

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Complaint)	
of Marilyn Rhodes)	
)	
)	
Complainant)	Case No. 14-834-GA-CSS
)	
v.)	
)	
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.)	
)	
Respondent)	

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

MELISSA COFFMAN

ON BEHALF OF

DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC.

Dated: December 2, 2014

Robert A. McMahon (0064319)
Eberly McMahon Copetas LLC
2321 Kemper Lane, Suite 100
Cincinnati, OH 45206
513-533-3441
513-533-3554 Fax
bcmahon@emclawyers.com
Attorney for Respondent,
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>DESCRIPTION OF TESTIMONY</u>	<u>TESTIMONY PAGES</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY	3
III. DISCUSSION.....	3
IV. CONCLUSION	16

ATTACHMENTS (Exhibits):

MC-1 Spreadsheet of history of Marilyn Rhodes' Account No. 0750-0025-21-7 at 9846
Arvin, Cincinnati, OH 45231

I. INTRODUCTION

1 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.**

2 A. My name is Melissa Coffman, and my business address is 1000 E. Main St.,
3 Plainfield, Indiana 46168.

4 **Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?**

5 A. I am employed by Duke Energy Shared Services, Inc., as Consumer Affairs
6 Specialist.

7 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND.**

8 A. I began working for Duke Energy on March 12, 2007, as a Customer Service
9 Representative. In that role, I provided support to customer inquiries such as
10 billing inquiries, order requests and troubleshooting. In June 2008 I transitioned
11 to the role of Customer Service Team Lead and assumed additional
12 responsibilities for training, coaching and providing leadership to new and
13 existing team members. I continued in that role until November 1, 2010, when I
14 joined the Consumer Affairs Department at Duke Energy. In my present role as
15 Consumer Affairs Specialist, I am responsible for communication, coordination
16 and resolution of escalated customer complaints received by Ohio, Kentucky and
17 Indiana state utility commissions, as well as responding to customer complaints
18 received by various departments within Duke Energy, including Corporate
19 Communications, Legal, Company Executive Offices and Government Affairs, as
20 well as the Better Business Bureau.

21

1 As previously mentioned, I work with the Commission as a liaison for
2 specific customer requests, as well both informal and formal complaints. I have a
3 working knowledge of all existing Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. (DE-Ohio) tariffs,
4 programs and policies and communicate this information to customers on a
5 frequent basis. I also interact with gas and electric operating departments, meter
6 reading and various other departments on a daily basis, for many reasons,
7 including responding to and attempting to resolve customer complaints.

8 I have developed extensive experience regarding DE-Ohio's tariffs,
9 regulatory rules and procedures relating to its business and its credit and
10 collection procedures. This experience includes the following topics:

- 11 • Rates and billing issues and disputes
- 12 • Service Orders
- 13 • Energy usage and energy audits
- 14 • Power quality issues
- 15 • Consumer education
- 16 • Customer contracts issues

17 **Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THIS COMMISSION?**

18 A. No. My testimony has not been required in prior cases, although I have interacted
19 on multiple occasions with the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, attended
20 settlement conferences on behalf of DE-Ohio, and also handled informal
21 complaint cases.

1 **II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY**

2 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS**
3 **PROCEEDING?**

4 A. The purpose of my testimony is to respond to the allegations contained in the
5 complaint filed by Marilyn Rhodes (Ms. Rhodes) and to provide accurate
6 information regarding that complaint, including but not limited to: billing,
7 payments, account history for Ms. Rhodes' gas and electric account at 9846 Arvin
8 Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio 45236 (the "Property"), and information maintained
9 within DE-Ohio's business records regarding Ms. Rhodes' account.

10 **III. DISCUSSION**

11 **Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE COMPLAINT FILED BY MS.**
12 **RHODES?**

13 A. Yes.

14 **Q. PLEASE BRIEFLY SUMMARIZE YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF MS.**
15 **RHODES' COMPLAINT.**

16 A. Marilyn Rhodes filed her formal complaint in this case on May 6, 2014, when
17 apparently she was not pleased with the results from her informal complaint,
18 namely that the Commission did not find her informal complaint to have any
19 merit. Ms. Rhodes' original complaint consisted of approximately 49 pages of
20 documents, only some of which related to her DE-Ohio account, such as bills and
21 cancelled checks. Most of the documents submitted with Ms. Rhodes' complaint
22 did not relate to DE-Ohio or her account with our company. In particular, I am
23 referring to the health care coverage statement and credit report documents—none

1 of those documents have anything to do with DE-Ohio or Ms. Rhodes' account
2 with DE-Ohio.

