carefully reviewed by the Commission prior to the approval of any of these program costs in customer rates. While it is appropriate to contemplate that the costs for the expanded energy efficiency programs mandated by S.B. 221 will result in increased costs to all customers, at least in the short run, it is not appropriate to approve cost recovery for programs that result in large administrative costs. Rather, programs should be designed to assure that the largest percentage of costs reflect delivery of actual program measures and incentives to retail customers. Recently, the Maryland Commission rejected proposed energy efficiency programs submitted by Baltimore Gas & Electric for this very reason; that is, that the programs were not sufficiently cost effective and would result in far too high a ratio of administrative and marketing costs compared to customer benefits.[12] It is important to note as well that the Maryland Commission, similar to the PUCO, is operating to implement a statutory mandate to significantly expand energy efficiency objectives and usage reduction objectives. The Commission should carefully evaluate proposed programs in great detail so as to assure customers that these statutory mandates will not be relied upon to simply spend ratepayer money, but rather will be implemented in a manner that is efficient and designed to have the "biggest bang for the customer's buck." Non-profit agencies in Ohio currently operate a number of nationally recognized energy efficiency programs that operate with fairly low administrative costs. These program designs should serve as the foundation for AEP's energy efficiency programs, rather than 'reinventing the wheel'.

[12] Maryland Public Service Commission, Letter to BGE, Mail Log #108061 (August 18, 2008). In its letter, the Commission stated that this rejection should not be viewed as a rejection of cost effective energy efficiency programs to meet Maryland's statutory mandates, but, "...the fact that BGE's programs might qualify as cost effective under certain commonly utilized tests does not, in itself, convince the Commission to commit hundreds of millions of ratepayer dollars to them. The Commission views cost effectiveness as requiring a real rate of return on ratepayer's investment, measured by meaningful bill savings for all ratepayers and the achievement of a greater share of the State's ambitious conservation goals. These programs, which involve high overhead and administrative costs, but deliver a rather low market penetration, would make only a small dent in the EmPower Maryland Act's conservation targets, leading the Commission to fear that the $274 million price tag would end up representing a relatively small initial installment and that the ultimate cost to ratepayers to achieve the statutory savings goals in this fashion will multiply rapidly." Letter at 2. The Commission's letter approved the low income programs, but rejected the other residential programs. BGE has revised its proposed plan and the revised plan is now before the Maryland Commission.

Q. DO YOU HAVE RECOMMENDATIONS WITH RESPECT TO AEP'S PROPOSED COLLABORATIVE TO IMPLEMENT FUTURE ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND DEMAND RESPONSE PROGRAMS?

A. AEP has proposed a collaborative to be facilitated by Battelle.[13] I welcome the approach in general. However, I have several recommendations that should be attached to any approval of this approach. First, this collaborative should have the authority to review and make changes to the "interim" programs that AEP has proposed in this filing and for which it seeks cost recovery after a more detailed cost effectiveness analysis has been completed. Second, AEP's Market Potential Study should include information that will allow the participants to determine the mix of programs and benefits that will most likely result in the least-cost SSO, thus exploring the potential for additional targets and programs that exceed the SB 221 goals. This should be a multi-year effort that uses a long-term planning horizon because of the need to meet the benchmarks over time regardless of the nature of the generation supply. Once the collaborative concludes its analysis and makes a recommendation to the Commission, a public process should occur to review and obtain input to the recommendations of the collaborative prior to Commission approval. Finally, I recommend that the collaborative, subject to the approval of the Commission, have the authority to

[13] AEP's filing does not document why Battelle was selected for this purpose, or the price being incurred for such facilitation. I recommend that the Commission seek further information prior to approving this proposal to ensure that the costs are reasonable and that the facilitator would bring specialized expertise in these programs to the table.

hire a third party administrator that reports to the collaborative to implement most or all of the approved programs. The Companies have a significant incentive to maximize the sale of generation. This should be balanced with a stakeholder process which ensures adequate investment in cost-effective demand side management and low-income energy efficiency programs as a component of an integrated portfolio of resources that make up the SSO.

Q. WHAT RECOMMENDATIONS DO YOU HAVE WITH RESPECT TO PROGRAMS TARGETED TO LOW INCOME AND OTHER "AT RISK" CUSTOMERS?

A. I recommend that the Commission direct AEP and the collaborative to explore and fund a substantial expansion of programs aimed to low income, elderly, and other "at risk" residential customers such as families facing foreclosure, as part of the overall energy efficiency and demand side management portfolio of programs. These customers cannot afford to participate in the typical loan and incentive programs that require the customer to invest in new energy efficiency appliances, home repairs, or extensive remodeling to assure a proper level of weatherization. It is unfair to require these customers to fund the energy efficiency programs through the rate structure without a fair opportunity to participate in the programs offered by the utilities or the third party administrator. Furthermore, it is a benefit to all customers to reduce consumption and shift peak load usage because a kilowatt that is not used is a kilowatt that does not have to be purchased in the expensive wholesale market. Finally, there are the potential for other savings to other customers if the energy efficiency measures result in more frequent payments by customers who would otherwise fail to pay their electric bill on time. The collaborative should strongly consider targeting additional investments through Ohio's existing nationally recognized low income weatherization and energy efficiency programs. These programs are already implemented by a strong core of community-based organizations and I would expect that any additional funding for existing programs or new programs targeted to these customers would be implemented through that already existing network. The utilities should purchase the lowest cost resources. This is generally energy efficiency.

VII. AEP'S PROPOSED GRIDSMART PROGRAM SHOULD BE APPROVED IN PART AND REJECTED IN PART AT THIS TIME.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE AEP'S PROPOSED GRIDSMART PROGRAM AND ITS PROPOSED RECOVERY OF COSTS.

A. AEP is proposing "Phase I" of its 7-10-year plan to implement a three-pronged initiative: Distribution Automation, Advanced Metering for all customers, and the installation of a Home Area Network (HAN) in the customer's home to link appliances to the utility's meter. The ESP filing proposes to install the Distribution Automation, smart metering with the accompanying HAN, over its northeastern portion of the CSP service territory, approximately 110,000 meters and 70 distribution circuits. AEP proposes that this Phase will cost $109 million over three years and states that this estimated level of costs reflect $2.7 million in operational savings to the extent they can be implemented in this partial installation. According to AEP, the Commission should approve this proposal without "imposing a requirement that all such quantified benefits be specifically monetized and mathematically shown to equal or exceed the net costs."[14]

Q. DO YOU AGREE THAT THE COMMISSION SHOULD REQUIRE CSP CUSTOMERS TO PAY $109 MILLION FOR PHASE I OF THIS GRIDSMART SYSTEM BASED ON AEP'S FILING?

A. No. There are too many unanswered questions and insufficient time in this proceeding to fully explore AEP's stated costs and benefits. I do not agree with the notion that the Commission should approve this significant investment without detailed analysis of costs and benefits. This would be akin to allowing a utility to build a new power plant or sign a new power purchase agreement without any analysis of costs and benefits or evaluation of lesser cost alternatives. These materials were submitted by AEP without work papers or justification for its proposals. AEP did not submit any analysis of alternatives to achieve its objectives, particularly with respect to achieving demand response through dynamic or time-based pricing programs. Furthermore, AEP has failed to set forth in any detail what it will seek to "learn" or evaluate in Phase I that would then allow for a reasonable analysis of what should be done in the future.

---

[14] AEP Witness Sloneker at 17.

Viewed from this perspective, AEP's "phase I" is a large and inappropriate pilot program. Finally, AEP has not proposed any pricing programs or direct load control program details that would be offered to its customers once these metering and HAN systems are installed.

Q. WOULD IT BE APPROPRIATE FOR THE COMMISSION TO CONSIDER THE APPROVAL OF THE DISTRIBUTION AUTOMATION ASPECTS OF THIS PROPOSAL SEPARATELY FROM THE SMART METERING AND HAN INITIATIVES?

A. Yes. It would be appropriate for the Commission to distinguish between the Distribution Automation and "smart grid" portions of this proposal which are adequately supported by the application and proceed to evaluate the implementation of these initiatives, carefully monitoring the technologies selected and the result of their impacts on reliability and distribution system planning and controls. This would allow for a more careful evaluation and consideration of the individual customer smart metering and HAN aspects of these proposals in the future or in a different proceeding with sufficient time for careful analysis of AEP's proposals, costs, and estimated benefits. Finally, the Distribution Automation portion of this project appears to reflect experience and technologies familiar to AEP and implemented in its utilities in other States[15] and AEP has acknowledged

[15] AEP Response to IEU Set 2-3.

that the Distribution Automation portion of its proposal could be implemented independently of the metering and HAN deployment.[16]

Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON THE CONCERNS WITH RESPECT TO SMART OR ADVANCED METERING THAT HAVE NOT YET BEEN EVALUATED OR CONSIDERED BY THE COMMISSION?

A. Yes. AEP should be required to undertake a fair and comprehensive analysis (in the context of an integrated resource plan) of all cost effective means to achieve the state's objectives for consumption reduction through energy efficiency programs and peak load reduction through demand response programs. Rather than starting from the premise that smart or advanced metering systems are required to achieve customer benefits through pricing changes, a more conservative approach would be to evaluate how to achieve peak load reduction from residential customers in the least expensive way possible. I am confident that such an analysis would show that direct load control programs that focus on those 20%-30% of customers with central air conditioning[17] who volunteer to receive a modest monthly customer credit in return for allowing the utility to interrupt or cycle their central air conditioning system during summer critical peak

---

16 AEP Response to Staff Set 5-5.

17 The pilot programs in California and elsewhere generally demonstrate that only 20-30% of residential customers need to participate and take the desired actions to reduce peak load. However, all customers are typically required to pay for the new advanced metering investments, thus creating a mismatch between those who pay for the investment and those whose bills and usage profiles would allow for a benefit under time-based or hourly pricing schemes.

periods would have both beneficial impacts on reducing peak load usage and achieve that objective less expensively than the expensive advanced metering proposals that I have evaluated elsewhere. Residential customers, particularly those with lower than average usage, elderly, vulnerable, disabled, and medically challenged customers should not have to pay for new metering and communication systems that they cannot and do not need or want.

Q. MIGHT SOME CUSTOMERS BENEFIT IF THEY ARE ABLE TO SEE "REAL TIME PRICES" AS REFLECTED IN THE WHOLESALE MARKET AND REDUCE THEIR BILL BY SHIFTING USAGE TO CHEAPER HOURS?

A. In addition to the notion that peak load usage reduction might result in lower prices for all customers, some advocates promote smart meters and time-based pricing as a means to allow individual customers to reduce their own electricity bill by shifting usage to lower priced hours. In my experience, most residential customers do not care to monitor their electricity usage and electricity prices on an hourly or daily basis. Those customers who want to explore or participate in Time of Use Pricing can do so under the current metering system. In fact, AEP already offers Time of Use rates and meters to those residential customers who are interested in this alternative and I would certainly agree with a promotional program to advertise this option to customers whose usage profile would benefit from this rate option. Furthermore, proponents of advanced or smart metering have an additional agenda that should be of significant concern to Ohio policymakers. The "price signal" that is being delivered with the current "dynamic" or "real time" pricing proposals that accompany advanced metering relies on wholesale market spot prices and volatile day ahead markets to set prices for residential customers. This is the same wholesale market that has come under significant criticism by many policymakers in Ohio and elsewhere because of its structure and focus on volatile day ahead prices that can be subject to manipulation. I do not recommend such an approach. Rather, SSO should be based on stable and average prices of a diverse portfolio.

Q. DO YOU HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT THE CONSUMER PROTECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SMART METERING?

A. Yes. These meters are typically marketed with the functionality to allow the utility to remotely disconnect service to nonpaying customers, thus eliminating a premise visit to detect medical emergencies, obtain promises to pay, or otherwise seek contact with the customer to avoid disconnection of service. I remain concerned that smart metering with this functionality may result in deterioration in consumer protection that will ultimately impact lower income customers more severely than higher income customers.

Q. AEP IS PROPOSING A HOME AREA NETWORK AS PART OF ITS SMARTGRID PROPOSAL. DO YOU HAVE COMMENTS ON THIS ASPECT OF THEIR PROPOSAL?

