

**BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio	)	
Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric	)	
Illuminating Company, and The Toledo	)	Case Nos.12-2190-EL-POR
Edison Company For Approval of Their	)	12-2191-EL-POR
Energy Efficiency and Peak Demand	)	12-2192-EL-POR
Reduction Program Portfolio Plans for 2013	)	
through 2015	)	

---

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY  
AND MOTION FOR AN EXPEDITED RULING  
BY THE  
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL**

---

Natural Resources Defense Council (“NRDC”) requests leave to file the supplemental testimony<sup>1</sup> of Dylan Sullivan, as explained in the attached memorandum in support. In accordance with Ohio Administrative Code 4901-1-12(C), NRDC requests an expedited ruling.

/s/ Christopher J. Allwein  
Christopher J. Allwein, Counsel of Record  
*Williams, Allwein and Moser, LLC*  
1373 Grandview Ave., Suite 212  
Columbus, Ohio 43212  
Telephone: (614) 429-3092  
Fax: (614) 670-8896  
E-mail: [callwein@wamenergylaw.com](mailto:callwein@wamenergylaw.com)

**Attorney for the Natural Resources Defense Council**

---

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with Ohio Administrative Code 4901-1-29(C).

**BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio	)	
Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric	)	
Illuminating Company, and The Toledo	)	Case Nos.12-2190-EL-POR
Edison Company For Approval of Their	)	12-2191-EL-POR
Energy Efficiency and Peak Demand	)	12-2192-EL-POR
Reduction Program Portfolio Plans for 2013	)	
through 2015	)	

---

**NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL  
MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT**

---

**I. INTRODUCTION**

NRDC seeks to file this supplemental testimony regarding the Portfolio program filings of the Ohio Edison Company, the Toledo Edison Company and the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (Collectively “FirstEnergy” or “Companies”). According to Ohio Administrative Code 4901-1-29(C), “the presiding hearing officer may permit an expert witness to present additional...testimony” as long as certain requirements are met.<sup>2</sup>

This supplemental testimony relies on information received subsequent to the plan filings. Reasonable diligence was applied to determine how to employ and present the information received from a September Collaborative meeting while performing other time-consuming case obligations within the expedited schedule governing these cases. No party is prejudiced by this information, as the testimony relies entirely on information received from the Companies and available to all parties that are a part of the FirstEnergy Collaborative Process.

---

<sup>2</sup> Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-29(C) states: “Notwithstanding paragraph (A) of this rule, the presiding hearing officer may, in his or her discretion, permit an expert witness to present additional oral testimony at the hearing, provided that: such testimony could not, with reasonable diligence, have been filed and served within the time limits established by the commission or the presiding hearing officer or the presentation of such testimony will not unduly delay the proceeding or unjustly prejudice any other party.”

NRDC now respectfully requests the hearing officers assigned to these cases allow the presentation of this additional testimony and exhibits at the hearing.

The supplemental testimony relies on information received by NRDC from the FirstEnergy Collaborative on September 24, 2012. This information was crucial to the calculations in this testimony as the Companies' Benchmarks are presented only on a cumulative basis.<sup>3</sup> In order to calculate the cumulative efforts of the Companies now and during the future term of the plan, the reported cumulative results achieved to-date from the Companies' Existing Portfolio, including mercantile customer sited projects pending and approved as of September 18, 2012 (provided on September 24), were required.

Because the plans only present cumulative benchmarks,<sup>4</sup> this made understanding the projected impacts of the plans relative to the statutory benchmarks difficult. Further dissection and analysis of other information, as presented in Mr. Sullivan's testimony, demonstrate that this was a task which, performed in light of other case obligations and various individual review of the plans programs, could not be accomplished within the amount of time between when the material was furnished and the testimony deadline of October 5, 2012. In addition, any initial results had to be reviewed and verified prior to filing. Thus, NRDC respectfully moves that the hearing officers allow this information to be presented at the hearing.

This information will not unduly delay the proceeding or unjustly prejudice any other party. This testimony relies on information already possessed by the Companies' and available to all parties that are Collaborative members. The subject matter of the additional testimony, whether the plans as filed will meet the statutory benchmark requirements, is a primary issue in the case, and so will not cause significant delay. In fact, allowing this testimony will likely shorten the hearing timeframe (particularly the cross examination of the Companies' witnesses to establish these calculations and the information

---

<sup>3</sup> See the testimony of Bradley D. Eberts Exhibit BDE-1.