3 Ms. Rhodes' complaint relates only to her unfounded claim that DE-Ohio
4 supposedly had transferred the sum of \$791.26 to her account at the Property.
5 Ms. Rhodes does not state in her complaint when that transfer allegedly happened,
6 why it happened, where the charges being transferred originated, or any other
7 useful information. Notably Ms. Rhodes' complaint does not contain any
8 allegations or claims that Ms. Rhodes was disputing or questioning her bills, rates,
9 gas and electric usage at the Property, or DE-Ohio's compliance with any filed
10 tariff, rule or regulation enacted by the Commission. In fact, Ms. Rhodes'
11 complaint was so deficient that the Commission previously ordered her to file a
12 written explanation about what portion of her bills, if any, were in dispute or how
13 DE-Ohio supposedly violated a statute, rule or regulation of the Commission.
14 Even though Ms. Rhodes failed to comply with that order, the Commission did
15 not dismiss her complaint.

16 **Q. IS THE FORMAL COMPLAINT IN THIS CASE SIMILAR TO THE**
17 **INFORMAL COMPLAINTS AND CONCERNS RAISED BY MS.**
18 **RHODES?**

19 A. Yes.

20 **Q. HOW SO?**

21 A. During April and May 2014 Ms. Rhodes contacted both the Commission and DE-
22 Ohio to dispute what she claimed to be a balance transfer in the amount of
23 \$791.26 to her account at the Property. DE-Ohio's business records reflect that

1 various Call Center and Customer Service representatives attended and responded
2 to Ms. Rhodes' complaints by reviewing her account history and explaining the
3 charges and payments made on that account. At no point has anyone at DE-Ohio
4 found any evidence whatsoever that a transfer had occurred on Ms. Rhodes'
5 account with DE-Ohio, whether in the amount of \$791.26 or any other amount.

6 **Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH MS. RHODES' HISTORY WITH DE-**
7 **OHIO?**

8 A. Yes.

9 **Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW YOU ARE FAMILIAR WITH MS. RHODES'**
10 **ACCOUNT.**

11 A. Both another colleague in DE-Ohio's Consumer Affairs Department and I
12 personally researched DE-Ohio's business records relating to Marilyn Rhodes and
13 any accounts linked to her name and Social Security number, which I will not
14 identify for this public record. These records are maintained by DE-Ohio in the
15 ordinary course of its business as a public utility in Ohio. Among the records
16 researched and reviewed were Ms. Rhodes' actual bills generated by DE-Ohio
17 dating back to 2006—the company only retains 7 years' worth of customer bills—
18 and other account billing and payment information on DE-Ohio's computer
19 system going back to when Ms. Rhodes started service with DE-Ohio. Therefore,
20 my colleague and I were able to review virtually everything relating to Ms.
21 Rhodes' account history with DE-Ohio.

22 **Q. WHAT DO THE COMPANY'S RECORDS SHOW WITH RESPECT TO**
23 **MARILYN RHODES?**

1 A. Marilyn Rhodes established gas and electric service in her name at the Property
2 under Account No. 0750-0025-21-7 on February 1, 2003. Because Ms. Rhodes
3 was a new customer without established credit with DE-Ohio, she was charged a
4 security deposit of \$210 based on the gas and electric usage at the Property during
5 the prior 12 months, as authorized by DE-Ohio's tariffs on file with the
6 Commission and other applicable rules. DE-Ohio allowed Ms. Rhodes to pay the
7 deposit over a 3-month period and, in fact, transferred that deposit charge to a 3-
8 month payment plan on her account with the company.

9 **Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY DOCUMENTS REGARDING MS. RHODES'**
10 **ACCOUNT WITH DE-OHIO?**

11 A. Yes. Attached hereto as Exhibit MC-1 is a spreadsheet regarding the entire
12 history of Ms. Rhodes' account with DE-Ohio, starting when she first established
13 service in her name at the Property and continuing through and including her most
14 recent bill generated by DE-Ohio on October 30, 2014. That spreadsheet
15 identifies the date of each bill generated by DE-Ohio, the total monthly bill
16 charge, late fees (if any), dates on which Ms. Rhodes' payments posted to her
17 account, the total balance due at the time of each bill, and the bill due date. In
18 addition, the larger column in the middle of the spreadsheet identifies payment
19 plans which Ms. Rhodes entered into at various times over the nearly 12 year
20 history of her customer relationship with DE-Ohio.