A. Yes. It is not typical for a utility to propose a HAN as part of their smart grid proposals for several reasons. First, this technology is not yet developed in a manner that allows for open source or universal installation and communications between the customer's appliances and the utility's meter. A recent article in Public Utility Fortnightly explored the lack of development of standards and functionality for this aspect of the smart grid.[18] Second, the installation of a HAN will require the utility to gain the customer's permission to install this system inside their residence. Unlike the meter which is owned by the utility, customers are not required to allow the utility to install a HAN in their homes or to allow the utility to access their private use of appliances or other electric appliances. However, AEP did not identify or discuss this issue in its filing. Far more attention and consideration to customer privacy and access to such data, as well as the customer's right to refuse such installation should be considered prior to adopting AEP's proposed program.

VIII. AEP'S PROPOSAL TO CHARGE ALL CUSTOMERS A "POLR" CHARGE SHOULD BE REJECTED FOR RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS.

Q. SHOULD AEP BE ALLOWED TO CHARGE A NONBYPASSABLE POLR FEE TO RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS?

A. No. The notion that AEP should be allowed to impose a fee on residential customers to reflect the risk of customer migration or the existence of a retail competitive market is not reasonable. First, AEP should be required to manage

[18] Anderson, Steven, "I want my In-Home Display," *Public Utilities Fortnightly* (October 2008), pp. 48-53. The author described the current system wide smart meter installations underway and did not identify any such initiative in which the utility is installing HAN as part of this system.

its generation supply resources and purchases to reflect changes in the competitive market. AEP has the ability to sell excess power into the wholesale market. AEP has the ability to purchase power in the wholesale market. Second, the risk of migration or significant development of a retail market for residential customers is very low. Such a market has not developed in any other restructuring state and certainly has not yet developed in Ohio. I recommend that the Commission reject this proposal.

Q. DOES THIS COMPLETE YOUR TESTIMONY AT THIS TIME?

A. Yes, it does.

BARBARA R. ALEXANDER
Consumer Affairs Consultant

83 Wedgewood Dr.
Winthrop, ME 04364

Voice and FAX: (207)395-4143
E-mail: barbalex@ctel.net

Recent Clients:

AARP (Montana, Maine, New Jersey, California, Vermont, District of Columbia, Maryland, Ohio)
Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate
Maryland Office of People's Counsel
Citizens' Utility Board (Illinois)
New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate
Maine Office of Public Advocate
Ohio Consumers' Counsel
Colorado Office of Consumer Counsel
Vermont Department of Public Service
Delaware Division of the Public Advocate
The Utility Reform Network (TURN) (California)
Oak Ridge National Laboratory, DOE
Regulatory Assistance Project
Citizens' Utility Board (Wisconsin)
Texas Office of Public Utility Counsel

Areas of Expertise:

- Default Service, Consumer Protection, Service Quality, and Universal Service policies and programs associated with the move to competition in the electric, natural gas, and telecommunications industries;

- Consumer Protection and Service Quality policies and programs associated with the regulation of competitive energy and telecommunications providers;

- The regulatory policies associated with the regulation of Credit, Collection, Consumer Protection, Low Income, and Service Quality programs and policies for public utilities; and

- Code of Conduct and affiliated interest rules applicable to regulated utilities and their affiliates.

Prior Employment

DIRECTOR — 1986-96
Consumer Assistance Division
Maine Public Utilities Commission — *Augusta, Maine*

One of five division directors appointed by a three-member regulatory commission and part of commission management team. Direct supervision of 10 employees, oversight of public utility consumer complaint function, appearance as an expert witness on customer services, consumer protection, service quality and low income policy issues before the PUC. Chair, NARUC Staff Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs.

SUPERINTENDENT — 1979-83
Bureau of Consumer Credit Protection
Department of Professional and Financial Regulation — *Augusta, Maine*

Director of an independent regulatory agency charged with the implementation of Maine Consumer Credit Code and Truth in Lending Act. Investigations and audits of financial institutions and retail creditors, enforcement activities, testimony before Maine Legislature and U.S. Congress.

Education

JURIS DOCTOR — 1973-76
University of Maine School of Law — *Portland, Maine*

Admitted to the Bar of the State of Maine, September 1976.

B.A. (WITH DISTINCTION) IN POLITICAL SCIENCE — 1964-68
University of Michigan — *Ann Arbor, Michigan*

Publications and Testimony

"How to Construct a Service Quality Index in Performance-Based Ratemaking", The Electricity Journal, April, 1996

"The Consumer Protection Agenda in the Electric Restructuring Debate", William A. Spratley & Associates, May, 1996

Direct Testimony on behalf of the Telecommunications Workers Union, Telecom Public Notice 96-8, Price Cap Regulation and Related Issues, Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, September, 1996. [Analysis of and recommendations concerning the need to regulate service quality in move to price cap regulation]

Direct Testimony on behalf of Public Counsel Section, Office of Attorney General, Docket No. UE-960195, Application by Puget Sound Power and Light Co. And Washington Natural Gas Co. For Approval of Merger), Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, September, 1996 [Need for and design of a Service Quality Index for both electric and gas business units as part of a multi-year rate plan]

Consumer Protection Proposals for Retail Electric Competition: Model Legislation and Regulations", Regulatory Assistance Project, Gardiner, ME, October, 1996

Direct and Rebuttal Testimony on behalf of the Citizens Utility Board (IL), Docket 96-0178, Illinois Commerce Commission, CUB v. Illinois Bell Telephone Co., January 22, 1997; July, 1997. [Analysis of recent service quality performance and recommendations for changes in current service quality performance plan]

Direct and Surrebuttal Testimony on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate, Restructuring Proceedings before the Pennsylvania PUC: PECO Energy; Pennsylvania Power and Light Co.; GPU Energy; Duquesne Light Co.; West Penn Power Co., UGI-Electric, Pennsylvania Power Co., Pike County Light and Power Co. (1997 and 1998). [Specific consumer protection, consumer education and supplier-utility-customer interactions necessary for move to electric restructuring]

"The Transition to Local Telecommunications Competition: A New Challenge for Consumer Protection", Public Counsel Section, Washington Attorney General, October, 1997. [Reprinted in part in NRRI Quarterly Bulletin, Vol. 19, N0.1, Spring, 1998]

Direct and Surrebuttal Testimony on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate, Restructuring Proceedings before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities: Public Service Electric and Gas, Jersey Central (GPU), Rockland Electric Co., Atlantic Electric Co.,March-April, 1998. [Phase-in and customer enrollment, Code of Conduct, consumer protections associated with the provision of Provider of Last Resort service]

Oppenheim, Gerald (NCLC) and Alexander, Barbara, Model Electricity Consumer Protection Disclosures, A Report to the National Council on Competition and the Electric Industry, April, 1998.

Direct and Reply Testimony on behalf of the Maryland Office of People's Counsel, Investigation into Certain Unauthorized Practices (Slamming and Cramming), Case. No. 8776, before the Maryland Public Service Commission, 1998 and 1999.

Direct Testimony on behalf of the Maryland Office of People's Counsel, Universal Service Issues, Case No. 8745, before the Maryland Public Service Commission, November 20, 1998.

"Cramming is the Last Straw: A Proposal to Prevent and Discourage the Use of the Local Telephone Bill to Commit Fraud," NRRI Quarterly Bulletin, Fall, 1998.

Alexander, Barbara, Retail Electric Competition: A Blueprint for Consumer Protection, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy and Renewable Energy, Washington, D.C., October, 1998. Available at http://www.eren.doe.gov/electricity_restructuring.

Alexander, Barbara, "Consumer Protection Issues in Electric Restructuring for Colorado: A Report to the Colorado Electricity Advisory Panel," on behalf of the Colorado Office of Consumer Counsel, February, 1999.

Testimony on Proposed Interim Rules (Consumer Protection, Customer Enrollment, Code of Conduct, Supplier Licensing) on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate before the New Jersey BPU, May, 1999.

Direct Testimony on behalf of AARP, West Virginia PUC Investigation into Retail Electric Competition (consumer protection, universal service, Code of Conduct), June 15, 1999.

Direct and Surrebuttal Testimony on behalf of the Pennsylvania OCA, Gas Restructuring proceedings (8 natural gas utilities): consumer protection; consumer education; code of conduct, before the Pennsylvania PUC, October, 1999-April, 2000.

Comments on Draft Rules addressing slamming and cramming (Docket No. RMU-99-7) on behalf of the Iowa Office of Consumer Advocate, before the Iowa Utilities Board, October, 1999.

Alexander, Barbara, "Door to Door Sales of Competitive Energy Services," <u>LEAP Letter</u>, January-February, 2000 [Wm. A. Spratley & Associates, Columbus, OH]

Direct Testimony on behalf of the Maine Office of Public Advocate, Central Maine Power Company Alternative Regulation Plan [Docket 99-666] on service quality issues, before the Maine PUC, May, 2000.

Direct Testimony on behalf of AARP, Universal Service Programs and Funding of low-income programs for electric and natural gas service, before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. EX000200091, July, 2000.

Comments (on behalf of NASUCA and AARP) on Uniform Business Practices Reports, May and September, 2000.

Direct Testimony on behalf of the Pennsylvania OCA, Verizon-Pennsylvania Structural Separation Plan on service quality, customer service and consumer protection issues [Docket No. M-00001353] before the Pennsylvania PUC, October, 2000.

Direct and Rebuttal Testimony on behalf of the Maine Office of Public Advocate, Verizon-Maine Alternative Form of Regulation on service quality issues [Docket No. 99-851] before the Maine PUC, January and February, 2001.

Direct and Rebuttal Testimony on behalf of the Citizens Utility Board, Nicor Gas Customer Select Pilot Program, on consumer protection and regulation of competitive natural gas suppliers [Docket Nos. 00-0620 and 00-0621] before the Illinois Commerce Commission, December, 2000 and February, 2001.

Direct and Surrebuttal Testimony on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate on consumer protection and service quality issues associated with the pending merger between GPU Energy and FirstEnergy, before the Pennsylvania PUC, Docket Nos. A-110300F0095 and A-110400F.0040 (February and March, 2001)

Direct and Surrebuttal Testimony on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate on consumer protection, service quality, and universal service issues associated with the pending merger between GPU Energy and FirstEnergy, before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. EM00110870 (April, 2001).

Alexander, Barbara, "Default Service: What Should be Done when the Experiment Goes Awry?", April 2001

Responsive Testimony on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate on service quality issues associated with a Plan for Alternative Regulation by Verizon-New Jersey, before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. To01020095 (May 2001).

Direct and Surrebuttal Testimony on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate on service quality, consumer protection, and universal service issues associated with the pending merger between Conectiv and Pepco, before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, BPU Docket No. EM101050308 (September and November 2001).
Direct Testimony on behalf of the Public Interest Advocacy Centre (and others) on service quality regulation in the context of price cap rate plans, before the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, Docket No. CRTC 2001-37 (August 2001).

Alexander, Barbara, "Default Service: What Should be Done when the Experiment Goes Awry?", An Update to the April 2001 paper, October 2001.

Expert Witness Report, Sparks v. AT&T and Lucent Technologies, October 2001 [National class action lawsuit concerning the leasing of residential telephones]

Expert Witness Report, Brown v. Reliant Energy, November 2001 [Claim of negligence in death of elderly resident after disconnection of electric service]

Comments on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate on consumer protection, disclosure, and education program Guidelines applicable to local exchange telephone competition, before the Pennsylvania PUC, January 2002.

Alexander, Barbara, "Default Service for Retail Electric Competition: Can Residential and Low-Income Customers be Protected When the Experiment Goes Awry?" (April 2002) Available at www.ncat.org/liheap/pubs/barbadefault3.doc

Comments on behalf of AARP before the California PUC on CARE (low income program) concerning Rapid Deployment, Rulemaking 01-08-027 (2001 and 2002).

Comments on behalf of Citizens Utility Board before the Illinois Commerce Commission on Proposed Rule to Allow the Use of Credit Scoring to Determine When a Deposit May be Required, ICC Docket No. 01-0644, June 24, 2002.

Comments on behalf of Consumer Groups before the Texas PUC on Rulemaking Proceeding to Amend Requirements for Provider of Last Resort Service, Docket No. 25360, June 28, 2002.

Direct Testimony on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate before the Board of Public Utilities on Joint Petition of New Jersey-American Water Co. and Thames Water Aqua Holding for Approval of a Change in Control of New Jersey-American Water Co., Docket No. WM01120833, July 18, 2002.

Alexander, Barbara, Consumer Education Programs to Accompany the Move to Retail Electric Competition, prepared for the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates (NASUCA), July 2002. Available at www.nasuca.org

Direct Testimony on behalf of New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate before the Board of Public Utilities on Petition of NUI Utilities d/b/a Elizabethtown Gas Co. for Approval of Increased Base Tariff Rates and Charges for Gas Service, Docket No. GR02040245, September 6, 2002.

