

FILE

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of
Duke Energy Ohio for Approval of an
Electric Security Plan.

Case No. 08-920-EL-SSO

In the Matter of the Application of
Duke Energy Ohio for Approval to
Amend Accounting Methods.

Case No. 08-921-EL-AAM

In the Matter of the Application of
Duke Energy Ohio for Approval of
a Certificate of Public Convenience
and Necessity to Establish an
Unavoidable Capacity Charge(s).

Case No. 08-922-EL-UNC

In the Matter of the Application of
Duke Energy Ohio for Approval to
Amend its Tariff.

Case No. 08-923-EL-ATA

MOTION TO INTERVENE
OF
DOMINION RETAIL, INC.

PUCO

2008 AUG 21 PM 3:01

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV


By the above-styled applications, Duke Energy Ohio ("DE-Ohio") seeks approval of an electric security plan and certain related measures pursuant to Amended Substitute Senate Bill No. 221 ("SB 221"), the recently enacted legislation amending the Ohio statutory electric restructuring plan created by Amended Substitute Senate Bill No. 3 in 1999. As more fully discussed in the accompanying memorandum, Dominion Retail, Inc. ("Dominion Retail") has a real and substantial interest in this proceeding, and is so situated that the disposition of this proceeding may, as a practical matter, impair or impede its ability to protect that interest. Further, Dominion Retail's interest in this proceeding is not represented by any existing party, and its participation in this proceeding will contribute to a just and expeditious resolution of the

This is to certify that the images appearing are an
accurate and complete reproduction of a case file
document delivered in the regular course of business.
Technician MV Date Processed 8/21/08

issues involved without unduly delaying the proceeding or unjustly prejudicing any existing party. Accordingly, Dominion Retail hereby moves to intervene in this proceeding pursuant to Section 4903.221, Revised Code, and Rule 4901-1-11, Ohio Administrative Code ("OAC").

WHEREFORE, Dominion Retail respectfully requests that the Commission grant its motion to intervene.

Respectfully submitted,



Barth E. Royer (Counsel of Record)
BELL &, ROYER CO., LPA
33 South Grant Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3927
(614) 228-0704 – Phone
(614) 228-0201 – Fax
BarthRoyer@aol.com – Email

Gary A. Jeffries
Senior Counsel
Dominion Resources Services, Inc.
501 Martindale Street, Suite 400
Pittsburgh, PA 15212-5817
412-237-4729 – Phone
412-237-4782 -- Fax
Gary.A.Jeffries@dom.com

Attorneys for Dominion Retail, Inc.

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio for Approval of an Electric Security Plan.	: : :	Case No. 08-920-EL-SSO
In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio for Approval to Amend Accounting Methods.	: : :	Case No. 08-921-EL-AAM
In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio for Approval of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Establish an Unavoidable Capacity Charge(s).	: : : : :	Case No. 08-922-EL-UNC
In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio for Approval to Amend its Tariff.	: : :	Case No. 08-923-EL-ATA

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT
OF
MOTION TO INTERVENE
OF
DOMINION RETAIL, INC.

By these applications, DE-Ohio seeks to satisfy the requirements of SB 221 by requesting approval of an electric security plan that includes a standard service offer ("SSO") for generation service. Section 4903.221, Revised Code, provides that any "person who may be adversely affected by a public utilities commission proceeding may intervene in such proceeding."

Dominion Retail is a Commission-certified CRES provider authorized to offer competitive retail electric service to customers within the DE-Ohio's service territory. As such, Dominion Retail would be required to compete against the DE-Ohio's SSO to attract and retain customers. Thus, Dominion Retail clearly may be adversely affected by this proceeding. Moreover, not only does

Dominion Retail satisfy the underlying statutory test, but its also satisfies the standards governing intervention set forth in the Commission's rules.

Rule 4901-1-11(A), OAC, provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

(A) Upon timely motion, any person shall be permitted to intervene in a proceeding upon a showing that:

(2) The person has a real and substantial interest in the proceeding, and the person is so situated that the disposition of the proceeding may, as a practical matter, impair or impede his ability to protect that interest, unless the person's interest is adequately represented by existing parties.

