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The PUCO has invited comment on its rules regarding utility tariffs. The opportunity to comment is appreciated. Utility tariffs set forth the terms and conditions (including rates) for service to utility consumers, so tariffs are very important. The importance of tariffs was recently underscored by the Ohio Supreme Court, in an opinion where it sided with FirstEnergy’s claim that the PUCO could not make FirstEnergy refund $43 million to consumers for FirstEnergy’s renewable energy overcharges.[[1]](#footnote-2) There, the Court found that the PUCO was barred from ordering refunds because the PUCO had not made FirstEnergy’s tariffs subject to refund.[[2]](#footnote-3) In another recent denial of refunds, the Court found unlawful the PUCO’s allowance of a so-called distribution modernization rider (subsidy charge) for FirstEnergy. There, the Court denied half a billion dollars in refunds to two million consumers (where the PUCO had not protected consumers by making the charge subject to refund).[[3]](#footnote-4) In that case, the PUCO had rejected a motion by OCC and the Ohio Manufacturers’ Association, in 2016, to make FirstEnergy’s subsidy charge subject to refund.[[4]](#footnote-5)

Supreme Court Justice Pfeifer highlighted the extreme injustice to Ohio consumers when they are denied refunds for charges later found to be unlawful:

[T]he PUCO asserted that a refund under the circumstances would be tantamount to retroactive ratemaking, something it is not authorized to engage in.

It is unconscionable that a public utility should be able to retain $368 million that it collected from customers based on assumptions that are unjustified. The problem stems from this court’s 1957 decision [in *Keco Industries, Inc. v. Cincinnati & Suburban Bell Tel. Co.*] Clearly the time has come to overturn this case.

...

[I]t boggles the mind that this court would ever countenance such a proposition: that a public utility should be allowed to fatten itself on the backs of Ohio residents by collecting unjustified charges.

...

Allowing AEP to retain the $368 million that it collected based on charges that were not justified is unconscionable. Doing so because of a 50-year-old case that is not supported by the statute on which it is based is ridiculous. The ratepayers of Ohio deserve better. [[5]](#footnote-6)

Just since the advent of the 2008 energy law that favors electric utilities in ratemaking, Ohioans have lost $1.2 billion in denied refunds for electric charges after Supreme Court reversals of PUCO orders.[[6]](#footnote-7) In this case, the PUCO issued a draft proposal for rules changes regarding tariffs. An important addition to the PUCO’s proposals would be for a refund provision. Accordingly, the PUCO should adopt a new rule to this section as Ohio Adm. Code 4901:1-1-04. The new rule should be titled “Refund language in tariffs.” The rule should require refund language that is substantially similar to language that the PUCO has previously approved, as follows:[[7]](#footnote-8)

**O.A.C. 4901:1-1-04 Refund language in tariffs**

All utility rider tariffs shall include the following refund language: “This tariff is subject to reconciliation or adjustment, including but not limited to, increases, decreases or refunds. Such reconciliation or adjustment shall be calculated so that the rates or charges under the tariff fully compensate utility customers for charges determined to be unlawful, unreasonable, or imprudent by the Commission in the docket those rates were approved or the Supreme Court of Ohio.”

It is time for justice for consumers on the refund issue. Given the Supreme Court’s recent acknowledgment that PUCO subject-to-refund tariffs would solve the injustice, this rulemaking is the forum to right this wrong.
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