BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

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

APPLICATION FOR REHEARING AND REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF OHIO EDISON COMPANY, THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY AND THE TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY

James W. Burk (0043808)
Counsel of Record
Carrie M. Dunn (0076952)

ATTORNEYS FOR OHIO EDISON COMPANY, THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY AND THE TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY

76 South Main Street
Akron, OH 44308
Tel: (330) 384-5861
Fax: (330) 384-3875
burkj@firstenergycorp.com
cdunn@firstenergycorp.com

Pursuant to R.C. 4903.10 and Rule 4901:1-35, Ohio Administrative Code, Ohio Edison Company ("Ohio Edison"), The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company ("CEI") and The Toledo Edison Company ("Toledo Edison") (collectively, the "Companies") hereby file their Application for Rehearing and Request for Clarification of the Finding and Order entered on March 26, 2014 in the above-captioned case ("March 26 Order"). As explained in more detail in the attached Memorandum in Support, the Commission's Finding and Order requires is unreasonable and unlawful and/or requires clarification on the following grounds:

A. The March 26 Order is unreasonable and unlawful in that it fails to provide for adequate cost recovery for the new services it requires the electric distribution utilities ("EDUs") to provide.

B. The March 26 Order should be clarified to define the term "active competitive retail electric service ("CRES") providers" and to indicate that EDUs are not required to provide data related to customers who are engaged and informed about CRES products.

C. The March 26 Order should be clarified to specifically waive any rule, including Rule 4901:1-37-04, which would prohibit the disclosure of customer information.

D. The March 26 Order is unreasonable in providing that the market development working group develop an operational plan for the purpose of implementing either a statewide seamless move, contract portability, instant connect or warm transfer process.

E. The March 26 Order is unreasonable in requiring EDUs to calculate the price-to-compare on a rolling 12 month average.

F. The March 26 Order is unreasonable and unlawful to the extent it requires EDUs to offer CRES provider logos on their bills because there has been no showing that there is any benefit to customers, much less any perceived benefits which exceed the costs, or that it would assist customers in identification of its CRES provider or the costs of CRES service.

For these reasons, as discussed in greater detail below, the Companies respectfully request that the Commission grant the Companies' Application for Rehearing and Request for Clarification and appropriately modify and/or clarify the March 26 Order.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ *Carrie M. Dunn*
James W. Burk (0043808)
Counsel of Record
Carrie M. Dunn (0076952)
FIRSTENERGY SERVICE COMPANY
76 South Main Street
Akron, OH 44308
(330) 761-7735
(330) 384-3875 (fax)
burkj@firstenergycorp.com
cdunn@firstenergycorp.com

ATTORNEYS FOR OHIO EDISON COMPANY, THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY AND THE TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

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

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF APPLICATION FOR REHEARING AND REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF OHIO EDISON COMPANY, THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY AND THE TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

In initiating its investigation into Ohio's retail electric service markets, the Commission requested that the stakeholders and Staff focus their effort on solutions to problems and changes that can be immediately implemented and that the Commission can adopt in the short term. The stated intent of these changes was to promote the development of Ohio's retail electric service market.[1] Staff filed its Development Work Plan ("Plan") on January 16, 2014 with recommendations to the Commission. Numerous stakeholders filed comments and reply comments addressing various aspects of the Plan. Common denominators in those comments included concerns related to the benefits versus the costs of those recommended changes, especially in light of the fact that Ohio already has a robust retail electric service market, and the caution that any recommended changes should make sense and take into consideration each electric distribution utility's ("EDU") processes and systems. The EDUs also raised concerns related to cost recovery related to implementing the recommended changes.

On March 26, 2014, the Commission issued a Finding and Order on the Plan filed by Staff ("March 26 Order"). In that Order, the Commission did recognize the importance that it weigh the value of changes to standardize processes against the potential costs:

> Additionally, the Commission will consider the goal of consistency in making policy decisions; however, as urged by multiple commenters, in considering any specific issue or policy decision, the Commission will weigh the value of standardization against potential costs.[2]

The Commission also stated:

---

[1] May 29 Entry at ¶4.
[2] March 26 Order at ¶11

> The Commission believes that it is premature to divide customer bills between supply and delivery charges, and is concerned that the costs may exceed the benefit.[3]

While, in some areas, the Commission correctly weighed the benefits and costs, as well as the concerns expressed by the EDUs, in other areas, the Commission departed from its stated policy - that benefits should exceed costs - and ordered changes that would increase costs with little to no benefit to customers. For those and other reasons set forth in greater detail below, Ohio Edison Company ("Ohio Edison"), The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company ("CEI"), and The Toledo Edison Company ("Toledo Edison") (collectively "Companies") request rehearing and clarification on several items in the March 26 Order.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On December 12, 2012, the Commission issued an Entry ("December 12 Entry") initiating an investigation into Ohio's retail electric service market in the above-referenced matter. In that December 12 Entry, the Commission made several observations related to the electric industry and then directed interested parties to respond to twenty-two specific questions broken down into two major categories: Market Design and Corporate Separation. Various stakeholders provided comments on March 1, 2013 and reply comments on April 5, 2013.

On May 29, 2013, the Commission issued an Entry ("May 29 Entry") establishing a series of stakeholder collaboration workshops for the purpose of continuing the investigation into the health, strength, and vitality of the market. The Commission indicated that those workshops would be used to identify and overcome market constraints, existing issues impacting the relationship between Competitive Retail

[3] *Id.* at ¶28.

Electric Service ("CRES") providers and EDUs, existing issues regarding market access, and other issues identified by stakeholders. In that Entry, the Commission stressed:

> These workshops will be solution-driven; stakeholders attending the workshops are strongly encouraged to recommend changes that can be **immediately** implemented by competitive retail electric service providers and electric distribution utilities, as well as changes that can be adopted by the Commission. The workshops should also be used for the development of a short term market development work plan. This market development work plan should identify changes that the Commission **can adopt in the short term** to promote the development of Ohio's retail electric service market. This market development work plan will be developed by Commission Staff, as a result of the stakeholder collaboration effort, and will be filed in this case after the workshops have concluded.[4]

Also, in the May 29 Entry, the Commission found:

> …that by January 16, 2014, Commission Staff should file a status report in this case updating the Commission on the progress of the stakeholder collaboration workshops and indicating whether further workshops would be beneficial or are needed for the development of the market development work plan. The status report should also include a proposed date on which Commission Staff can submit the market development work plan to the Commission.[5]

On June 5, 2013, the Commission issued an Entry ("June 5 Entry") seeking comments on further questions related to Market Design and Corporate Separation to which various parties filed comments and reply comments.

From June to December 2013, six stakeholder collaboration workshops were held. As a result of the first workshop, Staff created three subcommittees – Market Evaluation, Data and Billing, and Purchase of Receivables ("POR"). The three subcommittees met regularly and had open discussions on a variety of topics. On January 16, 2014, rather than updating the Commission on the progress of the stakeholder collaboration workshops, Staff elected to file the Plan (with specific recommendations for the

[4] May 29 Entry at ¶4 (emphasis added).
[5] *Id.* at ¶6.

Commission). On that same day, the Attorney Examiner issued an Entry directing all stakeholders to provide comments by February 6, 2014 and reply comments by February 20, 2014. Numerous parties filed comments on the Plan.

On March 26, 2014, the Commission issued a Finding and Order on the Plan ("March 26 Order"). The Companies hereby seek rehearing and/or clarification on several issues related to the Plan.

ARGUMENT

I. The March 26 Order is unreasonable and unlawful in that it fails to provide for adequate cost recovery for the new services it requires EDUs to provide.

In the March 26 Order, the Commission adopted Staff's recommendation that each EDU should have a corporate separation audit every four years with costs recovered by the EDU as a normal operating expense.[6] The March 26 Order also requires EDUs to provide a whole host of new services to accommodate CRES providers including:

- Through a Market Development Working Group ("MDWG"), customer payment information;[7]
- Through the MDWG, an operational plan for the purpose of implementing a statewide seamless move, contract portability, instant connect or warm transfer process;[8]
- Revised price to compare information; and[9]
- CRES provider logos on EDU bills for electric service.[10]

The Commission also indicated that the MDWG, EDUs and Staff should work together to provide other types of new services such as a web-based registration system.[11]

[6] March 26 Order at ¶16.
[7] *Id.* at ¶20.
[8] *Id.* at ¶24.
[9] *Id.* at ¶31.
[10] *Id.* at ¶32.
[11] *See e.g. id.* at ¶36.

Except for the cost of corporate separation audits and CRES provider logos, in which the Commission found that costs should be recovered by an EDU in its next distribution rate case,[12] the Commission did not provide for a cost recovery mechanism for those new services. For the reasons discussed below, the March 26 Order is unreasonable and unlawful in that it does not provide for an adequate cost recovery mechanism for the costs incurred to provide these new Commission-mandated services.

As to the two instances where the Order did discuss cost recovery, permitting EDUs to seek cost recovery in their next distribution rate cases is unreasonable. Specifically for the Companies, as a result of their ESP 3 Order, distribution rates are frozen until May 31, 2016.[13] Many of the new services mandated by the March 26 Order are required to be implemented long before May 31, 2016, making it unlikely the costs will be recoverable through a distribution rate case. Moreover, R.C. 4909.15 provides: "the public utilities commission, when fixing and determining just and reasonable rates…shall determine the valuation as of the date certain of the property of the public utility used and useful …in rendering the public utility service for which rates are to be fixed and determined."[14] "The language of R.C. 4909.15 is unequivocal. Rate increases are based on costs of rendering utility service *during the test period*."[15] It is unknown as to what test period would be utilized for an EDU's next distribution rate case and whether any of the costs associated with the March 26 Order will fall into that test year. For those reasons, allowing EDUs to recover costs of the Plan in a next distribution rate case

[12] *Id.* at ¶26.
[13] *In the Matter of [the Companies] Application for Authority to Provide for a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code in the Form of an Electric Security* Plan, Case No. 12-1230-EL-SSO, Stipulation at pp. 18-19 (April 13, 2012), approved by Opinion and Order (July 18, 2012).
[14] R.C. 4909.15
[15] *Dayton Power & Light Co. v. Pub. Util. Comm.*, 4 Ohio St.3d 91, 94 (1983).

unreasonably and unlawfully denies recovery of those costs. The Commission should grant rehearing and modify the March 26 Order to clarify that an EDU shall be permitted to fully and timely recover all of the costs arising from the implementation of the March 26 Order through an existing or newly filed tariff or rider.

II. The March 26 Order should be clarified to define the term "active CRES providers" and to indicate that EDUs are not required to provide data related to customers who are engaged and informed about CRES products.

In the March 26 Order, the Commission adopted Staff's recommendation that EDUs should make certain measurement data available to Staff by the beginning of the third quarter after the issuance of the Order and that EDUs should work with Staff on the process and dates of the data submittal.[16] Specifically, the Commission ordered EDUs to provide to Staff information related to: 1) the number of Commission-certified CRES providers in Ohio; 2) the number of Commission-certified CRES providers by EDU service territory; 3) number of active CRES providers by EDU service territory; 4) number of customers shopping by class by EDU service territory; and 5) percentage of load shopping by class by EDU service territory. The Companies acknowledge that the information sought by numbers 1, 2, 4, and 5 is either already in the possession of Staff or provided to Staff by EDUs and CRES providers. The Commission also adopted two additional indicators as to the health of the CRES market: 1) all EDUs in Ohio have at least structural separation; and 2) customers are engaged and informed about the products and services that they receive.

Although the Commission recognized the EDUs' concerns regarding producing data that is outside of the EDUs' control or inappropriate to request from the EDUs, the Commission expressly found, nevertheless, that they should work with Staff on the

[16] March 26 Order at ¶12.

process and dates of data submittals.[17] However, specifically related to number 3, and as the Companies indicated in their comments, they do not agree with Staff or other parties' definition of "active CRES provider," and request that the Commission clarify that "active CRES provider" means any CRES provider certified with the Commission and registered with an EDU to provide CRES service and serving customers or providing offers to serve customers in a service territory.