<sup>4</sup> Id.

used to obtain them) considerably. Therefore, the NRDC respectfully requests that the hearing officers allow the supplemental testimony and exhibits of Dylan Sullivan to be presented at this hearing.

Finally, pursuant to Ohio Administrative Code 4901-1-12(C), NRDC moves for an expedited ruling on this matter. The hearing begins on the same day that this motion is filed, and Mr. Sullivan is scheduled for presentation at the hearing on Tuesday, October 23, 2012. NRDC was unable to contact the other parties to determine if any other party had an objection. NRDC respectfully request that the additional testimony be allowed for presentation and for an expedited ruling.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Christopher J. Allwein\_\_\_\_\_

Christopher J. Allwein, Counsel of Record  
*Williams, Allwein and Moser, LLC*  
1373 Grandview Ave., Suite 212  
Columbus, Ohio 43212  
Telephone: (614) 429-3092  
Fax: (614) 670-8896  
E-mail: [callwein@wamenergylaw.com](mailto:callwein@wamenergylaw.com)

**Attorney for the Natural Resources Defense Council**

**BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio	)	
Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric	)	
Illuminating Company, and The Toledo	)	Case Nos.12-2190-EL-POR
Edison Company For Approval of Their	)	12-2191-EL-POR
Energy Efficiency and Peak Demand	)	12-2192-EL-POR
Reduction Program Portfolio Plans for 2013	)	
through 2015	)	

---

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY  
OF  
DYLAN SULLIVAN  
ON BEHALF OF THE  
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL**

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I:	Introduction .....	3
II:	The Plan is Not Designed to Meet the Energy Efficiency Benchmarks .....	4
III:	Conclusion .....	7

1 **I: Introduction**

2 **Q: What is your name, address, and position?**

3 A: My name is Dylan Sullivan. My business address is 2 North Riverside Plaza, Suite 2250,  
4 Chicago, Illinois 60606. I am employed by the Natural Resources Defense Council  
5 (“NRDC”) as a Staff Scientist.

6 **Q: Are you the same Dylan Sullivan who earlier gave Direct Testimony in this proceeding?**

7 A: Yes.

8 **Q: Please summarize your Supplemental Testimony?**

9 A: Based on my review of the projected benchmarks and savings included in the Energy Efficiency  
10 and Peak Demand Reduction Program Portfolio Plans for 2013 through 2015 (the “Plan”) of Ohio  
11 Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison  
12 Company (“FirstEnergy” or “Companies”), and the Companies’ testimony and discovery  
13 responses, I believe that the Plan is *NOT* designed to meet or exceed Ohio’s statutory benchmarks  
14 for energy efficiency, and in fact may not achieve the statutory benchmarks for energy efficiency  
15 (“benchmarks”). The Plan as-filed fails to consistently achieve the benchmarks no matter how the  
16 benchmarks are calculated (incremental annual savings or cumulative savings) or how savings are  
17 calculated (using the annualized or *pro-rata* convention).

18 **Q: What do you rely on to make this conclusion?**

19 A: Crucially, I rely upon information presented by the Companies at the September 24, 2012  
20 Collaborative meeting: the reported cumulative results achieved to-date from the Companies’  
21 Existing Portfolio, including mercantile customer sited projects pending and approved as of  
22 September 18, 2012. I also rely on Revised Code Section 4928.66(A)(1)(a), PUCO Table 7A-7G  
23 for each Operating Company, Companies Exhibit BDE-1, and Companies Exhibit ECM-2, for  
24 which the Companies provided Microsoft Excel versions in response to NRDC Request for  
25 Production of Documents 1.

26

1 Because nowhere in the Plan do the Companies actually compare the benchmarks to the expected  
2 impacts of the Plan’s programs, I had to do several calculations myself, which I will explain  
3 below.

4 **Q: On what authority are you filing this Supplemental Testimony?**

5 A: I am filing this Supplemental Testimony pursuant to Ohio Administrative Code Section 4901-1-  
6 29(C).

7 **Q: Could you have, with reasonable diligence, filed this testimony earlier?**

8 A: No. First, exhibits DES-3 and DES-4 are based in substantial part on information received on  
9 September 24, 2012, 10 days before the testimony deadline. Second, with the expedited  
10 procedural schedule, our review of the plan was truncated. Third, nowhere in the Plan do the  
11 Companies compare the benchmarks to the expected results of programs. Benchmarks are  
12 presented only on a cumulative basis,<sup>1</sup> while the law requires the utilities to save an “additional”  
13 amount of energy efficiency each year. Savings are projected in an easily accessible form only on  
14 a *pro-rata* basis<sup>2</sup>, even though the Companies request a waiver so that savings can be reported  
15 using an annualized accounting methodology.<sup>3</sup>