As a CRES supplier, Dominion Retail plainly has a real and substantial interest in a proceeding in which the Commission is being asked to determine how the price against which it must compete will be established. At this juncture, none of the pending motions to intervene in this proceeding have been granted. Thus, by definition, no existing parties adequately represent Dominion Retail's interest.

Although Dominion Retail does not believe this to be a close question, each of the specific considerations that the Commission may, by rule, take into account in applying the Rule 4901-1-11(A)(2), OAC, standard, also fully support granting Dominion Retail's motion to intervene. Rule 4901-1-11(B), OAC, provides as follows:

In deciding whether to permit intervention under paragraph (A)(2) of this rule, the commission, the legal director, the deputy legal director, or an attorney examiner case shall consider:

- (1) The nature and extent of the prospective intervenor's interest;
- (2) The legal position advanced by the prospective intervenor and its probable relation to the merits of the case.
- (3) Whether the intervention by the prospective intervenor will unduly prolong or delay the proceedings.
- (4) Whether the prospective intervenor will significantly contribute to full development and equitable resolution of the factual issues.

- (5) The extent to which the person's interest is represented by existing parties;

First, as previously explained, Dominion Retail's interest in connection with these proposals is obviously direct and substantial. Second, although Dominion Retail must necessarily await further developments before determining the specific positions it will adopt with respect to the issues in these proceedings, Dominion Retail will certainly advocate that any process adopted as a result of the applications be fair, reasonable, non-discriminatory, and designed to promote competition. Third, in view of the fact that the proceeding has just commenced, granting Dominion Retail's motion to intervene will not unduly delay or prolong the proceeding. Fourth, Dominion Retail has been a frequent participant in cases involving the establishment of competitive electric and gas markets in Ohio and the numerous other states in which it does business. Thus, Dominion Retail will bring substantial experience to bear on the issues raised. Finally, not only are there no existing parties that represent Dominion Retail's interest, but it would be inconsistent with the Commission's stated policy "to encourage the broadest possible participation in its proceedings" (*see, e.g., Cleveland Elec. Illum. Co.*, Case No. 85-675-EL-AIR, Entry dated January 14, 1986, at 2) to apply the Rule 4901-1-11(B)(5) standard in a manner that would favor certain CRES providers or potential bidders over others. Thus, granting Dominion Retail intervenor status is consistent with all the considerations set out in Rule 4901-1-11(B), OAC.

WHEREFORE, Dominion Retail respectfully requests that the Commission grant its motion to intervene.

Respectfully submitted,



Barth E. Royer (Counsel of Record)
BELL &, ROYER CO., LPA
33 South Grant Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3927
(614) 228-0704 – Phone
(614) 228-0201 – Fax
BarthRoyer@aol.com – Email

Gary A. Jeffries
Senior Counsel
Dominion Resources Services, Inc.
501 Martindale Street, Suite 400
Pittsburgh, PA 15212-5817
412-237-4729 – Phone
412-237-4782 -- Fax
Gary.A.Jeffries@dom.com

Attorneys for Dominion Retail, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing has been served upon the following parties by first class mail, postage prepaid, this 21st day of August 2008.


Barth E. Royer

Paul A. Colbert
Rocco D'Ascenzo
Elizabeth H. Watts
Amy Spiller
Duke Energy Ohio
139 Fourth Street, Room 25 ATII
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(513) 419-1827

Janine L. Migden-Ostrander
Ann M. Hotz
Jeffrey L. Small
Jacqueline Lake Roberts
Michael E. Idzkowski
Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

David F. Boehm
Michael L. Kurtz
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry
36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

John W. Bentine
Mark S. Yurick
Matthew S. White
Chester, Willcox & Saxbe LLP
65 East State Street, Suite 1000
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4213

Thomas J. O'Brien
Sally W. Bloomfield
BRICKER & ECKLER LLP
100 South Third Street
Columbus, OH 43215-4291

Samuel C. Randazzo
Lisa G. McAlister
Daniel J. Neilsen
Joseph M. Clark
MCNEES WALLACE & NURICK LLC
21 East State Street, 17th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

David C. Rinebolt
Colleen L. Mooney
Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy
231 West Lima Street
P.O. Box 1793
Findlay, Ohio 45839-1793

M. Howard Petricoff
Stephen M. Howard
VORYS, SATER, SEYMOUR AND
PEASE LLP
52 East Gay Street
P. O. Box 1008
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008