21 **Q. WHY WAS IT NECESSARY TO INCLUDE INFORMATION ABOUT MS.**
22 **RHODES' PAYMENT PLANS IN THIS CASE?**

1 A. First, DE-Ohio wants to show the complete history of Marilyn Rhodes' account
2 with the company. Ms. Rhodes has concocted a completely baseless claim about
3 an unidentified and unspecified transfer to her account, which never happened.
4 Therefore, we feel it is necessary to provide the Commission with as much
5 information as possible within DE-Ohio's business records relating to Marilyn
6 Rhodes to demonstrate the accuracy of the company's records and to explain as
7 easily as possible why Ms. Rhodes' claims have no merit. Second, payment plans
8 reflect both the amount owed by a customer for gas and electric usage at a
9 particular time and the customer's agreement to pay that acknowledged sum to
10 DE-Ohio. Therefore, DE-Ohio wanted the Commission to have that information
11 while it considered Ms. Rhodes' claims. Finally, when a customer enters into a
12 payment plan with the company, DE-Ohio's billing system pulls the amount owed
13 out of the current amount due so that the payment plan amount is reflected on the
14 bills as a separate and distinct obligation from ongoing, future gas and electric
15 usage, thereby enabling the company and customer to track the customer's dual
16 payment obligations.

17 **Q. THE PAYMENT PLAN INFORMATION MAY TELL THE COMPLETE**
18 **STORY ABOUT MS. RHODES' ACCOUNT WITH DE-OHIO, BUT DOES**
19 **IT ALSO RELATE TO THE COMPANY'S SUBSTANTIVE RESPONSE**
20 **TO MS. RHODES' FORMAL COMPLAINT IN THIS CASE?**

21 A. Yes

22 **Q. HOW SO?**

1 A. Let's start with the initial security deposit of \$210 which DE-Ohio properly
2 charged to Ms. Rhodes' account in February 2003. In Ms. Rhodes' letter dated
3 June 19, 2014, which she mailed to DE-Ohio in response to the Commission's
4 order for her to amend her complaint, Ms. Rhodes showed a fundamental
5 misunderstanding of that charge on her account. Ms. Rhodes mistakenly believes
6 that she had a beginning balance of \$210 when service started in her name at the
7 Property, and that sum somehow transferred to her new account from a prior
8 account at the Property in the name of her ex-husband. That is absolutely not
9 true. No unpaid usage was transferred or placed on Ms. Rhodes' account when
10 she established service in her name, either from her ex-husband or anyone else.
11 Also, as I already explained, DE-Ohio's records for Ms. Rhodes' account confirm
12 that the \$210 charge was, in fact, a security deposit for the new service in her
13 name. While DE-Ohio may not have the nearly 12-year old bill from that time
14 period, DE-Ohio still maintains accurate account information in its billing system.
15 I personally have verified the \$210 security deposit and other information set
16 forth in Exhibit MC-1 on several occasions.

17 **Q. HOW ELSE DOES THE INFORMATION RELATING TO PAYMENT**
18 **PLANS RELATE TO DE-OHIO'S SUBSTANTIVE RESPONSE TO MS.**
19 **RHODES' COMPLAINT?**

20 A. If you look at Exhibit MC-1 carefully, you will see that Ms. Rhodes entered into
21 13 separate payment plans with DE-Ohio from October 31, 2008, through July 1,
22 2013. Those plans related only to Ms. Rhodes' unpaid gas and electric bills at the
23 Property and had nothing to do with the original payment plan for the \$210

1 security deposit. By entering into those payment plans, Ms. Rhodes
2 acknowledged that she owed DE-Ohio for her gas and electric bills at the
3 Property.

4 **Q. DID MARILYN RHODES FULLY COMPLY WITH EACH OF THOSE**
5 **PAYMENT PLANS?**

6 A. No. Ms. Rhodes fully paid only one 6-month payment plan as of June 2009. In a
7 few limited circumstances, her unpaid payment plan was converted or rolled into
8 a new payment plan. Other than that one plan, Ms. Rhodes defaulted on every
9 other payment into which she entered with DE-Ohio.

10 **Q. INCLUDING THE MOST RECENT PAYMENT PLAN?**

11 A. Yes. In fact, Ms. Rhodes has not made a payment to DE-Ohio on her account
12 since February 19, 2014, when she paid \$386. Ms. Rhodes made that payment in
13 response to the bill generated by DE-Ohio on February 3, 2014, at which time the
14 total amount owed was \$765.40. That sum was due March 11, 2014. After
15 getting that partial and inadequate payment of \$386, Ms. Rhodes' account balance
16 has grown every month. As of November 2014, the total amount owed by Ms.
17 Rhodes for unpaid gas and electric usage at her Property is \$4,111.40, which is
18 due by December 4, 2014. All of that information is reflected in Exhibit MC-1.