Alexander, Barbara, An Analysis of Residential Energy Markets in Georgia, Massachusetts, Ohio, New York, and Texas, prepared for the National Energy Affordability and Accessibility Project, National Center for Appropriate Technology, September 2002. Available at www.ncat.org/neaap

Direct and Surrebuttal Testimony on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate before the Pennsylvania PUC on Philadelphia Gas Works' Gas Restructuring Filing, Docket No. M-00021612, September 2002 and November 2002.

Direct Testimony on behalf of Consumer Groups before the Texas PUC on Notice and Request of Mutual Energy CPL and Mutual Energy WTU for Approval of Changes in Ownership and Affiliation, Docket No. 25957, October 15, 2002.

Comments on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate before the Pennsylvania PUC, Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for Revision of Chapter 54 Pertaining to Electric Generation Supplier Licensing, Docket No. L-00020158, March 5, 2003.
Direct and Surrebuttal Testimony on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate before the New Jersey BPU on Jersey Central Power & Light's base rate case proceeding (service quality and reliability of service), Docket No. ER02080506, ERT02080507, and ER02070417, December 2002 and February 2003.

Alexander, Barbara, "Managing Default Service To Provide Consumer Benefits In Restructured States: Avoiding Short-Term Price Volatility" (National Center for Appropriate Technology, June 2003). Available at: http://neaap.ncat.org/experts/defservintro.htm

Comments and Reply Comments on behalf of New Jersey AARP before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities on Basic Generation Service, Docket No. EO03050394, August and September 2003.

Direct and Surrebuttal Testimony on behalf of the New Jersey Division of the Ratepayer Advocate before the New Jersey BPU on rate case proceedings for New Jersey-American Water Co., Elizabethtown Water Co., and Mt. Holly Water Co. (service quality and low-income programs and policies), Dockets Nos. WR03070509-WR03070511 (December 2003).

Comments on behalf of the Texas Legal Services Center and other Consumer Groups before the Public Utility Commission of Texas, Proposed Revisions to Chapter 25, Substantive Rules Applicable to Electric Service Providers, Project No. 27084 (December 2003).

Alexander, Barbara, "Natural Gas Price Volatility: Regulatory Policies to Assure Affordable and Stable Gas Supply Prices for Residential Customers," (2004), available at http://www.ncat.org/liheap/news/Feb04/gaspricevol.htm

Alexander, Barbara, "Montana's Universal Systems Benefit Programs and Funding for Low Income Programs: Recommendations for Reform: A Report to AARP" (January 2004).

Comments and Reply Comments on behalf of the Colorado Office of Consumer Counsel before the Public Utilities Commission of Colorado, In the Matter of the Proposed Repeal and Reenactment of all Rules Regulating Gas Utilities (Docket No. 03R-520G) and Electric Utilities (Docket No. 03R-519E) (February and September 2004).

Direct, Rebuttal, and Supplemental Testimony on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate before the Pennsylvania PUC, Petition of Duquesne Light Co. for Approval of Plan for Post-Transition Period POLR Services, Docket No. P-00032071 (February-April 2004).

Comments on behalf of AARP before the California PUC, Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion to Establish Consumer Rights and Consumer Protection Rules Applicable to All Telecommunications Utilities, R. 00-02-004 (March 2004).

Comments and Reply Comments on behalf of AARP before the Maine PUC, Inquiry into Standard Offer Supply Procurement for Residential and Small Commercial Customers, Docket No. 2004-147 (April 2004).

Comments on behalf of Wisconsin Citizens' Utility Board before the Wisconsin Public Service Commission's Gas Service Standards, Docket No. 1-AC-210 (July 2004).

Comments on behalf of the Colorado Office of Consumer Counsel before the Public Utilities Commission of Colorado, *In the Matter of the Proposed Repeal and Reenactment of all Rules Regulating Telephone Utilities and Providers* (Docket No. 03R-524T) (September 2004).

Direct Testimony on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate before the Pennsylvania PUC, Investigation if Metropolitan Edison Co., Pennsylvania Electric Co. and Pennsylvania Power Co. Reliability Performance, Docket no. I-00040102, [customer service and reliability performance] (June 2004).

Direct and Surrebuttal Testimony on behalf of the Vermont Department of Public Service before the Vermont Board of Public Utilities, Investigation into Successor Alternative Regulatory Plan for Verizon Vermont, Docket 6959 [Service Quality] (November 2004 and March 2005).

Alexander, Barbara, "Vermont Energy Programs for Low-Income Electric And Gas Customers: Filling The Gap" (November 2004), Prepared for AARP Vermont.

Direct and Surrebuttal Testimony on behalf of Wisconsin Citizens' Utility Board before the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, Application of Wisconsin Power and Light Co. for Authority to Increase Retail Electric, Natural Gas and Ripon Water Rates, Docket No. 6680-UR-114 [customer service, credit and collection programs and expenses, low income programs, fixed bill program] (April 2005).

Comments on behalf of the Maine Office of Public Advocate before the Maine Public Utilities Commission, Inquiry into Revisions to Chapter 81, Residential Utility Service Standards for Credit and Collection Programs, and Chapter 86, Disconnection and Deposit Regulations for Nonresidential Utility Service, Docket No. 2005-005 (April and May 2005).

Direct and Rebuttal Testimony on behalf of AARP Montana before the Montana Public Service Commission, Northwestern Energy Electric Cost Tracker, Docket No. D2004.6.90 [Default Service cost recovery policies and integration with low income programs] (December 2004 and July 2005).

Direct Testimony on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate before the Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission, Joint Application of PECO Energy Co. and Public Service Electric and Gas Co. for Approval of the Merger of Public Service Enterprise Group, Inc. with and into Exelon Corporation, Docket No. A-110550F0160 [customer service, reliability of service, low income programs] (June 2005).

Direct Testimony on behalf of Illinois Citizens' Utility Board, City of Chicago, and Community Action for Fair Utility Practice, before the Illinois Commerce Commission, Petition to Initiate Rulemaking with Notice and Comment for Approval of Certain Amendments to Illinois Administrative Code Part 280 Concerning Deposit Requests and Deposit Refunds by Utilities, Docket No. 05-0237 (June 2005).