16 **II: The Plan is Not Designed to Meet the Energy Efficiency Benchmarks**

17 **Q: What is your understanding of the benchmarks the Companies will be required to meet**  
18 **over this Plan?**

19 A: It is my understanding that the Companies must meet benchmarks for both cumulative energy  
20 savings and incremental energy savings: that is, they must save an *additional* amount of energy  
21 each year, which, when added to previous years’ benchmark amounts, must equal a *cumulative*  
22 amount of energy savings. I term this annual additional amount of energy savings “incremental  
23 savings.” The amount of these incremental savings required each year are in Revised Code

---

<sup>1</sup> Exhibit BDE-1.

<sup>2</sup> Exhibit ECM-2

<sup>3</sup> Application at 12 Paragraph 30.



1 Section 4928.66(A)(1)(a): in 2013 each Operating Company must save an additional .9% of  
2 three-year average sales, and an additional 1% of sales in both 2014 and 2015.

3 **Q: Do the Companies' Plans describe the amount of incremental savings each Operating**  
4 **Company must achieve each year?**

5 A: No. The Companies only include the amount of cumulative savings each Operating Company  
6 must achieve each year. This calculation of cumulative savings is included in the Direct  
7 Testimony of Eberts in Exhibit BDE-1. Eberts doesn't calculate the incremental savings  
8 benchmarks, only cumulative benchmarks. This makes understanding the projected impacts of the  
9 Plans relative to the statutory benchmarks difficult.

10 **Q: Did you independently calculate the incremental amount of energy that each Operating**  
11 **Company is required to save each year?**

12 A: Yes. For the years 2013 through 2015, I multiplied the baseline given in Column 8 of Exhibit  
13 BDE-1 by the required amount of incremental savings: .9% in 2013 and 1% in 2014 and 2015.  
14 The incremental benchmarks for each year and Operating Company are shown in Column 4 of  
15 Exhibits DES-4 and 5.

16 **Q: When the projected cumulative impacts of the Plan, combined with the cumulative impacts**  
17 **to-date of the Existing Plan, are compared to the cumulative benchmarks, does the Plan as-**  
18 **filed meet the targets?**

19 A: No. When the projected cumulative impacts of the Plan, combined with cumulative impacts from  
20 the Companies' Existing Plan (including mercantile customer projects pending and approved as  
21 of September 18, 2012) are compared to the cumulative benchmarks, the Plan fails to meet the  
22 cumulative benchmarks in 6 out of the 9 Operating Company-compliance years. This is shown in  
23 Exhibit DES-3.

24 **Q: From where did you get the cumulative benchmarks and the projected cumulative impacts**  
25 **of the Plan?**

1 A: The cumulative benchmarks are in Column 10 of Exhibit BDE-1, and shown in Column 3 of  
2 Exhibit DES-3. The projected cumulative impacts are from Exhibit ECM-2 (the “MWh Saved”  
3 row in the “Portfolio Plan total – Cumulative Projected Savings” column), and shown in column  
4 4 of Exhibit DES-3.

5 **Q: From where did you get the cumulative impacts of the Existing Plan?**

6 A: From information presented at the Companies September 24, 2012 Collaborative meeting, and  
7 included as Exhibit DES-6. The Existing Plan impacts, shown in Column 5 of Exhibit DES-5,  
8 include the impacts of mercantile customer projects pending and approved as of September 18,  
9 2012. These numbers are of course subject to evaluation, measurement, and verification, and not  
10 all pending applications may be approved. Also, some mercantile customer applications could be  
11 filed between September 18, 2012 and November 1, 2012 (the Companies’ deadline if they  
12 process the application). These additional applications would not be reflected in the savings  
13 included in Column 5.

14 **Q: When incremental savings measured from the Plan’s programs using a *pro-rata* accounting  
15 convention are compared to incremental benchmarks, does the Plan meet the benchmarks?**

16 A: No. When judged on a *pro-rata* savings basis, the Plan as-filed does not achieve the benchmarks.  
17 This is shown in Exhibit DES-4.

18 **Q: How did you determine each program year’s savings on a *pro-rata* basis?**

19 A: The information is in Exhibit ECM-2. But as presented by Miller, the savings accumulate over  
20 the life of the Plan: that is, Cumulative Projected Savings in Program Year 2015 include the  
21 impacts of Program Year 2013 and 2014. To determine the incremental impact of the Companies’  
22 Plan on a *pro-rata* basis, I subtracted Program Year 2013 Cumulative Projected MWh savings  
23 from Program Year 2014 Cumulative Projected MWh savings to determine incremental *pro-rata*  
24 savings in 2014 and I subtracted Program Year 2014 Cumulative Projected MWh savings from  
25 Program Year 2015 Cumulative Projected MWh savings to determine incremental *pro-rata*  
26 savings in 2015.

1 **Q: When incremental savings measured from the Plan’s programs using an annualized**  
2 **accounting convention are compared to these incremental benchmarks, does the Plan meet**  
3 **the benchmarks?**

4 A: When judged on an annualized savings basis, the Plan as-filed does not achieve the benchmarks  
5 in 6 out of the 9 Operating Company-compliance years. This is shown in Exhibit DES-5,  
6 Columns 11 and 12.

7 **Q: How did you calculate the amount of incremental annualized savings for each portfolio and**  
8 **Operating Company?**

9 A: I had to use a roundabout method to calculate the amount of annualized savings each Operating  
10 Company’s energy efficiency portfolio produced in each year of the Plan period, because  
11 nowhere do the Companies present annualized savings for a portfolio in each year of the Plan.  
12 The Companies do not include this information even though they are asking the Commission for  
13 a waiver so they can report annual program progress using an annualized accounting convention.  
14 To determine incremental annualized savings, I used PUCO Table 7A through 7G. Each portfolio  
15 table includes an Annual MWh Saved column at the right edge of the page. But the savings  
16 accumulate in the Column: that is, reported savings for 2015 include the impacts of the program  
17 in 2013 and 2014. So to determine *incremental* annual savings in 2014 I subtracted 2013 Annual  
18 MWh Saved from 2014 Annual MWh Saved and to determine *incremental* annual savings in  
19 2015 I subtracted 2014 Annual MWh Saved from 2015 Annual MWh Saved. The result for each  
20 portfolio, Operating Company, and Program Year is reported in Columns 5 through 9 of Exhibit  
21 DES-5.

22 **III: Conclusion**

23 **Q: What can you conclude from the benchmark-anticipated savings comparisons described**  
24 **above?**

25 A: If the Companies’ programs generate the projected results, the Companies will fall short of their  
26 benchmarks. The Plan as-filed does not appear to be designed to achieve the benchmarks.

1 Q: Does this conclude your Supplemental Testimony?

2 A: Yes.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing *Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Testimony and Motion for Expedited Ruling* has been served upon the following parties via electronic mail on October 22, 2012.

/s/ Christopher Allwein

Christopher J. Allwein

Devin Parram  
Attorney General's Office  
Public Utilities Commission of  
Ohio  
180 East Broad St., 6th Fl.  
Columbus, OH 43215  
[Devin.parram@puc.state.oh.us](mailto:Devin.parram@puc.state.oh.us)

Kathy J. Kolich  
Carrie M. Dunn  
FirstEnergy Service Company  
76 South Main Street  
Akron, OH 44308  
[kjkolich@firstenergycorp.com](mailto:kjkolich@firstenergycorp.com)  
[cdunn@firstenergycorp.com](mailto:cdunn@firstenergycorp.com)  
Attorneys for FirstEnergy Service  
Company

Cathryn N. Loucas  
Trent Dougherty  
The Ohio Environmental Council  
1207 Grandview Avenue, Suite 201  
Columbus, OH 43212-3449  
[Cathy@theOEC.org](mailto:Cathy@theOEC.org)  
[Trent@theOEC.org](mailto:Trent@theOEC.org)  
Attorneys for the Ohio Environmental  
Council

Colleen L. Mooney  
Ohio Partners for Affordable  
Energy  
231 West Lima Street  
Findlay, OH 45839-1793  
[cmooney2@columbus.rr.com](mailto:cmooney2@columbus.rr.com)

Robert Kelter  
Justin M. Vickers  
Nick McDaniel  
Environmental Law & Policy Center  
35 East Wacker Drive, Suite 1600  
Chicago, IL 60601  
[jvickers@elpc.org](mailto:jvickers@elpc.org)  
[rkelter@elpc.org](mailto:rkelter@elpc.org)  
[nmcdaniel@elpc.org](mailto:nmcdaniel@elpc.org)  
Attorneys for the Environmental Law  
& Policy Center