19 **Q. WHY DID DE-OHIO ALLOW HER ACCOUNT BALANCE TO GET SO**
20 **HIGH?**

21 A. We didn't; the Commission did. Pursuant to its filed tariffs and other rules
22 applicable to regulated utilities like DE-Ohio, the company is authorized to
23 disconnect customers' services for non-payment. In this case, Ms. Rhodes used

1 the complaint process to avoid disconnection even though her Complaint never
2 identifies a single thing that DE-Ohio did wrong or any rule or tariff which the
3 company violated. When DE-Ohio moved to dismiss the Complaint, DE-Ohio
4 was prevented from disconnecting Ms. Rhodes' services even though Ms. Rhodes
5 never agreed in writing to pay all amounts due and owing to DE-Ohio that are not
6 in dispute. Oddly, the burden was placed on DE-Ohio to go back and provide
7 billing and payment information for Ms. Rhodes' account over the past 10 years
8 even though she already has that information and has never questioned a single
9 bill, payment or charge for her gas and electric usage. As a result, the
10 Commission prevented DE-Ohio from disconnecting this customer's gas and
11 electric service into July 2014 even though Ms. Rhodes had not made a payment
12 since February 19, 2014. Not surprisingly, her unpaid balance continued to grow
13 and reached \$3,325.47 by the time DE-Ohio generated a bill on July 2, 2014.

14 **Q. WHAT HAPPENED NEXT?**

15 A. Once again, Ms. Rhodes failed to comply with the rules and Commission entry,
16 and DE-Ohio and its other rate payers were prejudiced as a result.

17 **Q. HOW?**

18 A. Ms. Rhodes never filed the supplemental complaint or information as ordered by
19 the Commission. She mailed a hand-written letter dated June 19, 2014, to DE-
20 Ohio's attorney. DE-Ohio treated that document as her amended complaint and
21 attached it to the company's motion to dismiss. Notably, in her document Ms.
22 Rhodes identified only the \$210 security deposit from February 2003 as a charge
23 which she disputed for the first time all these years later. Even though DE-Ohio

1 fully explained that charge and provided a similar spreadsheet to Exhibit MC-1 in
2 this case—and Ms. Rhodes never questioned any other charges or bills of any
3 kind—the Commission inexplicably added \$210 to \$791.26 and concluded that
4 the sum of \$1,001.26 was in dispute and that all other sums due and owing by Ms.
5 Rhodes at that time (\$2,061.94) were not in dispute. Therefore, Ms. Rhodes
6 successfully bought more time to pay \$1,001.26 which the Commission
7 mistakenly decided was legitimately in dispute in this case. Ms. Rhodes also
8 avoided disconnection for a longer period of time because DE-Ohio had to restart
9 the disconnection process with proper notice to her, thereby preventing any
10 disconnection until well into August 2014. By that time Ms. Rhodes owed
11 \$3,639.20 to DE-Ohio, which is not surprising considering that she last made a
12 payment on her gas and electric account back in February.

13 **Q. I THINK YOU'VE EXPLAINED THIS BUT, BASED ON YOUR**
14 **RESEARCH AND REVIEW OF DE-OHIO'S RECORDS FOR MARILYN**
15 **RHODES' ACCOUNT, WHAT IS YOUR RESPONSE TO MS. RHODES'**
16 **CLAIM THAT IMPROPER CHARGES WERE TRANSFERRED TO HER**
17 **ACCOUNT AT THE PROPERTY?**

18 **A.** Simple: those claims are not remotely true. I have scoured Ms. Rhodes' account
19 history with DE-Ohio. No gas or electric charges have been transferred to or
20 placed on Ms. Rhodes' account since she established service in February 2003.

21 **Q. WHAT ABOUT MS. RHODES' CLAIM THAT CHARGES WERE**
22 **TRANSFERRED TO HER ACCOUNT AT THE PROPERTY FROM AN**

1 **ACCOUNT AT 2505 VERA AVENUE, CINCINNATI, OHIO, EITHER IN**
2 **THE NAME OF HER EX-HUSBAND OR SOMEONE ELSE?**

3 A. Again, that claim is simply true. I cannot reveal confidential information about a
4 another customer's account, but I personally reviewed the billing and account
5 history for the property located at 2505 Vera Avenue, including the prior account
6 in the name of William Rhodes, Ms. Rhodes' ex-husband. Mr. Rhodes paid that
7 account in full after it went final. Nothing ever was transferred from that
8 account or any other account to Ms. Rhodes' account at the Property.

