

In the Matter of the Commission's Investigation of)
Ohio's Retail Electric Service Market.) Case No. 12-3151-EL-COI
)

regarding standardized billing submitted by the Industrial Energy Users – Ohio,³ FirstEnergy Solutions,⁴ the Ohio Consumers' Counsel,⁵ and the National Energy Marketers Association.⁶

Many of Ohio's manufacturers are high electricity-intensive users that spend two percent (2%) or more of their total annual expenditures on electricity. For many manufacturers, this amounts to millions of dollars. Therefore, a greater ability for customers to discern electricity costs and make comparisons for shopping purposes is substantially more valuable than a "very little benefit to the customer."

III. CONCLUSION

The OMAEG appreciates the opportunity to work with the Commission to improve Ohio's retail electric service market. The OMAEG remains supportive of its Initial Comments filed in this proceeding on March 1, 2013, and respectfully requests the Commission to consider and adopt its recommendations provided in its Initial and Reply Comments in this proceeding.

³ See Industrial Energy Users – Ohio Comments at 28 ("Where possible, measurement of billing determinants should be standardized based on measurement practices in the wholesale market to facilitate 'apples to apples' comparisons and to better predict actual bill outcomes.").

⁴ See FirstEnergy Solutions Corp. Comments at 19 (stating that "a clear price-to-compare that is provided to customers [on their bills] will enable customers to more readily evaluate any savings that may be available in the competitive market").

⁵ See The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel Comments at 19 ("A bill should be structured in a manner that provides consumers with useful information to evaluate the cost effectiveness of potential Marketer charges and to determine the savings being obtained, or which could be obtained, by switching to a different provider.").

⁶ See National Marketers Association Comments at 11 ("Unbundled rates expose consumers to price signals that permit them to compare competitive options.").

Respectfully submitted on behalf of
THE OMA ENERGY GROUP



J. Thomas Siwo
Frank L. Merrill
BRICKER & ECKLER LLP
100 South Third Street
Columbus, OH 43215-4291
Telephone: (614) 227-2389
Facsimile: (614) 227-2390
E-mail: tsiwo@bricker.com
fmerrill@bricker.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing Reply Comments of the OMA Energy Group was served upon the parties listed below this 5th day of April 2013 *via* electronic mail.



J. Thomas Siwo

mhpetricoff@vorys.com
smhoward@vorys.com
grady@occ.state.oh.us
serio@occ.state.oh.us
fdarr@mwncmh.com
sam@mwncmh.com
dboehm@BKLawfirm.com
mkurtz@BKLawfirm.com
cmooney2@columbus.rr.com
drinebolt@ohiopartners.org,
msmalz@ohiopoveritylaw.org
jmaskovyak@ohiopoveritylaw.org
william.wright@puc.state.oh.us
burkj@firstenergycorp.com
judi.sobecki@dplinc.com
gkrassen@bricker.com
mwarnock@bricker.com
amy.spiller@duke-energy.com
elizabeth.stevens@puc.state.oh.us
stephen.bennett@exeloncorp.com
cynthia.brady@constellation.com
david.fein@constellation.com
stnourse@aep.com
mjsatterwhite@aep.com
yalami@aep.com

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

4/5/2013 3:35:51 PM

in

Case No(s). 12-3151-EL-COI

Summary: Reply Comments of the OMA Energy Group electronically filed by J. Thomas Siwo
on behalf of OMA Energy Group