Christopher J. Allwein  
Williams Allwein & Moser, LLC  
1373 Grandview Ave., Suite 212  
Columbus, OH 43212  
[callwein@wamenergylaw.com](mailto:callwein@wamenergylaw.com)  
Attorney for the Sierra Club

Jody M. Kyler  
David F. Boehm  
Michael L. Kurtz  
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry  
36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
[jkyler@bkllawfirm.com](mailto:jkyler@bkllawfirm.com)  
[dboehm@bkllawfirm.com](mailto:dboehm@bkllawfirm.com)  
[mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com](mailto:mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com)  
Attorneys for Ohio Energy Group

Richard L. Sites  
General Counsel & Senior Director of  
Healthy Policy  
Ohio Hospital Association  
155 East Broad Street, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
[ricks@ohanet.org](mailto:ricks@ohanet.org)

Michael K. Lavanga  
Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone,  
P.C.  
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.  
8<sup>th</sup> Floor, West Tower  
Washington, D.C. 20007  
(202) 342-0800 (Main Number)  
(202) 342-0807 (Facsimile)  
[Mike.Lavanga@bbrslaw.com](mailto:Mike.Lavanga@bbrslaw.com)

Attorney for Nucor Steel Marion

J. Thomas Siwo  
Thomas J. O'Brien  
BRICKER & ECKLER LLP  
100 South Third Street  
Columbus, OH 43215-4291  
Telephone: (614) 227-2389  
Facsimile: (614) 227-2390  
E-mail: [tsiwo@bricker.com](mailto:tsiwo@bricker.com)  
[tobrien@bricker.com](mailto:tobrien@bricker.com)

Attorneys for Ohio Manufacturers'  
Association

Kyle L. Kern  
Assistant Consumers' Counsel  
Office of the Ohio Consumers'  
Counsel  
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800  
Columbus, OH 43216  
[kern@occ.state.oh.us](mailto:kern@occ.state.oh.us)

Thomas J. O'Brien  
Bricker & Eckler LLP  
100 South Third Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
[tobrien@bricker.com](mailto:tobrien@bricker.com)

Attorney for Ohio Hospital  
Association

Glenn S. Krassen  
BRICKER & ECKLER LLP  
1001 Lakeside Avenue East, Suite  
1350  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone: (216) 523-5469  
Facsimile: (216) 523-7071  
E-mail: [gkrassen@bricker.com](mailto:gkrassen@bricker.com)

Matthew W. Warnock  
BRICKER & ECKLER LLP  
100 South Third Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
Telephone: (614) 227-2388  
Facsimile: (614) 227-2301  
[mwarnock@bricker.com](mailto:mwarnock@bricker.com)

Attorneys for Northeast Ohio Public  
Energy Council

[robinson@citizenpower.org](mailto:robinson@citizenpower.org)

[toddm@wamenergylaw.com](mailto:toddm@wamenergylaw.com)

Exhibit DES-3

Cumulative benchmarks/cumulative savings

Company	Year	Cumulative benchmark (MWh)	Projected Cumulative pro-rata Savings (MWh) from Portfolio	Cumulative Savings from Existing Plan (MWh)	Shortfall (MWh), Surplus (-MWh)	Shortfall (% of cumulative benchmark)			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
<b>CEI</b>				651,443					
	2013	608,007	63,849		-107,285	-			
	2014	810,348	172,501		-13,596	-			
	2015	1,015,987	285,767		78,777	<b>7.75</b>			
<b>OE</b>				597,160					
	2013	777,392	120,898		59,334	<b>7.63</b>			
	2014	1,033,169	328,307		107,702	<b>10.42</b>			
	2015	1,292,460	530,273		165,027	<b>12.77</b>			
<b>TE</b>				279,820					
	2013	339,969	62,393		-2,244	-			
	2014	462,569	169,617		13,132	<b>2.84</b>			
	2015	594,962	266,360		48,782	<b>8.20</b>			
Notes	(3) from Exhibit BDE-1, Column 10								
	(4) from Exhibit ECM-2, "Portfolio Plan Total - Cumulative Projected Savings" "MWh saved"								
	(5) from Portfolio Progress Estimate as of 7/31/2012, Ohio Energy Efficiency Collaborative, September 24, 2012								
	(6) = (3)-(4)-(5)								
	(7) = (6)/(3)*100								

Exhibit DES-4

Incremental benchmark/*pro-rata* savings

	Company	Year	Baseline (GWh)	Incremental annual benchmark (MWh)	Incremental <i>pro-rata</i> projected Portfolio savings (MWh)	Shortfall (MWh)	Shortfall (% of incremental annual benchmark)					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7					
	<b>CEI</b>											
		2013	19,000	171,002	63,849	107,153	63					
		2014	19,294	192,940	108,653	84,287	44					
		2015	19,538	195,382	113,265	82,117	42					
	<b>OE</b>											
		2013	24,294	218,642	120,898	97,744	45					
		2014	24,599	245,993	207,409	38,584	16					
		2015	24,855	248,550	201,967	46,583	19					
	<b>TE</b>											
		2013	10,624	95,616	62,393	33,223	35					
		2014	11,014	110,136	107,224	2,911	3					
		2015	11,442	114,416	96,743	17,673	15					
	Notes	(3) From Exhibit BDE-1 Column 8										
		(4) = (3)*.009 in 2013 and (3)*.01 in 2014 and 2015										
		(5) From Exhibit ECM-2, "Portfolio Plan Total - Cumulative Projected Savings," 2013 = Program Year("PY") 13, 2014 = PY14-PY13, 2015=PY15-PY14										
		(6) = (4)-(5)										
		(7) = (6)/(4)*100										



Exhibit DES-5

Incremental benchmarks/annualized savings

Company	Year	Baseline (GWh)	Incremental annual benchmark (MWh)	Projected Annualized Savings (MWh) from Residential Portfolio	Projected Annualized Savings (MWh) from Small Enterprise Portfolio	Projected Annualized Savings (MWh) from Mercantile Customer Program	Projected Annualized Savings (MWh) from Mercantile Utility Portfolio	Projected Annualized Savings (MWh) from Government Portfolio	Projected Annualized Savings (MWh) from Total Portfolio	Shortfall (MWh) Surplus (- MWh)	Shortfall (% of incremental annual benchmark)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<b><u>CEI</u></b>											
	2013	19,000	171,002	36,768	39,851	18,999	11,027	185	106,830	64,172	<b>38</b>
	2014	19,294	192,940	40,666	52,806	13,299	12,295	308	119,374	73,566	<b>38</b>
	2015	19,538	195,382	45,551	52,829	9,499	12,364	308	120,552	74,831	<b>38</b>
<b><u>OE</u></b>											
	2013	24,294	218,642	79,633	59,394	40,166	18,843	150	198,187	20,454	<b>9</b>
	2014	24,599	245,993	89,597	85,670	28,539	19,979	187	223,972	22,020	<b>9</b>
	2015	24,855	248,550	84,753	73,291	20,083	19,979	187	198,292	50,258	<b>20</b>
<b><u>TE</u></b>											
	2013	10,624	95,616	25,080	31,960	20,115	25,003	25	102,183	-6,567	-
	2014	11,014	110,136	34,443	40,356	13,763	26,681	25	115,268	-5,133	-
	2015	11,442	114,416	20,401	30,113	9,528	26,681	25	86,748	27,668	<b>24</b>
Notes	(3) From Exhibit BDE-1 Column 8										
	(4) = (3)*.009 in 2013 and (3)*.01 in 2014 and 2015										
	(5) From PUCO Tables 7A-B, Summed "Annual" "MWh saved" of programs, 2013=2013, 2014=2014-2013, 2015=2015-2014										
	(6) From PUCO Tables 7C, Summed "Annual" "MWh saved" of programs, 2013=2013, 2014=2014-2013, 2015=2015-2014										
	(7) From PUCO Tables 7D, Summed "Annual" "MWh saved" of programs, 2013=2013, 2014=2014-2013, 2015=2015-2014										
	(8) From PUCO Tables 7E, Summed "Annual" "MWh saved" of programs, 2013=2013, 2014=2014-2013, 2015=2015-2014										
	(9) From PUCO Tables 7F, Summed "Annual" "MWh saved" of programs, 2013=2013, 2014=2014-2013, 2015=2015-2014										
	(10) = (5)+(6)+(7)+(8)+(9)										
	(10) no savings from Transmission and Distribution because the Companies project no savings										
	(11) = (4)-(10)										
	(12) = (11)/(4)*100										

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

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**10/21/2012 8:26:56 PM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 12-2191-EL-POR, 12-2190-EL-POR, 12-2192-EL-POR**

Summary: Motion as Amended to file the Supplemental Testimony and exhibits of Dylan Sullivan electronically filed by Mr. Christopher J Allwein on behalf of Natural Resources Defense Council