9 **Q. NOW, LET ME ASK YOU ABOUT WHAT APPEARS TO BE A CLAIM**
10 **BY MS. RHODES THAT DE-OHIO SOMEHOW WAS INVOLVED IN**
11 **THE THEFT OF HER IDENTITY, FRAUD OF SOME KIND OR THE**
12 **DIVERSION OF HER MAIL.**

13 A. It is a little difficult to respond to those accusations because they are so bizarre.
14 DE-Ohio operates its gas and electric businesses; it does not and cannot have a
15 customer's mail diverted. DE-Ohio does not have any information to support
16 Ms. Rhodes' claim about the theft of her identity. DE-Ohio knows for a fact that
17 Ms. Rhodes' name and Social Security Number are attached only to the one
18 account at the Property, the same account which Ms. Rhodes has used and
19 benefitted from since February 1, 2003. Ms. Rhodes has not been charged or
20 held financially responsible by DE-Ohio for any other gas or electric account. I
21 cannot speak for any other company or what any other person has done. All I
22 can say unequivocally is that DE-Ohio has not done anything that would
23 remotely involve identity theft, fraud or the diversion of Ms. Rhodes' mail.

1

2 **Q. BY THE WAY, DOES DE-OHIO MAINTAIN RECORDS FOR WHEN**
3 **CUSTOMERS CONTACT THE COMPANY ABOUT THEIR ACCOUNT?**

4 A. Yes.

5 **Q. DOES DE-OHIO HAVE THOSE RECORDS FOR MS. RHODES?**

6 A. Yes.

7 **Q. HAVE YOU REVIEWED THEM?**

8 A. Yes.

9 **Q. HAVE YOU SEEN ANY RECORD OR OTHER EVIDENCE THAT MS.**
10 **RHODES EVER CLAIMED PRIOR TO SPRING 2014 THAT THERE**
11 **WERE IMPROPER OR UNAUTHORIZED CHARGES ON HER**
12 **ACCOUNT, OR THAT DE-OHIO SOMEHOW DID SOMETHING—**
13 **ANYTHING—WITH RESPECT TO IDENTIFY THEFT, MAIL**
14 **DIVERSION, FRAUD, ETC.?**

15 A. No. Ms. Rhodes has never contacted the company and made any such claims, at
16 least not until she stopped paying her gas and electric bills in March 2014 and
17 started receiving disconnection notices from DE-Ohio. Only then did these
18 incredible allegations first make their appearance.

19 **Q. ARE YOU CONFIDENT THAT DE-OHIO COMPLIED WITH ITS FILED**
20 **TARIFFS AND OTHER RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE**
21 **COMMISSION WITH RESPECT TO MARILYN RHODES AND HER**
22 **ACCOUNT AT THE PROPERTY?**

1 A. Absolutely. I think that another colleague and I now have reviewed and re-
2 reviewed Ms. Rhodes' entire account history at least three (3) separate times since
3 Ms. Rhodes first raised these issues in her informal complaint to the Commission
4 and then filed her formal Complaint in this case. We also have provided Ms.
5 Rhodes with her detailed account history on more than one occasion since earlier
6 this year. To date I have never seen a shred of evidence relating to or supporting
7 Ms. Rhodes' claims. In fact, all of the evidence proves otherwise.

8 **Q. WHERE DO THINGS STAND TODAY WITH RESPECT TO MARILYN**
9 **RHODES AND THE PROPERTY?**

10 A. Marilyn Rhodes' account has been subject to disconnection for months in light of
11 her failure to make a payment since February 2014 and her disregard of repeated
12 notices that her gas and electric services are subject to disconnection for
13 nonpayment. Until recently Ms. Rhodes had never contacted DE-Ohio to exercise
14 her rights under the recent Winter Rule that went into effect in October.

15 **Q. WHAT, IF ANYTHING, HAPPENED RECENTLY WITH RESPECT TO**
16 **MARILYN RHODES' ACCOUNT AND THE PROPERTY?**

17 A. On December 1, 2014, DE-Ohio disconnected Ms. Rhodes' electric service at the
18 Property in accordance with its tariffs filed with the Commission. This
19 disconnection related only to Marilyn Rhodes' failure to pay any of the amount
20 not in dispute in this case. As you may recall, the Commission previously
21 determined that \$1,001.26 was in dispute in this case and that Ms. Rhodes owed
22 DE-Ohio for all other gas and electric charges on her account. DE-Ohio
23 disagreed—and still disagrees—with that calculation, as the company does not

1 believe that Ms. Rhodes has demonstrated or even suggested in any rational
2 manner that any portion of her unpaid gas and electric bills are legitimately in
3 dispute. However, DE-Ohio fully complied with all rules and regulations and did
4 not disconnect Ms. Rhodes' electric service with respect to any of the allegedly
5 disputed unpaid sums due and owing by her to DE-Ohio.