Clarification is sought because, in discussing how many active CRES providers were in the Companies' service territories, Staff defined "active CRES providers" as those listed on the Apples to Apples chart.[18] In their comments, the Companies respectfully disagreed with Staff's sole reliance upon the Apples to Apples Chart to assert that certain EDUs have less active CRES providers because the Commission's Apples to Apples Chart only shows the residential offers made at some point in time.[19] The posting of offers on the Apples to Apples Chart is neither indicative of the number of active CRES providers nor offers being made by CRES providers in a given EDU service territory as posting those offers is purely voluntary. Moreover, offers to non-residential customers are specifically excluded from the list. Use of the Apples to Apples list, particularly as the sole basis, is neither reliable nor sufficient to indicate the number of active CRES providers. For those reasons, the Companies request that the Commission clarify the definition of "active CRES providers" as any CRES provider certified by the

[17] *Id.*
[18] Appendix B of the Plan lists the "Active CRES providers" for the Companies as 15. However, this number appears to come from the current Apples to Apples chart, which is limited to residential customers, suppliers who voluntarily list their residential offer on the Apples to Apples Chart, and only reflects new residential offers that are available – not all CRES providers that are serving customers or making offers.
[19] Companies' Comments at pp. 16-17 (February 6, 2014).

Commission and registered with an EDU to provide CRES service in its service territory and serving customers or providing offers to serve customers in a service territory.

In addition, the Companies request that the Commission clarify that EDUs are not required to provide data to Staff related to customers that are "engaged and informed about the products and services that they receive." While this intention seems fairly clear based upon the language and structure of the March 26 Order, the Companies believe it would be helpful to clarify this point since it impacts an affirmative obligation of all EDUs to provide information to Staff. The Companies do not, and would not, have this type of information and this indicator is very subjective and open to interpretation.

III. The March 26 Order should be clarified to specifically waive any rule, including Rule 4901:1-37-04(D)(1), which would prohibit the disclosure of customer information.

In the March 26 Order, the Commission directed the EDUs to work with CRES providers and the MDWG to develop proper procedures for providing to CRES providers the total customer payment amount, the amount billed by the CRES provider, the amount of payment allocated to the CRES provider and the date payment was applied.[20] The Commission did not provide, however, a waiver of certain rules that prohibit the disclosure of this information or an indication that a change in rules would be forthcoming to permit this disclosure. For example, Rule 4901:1-37-04(D)(1) provides:

> The electric utility shall not release any proprietary customer information (e.g., individual customer load profiles or billing histories) to an affiliate, or otherwise, without the prior authorization of the customer, except as required by a regulatory agency or court of law.

[20] March 26 Order at ¶20.

The Commission should modify its Order to specifically waive any rule that would prohibit the disclosure of the information, including Rule 4901:1-37-04(D)(1), and those rules should be modified accordingly in a future rulemaking proceeding.

IV. The March 26 Order is unreasonable in providing that the market development working group develop an operational plan for the purpose of implementing either a statewide seamless move, contract portability, instant connect or warm transfer process.

In the March 26 Order, the Commission adopted Staff's proposal, in part, related to an operational plan to put a seamless moves process into effect.[21] The Commission specifically ordered that Staff facilitate discussion with the MDWG to develop an operational plan for the purpose of implementing either a statewide seamless move, contract portability, instant connect or warm transfer process.[22] The Companies appreciate the Commission's recognition that there are several reasonable methods to address the Commission's preference for shopping customers to return to SSO service for as short a period as possible. The Commission's order, however, for a statewide, uniform solution is unreasonable for several reasons. The Commission should grant rehearing to modify its order and permit the MDWG to discuss the best operational plan for each specific EDU and permit the flexibility to provide for a solution on an EDU by EDU basis, rather than a statewide process.

First, there was not universal agreement, even among CRES providers, that the seamless move plan as proposed by Staff was the most desirable option; rather several different options were discussed. Second, during the workshop process and in their comments, each EDU presented a method that would provide a customer the opportunity to maintain a CRES provider when a customer moves within the same EDU's territory.

