BEFORE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of Protocols for the)	
Measurement and Verification of Energy)	Case No. 09-512-GE-UNC
Efficiency and Peak Demand Reduction)	
Measures.)	

Comments of Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy Regarding Appendix A of the Entry of July 8, 2009.

Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy ("OPAE") hereby submits the following comments to the Appendix A of the Entry of July 8, 2009.

Question 1.

OPAE supports the Provisional Recommendations of the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio ("PUCO" or "the Commission") to utilize gross savings when assessing the energy efficiency achieved by utility portfolios. Because Ohio has not had the benefit of utility demand side management ("DSM") programs in recent years, the initial implementation of programs will serve to hasten market transformation activities. At this point, spillover effects and "free ridership" are not critical issues; changing Ohioans approach to using energy is. As a result, the Commission's proposal to utilize gross savings as the measure and to review this resolution in the future is the appropriate approach.

Question 2.

OPAE supports the use of federal standards and state codes as the baseline for determining the effect of installing efficiency measures. However, we have concerns about using current market practice at this stage of

implementation in Ohio. In our view, the utility program is the incentive that causes people to make the decision to move to a higher efficiency option. Using a current market practice that reduces the amount of savings above code serves to discount the savings that was precipitated by the utility funds. Our agencies tend to look at savings as what goes into a customer's pocket due to reduction in use. Discounting the savings above code based on market practice removes the direct link between the utility funding and the reduction in energy use. Current market practice is a somewhat amorphous concept and does not accurately reflect the *customer's* decision. OPAE recommends using codes and standards, and if there is no code or standard using the actual savings against the actual baseline.

Question 3.

OPAE supports the provisional recommendation of the Commission.

Question 4.

OPAE supports the provisional recommendation of the Commission. We do, however, suggest adding an additional justification for what are described as 'non-cost effective measures'; reduction in arrearages and improved payment behavior which translates into lower bad debt and related costs. This is particularly important for low-income programs. A program that is marginal under a TRC test can have monetary benefits not considered by that test. Those types of factors should be incorporated into the Commission's analysis.

Question 5.

OPAE supports the provisional recommendation of the Commission.

Conclusion

The Commission is moving in a logical fashion and these recommendation generally follow "best practices". Ohio is just beginning to implement DSM for non-low income customers. The existing low-income programs can provide some insight into the maturation of DSM programs over time. The Commission recommendations reflect the fact that DSM in Ohio will evolve over time and the appropriate policy at this point should evolve as well. OPAE also recognizes that SB 221 imposed somewhat unreasonable benchmarks for at least the first 2 years of the program. DSM programs are complicated because they are retail programs delivered to customers. Unlike using electricity, DSM requires affirmative acts by customers in order to succeed. Defining savings too narrowly as programs are in a nascent stage is counterproductive to the policy espoused in SB 221. At the same time, the savings need to be real, to the customer implementing the measure and to the ratepayers who pay the bill.

SB 221 recognizes that utilities provide a service and that service can be provided through the supply of electricity or through efficiency. The Commission recommendations are a good first step down that path.

Respectfully submitted,

/S/David C. Rinebolt

David C. Rinebolt (0073178) Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy P.O. Box 1793 Findlay, OH 45839-1793

Telephone: (419) 425-8860

e-mail: drinebolt@ohiopartners.org

On Behalf of Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of these Objections to the Staff Report of Investigation were served by regular U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, upon the parties of record identified below on this 24th day of July, 2009.

/S/David C. Rinebolt

David C. Rinebolt, Esq.

Counsel for Ohio Partners for Affordable

Energy

Marvin I. Resnik American Electric Power Service Corp. 1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor Columbus, OH 43215 Randall V. Griffin The Dayton Power & Light Company 1065 Woodman Drive Dayton, OH 45432 Elizabeth H. Watts
Duke Energy Ohio
PO Box 960
Cincinnati, OH 45201-0960

Kathy J. Kolich FirstEnergy Service Company 76 South Main St. Akron, OH 44308 Samuel C. Randazzo McNees Wallace & Nurick 21 East State St., 17th Floor Columbus, OH 43215-4228

David A. Kutik Jones Day 901 Lakeside Avenue Cleveland, OH 44114

Stephen Seiple Columbia Gas of Ohio PO Box 117 Columbus, OH 43215 Mark A. Whitt Carpent Lipps & Leland 280 North High St, Suite 1300 Columbus, OH 43215 Jeffrey L. Small
Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel
10 West Broad St., Suite 1800
Columbus, OH 43215-3485

Janet K. Stoneking
Ohio Department of Development
PO Box 1001
Columbus, OH 43216-1001

Nolan Moser The Ohio Environmental Council 1207 Grandview Ave., Suite 201 Columbus, OH 43212-3449

Bricker & Eckler 100 South Third St. Columbus, OH 43215-4291

Thomas J. O'Brien

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

7/24/2009 2:57:00 PM

in

Case No(s). 09-0512-GE-UNC

Summary: Comments Comments of Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy to Appendix A electronically filed by Mr. David C Rinebolt on behalf of Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy