

**BEFORE**

**THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

**In the Matter of Protocols for the  
Measurement and Verification of Energy  
Efficiency and Peak Demand Reduction  
Measures.**

**Case No. 09-512-GE-UNC**

---

**JOINT COMMENTS REGARDING APPENDIX A OF THE EAST OHIO GAS  
COMPANY D/B/A DOMINION EAST OHIO, COLUMBIA GAS OF OHIO, INC.,  
VECTREN ENERGY DELIVERY OF OHIO, INC., AND DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC.**

---

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Pursuant to the Commission's June 24, 2009 Entry ("Entry"), The East Ohio Gas Company d/b/a Dominion East Ohio ("DEO"), Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc. ("Columbia"), Vectren Energy Delivery of Ohio, Inc. ("VEDO"), and Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. ("DE-Ohio") (together, the "Gas Utilities") jointly file these comments regarding Appendix A to that Entry. The Gas Utilities are filing these joint comments to construct a consensus regarding policy issues associated with the development of an energy efficiency Technical Reference Manual ("TRM") for Ohio. The Gas Utilities reserve the right to raise additional issues throughout this proceeding.

There are four things that the Commission should consider in determining whether to adopt a TRM for gas utilities and, if adopted, what such a TRM should contain. First, the Commission should consider whether it is necessary to have a TRM for gas utilities at all, especially in light of the programs that already exist in Ohio and the manner in which those programs have developed and similar future programs will develop in the absence of a TRM. The Commission has approved voluntary energy efficiency programs for all of the Gas Utilities. Entry at 2. It approved all of those programs without a TRM. Some of the energy efficiency programs approved by the Commission include many of the same features that the Commission

may prescribe through a TRM, including engineering data and measurement and verification. Imposing new requirements on Gas Utilities will only lead to higher rates for customers because customers will bear the costs of any additional administrative requirements associated with a TRM. Given the progress already achieved in reducing per customer consumption and increasing energy efficiency for gas customers, the Commission should consider whether new procedures imposed through a TRM will be worth the cost.

Second, if the Commission adopts a TRM, the TRM should not disturb existing programs, including the methodologies to determine whether those existing programs are cost effective.

Third, the parameters set forth in the TRM should be flexible enough to permit each sponsoring utility to present accurately the costs and benefits associated with its portfolio, program(s), project(s) or measure(s).

Fourth, the TRM should be simple and inexpensive to administer. There is a cost to gather all of the data so that sponsoring utilities can: (a) produce an application for program approval; (b) demonstrate that the program is cost-effective; (c) provide appropriate measurement and verification; (d) develop new programs; (e) annually amend existing programs to meet ongoing requirements; and (f) participate in continuous regulatory proceedings to amend the TRM. Many of these activities may be necessary, but they should be designed to minimize time and cost.

## **II. COMMENTS**

### **A. The Commission Should Not Adopt a TRM for Gas Utilities.**

The Commission's Entry requires interested parties to comment on policy issues set forth in Appendix A regarding the development of a TRM. Entry at 5. It also invites parties to

“suggest other policy considerations....” *Id.* A preliminary policy consideration is whether a TRM applicable to energy efficiency programs sponsored by the Gas Utilities is necessary at all.

Despite the lack of a TRM, customers already benefit from gas energy efficiency innovations developed and implemented by the manufacturers of gas appliances and other home equipment. Most gas appliances — including stoves, ovens, furnaces, and water heaters — have become more efficient over the years and efficiency continues to improve. These efficiencies have evolved from, among other factors, pilotless features and technologies that burn gas more completely. Other nongas-burning residential equipment have also contributed to reduce gas consumption. For example, low-flow showerheads reduce the need for hot water usage, thereby reducing the amount of gas used to heat water. Newer homes have also become more energy efficient because they are better insulated than ever before. And, despite the fact that there is no statutory requirement that the Gas Utilities invest in energy efficiency, all of the Gas Utilities have made Commission-approved energy efficiency investments, and customers have instituted their own energy efficiency investments, without a TRM. Entry at 2. Some of the Gas Utilities have developed cost effective energy efficiency programs with measurement and verification standards approved by the Commission. Additional approval and verification processes, along with the time and expense that would accompany such additional processes, are not necessary.