[21] *Id.* at ¶24.
[22] *Id.*

In their Comments, DP&L stated "there is no "one size fits all" process for EDUs with different systems and operational processes" and proposed that: "[a] more reasonable and less costly approach to seamless moves would be for the EDU to simply provide the moving customer with the name and phone number of their CRES Provider so that the customer has the option to contact the CRES Provider to begin a new contract for the new address at the time of the move, that follows today's normal switching timelines."[23] Duke highlighted the cost and labor involved in developing such a process.[24] AEP Ohio questioned the benefits versus the costs of this type of program.[25]

As the workshop discussions and various comments filed in this proceeding indicate, there are a number of different ways to effectuate a transfer process that is cost-effective for each EDU, which requires flexibility. For example, the Companies' recommend a "warm transfer" program whereby a customer is connected telephonically to its current supplier as part of the transfer process with the EDU. Such an approach is a reasonable means to achieve the Commission's goal and can be implemented in a shorter period of time as compared to the process ordered in this proceeding. It is also anticipated that the warm transfer approach would be far less costly to implement. The Companies echo the concerns of the other EDUs. An appropriate solution would be to allow the MDWG to discuss the best operational plan for each specific EDU and permit the flexibility to provide for a solution on an EDU by EDU basis, rather than a statewide process, which will ultimately reduce the costs to the customers. A mandated statewide solution will only increase costs to customers.

[23] DP&L February 6, 2014 Comments at 6.
[24] Duke February 6, 2014 Comments at 6.
[25] AEP Ohio February 6, 2014 Comments at 6.

Third, the Commission ordered-process cannot be developed and implemented immediately or in the short term and thus is not within the initially contemplated scope of this proceeding. Finally, the Companies stress that cost issues associated with any seamless move program must be addressed and the Companies must be allowed to recover the costs through an existing or newly filed tariff or rider mechanism. For all of those reasons, the Commission should grant rehearing and modify its March 26 Order and permit the MDWG to discuss the best operational plan for each specific EDU and permit the flexibility to provide for a solution on an EDU by EDU basis, rather than a statewide process. In the alternative, at a minimum, the Commission should order the MDWG to first examine whether a statewide process is cost-effective versus the benefit it may provide to customers.

V. The March 26 Order is unreasonable in requiring EDUs to calculate the price-to-compare on a rolling 12 month average.

In the March 26 Order, the Commission ordered that EDUs revise their price-to-compare methodology. Specifically, the Commission ordered that EDUs use a rolling annual average price-to-compare by calculating the SSO rate for the previous 12 months and dividing it by the customer's usage.[26] The Commission found that "revising the price-to-compare [is] necessary for proper disclosure of the costs of CRES service[27] consistent with R.C. 4928.07."

This mandated method of calculating the price-to-compare is unreasonable in that it is less accurate than the method currently used by the Companies for calculating a customer's price-to-compare, and will not assist customers. In fact, using a 12 month

[26] March 26 Order at ¶¶ 26; 30.
[27] The price-to-compare actually demonstrates the EDU's cost of providing SSO service – not the costs of CRES service.

average methodology may well cause customer confusion and frustration because the price-to-compare amount will less comparable to the actual amount that customers are paying for EDU SSO service. This undermines the usefulness of the price-to-compare for customers, as customers will be less able to determine if they would save money with a CRES provider.

Currently, the Companies calculate price-to-compare on a monthly basis by dividing the total amount of bypassable charges by the customer's kilowatt hour usage for the month. Therefore, customers receive the most current and up-to-date calculation of their supply charges. If the price-to-compare is calculated based on a rolling 12 month average, the EDUs would be required to use outdated information to determine the price-to-compare. Certain charges included in the price-to-compare change as often as quarterly. Basing the calculation on a 12 month rolling average will skew the price-to-compare and provide customers either an inflated or deflated price signal compared to the price-to-compare number being provided today, which is based on the actual cost of taking SSO service from the EDU for the current month.

Moreover, changing the price-to-compare will likely cause customer confusion and increase complaints from customers, both shopping and non-shopping, that may increase the volume of calls into both the EDU's and the Commission's contact center. With respect to shopping customers, the March 26 Order does not take into consideration the fact that CRES providers have already made offers based on a percentage off price-to-compare currently calculated as a monthly figure. CRES providers will be required to review their current offers and potentially rescind or change offers based on the new price-to-compare calculation methodology. This holds true for all EDUs that will be

required to change their current price-to-compare as a result of the March 26 Order. For non-shopping customers, this proposed change in the calculation of the price-to-compare will result in customers paying one price for SSO service from the EDU for the month, while the 12 month rolling average price-to-compare on the monthly bill will be a different price, thus causing further confusion. For all of those reasons, the Commission should grant rehearing and modify its March 26 Order and eliminate the standardized price-to-compare requirement and permit EDUs to continue calculating price-to-compare using their current methodology.

VI. The March 26 Order is unreasonable and unlawful to the extent it requires EDUs to offer CRES provider logos on their bills because there has been no showing that there is any benefit to customers, much less any perceived benefits which exceed the costs, or that it would assist customers in identification of its CRES provider or the costs of CRES service.

In the March 26 Order, the Commission ordered that:

> [i]f a customer is shopping, then the CRES provider's logo or name must be displayed on the customer's bill next to the EDU's logo or in the area containing the supply charges of the bill.[28]

The Commission further found that CRES providers that do not desire to have their logos placed on customer bills, can use their name instead of their logo.[29] The Commission found that this proposal would "bring clarity and uniformity to customer bills, as well as promote further development of Ohio's CRES markets."[30] Furthermore, the Commission found that "displaying the applicable CRES provider's logo" is "necessary for proper disclosure of the costs of CRES service consistent with R.C. 4928.07 and fulfills the identification of the supplier of each service as required by R.C. 4928.10(C)(3)."[31] The

[28] March 26 Order at ¶32.
[29] *Id.*
[30] *Id.* at ¶26.
[31] *Id.*

Commission declined to require CRES providers to pay for the costs of these services even though it recognized "the cost causer is normally assessed."[32]

The March 26 Order – as it should – appears to give an EDU the option of offering either the CRES provider logo on the bill or the identification of the CRES provider name in the supply portion of the bill. However, to the extent the Commission did not intend to provide the EDU that option, and, rather, intended to require that EDUs offer the new service of CRES provider logos on EDU bills, the March 26 Order is unreasonable and unlawful for several reasons.

First, R.C. 4928.07 merely provides: "[t]o the maximum extent practicable on or after the starting date of competitive retail electric service, an electric utility…shall separately price competitive retail electric services, and the prices shall be itemized on the bill of a customer or otherwise disclosed to the customer." Nothing in R.C. 4928.07 requires an EDU to provide CRES provider logos on its bills. The Companies are already in full compliance with R.C. 4928.07 because they provide separate, itemized CRES pricing on their bills, which is all that R.C. 4928.07 requires, to the extent it even requires that. Moreover, it is unclear how requiring EDUs to provide CRES provider logos on their bills will further educate customers on the costs of CRES service or even provide any benefit to the customer in excess of cost especially in light of the costs associated with such logos.

Second, while R.C. 4928.10(C)(3) does require the identification of the CRES provider on an EDU bill, this can be effectuated by displaying the CRES provider name on the bill, as the Companies have done since the commencement of retail generation service competition in 2001. This is the least cost method of meeting this requirement.

[32] *Id.*

Requiring CRES provider logos on EDU bills, a service that only certain CRES providers have advocated, is not cost-effective. Indeed, no CRES provider has provided any evidence that the supplier logos will further the retail electric service market or provide any benefit to the customer at all.

Third, the March 26 Order does not explain why the EDU's customers should pay for this service, especially when there is no indication that the cost of implementing and maintaining CRES provider logos adds value to the customer's experience. CRES providers who elect to participate in this new service, if the EDU chooses to provide it, should pay for the service.

Fourth, the March 26 Order fails to address the several administrative burdens the EDUs articulated, namely: 1) how logos will be submitted to the EDUs; 2) how changes to logos will be handled; and 3) how often logos will need to be changed as CRES providers enter and leave certain territories. As CRES providers change and enter into the market, or simply change their logos over time, costs continue to be incurred over time – costs that the Companies must recover. Requiring EDUs to absorb those implementation and maintenance costs is not appropriate.