Direct Testimony on behalf of The Utility Reform Network (TURN) before the California Public Utilities Commission, Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion to Establish Consumer Rights and Consumer Protection Rules Applicable to All Telecommunications Utilities, Docket R-00-02-004 (August 2005).

Alexander, Barbara, <u>Red Flags for Consumer Protection Policies Governing Essential Electric and Gas Utility Services: How to Avoid Adverse Impacts on Low-Income Consumers</u>, prepared under contract with Oak Ridge National Laboratory Energy Division (October 2005).

Comments on behalf of Texas Office of Public Utility Counsel, Texas Legal Services Center, Texas Ratepayers' Organization to Save Energy and AARP Texas, before the Texas PUC, Evaluation of Default Service for Residential Customers and Review of Rules Relating to the Price to Beat and Provider of Last Resort, Project No. 31416 (March 2006) [Default service policies]

Rebuttal and Surrebuttal Testimony on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate before the Pennsylvania PUC, In the Matter of the Petition of the Pennsylvania Power Co. for Approval of an Interim Provider of Last Resort Supply Plan, Docket No. P-00052188 [Default Service policies] (December 2005 and January 2006).

Direct and Rebuttal Testimony on behalf of the Maine Office of Public Advocate before the Maine PUC, Investigation into Verizon Maine's Alternative Form of Regulation, Docket No. 2005-155 [Retail Service Quality] (January and May 2006).

Alexander, Barbara, "State Developments Changing for Default/Standard Retail Electric Service," Natural Gas & Electricity, September 2006.

Direct and Rebuttal Testimony on behalf of the Government and Consumer Parties (CUB, Attorney General of Illinois) before the Illinois Commerce Commission, Petition to Initiate Rulemaking with Notice and Comment for Approval of Certain Amendments to Illinois Administrative Code Part 280, Docket No. 06-0379 (May and September 2006). [Consumer Protection rules]

Direct Testimony on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate before the Pennsylvania PUC, In Re Application of UGI Utilities, Inc., UGI Utilities Newco, Inc., and Southern Union Co., Docket Nos. A-120011F2000, A-125146, A-125146F5000 (June 2006). [Customer Service, Service Quality, and Universal Services]

Direct and Rebuttal Testimony on behalf of the Maryland Office of People's Counsel before the Maryland PSC, In The Competitive Selection of Electricity Supplier/Standard Offer or Default Service for Investor-Owned Utility Small Commercial Customers and, Delmarva Power and Light and Potomac Electric Power Residential Customers, Case No. 9064 (August and September 2006). [Default Service policies]

Direct and Rebuttal Testimony on behalf of the Maryland Office of People's Counsel before the Maryland PSC, In The Matter of the Optimal Structure of the Electric Industry of Maryland, Case No. 9063 (October and November 2006). [Default service policies]

Comments on behalf of AARP Maine before the Maine PUC on various dockets and notices concerning the implementation of Standard Offer Service for residential customers, Docket Nos. 2006-314, 2006-557, and 2006-411 (July-November 2006). [Default service policies]

Comments on behalf of AARP District of Columbia before the District of Columbia PSC, In the Matter of the Development and Designation of Standard Offer Service in the District of Columbia, Case No. 1017 (2006). [Default service policies]

Comments on behalf of AARP New Jersey before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, In the Matter of the Establishment of a Universal Service Fund Pursuant to Section 12 of the Electric Discount and Energy Competition Act of 1999, Docket No. EX00020091 (August 2006) [Recommendations for USF program changes]

Direct and Rebuttal Testimony on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate before the Pennsylvania PUC, Joint Application of Equitable Resources, Inc. and the People's Natural Gas Co., d/b/a Dominion Peoples, for Approval of the Transfer of All Stock Rights of the Latter to the Former and for the Approval of the Transfer of All Stock of Hope Gas, Inc., d/b/a/ Dominion Hope to Equitable Resources, Inc., Docket No. A-122250F5000 (September and October 2006). [Customer Service, Service Quality, and Universal Service issues)

Direct Testimony on behalf of Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate before the Pennsylvania PUC, Pennsylvania PUC v. Natural Fuel Gas Distribution Corp., Docket No. R-00061493 (September 2006) [Supplier Purchase of Receivables Program]

Direct Testimony on behalf of AARP Montana before the Montana Public Service Commission, Joint Application of NorthWestern Energy and BBI to purchase NorthWestern Energy, Docket No. 2006.6.82 [December 2006] [Conditions for approval of merger; low income and customer service programs]

Rebuttal Testimony on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate before the Pennsylvania PUC, Petition by PPL Electric Utilities Corp. for Approval of a Competitive Bridge Plan, Docket No. P-00062227 (December 2006) [Default Service policies]

Direct and Rebuttal Testimony on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate before the Pennsylvania PUC, Application of Duquesne Light Company for a Certificate of Public Convenience Under Section 1102(a)(3) of the Public Utility Code Approving the Acquisition of Duquesne Light Holding, Inc. by Merger, Docket A-110150F0035 (December 2006 and January 2007) [Conditions for approval of merger; low income and customer service programs]

Testimony before the House Least Cost Power Procurement Committee, Illinois General Assembly, on HB 1510, on behalf of AARP [March 22, 2007]
Rebuttal and Surrebuttal Testimony on behalf of Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate before the Pennsylvania PUC, Petition of Duquesne Light Co. for Approval of Default Service Plan for January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2010, Docket No. P-00072247 [April 2007] [Default Service policies]

Comments and Reply Comments on behalf of AARP New Jersey before the Board of Public Utilities BGS Working Group concerning BGS procurement policies and proposed demand response program, (March-May 2007) [Default Service policies]

Comments on behalf of AARP New Jersey to the New Jersey BPU Staff on draft proposed USF regulations (May 2007) [Low income program design and implementation]

Alexander, Barbara, Smart Meters, Real Time Pricing, And Demand Response Programs: Implications For Low Income Electric Customers (May 2007)

Direct and Surrebuttal Testimony on behalf of Maine Office of Public Advocate before the Maine Public Utilities Commission, Re: Joint Application for Approvals Related to Verizon's Transfer of Property and Customer Relations to Company to be Merged with and into FairPoint Communications, Inc., Docket 2007-67 (July and September 2007) [Service Quality and Customer Service Conditions for Merger]