Indeed, the additional process, time and cost associated with a TRM may have the opposite effect intended by the Commission. A TRM could create a barrier to gas utility energy efficiency investment. Redundant market assessment, sampling, and engineering costs are just some of the increased costs that result from unnecessary regulatory requirements. These increased costs will ultimately be borne by customers. And the more it costs for an individual to participate in any energy efficiency measure, the less likely that person will participate in the

program. For energy efficiency programs sponsored by Gas Utilities, the Commission already has an application, approval and cost recovery process. No additional processes — and costs — are required.

If the Commission determines that a TRM should apply to gas energy efficiency programs, it should not retroactively apply the TRM. The Gas Utilities' existing energy efficiency programs were developed as part of a collaborative process and the Commission determined they were cost-effective when it approved them. The collaborative process provides the flexibility necessary to design and evaluate each Gas Utility's programs to account for the differences among the Gas Utilities' respective systems. The Commission has applied reporting requirements to some of the Gas Utilities. The Commission receives measurement and verification of program performance relative to program goals from some of the Gas Utilities. The different application and approval processes used by the Commission to implement diverse energy efficiency programs sponsored by the Gas Utilities demonstrates the value of a flexible process necessary to accommodate the unique circumstances of each Gas Utility. The "one size fits all" approach of a TRM may undo much of what has already been done. No additional process or expense is necessary relative to the gas energy efficiency programs already approved.

The Commission suggested that "the electric and gas utilities... review and consider the TRMs and protocols developed by other states and regional entities for energy efficiency programs, such as the Pennsylvania TRM...." The Gas Utilities are reviewing the protocols developed by other states beginning with the eleven states identified by the Commission at its technical conference and in its June 24, 2009 Entry. Three things have become clear:

- Of those eleven states, only Minnesota and Wisconsin require gas utilities to develop and implement energy efficiency programs (Minn. Stat. 216B.241(1c); Wis. Stat. 196.374(1)(e));
- Only Minnesota has adopted a mandatory TRM that is applicable to gas utilities (Minnesota Public Utilities Commission, Case No. 08-272); and
- Some states, including Pennsylvania, have adopted a TRM applicable only to energy efficiency programs sponsored by electric utilities (73 P.S. § 1648.3).<sup>1</sup>

Most states — including California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Oregon, Vermont, and Washington — have adopted energy efficiency requirements for electric utilities only. Some of the states that mandate that electric utilities develop and implement energy efficiency programs, like Massachusetts and California, suggest that gas utilities voluntarily sponsor energy efficiency programs or adopt published measures. None of those states, statutorily or by TRM, mandate that gas utilities sponsor energy efficiency programs. The Commission should follow the policy decision adopted by most states and develop a TRM applicable only to electric utilities.

**B. Should the Commission Evaluate Performance of Utility Programs on the Basis of Achieved Gross or Net Savings, or Both?**

**1. The Commission Should Determine Program-by-Program Whether to Evaluate Savings on a Gross or Net Basis.**

The Commission should evaluate gas energy efficiency programs on the basis of either gross savings or net savings, depending upon the attributes of the particular program. In addition to the energy efficiency measure and the various ancillary circumstances that affect a measure (*e.g.*, the amount of insulation in a home affects the amount of gas that a new high efficiency furnace will consume), there are three factors that should be evaluated: free riders; take-back

---

<sup>1</sup> The Gas Utilities will not list the state statutes that do not apply to gas utilities. In Ohio, the statute corresponding to Pennsylvania's is R.C. 4928.66, which, like Pennsylvania's statute, applies only to electric utilities.

effect; and spillover effect. *See* Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission, *Implementation of the Alternative Energy Portfolio Standards Act of 2004: Standards for the participation of Demand Side Management Resources – Technical Reference Manual Update* (Order at 16) (June 1, 2009).

Free riders are customers that take advantage of energy efficiency program incentives even though they would have installed the measure(s) anyway. *Id.* Take-back effect occurs when a customer implements an energy efficiency measure but increases energy use for comfort or convenience. *Id.* Spillover is when a customer invests in energy efficiency without taking advantage of program incentives. *Id.* The savings associated with gas energy efficiency programs with significant and measurable free riders, take-back effect, or spillover may be more accurately determined through a net savings calculation because such effects increase or decrease the savings associated with energy efficiency programs. For example, spillover causes customers to implement additional energy efficiency measures without using program resources.

The savings associated with other gas energy efficiency programs may be more accurately determined through a gross savings calculation because there is no ancillary influence on the savings calculation.

The Gas Utilities should be free to suggest either a net or gross savings calculation methodology as part of an application seeking approval of a gas energy efficiency program if such an application is required.

**2. The Commission Should Consider Measures That Have a Payback Period of Less Than One-Year.**

The Commission recommends that “utilities should not provide incentives for measures that have a payback period of one year or less to customers.” Entry at Appendix A at 2. The Gas Utilities disagree with the Commission’s recommendation.

Each gas energy efficiency portfolio — and ultimately each program within a portfolio — should be judged upon its cost-effectiveness and other benefits and detriments. The length of a payback period is irrelevant, especially when affordability is an issue. In difficult economic times, a customer may participate in energy efficiency programs with a shorter payback period because the customer cannot afford to invest more capital in energy efficiency. When economic conditions are better, customers may be willing to participate in energy efficiency programs with longer payback periods. To reject a gas energy efficiency program because its payback period is less than one year is an arbitrary standard that may prevent a beneficial program from being proposed and approved.

For example, there are few low-flow showerheads that are currently available at retail stores. The Commission has approved gas energy efficiency programs that offer incentives to residential customers to purchase low-flow showerheads. The payback period for such devices is less than a year. However, supporting programs that offer incentives to purchase such showerheads is a market transformation opportunity. Such programs should not be rejected simply because the customer saves more than the cost of the purchase in less than a year.

**C. How Should Baseline Efficiency and Market Penetration be Defined for Determining Energy Savings and Demand Reductions?**

The Commission recommends that the baseline efficiency “used to calculate savings should be set at the minimum efficiency requirements of federal standards and state codes or current market practice, whichever is higher.” Entry at Appendix A at 4. During the July 8, 2009 technical conference on the Commission’s energy efficiency policy, the Commission’s consultant asked the question: how good is good enough? This is the right question to ask in relation to the determination of a baseline efficiency from which to measure savings.

The Commission's recommendation would require a market assessment as part of the process to determine an efficiency baseline for every gas energy efficiency measure. Market assessments are expensive. Where different social groups have different practices – for instance, where purchasing habits differ between socio-economic classes – there effectively could be multiple markets within a region, each requiring a market assessment. Because customers ultimately pay for those assessments, the Commission should consider whether market assessments add sufficient value before requiring them in all cases.

It is not necessary to perform a market assessment where the market practice is reasonably known or the energy-efficient technology is not significantly different than technology already available in the market. On the other hand, a market assessment should be performed where market participants have market options that may be significantly less energy efficient than the federal or state standards would otherwise require. That may occur, for example, when consumers purchase used, energy-inefficient gas stoves because they cannot afford the cost of new models that meet the federal or state standard.

Ultimately, the Commission should consider the appropriate baseline efficiency approach on a case- by-case basis. If government standards provide a reasonable result at a minimal cost, the Commission should approve those standards. If a market assessment is necessary to establish a reasonable baseline, the Commission should approve a market assessment process if such a process permits the gas energy efficiency program to remain cost-effective. The Commission should consider a flexible approach in reviewing any application that proposes a reasonable methodology to establish baseline efficiency.

The Gas Utilities agree with the Commission's recommendation that, for "early retirement" programs, the baseline should be the energy use of the existing appliance or



equipment until the remaining useful life of the existing equipment would have ended. After that point, the baseline should be the efficiency of new standard equipment, as defined by code, standard, or standard practice. Entry at Appendix A at 4. In determining remaining useful life for existing equipment, however, the Commission should keep in mind that remaining useful life actually goes up the older a piece of equipment is. The longer a piece of equipment has run without replacement, the greater the likelihood that the equipment is well-made and will continue operating longer than usual.

**D. Should Reported Energy Savings and Demand Reduction Use Retroactive or Prospective TRM Values?**

The Gas Utilities agree with the Commission's recommendation that energy savings and demand reduction estimates approved by the Commission as part of a gas energy efficiency program should not be adjusted retroactively. *Ex post* estimates should cause adjustments only on a going forward basis. The Commission should proceed with caution when making such adjustments.