Fifth, upon review of the various comments filed by CRES providers, it is clear that there is not a consensus among them as to whether they even want (or would permit) their logos on the EDUs' bills or how the process would work. Put simply, there was no indication that the benefits to the customer of having the CRES provider logo placed on the bill exceeds the costs of that service, or that there would be any benefits to customers at all. R.C. 4928.07 and R.C. 4928.10(C)(3) do not require CRES provider logos on EDU bills, and also do not authorize the Commission to order such a service. If the

Commission's March 26 Order intended to require EDUs to provide a CRES provider logo service, it is unreasonable and unlawful. The Commission should grant rehearing and modify its Order to clarify that an EDU may, but is not required to, offer a CRES provider logo service so long as the CRES provider's name is displayed on the bill in the area containing the supply charges of the bill.

CONCLUSION

For all of the foregoing reasons, the Commission should grant rehearing and/or clarification on the issues discussed above.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ *Carrie M. Dunn*
James W. Burk (0043808)
Counsel of Record
Carrie M. Dunn (0076952)
FIRSTENERGY SERVICE COMPANY
76 South Main Street
Akron, OH 44308
(330) 761-7735
(330) 384-3875 (fax)
burkj@firstenergycorp.com
cdunn@firstenergycorp.com

Attorney for Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and The Toledo Edison Company

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The PUCO's e-filing system will electronically serve notice of filing of this document on the following parties and courtesy copies have been emailed to the following parties:

wsundermeyer@aarp.org; ejacobs@ablelaw.com; stnourse@aep.com; mjsatterwhite@aep.com; yalami@aep.com; judi.sobecki@aes.com; barthroyer@aol.com; mkl@bbrslaw.com; dboehm@BKLlawfirm.com; mkurtz@BKLlawfirm.com; gkrassen@bricker.com; dstinson@bricker.com; mwarnock@bricker.com; tsiwo@bricker.com; jlang@calfee.com; talexander@calfee.com; coneil@calfee.com; lsacher@calfee.com; bojko@carpenterlipps.com; hussey@carpenterlipps.com; mohler@carpenterlipps.com; storguson@columbuslegalaid.com; mlinville@columbuslegalaid.com; cmooney2@columbus.rr.com; gbenjamin@communitylegalaid.org; Cynthia.Brady@Constellation.com; David.Fein@Constellation.com; joseph.clark@directenergy.com; Gary.A.Jeffries@dom.com; rocco.dascenzo@duke-energy.com; Elizabeth.watts@duke-energy.com; Jeanne.Kingery@duke-energy.com; amy.spiller@duke-energy.com; NMcDaniel@elpc.org; cgoodman@energymarketers.com; srantala@energymarketers.com; gpoulos@enernoc.com; Stephen.Bennett@Exeloncorp.com; burkj@firstenergycorp.com; cdunn@firstenergycorp.com; haydenm@firstenergycorp.com; scasto@firstenergycorp.com; cweber@firstenergycorp.com; trhayslaw@gmail.com; jkooper@hess.com; mswhite@igsenergy.com; vparisi@igsenergy.com; nmorgan@lascinti.org; anne.reese@lasclev.org; julie.robie@lasclev.org; jaborrell@co.lucas.oh.us; fdarr@mwncmh.com; sam@mwncmh.com; jolicker@mwncmh.com; mpritchard@mwncmh.com; maureen.grady@occ.ohio.gov; joseph.serio@occ.ohio.gov; edmund.berger@occ.ohio.gov; schuler@occ.state.oh.us; drinebolt@ohiopartners.org; msmalz@ohiopovertylaw.org; jmaskovyak@ohiopovertylaw.org; plee@oslsa.org; rjohns@oslsa.org; mwalters@proseniors.org; William.wright@puc.state.oh.us; trent@theoec.org; cathy@theoec.org; dougherty@theoec.org; leslie.kovacik@toledo.oh.gov; markbrooks@uwua.net; carlwwood@verizon.net; mhpetricoff@vorys.com; smhoward@vorys.com; glpetrucci@vorys.com; callwein@wamenergylaw.com; toddm@wamenergylaw.com; meissnerjoseph@yahoo.com

/s/ Carrie M. Dunn
Carrie M. Dunn
Attorney for the Companies

Summary: App for Rehearing electronically filed by Ms. Carrie M Dunn on behalf of Ohio Edison Company and The Toledo Edison Company and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company