6 **Q. WHAT HAPPENED NEXT?**

7 A. Marilyn Rhodes called me to complain about the disconnection of her electric.
8 Ms. Rhodes claimed that the disconnection was unlawful. I politely explained to
9 her that she was incorrect. I specifically mentioned our conversation at the
10 settlement conference at the Commission back in September and how both the
11 attorney examiner and I explained to her at that time that she was required to pay
12 all gas and electric charges not in dispute and, if she failed to do so, her services
13 could be disconnected. When I asked Ms. Rhodes why she had not made any
14 payments on her account, she failed to respond. I then reminded Ms. Rhodes that
15 she could exercise her rights under the Winter Rule to reconnect her services and,
16 if she chose to do so, she would have to pay the required \$175 fee, plus a
17 reconnection fee and then enter into a payment plan for the balance.

18 **Q. DID THAT HAPPEN?**

19 A. Yes. Marilyn Rhodes agreed to and did pay the \$175 fee under the Winter Rule,
20 but I was not the person who handled the actual payment plan. DE-Ohio's
21 account records for Ms. Rhodes reflect that she called back to Customer Service
22 for the payment plan with DE-Ohio. At that point the \$25 reconnection fee was
23 applied to Ms. Rhodes' account, as was a \$295 security deposit. DE-Ohio

1 previously had applied Ms. Rhodes' prior security deposit to her unpaid charges
2 and credited her for that sum. Therefore, DE-Ohio was entitled to charge her a
3 new security deposit to protect its interests going forward. In accordance with the
4 Winter Rule, DE-Ohio then put Ms. Rhodes on a 6-month payment plan for her
5 unpaid gas and electric charges. Under that plan, to which Ms. Rhodes agreed,
6 she is required to pay \$657 per month for her past due gas and electric charges,
7 and she must pay all current charges in a timely manner.

8 **Q. DO YOU HAVE ANYTHING FURTHER TO ADD?**

9 A. Not at this time, although I reserve the right to supplement this written testimony
10 based on evidence produced at the hearing, whether by Marilyn Rhodes, any of
11 her witnesses or DE-Ohio.