Energy price forecasts are an important component of the estimated energy savings projected by the Gas Utilities in a gas energy efficiency program application. Energy prices, including gas prices, are volatile. Additionally, price forecasts are typically for a period of twenty-years or more. The basis for price forecasts may be a proprietary model for the early years and an index adjustment for inflation for the remaining years. Differences between early year price forecasts and actual prices should not require the Commission automatically to adjust energy savings on a going forward basis. Subsequent years' prices may move just as quickly in the opposite direction, better aligning forecasts with actual prices. Because prices may move quickly in the opposite direction (a not-unexpected phenomenon with energy commodity prices), changes to energy savings should be based upon established trends rather than upon a reaction to

short-term price volatility. Energy savings reporting requirements should permit the Gas Utilities to contrast estimated savings with current and reasonably forecasted conditions and make recommendations based upon historical facts and judgment. The TRM should permit the Commission the flexibility to amend estimated savings proactively in a reasonable manner rather than in a manner dictated by an inflexible rule.

**E. Should the Cost-Effectiveness Test be Applied at the Measure, Project, Program or Portfolio Level?**

The Gas Utilities generally agree with the Commission's recommendation to apply the cost-effectiveness test at the portfolio or program level. Such a standard allows the Commission, Gas Utilities and customers flexibility to design, test, and adjust energy efficiency measures, projects and programs to maximize benefits. Some measures, projects, and programs may require the application of a cost-effectiveness test, such as the TRC, before being submitted to the Commission for approval. The TRM should be flexible enough to accommodate application of the TRC, or other cost-effectiveness test, at any appropriate level. For example, if a measure requires the use of engineering standards to design, measure and verify the measure, it is likely that the engineering standards should also be used at the measure level to determine cost-effectiveness.

The Gas Utilities also generally agree with the factors that the Commission has listed for consideration in weighing whether a non-cost-effective measure should be included in an approved program. *See* Entry at Appendix A at 7. The Gas Utilities would recommend including "Building science/performance issues" as an additional potential factor. In some instances, an energy efficiency measure could be considered non-cost-effective due to extrinsic home improvement costs necessitated by the measure. For instance, installing a new, high-efficiency gas heating system at a residence that had both a gas furnace and a gas water heater

might require installing a separate venting system for the new, replacement furnace and re-lining the existing chimney venting for the water heater to insure that combustion products from the water heater draft properly. As another example, a homeowner may need to repair his or her roof before installing additional attic insulation. If the Commission rejects energy efficiency measures because of extrinsic costs due to building science or performance issues, the Commission could lose important opportunities for energy savings. The Gas Utilities encourage the Commission to consider that some costs are only indirectly related to an energy-efficiency measure, and more directly related to building science/performance issues, when weighing requests to include non-cost effective measures in a program.

**F. What Expectations Should the Commission Establish for Energy Savings and Demand Reduction Determination Certainty?**

The Commission recommends that “any evaluation sampling provide results at a 90 percent confidence level with 10 percent precision.” Such a standard makes sense if there is a need for sampling. Many gas energy efficiency programs, however, do not require sampling. Sampling can be an expensive process that requires an evaluation of measure or project units. For most gas energy efficiency programs, a bill analysis may yield better results at a lower cost. Moreover, a 90 percent confidence level with 10 percent precision may not always be achievable, depending on the population size and the parameters of interest.

The Commission should consider the cost of precision before it applies a blanket prescription for sampling. The Gas Utilities recommend a flexible approach permitting an application to the Commission that suggests sampling or another reasonable approach to establish energy savings certainty.

### III. CONCLUSION

The Gas Utilities appreciate the opportunity to present comments to the Commission's proposed Appendix A. The Gas Utilities are in the process of implementing energy efficiency programs. A process that encourages the development and implementation of cost-effective gas energy efficiency programs is prudent. A flexible approach to the development of gas energy efficiency portfolios is necessary to achieve accurate results and maximize benefits for customers. This is consistent with the process currently used by Gas Utilities, which does not include a TRM.

Respectfully submitted,

/s Paul A. Colbert

David A. Kutik (Counsel of Record)

JONES DAY

North Point, 901 Lakeside Avenue

Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Telephone: (216) 586-3939

Facsimile: (216) 579-0212

dakutik@jonesday.com

Paul A. Colbert

Grant W. Garber

JONES DAY

325 John H. McConnell Blvd., Suite 600

P. O. Box 165017

Columbus, Ohio 43216-5017

Telephone: (614) 469-3939

Facsimile: (614) 461-4198

pacolbert@jonesday.com

gwggarber@jonesday.com

ATTORNEYS FOR THE EAST OHIO GAS  
COMPANY D/B/A DOMINION EAST OHIO

/s Eric Gallon per email authority/PAC

Eric Gallon  
Porter Wright Morris & Arthur LLP  
Huntington Center  
41 South High Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
Telephone: (614) 227-2190  
Facsimile: (614) 227-2100  
egallon@porterwright.com

Stephen Seiple  
Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc.  
200 Civic Center Drive, PO Box 117  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
Telephone: (614) 460-4648  
Facsimile: (614) 460-4944  
sseiple@nisource.com

ATTORNEYS FOR COLUMBIA GAS OF  
OHIO, INC.

/s Mark A. Whitt per email authority/PAC

Mark A. Whitt  
Carpenter Lipps & Leland LLP  
280 Plaza, Suite 1300  
280 North High Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
Telephone: (614) 365-4100  
Facsimile: (614) 365-9145  
whitt@carpenterlipps.com

ATTORNEY FOR VECTREN ENERGY  
DELIVERY OF OHIO, INC.

/s Elizabeth H. Watts per phone authority/PAC

Elizabeth H. Watts  
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.  
155 East Broad Street, 21<sup>st</sup> Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
Telephone: (614) 222-1331  
Facsimile: (614) 222-1337  
Elizabeth.watts@duke-energy.com

ATTORNEY FOR DUKE ENERGY OHIO,  
INC.

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was sent by electronic mail\* or regular U.S. mail, postage paid to the following parties on this 24th day of July, 2009.

---

Paul A. Colbert

\*Mark A. Whitt, Esq.  
Carpenter, Lipps & Leland LLP  
280 Plaza, Suite 1300  
280 North High Street  
Columbus, OH 43215

\*Kathy J. Kolich, Esq.  
FirstEnergy Corp  
76 South Main Street  
Akron, OH 44308  
kjkolich@firstenergycorp.com

\*Rodger A. Kershner, Esq.  
450 West Fourth Street  
Royal Oak, MI 48067-2557  
rkershner@howardandhoward.com

\*Mr. Kenneth D. Schisler  
Enernoc, Inc.  
75 Federal St., Suite 300  
Boston, MA 02110  
kschisler@enernoc.com

\*Ms. Janet K. Stoneking  
Ohio Department of Development  
77 S. High Street  
P.O. Box 1001  
Columbus, OH 43216-1001

\*Carolyn S. Flahive, Esq.  
Thompson Hine LLP  
41 South High Street Suite 1700  
Columbus, OH 43215-6101  
carolyn.flahive@thompsonhine.com

\*Mary W. Christensen, Esq.  
Christensen Christensen Donchatz  
Kettlewell & Owens  
100 East Campus View Blvd., Suite 360  
Columbus, OH 43235  
mchristensen@columbuslaw.org

\*W. Jonathan Airey, Esq.  
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP  
52 East Gay Street Po Box 1008  
Columbus, OH 43216-1008  
wjairy@vorys.com

\*Mr. Nolan M. Moser  
The Ohio Environmental Council  
1207 Grandview Ave.  
Columbus, OH 43212-3449  
nolan@theoec.org

\*Lisa G. McAlister, Esq.  
McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC  
21 East State Street, 17th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
lmcaster@mwncmh.com

\*Ms. Deb J. Bingham  
The Office of the Ohio Consumers'  
Counsel  
10 West Broad St., Suite 1800  
Columbus, OH 43215-3485

\*Ms. Christine M. Falco  
PJM Interconnection LLC  
965 Jefferson Avenue  
Norristown, PA 19403  
falcoc@pjm.com

\*Matthew S. White, Esq.  
Chester Willcox & Saxbe  
65 E State Street  
Columbus, OH 43228  
mwhite@cwslaw.com

\*Mr. Dwight N. Lockwood  
Global Energy, Inc.  
312 Walnut Street, Suite 2300  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
dnlockwood@globalenergyinc.com

\*Elizabeth H. Watts, Esq.  
Assistant General Counsel  
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.  
155 East Broad Street, Suite 2100  
Columbus, OH 43215  
elizabeth.watts@duke-energy.com

\*Ms. Connie L. Lausten  
V.P. Regulatory and Legislative Affairs  
New Generation Biofuels  
4308 Brandywine St. NW  
Washington, DC 20016  
cllausten@newgenerationbiofuels.com

\*Mr. Steven T. Nourse  
American Electric Power Service  
Corporation  
1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
stnourse@aep.com

\*Ms. Kari Decker  
APX  
2939 27th St  
Sacramento, CA 95818  
kdecker@apx.com

Duane Luckey, Section Chief  
Office of the Ohio Attorney General  
Public Utilities Section  
180 East Broad Street, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
duane.luckey@puc.state.oh.us

Columbia Gas of Ohio Inc  
Robert G. Kriner  
200 Civic Center Drive  
Columbus, OH 43215

Eric B Gallon, Esq.  
Porter Wright Morris & Arthur LLP  
41 South High Street Suite 3000  
Columbus, OH 43215  
egallon@porterwright.com

Vectren Energy Delivery of Ohio, Inc.  
Ronald E. Christian  
One Vectren Square  
Evansville, IN 47708

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel  
Jeffery Small, Esq.  
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800  
Columbus, OH 43215-3485  
small@occ.state.oh.us  
serio@occ.state.oh.us

Michael R. Beiting, Esq.  
FirstEnergy Corp  
76 South Main Street  
Akron, OH 44308  
kjkolich@firstenergycorp.com

Sally Bloomfield, Esq.  
Bricker & Eckler LLP  
100 South Third Street  
Columbus, OH 43215-4291

Candace Jones, Esq.  
Ohio Department of Development  
77 S. High Street  
P.O. Box 1001  
Columbus, OH 43216-1001

Thomas E. Lodge, Esq.  
Thompson Hine LLP  
41 South High Street Suite 1700  
Columbus, OH 43215-6101

Steven Millard  
200 Tower City Center  
50 Public Square  
Cleveland, OH 44113

Garrett A. Stone, Attorney At Law  
Brickfield, Burchette, Rim & Stone, P.C.  
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street N.W.  
8th Floor, West Tower  
Washington, DC 20007

Randall V. Griffin, Chief Regulatory  
Counsel  
Dayton Power and Light Company  
1065 Woodman Drive  
P O Box 8825  
Dayton, OH 45401

Gregory J. Poulos, Attorney  
The Office of the Ohio Consumers'  
Counsel  
10 West Broad St., Suite 1800  
Columbus, OH 43215-3485

Ms. Anita Schafer  
Duke Energy Ohio  
139 East Fourth Street  
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Harvey Wagner  
Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.  
Ohio Edison Company  
Toledo Edison Company  
76 S. Main Street  
Akron, OH 44308

Selwyn J. Dias, Esq.  
Columbus Southern Power  
Ohio Power Company  
88 East Broad Street, Suite 800  
Columbus, OH 43215

Gary S. Guzy, Esq.  
General Counsel  
APX Inc  
5201 Great America Parkway #522  
Santa Clara, CA 95054

David C. Rinebolt  
Ohio Partners For Affordable Energy  
231 West Lima St  
P O Box 1793  
Findlay, OH 45839-1793

Robert J. Triozzi, Esq.  
Director of Law  
Cleveland City Hall  
601-Lakeside Ave, Room 206  
Cleveland, OH 44114-1077

David R. Marchese  
Haddington Ventures, L.L.C.  
2603 Augusta, Suite 900  
Houston, TX 77057

Joseph V. Maskovyak  
Ohio State Legal Services Association  
555 Buttles Avenue  
Columbus, OH 43215-1137

Dayton Power & Light Company  
Dona Seger-Lawson  
1065 Woodman Drive  
Dayton, OH 45432



Judi L. Sobecki, Attorney at Law  
1065 Woodman Drive  
Dayton, OH 45432

Environment Ohio-Environmental  
Advocate  
Amy Gomberg  
203 East Broad Street, Ste 3  
Columbus, OH 43215

Greenfield Steam & Electric  
Neil Sater  
6618 Morningside Drive  
Brecksville, OH 44141

Industrial Energy Users of Ohio  
Samuel C. Randazzo, Gener  
21 E. State Street, 17th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215

Joseph M. Clark, Attorney at Law  
McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC  
21 East State Street, 17th Fl.  
Columbus, OH 43215-4228

Mid Ohio Regional Planning Commission  
Erin Miller  
111 Library Street, Suite 100  
Columbus, OH 43215

Ohio Energy Group, Inc.  
David Boehm  
36 E. Seventh Street, Suite 1510  
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Michael Kurtz  
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry  
36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510  
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, Inc.  
Dale Arnold  
Director Energy Services  
P.O. Box 182383  
Columbus, OH 43218

Ohio Fuel Cell Coalition  
737 Bolivar Road  
Cleveland, OH 44115

Rolls-Royce Fuel Cell Systems, Inc.  
6065 Strip Avenue NW  
North Canton, OH 44720

Sierra Club Ohio Chapter  
Brandi Whetstone  
131 N High St., Ste. 605  
Columbus, OH 43215

The Climate Registry  
Ann McCabe  
1543 W. School St  
Chicago, IL 60657

United Steel Workers District 1  
Dave Caldwell  
777 Dearborn Park Land, J  
Columbus, OH 43085

Vertus Technologies Inc  
Joseph Koncelik  
2500 Key Center  
127 Public Square  
Cleveland, OH 44114-1230

FirstEnergy Solutions Corp.  
Lou D'Alessandris, Market  
341 White Pond Drive  
Akron, OH 44320

Morgan Parke, Attorney at Law  
FirstEnergy Service Company  
76 South Main Street  
Akron, OH 44308

AARP  
Ron Bridges  
17 South High Street  
Suite 800  
Columbus, OH 43215

American Municipal Power-Ohio Inc  
Marc Gerken, P.E., President  
2600 Airport Drive  
Columbus, OH 43219-2266

John Bentine, Esq.  
Chester Wilcox & Saxbe, LLP  
65 East State Street, Suite 1000  
Columbus, OH 43215-4259

American Wind Energy Assoc.  
1101 14th Street NW  
12th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005

Appalachian People's Action, Coalition  
Michael R. Smalz  
Ohio State Legal Service Assoc.  
555 Buttles Avenue  
Columbus, OH 43215

APX Inc  
5201 Great America Parkway  
#522  
Santa Clara, CA 95054

BrightPath Energy LLC  
33 West 19th Street  
4th Floor  
New York, NY 10011

Buckeye Power, Inc.  
P.O. Box 26036  
Columbus, OH 43226-0036

Citizen Power  
David Hughes, Ex. Dir.  
2121 Murray Avenue  
Third Floor  
Pittsburgh, PA 15217

Theodore Robinson  
Citizen Power  
2424 Dock Road  
Madison, OH 44057

Citizens for Fair Utility Rates  
Tim Walters  
c/o The May Dugen Center  
4115 Bridge Avenue  
Cleveland, OH 44113

Joseph Meissner  
Director of Urban Development  
Attorney at Law  
1223 West Sixth Street  
Cleveland, OH 44113

City of Cleveland  
601 Lakeside Avenue, Room 106  
Cleveland, OH 44114-1044

Steven L Beeler Assistant Director of Law  
City of Cleveland Department of Law  
601 Lakeside Avenue  
Room 106  
Cleveland, OH 44114

City of Hamilton  
Charles S. Young  
345 High Street  
Hamilton, OH 45011

City of Toledo  
One Government Center  
Suite 2250  
Toledo, OH 43604

Leslie Kovacik  
420 Madison Avenue, 4th Fl  
Toledo, OH 43624

Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company  
76 South Main Street  
Akron, OH 44308

Cleveland Housing Network  
2999 Payne Avenue  
Cleveland, OH 44114

Columbus Southern Power Company  
1 Riverside Plaza  
Columbus, OH 43215

Communities United for Action  
Noel M. Morgan, Attorney  
Legal Aid Society of Southwest Ohio  
215 E. Ninth Street Suite 200  
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Constellation NewEnergy, Inc.  
David I. Fein  
550 W. Washington Blvd, Suite 300  
Chicago, IL 60661