Testimony on behalf of AARP Montana before the Montana Public Service Commission, In the Matter of Montana Dakota Utilities Co., Public Service Commission Investigation and Direction on Electric and Natural Gas Universal System Benefits, Docket No. D2006.1.2 (July 30, 2007) [Design and funding for low income programs]

Testimony on behalf of Maine Office of Public Advocate before the Maine Public Utilities Commission, Central Maine Power Co. Chapter 120 Information (Post ARP 2000) Transmission and Distribution Utility Revenue Requirement and Rate Design And Request for Alternative Rate Plan, Docket No. 2007-215 (August 30, 2007) [AMI deployment]

Direct and Reply Testimony on behalf of AARP Maryland before the Maryland Public Service Commission, In the Matter of the Commission's Investigation of Investor-Owned Electric Companies' Standard Offer Service for Residential and Small Commercial Customers in Maryland, Case No. 9117, Phase I and II (September 2007) [Default Service policies]

Testimony on behalf of AARP Maryland before the Maryland Public Service Commission, In the Matter of the Commission's Investigation of Advanced Metering Technical Standards, Demand Side Management Competitive Neutrality, and Recovery of Costs of Advanced Meters and Demand Side Management Programs, Case 9111 (November 2, 2007) [Default Service policies; AMI deployment]

Comments on behalf of AARP District of Columbia before the D.C. Public Service Commission, In the Matter of The Application Of Potomac Electric Power Co. For Authorization to Establish A Demand Side Management Surcharge and an Advanced Metering Infrastructure Surcharge And to Establish a DSM Collaborative and an AMI Advisory Group, Formal Case No. 1056 (August 10, September 10, November 13, 2007) [Default Service policies; AMI deployment]

Comments on behalf of AARP District of Columbia before the D. C. Public Service Commission, Re: The Petition of the Office of the People's Counsel for the District of Columbia for an Investigation into the Structure of the Procurement Process for Standard Offer Service, Formal Case No. 1047 (November 2007) [Default Service policies]

Presentations and Training Programs:

- National Low Income Energy Consortium (NLIEC) Annual Conference
- NARUC
- NASUCA
- State Legislatures: New Jersey, Texas, Kentucky, Illinois, and Maine
- Commissions: Pennsylvania, Georgia, Kentucky, Illinois, New Jersey
- DOE-NARUC National Electricity Forum
- AIC Conference on Reliability of Electric Service
- Institute of Public Utilities, MSU (Camp NARUC) [Instructor since 1996]
- Training Programs on customer service and service quality regulation for international regulators (India and Brazil) on behalf of Regulatory Assistance Project
- Georgia Natural Gas Deregulation Task Force [December 2001]
- Mid Atlantic Assoc. of Regulatory Utility Commissioners [July 2003]
- Illinois Commerce Commission's Post 2006 Initiative [April 2004]
- Delaware Public Service Commission's Workshop on Standard Offer Service [August 2004]

Exhibit BA-2

AEP OHIO'S RESPONSE TO
THE OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMER COUNSEL
INTERROGATORY REQUESTS
THIRD SET
CASE NO. 08-917-EL-SSO & CASE NO. 08-918-EL-SSO

INTERROGATORY REQUEST NO. 3-92.

Referring to the Application at page 5, how is the percentage increase of the non-fuel generation components (specifically three percent per year for 2009, 2010; and 2011 for CSP and seven percent per year for 2009, 2010, and 2011 for OP) calculated and what is the basis for the calculation?

RESPONSE:

The proposed annual percentage increases to the non-fuel components of the Companies' generation rates reflect judgmental estimates of the appropriate increase during the three-year ESP. The 3% and 7% annual increase levels for non-FAC generation rates are consistent with the 3% and 7% annual increase levels for total generation costs authorized in their RSP proceeding.

Prepared by: J.C. Baker

Exhibit BA-3

AEP OHIO'S RESPONSE TO
COMMISSION STAFF'S
INFORMAL REQUEST NO. 4
CASE NO. 08-917-EL-SS0 & CASE NO. 08-918-EL-SSO

INTERROGATORY REQUEST NO. 4-2

With respect to the Companies' response to Staff Data Request No. 3, Item 83, please itemize the estimated system reliability improvement (on SAIFI and CAIDI) that is attributable to each of the following:

a. The Enhanced Overhead Inspection and Mitigation Initiative;
b. The Enhanced Vegetation Management Initiative;
c. The Enhanced Cable Initiative;
d. The Distribution Automation Initiative; and
e. The gridSMART Phase 1 Initiative;

RESPONSE:

a. The 2005 through 2007 average SAIFI and CAIDI for CSP are 1.68 and 121.0 and for OP they are 1.42 and 138.6, respectively. Assuming all other things remain equal from the 2005 through 2007 averages, which they will not (see Karl Boyd's Direct Testimony at page 8 through 10), the estimated improvement associated with the Enhanced Overhead Inspection and Mitigation Initiative for SAIFI and CAIDI in 2012 would be to 1.56 and 122.6 for CSP and to 1.26 and 132.5 for OP. The above indices do not include impacts of major events. Therefore, these indices do not reflect the improvement associated with reduced outages during major events.

b. The 2005 through 2007 average SAIFI and CAIDI for CSP are 1.68 and 121.0 and for OP they are 1.42 and 138.6, respectively. Assuming all other things remain equal from the 2005 through 2007 averages, which they will not (see Karl Boyd's Direct Testimony at page 8 through 10), the estimated improvement associated with the Enhanced Vegetation Management Initiative for SAIFI and CAIDI in 2012 would be to 1.62 and 120.2 for CSP and to 1.34 and 139.6 for OP. The above indices do not include impacts of major events. Therefore, these indices do not reflect the improvement associated with reduced outages during major events.

c. The Enhanced Cable Initiative has a very nominal impact on SAIFI and CAIDI across the entire system and is therefore not reflected in the estimated system reliability improvements provided. For the customers directly affected by this work their reliability will be significantly improved.

d. Since the additional twenty circuits for the Distribution Automation Initiative (outside gridSMART phase 1) have not been finalized, the benefits for these additional circuits are not included in the reliability improvements provided and cannot be estimated at this time. However, it is expected that the customers served from these circuits will see significant reductions in outage minutes.