12 **IV. CONCLUSION**

13 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?**

14 A. Yes



6/10/2014

Re: 07500025 Z1

MARILYN J RHODES
9846 ARVIN
CINCINNATI, OH
45231

DATE BILL GENERATED	TOTAL MONTHLY BILL CHARGE	LATE FEE BILLED	PAYMENT PLAN	PAYMENT POSTING DATE	PAYMENTS RECEIVED	TOTAL ACCOUNT BALANCE DUE	BILL DUE
10/30/2014	\$ 129.07	\$ 63.09			\$286.51 (deposit applied)	\$ 4,111.40	DUE 12/4/2014
10/1/2014	\$ 191.95	\$ 59.32					
9/2/2014	\$ 315.28					\$ 4,205.75	DUE 11/5/2014
8/1/2014	\$ 313.73					\$ 3,954.48	DUE 10/7/2014
7/2/2014	\$ 262.27					\$ 3,639.20	DUE 9/5/2014
6/3/2014	\$ 136.82					\$ 3,525.47	DUE 8/7/2014
5/2/2014	\$ 351.36	\$ 41.01	NEW BILL PENDING 6/3/14, DISCONNECTION SUSPENDED PER FILING OF PUCO FORMAL 4/15/14 -- \$1,744.18 PAYMENT PLAN DEFAULT REMAINING BALANCE			\$ 3,063.20	
4/2/2014	\$ 232.81					\$ 2,926.38	DUE 6/6/14
3/4/2014	\$ 276.61	\$ 5.70		2/19/2014		\$ 2,734.01	DUE 5/7/14
2/3/2014	\$ 266.17	\$ 5.70			\$ 386.00	\$ 1,445.40	DUE 4/24/14
1/3/2014	\$ 243.52			1/15/2014		\$ 765.40	DUE 4/9/14
12/3/2013	\$ 216.27				\$ 386.00	\$ 765.70	DUE 3/11/14
10/30/2013	\$ 147.33			12/6/2013		\$ 380.00	DUE 2/10/14
10/1/2013	\$ 222.03			11/6/2013		\$ 380.00	DUE 1/7/14
8/30/2013	\$ 306.66			10/9/2013		\$ 380.00	DUE 12/6/13
8/1/2013	\$ 323.73			9/9/2013		\$ 380.00	DUE 11/6/13
7/2/2013	\$ 159.30			8/8/2013		\$ 380.00	DUE 10/8/13
7/1/2013						\$ 380.00	DUE 9/6/13
6/17/2013	\$ 78.05		7/1/13 -- \$2,994.48 BALANCE TRANSFERRED TO 24 MONTH PAYMENT PLAN, \$125 INSTALLMENT + BUDGET \$255 6/18/13 -- \$65.00 SECURITY DEPOSIT ADDED (DUE TO ELECTRIC DISCONNECT) ELECTRIC DISCONNECTED FOR NON-PAYMENT 6/17/13	7/1/2013	\$ 700.00	\$ 4,429.48	DUE 7/9/13
6/3/2013	\$ 131.15	\$ 63.76		6/18/2013	\$ 800.00	\$ 4,250.55	DUE 6/7/13
5/2/2013	\$ 156.93					\$ 4,093.62	DUE 5/9/13
4/3/2013	\$ 243.97	\$ 56.89		4/3/2013	\$ 693.56	\$ 3,732.09	DUE 10/8/12
3/4/2013	\$ 247.48		2/4/13 -- \$3,976.88 BALANCE TRANSFERRED TO 9 MONTH PAYMENT PLAN \$442 INSTALLMENT 2/4/13 -- WINTER RULE USED	2/4/2013	\$ 175.00	\$ 3,732.09	DUE 9/6/12
2/1/2013	\$ 251.56					\$ 683.56	DUE 3/11/13
1/3/2013	\$ 261.83	\$ 17.63		11/26/2012	\$189.00 HEAP PAYMENT	\$ 4,151.88	DUE 2/8/13
11/30/2012	\$ 226.03	\$ 10.74	1/17/13 -- \$2,735.09 ENDING BALANCE, PAYMENT PLAN DEFAULTED, BUDGET REMAINING CREDIT BALANCE -\$38.15			\$ 1,175.48	DUE 1/7/13
10/30/2012	\$ 156.59	\$ 6.74	10/4/12 -- \$3,732.09 BALANCE TRANSFERRED TO 15 MONTH PAYMENT PLAN, \$249 INSTALLMENT + \$200 BUDGET			\$ 904.74	DUE 12/5/12
10/1/2012	\$ 179.23	\$ -				\$ 449.00	DUE 11/6/12
8/30/2012	\$ 308.55	\$ 50.59				\$ 3,732.09	DUE 10/8/12
8/1/2012	\$ 340.11	\$ 44.82				\$ 3,732.09	DUE 9/6/12

[illegible]

[illegible]