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

Council of Smaller Enterprises  
Steve Millard  
100 Public Square, Suite 201  
Cleveland, OH 44113

Direct Energy Services LLC  
Ron Cerniglia  
40 Columbine Drive  
Glenmont, NY 12077

Edgemont Neighborhood Coalition  
Ellis Jacobs  
333 West First Street, Suite 500B  
Dayton, OH 45402

Empowerment Center of Greater  
Cleveland  
3030 Euclid Avenue, Unit 100  
Cleveland, OH 44115

Global Energy  
Dwight N. Lockwood, Group Vice  
President  
312 Walnut Street, Suite 2300  
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Great Lakes Energy Development Task  
Force, Cuyahoga County, Ohio  
100 East Campus View Blvd.  
Suite 360  
Columbus, OH 43235-4679

Integrays Energy Services, Inc  
Teresa Ringenbach  
300 West Wilson Bridge Road  
Suite 350  
Worthington, OH 43085

Interstate Gas Supply, Inc.  
Vincent Parisi  
5020 Bradenton Avenue  
Dublin, OH 43017

The Kroger Company  
Mr. Denis George  
1014 Vine Street-G07  
Cincinnati, OH 45202-1100

KW Solar Solutions LLC  
Robert Wevodau  
250 Corporate Blvd Suite D  
Newark, DE 19702

Legal Aid Society of Cleveland  
Joseph Meissner  
Urban Develop Off  
1223 W. Sixth St  
Cleveland, OH 44113

Lucas County Commissioners  
Lance Keiffer  
711 Adams, 2nd Floor  
Toledo, OH 43624

Midwest Energy Efficiency Alliance  
645 N. Michigan Avenue  
Suite 990  
Chicago, IL 60611

Natural Resources Defense Council  
2 N Riverside Plaza  
#2250  
Chicago, IL 60606-2600

Neighborhood Environmental Coalition  
Rev. Mike Frank, Co-Chair  
5920 Engle Ave.  
Cleveland, OH 44127

NOPEC  
31320 Solon Road, Ste 20  
Solon, OH 44139

Norton Energy Storage, L.L.C.  
c/o Langdon D. Bell, Esq.  
Bell & Royer Co., LPA  
33 South Grant Avenue  
Columbus, OH 43215

Nucor Steel Marion, Inc  
912 Cheney Avenue  
Marion, OH 43302

Michael K. Lavanga, Esq.  
Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C.  
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street N.W.  
8th Floor West Tower  
Washington, DC 20007

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

Ohio Farmers Union  
20 S. Third Street  
Columbus, OH 43215

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

Thomas O'Brien Attorney at Law  
Bricker & Eckler LLP  
100 South Third Street  
Columbus, OH 43215

Ohio Interfaith Power and Light  
Gregory E. Hitzhusen, MD  
P.O. Box 26671  
Columbus, OH 43226

Ohio Manufacturers Association  
Eric L. Burkland, President  
33 North High Street  
Columbus, OH 43215-3005

Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy  
Colleen L Mooney  
1431 Mulford Rd  
Columbus, OH 43212

Ohio Power Company  
1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215

Sierra Club Ohio Chapter  
Jennifer Miller  
131 N. High Street, Suite 605  
Columbus, OH 43215

SunEdison  
12500 Baltimore Avenue  
Beltsville, MD 20705

The Solid Waste Authority of  
Central Ohio  
4239 London Groveport Road  
Grove City, OH 43123

Dennis Hirsch  
Porter Wright Morris & Arthur  
41 S. High Street  
Columbus, OH 43215

Toledo Edison Company  
76 S Main Street  
Akron, OH 44308

United Clevelanders Against Poverty  
May Dugan Center  
4115 Bridge Avenue  
Cleveland, OH 44113

Wind on the Wires  
1619 Dayton Avenue  
Suite 203  
Saint Paul, MN 55104

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

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**7/24/2009 4:11:32 PM**

**in**

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

Summary: Comments Joint Comments regarding Appendix A to the Commission's June 24, 2009 Entry electronically filed by Paul A Colbert on behalf of The East Ohio Gas Company d/b/a Dominion East Ohio and Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc. and Vectren Energy Delivery of Ohio, Inc. and Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.