INTERROGATORY REQUEST NO. 4-2 CONTINUED

e. The 2005 through 2007 average SAIFI and CAIDI for CSP are 1.68 and 121.0 and for OP they are 1.42 and 138.6, respectively. Assuming all other things remain equal from the 2005 through 2007 averages, which they will not (see Karl Boyd's Direct Testimony at page 8 through 10), the estimated improvement associated with the gridSMART Phase 1 Initiative for SAIFI and CAIDI in 2012 would be to 1.66 and 116.8 for CSP. The gridSMART Phase I initiative is not located in OP territory and therefore has zero impact for OP. The above indices do not include impacts of major events. Therefore, these indices do not reflect the improvement associated with reduced outages during major events.

Prepared by: K. G. Boyd

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing *Direct Testimony of Barbara R. Alexander* was served electronically to the persons listed below on this 31st day of October, 2008.

Colleen Mooney
Colleen L. Mooney

SERVICE LIST

Marvin Resnik
Steve Nourse
AEP Service Corp.
1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215

John Jones
William Wright
Werner Margard
Assistant Attorneys General
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
180 E. Broad St., 9th Fl.
Columbus, OH 43215

John W. Bentine
Mark S. Yurick
Matthew S. White
Chester, Willcox & Saxbe LLP
65 East State St., Ste. 1000
Columbus, OH 43215-4213

Attorney for The Kroger Company, Inc.

Nolan Moser
Air & Energy Program Manager
The Ohio Environmental Council
1207 Grandview Ave., Ste. 201
Columbus, OH 43212-3449

Barth E. Royer
Bell & Royer Co. LPA
33 South Grant Avenue
Columbus, OH 43215-3927

The Ohio Environmental Council and
Dominion Retail, Inc.

Trent A. Dougherty
The Ohio Environmental Council
1207 Grandview Ave., Ste. 201
Columbus, OH 43212-3449

M. Howard Petricoff
Stephen M. Howard
Vorys, Sater, Seymour And Pease LLP
52 East Gay S., P. O. Box 1008
Columbus, OH 43216-1008

Attorneys for Constellation NewEnergy, Inc. and Constellation Energy Commodities Group, Inc.

Cynthia A. Fonner
Senior Counsel
Constellation Energy Group, Inc.
550 W. Washington St., Suite 300
Chicago, IL 60661

Attorneys for Constellation NewEnergy, Inc. and Constellation Energy Commodities Group, Inc.

Samuel C. Randazzo
Lisa G. McAlister
Daniel J. Neilsen
Joseph M. Clark
McNees, Wallace & Nurick LLC
21 East State St., 17th Fl.
Columbus, OH 43215

Attorneys for Industrial Energy Users-Ohio

David C. Rinebolt
Colleen L. Mooney
Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy
231 West Lima Street
P.O. Box 1793
Findlay, OH 45839-1793

Attorneys for Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy

David F. Boehm, Esq.
Michael L. Kurtz, Esq.
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry
36 East Seventh St., Ste. 1510
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Attorneys for The Ohio Energy Group

Daniel R. Conway
Porter Wright Morris & Arthur
Huntington Center
41 S. High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Michael R. Smalz
Joseph V. Maskovyak
Ohio State Legal Services Association
Appalachian People's Action Coalition
555 Buttles Avenue
Columbus, OH 43215

Attorneys for APAC

Richard L. Sites
Ohio Hospital Association
155 East Broad Street, 15th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215-3620

Attorney for Ohio Hospital Association

Henry W. Eckhart
50 W. Broad St., #2117
Columbus, OH 43215

Attorney for The Sierra Club Ohio Chapter and Natural Resources Defense Council

Craig G. Goodman
National Energy Marketers Association
3333 K St., N.W., Ste. 110
Washington, D.C. 20007

Sally W. Bloomfield
Terrence O'Donnell
Bricker & Eckler, LLP
100 South Third Street
Columbus, OH 43215-4291

Attorney for American Wind Energy Association, Wind On The Wires and Ohio Advanced Energy

Larry Gearhardt
Chief Legal Counsel
Ohio Farm Bureau Federation
280 North High St., P.O. Box 182383
Columbus, OH 43218-2383

Clinton A. Vince
Presley R. Reed
Emma F. Hand
Ethan E.Rii
Sonnenschein, Nath & Rosenthal LLP
1301 K Street NW
Suite 600, East Tower
Washington, DC 20005

Attorneys for Ormet Primary Aluminum Corporation

Langdon D. Bell
Bell & Royer Co., LPA
33 South Grant Ave.
Columbus OH 43215-3927

Attorney for Ohio Manufacturer's Association

Scott H. DeBroff
Stephen J. Romeo
Alicia R. Petersen, J.D.
Smigel, Anderson & Sacks, LLP
River Chase Office Center
4431 North Front St.
Harrisburg, PA 17110

Attorneys for ConsumerPowerline

Benjamin Edwards
Law Offices of John L. Alden
One East Livingston Ave.
Columbus, OH 43215-5700

Attorney for ConsumerPowerline

M. Howard Petricoff
Stephen M. Howard
Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease LLP
52 East Gay St., P.O. Box 1008
Columbus, OH 43216-1008

Attorneys for the Ohio Association of School Business Officials, Ohio School Boards Association, and Buckeye Association of School Administrators

sam@mwncmh.com
lmcalister@mwncmh.com
dneilsen@mwncmh.com
jclark@mwncmh.com
Thomas.McNamee@puc.state.oh.us
william.wright@puc.state.oh.us
Werner.Margard@puc.state.oh.us
drinebolt@aol.com
cmooney2@columbus.rr.com
dboehm@bkllawfirm.com
mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com
miresnik@aep.com
stnourse@aep.com
cgoodman@energymarketers.com
LGearhardt@ofbf.org
LBell33@aol.com
sromeo@sasllp.com
sbloomfield@bricker.com

dconway@porterwright.com
BarthRoyer@aol.com
nmoser@theOEC.org
trent@theOEC.org
jbentine@cwslaw.com
myurick@cwslaw.com
mwhite@cwslaw.com
msmalz@oslsa.org
jmaskovyak@oslsa.org
Cynthia.A.Fonner@constellation.com
smhoward@vssp.com
mhpetricoff@vssp.com
ricks@ohanet.org
henryeckhart@aol.com
mhpetricoff@vorys.com
bedwards@aldenlaw.net
mhpetricoff@vorys.com
todonnell@bricker.com