8/30/2007	\$	339.86	\$	5.00	9/26/2007	\$	338.51	673.51	DUE 9/21/07
8/1/2007	\$	324.31	\$		9/5/2007	\$	340.00		
7/12/2007	\$	294.00	\$	4.41		\$			328.72 DUE 8/23/07
6/1/2007	\$	106.81	\$	1.60	7/27/2007	\$			294.00 DUE 7/24/07
5/12/2007	\$	146.48	\$		6/27/2007	\$	108.41	\$	106.81 DUE 6/25/07
4/1/2007	\$	167.07	\$	2.51	5/23/2007	\$	146.06	\$	148.06 DUE 5/24/07
3/12/2007	\$	282.95	\$	4.29	5/2/2007	\$	168.00	\$	167.07 DUE 4/24/07
2/1/2007	\$	234.47	\$	3.52	3/28/2007	\$	290.18	\$	285.89 DUE 3/26/07
1/3/2007	\$	240.95	\$		3/1/2007	\$	235.00	\$	234.42 DUE 2/23/07
11/30/2006	\$	196.61	\$	2.95	1/24/2007	\$	241.00	\$	240.95 DUE 1/25/07
10/30/2006	\$	129.23	\$	1.96	12/28/2006	\$	199.56	\$	196.61 DUE 12/22/06
9/29/2006	\$	120.70	\$	1.74	11/27/2006	\$	132.93	\$	130.97 DUE 10/30/06
8/30/2006	\$	227.42	\$	3.41	10/25/2006	\$	116.29	\$	116.29 DUE 10/23/06
					9/27/2006	\$	235.00	\$	227.42 DUE 9/21/06
8/1/2006	\$	159.84	\$		8/23/2006	\$	159.72	\$	
6/30/2006	\$	82.14	\$	1.25	7/27/2006	\$	85.00	\$	159.72 DUE 8/23/06
5/2/2006	\$	129.30	\$	1.49	5/24/2006	\$	130.00	\$	
4/3/2006	\$	195.87	\$	2.94					
3/3/2006	\$	243.97	\$		3/27/2006	\$	243.77	\$	
2/6/2006	\$	146.88	\$		2/24/2006	\$	218.00	\$	
					1/26/2006	\$	305.00	\$	
1/4/2006	\$	305.13	\$		1/5/2006	\$	205.00	\$	
12/1/2005	\$	201.65	\$	3.02					
10/31/2005	\$	102.22	\$		11/16/2005	\$	102.22	\$	
					10/28/2005	\$	101.41	\$	
9/3/2005	\$	99.91	\$	1.50	10/3/2005	\$	161.74	\$	
8/31/2005	\$	159.35	\$	2.39					
8/2/2005	\$	206.04	\$		8/24/2005	\$	207.14	\$	
7/1/2005	\$	116.35	\$	1.75	7/27/2005	\$	117.00	\$	
6/2/2005	\$	86.19	\$		6/27/2005	\$	85.02	\$	
5/3/2005	\$	118.32	\$	4.44	5/31/2005	\$	300.51	\$	
4/4/2005	\$	178.54	\$	2.63	4/25/2005	\$	200.00	\$	
3/3/2005	\$	193.67	\$	2.91					
2/2/2005	\$	217.79	\$		2/23/2005	\$	275.50	\$	
1/4/2005	\$	257.30	\$	3.81	2/1/2005	\$	200.00	\$	
12/1/2004	\$	154.48	\$	2.32	1/3/2005	\$	160.00	\$	
10/29/2004	\$	96.58	\$	1.45	11/25/2004	\$	98.03	\$	
9/30/2004	\$	97.31	\$	1.46	10/27/2004	\$	98.77	\$	
8/31/2004	\$	70.50	\$		9/17/2004	\$	117.20	\$	
					8/27/2004	\$	80.00	\$	
7/1/2004	\$	81.69	\$	1.87	7/23/2004	\$	81.69	\$	
6/3/2004	\$	65.61	\$		6/24/2004	\$	67.93	\$	
5/3/2004	\$	101.30	\$	3.02	5/27/2004	\$	202.00	\$	
4/1/2004	\$	128.38	\$	3.41	4/28/2004	\$	131.05	\$	
3/3/2004	\$	202.91	\$	3.26	3/26/2004	\$	121.02	\$	
2/3/2004	\$	287.39	\$	0.21	2/25/2004	\$	400.00	\$	
1/5/2004	\$	249.27	\$	1.87	1/22/2004	\$	200.00	\$	

12/2/2003	\$	165.10	\$	2.89	12/30/2003	\$	120.00
10/30/2003	\$	83.26	\$	4.10	11/29/2003	\$	250.00
10/2/2003	\$	105.73	\$	2.81	10/3/2003	\$	70.00
9/2/2003	\$	150.66	\$	2.24	8/26/2003	\$	108.00
8/1/2003	\$	107.16			7/21/2003	\$	109.00
7/2/2003	\$	109.38					
5/2/2003	\$	139.30					
					5/2/03 -- PAYMENT PLAN DEFAULTED, \$70 ENDING BALANCE		
4/2/2003	\$	168.74			4/28/2003	\$	70.00
3/4/2003	\$	270.90	\$	4.06	4/24/2003	\$	172.00
					3/31/2003	\$	70.00
					3/27/2003	\$	270.00
2/1/2003	\$210 Security deposit added				2/17/2003	\$	70.00
					2/11/03 -- \$210 BALANCE TRANSFERRED TO 3 MONTH PAYMENT PLAN \$70 installment SERVICE BEGAN 2/1/03		

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Direct Testimony of Melissa Coffman was served via regular US Mail, postage prepaid, on the 2nd day of December, 2014, upon the following Complainant:

Marilyn J. Rhodes
9846 Arvin Avenue
Cincinnati, OH 45236



Robert A. McMahon

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

12/2/2014 2:48:15 PM

in

Case No(s). 14-0834-GA-CSS

Summary: Testimony Direct Testimony of Melissa Coffman on Behalf of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. electronically filed by Mr. Robert A. McMahon on behalf of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.