

**BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV  
2008 DEC 18 PM 5:12  
PUCO

In the Matter of the Application of )  
Columbus Southern Power Company and )  
Ohio Power Company to Modify Their ) Case No. 08-1301-EL-AAM  
Accounting Procedure for Certain Storm- )  
Related Service Restoration Costs. )

---

**MOTION TO INTERVENE  
BY  
THE OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL**

---

The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel ("OCC") moves to intervene in this case where the applicants<sup>1</sup> seek approval for accounting authority to defer operating and maintenance ("O&M") costs associated with damage to their plant that they claim resulted from the storm in September 2008, and which would result in rate increases for Ohio customers. OCC is filing on behalf of all the approximately 1.2 million residential utility consumers of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company ("Companies").<sup>2</sup> The reasons the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("Commission" or "PUCO") should grant OCC's Motion are further set forth in the attached Memorandum in Support.

---


<sup>1</sup> The Applicants are Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company.

<sup>2</sup> See R.C. Chapter 4911, R.C. 4903.221 and Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-11.

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 TM Date Processed 12/18/2008

Respectfully submitted,

JANINE L. MIGDEN-OSTRANDER  
CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Richard C. Reese", written in black ink.

Richard C. Reese, Counsel of Record

Melissa R. Yost

Gregory J. Poulos

Assistant Consumers' Counsel

**Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel**

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800

Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

Telephone: (614) 466-8574

Email: [reese@occ.state.oh.us](mailto:reese@occ.state.oh.us)

[yost@occ.state.oh.us](mailto:yost@occ.state.oh.us)

[poulos@occ.state.oh.us](mailto:poulos@occ.state.oh.us)

In the Matter of the Application of )  
Columbus Southern Power Company and )  
Ohio Power Company to Modify Their ) Case No. 08-1301-EL-AAM  
Accounting Procedure for Certain Storm- )  
Related Service Restoration Costs. )

<sup>4</sup> *Application* at ¶9.

## II. THE APPLICATION

The Companies allege that the “[P]resent application is consistent with the Commission-approved application in Case No. 06-412-EL-UNC.”<sup>5</sup> There are some similarities between this Application and that prior application, but not necessarily in a good way for consumers. For example, the Commission noted in that Finding and Order that the costs sought to be recovered were not “adequately describe[d].”<sup>6</sup> In the current Application, the Companies do not provide any detail on the amount of expenses to be deferred or the amount of costs to be recovered. However, the Application provides specific descriptions of equipment and facilities damaged.<sup>7</sup> In addition, it appears that the Companies are aware of the amount of labor employed to restore service.<sup>8</sup>

The PUCO should not grant the Application, as framed, with its lack of information about the dollar amounts for deferral or recovery that will be presented for the Commission’s consideration. The OCC’s intervention, aligned with its interest in advocating for residential customers, will assist the Commission in ensuring that a complete and transparent record will be provided, under R.C. 4903.10, of what amounts of deferral or recovery the Commission should consider for approval or denial, and the reasons for an approval or denial of each cost or expense.

In addition, this current Application may be distinguished from the application submitted in the previous case by noting the circumstances surrounding the current

---

<sup>5</sup> *Application* at ¶6.

<sup>6</sup> *In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company to Modify Their Accounting Procedure for Certain Storm-Related Service Restoration Costs*, Case No. 06-412-EL-UNC, Finding and Order at ¶8 (August 9, 2006).

<sup>7</sup> *Application* at ¶7.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.*

submission. Currently, the Companies are in the midst of an Electric Security Plan (ESP) proceeding. This proceeding will decide the rates for a substantial portion of the Companies' customers. These proceedings involve issues of reliability, maintenance and service quality. The Companies note in their application that the storm occurred over three months ago.<sup>9</sup> The rate plans cited by the Companies in this application expire in less than two weeks.<sup>10</sup> They will be replaced by the outcome of the ESP case. Rather than abruptly granting yet another storm exception with no investigation or deliberate consideration, under plans whose terms were designed to end in 12 days, the Commission should instead consider the deferral/cost recovery request in this Application under the totality of the current circumstances. These circumstances include the rate implications of the ESP currently being litigated.

Furthermore, the OCC has reasonably requested a specific Commission investigation into the practices of the Companies in maintaining their facilities and equipment.<sup>11</sup> Part of this application for investigation describes some of the specific problems that these Companies have had with vegetation management and other practices that may have contributed to the length of outages experienced by the Companies' customers and the damages the Companies claim they incurred.<sup>12</sup> The documentation

---

<sup>9</sup> Application at ¶7.

<sup>10</sup> *In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company to Modify Their Accounting Procedure for Certain Storm-Related Service Restoration Costs*, Case No. 06-412-EL-UNC, Finding and Order at ¶3 (August 9, 2006).

<sup>11</sup> *In the matter of a Commission Investigation into the Reliability of the Electric Distribution Service Provided by Ohio's Investor Owned Electric Companies*, Case No. 08-1299-EL-UNC, Application (December 15, 2008).

<sup>12</sup> *Commission Investigation* at 18-22.

provided in the OCC application should certainly be part of the record in this case, and OCC should be granted intervention in order to present it.

### **III. INTERVENTION**

This case involves the review of the reasonableness and lawfulness of issues related to proposed accounting deferrals and cost recovery. OCC has authority under law to represent the interests of all the approximately 1.2 million residential utility customers of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company, pursuant to R.C. Chapter 4911.

R.C. 4903.221 provides, in part, that any person “who may be adversely affected” by a PUCO proceeding is entitled to seek intervention in that proceeding. The interests of Ohio’s residential consumers may be “adversely affected” by this case, especially if the consumers were unrepresented in a proceeding in which the Commission considers the deferral of significant O & M expenses and/or collection of costs associated with storm damage repair, which could affect rates paid by these residential customers. Thus, this element of the intervention standard in R.C. 4903.221 is satisfied.

R.C. 4903.221(B) requires the Commission to consider the following criteria in ruling on motions to intervene:

- (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 proceeding; and
- (4) Whether the prospective intervenor will significantly contribute to the full development and equitable resolution of the factual issues.

First, the nature and extent of OCC's interest is representing the residential consumers of the Applicants in order to review each request and present the affects of these requests on rates paid by the Companies' residential customers. This interest is different than that of any other party and especially different than that of the utilities whose advocacy includes the financial interest of stockholders.

Second, OCC's advocacy for consumers will include advancing the position that the Companies' requests in this case – specifically recovery for storm damage - should be no more than what is reasonable and lawful under Ohio law, for service that is adequate under Ohio law. OCC's position is therefore directly related to the merits of this case that is pending before the PUCO, the authority with regulatory control of public utilities' rates and service quality in Ohio.

Third, OCC's intervention will not unduly prolong or delay the proceedings. OCC, with its longstanding expertise and experience in PUCO proceedings, will duly allow for the efficient processing of the case with consideration of the public interest.

Fourth, OCC's intervention will significantly contribute to the full development and equitable resolution of the factual issues. OCC will obtain and develop information that the PUCO should consider for equitably and lawfully deciding the case in the public interest.

OCC also satisfies the intervention criteria in the Ohio Administrative Code (which are subordinate to the criteria that OCC satisfies in the Ohio Revised Code). To intervene, a party should have a "real and substantial interest" according to Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-11(A)(2). As the residential utility consumer advocate, OCC has a very real and substantial interest in this case where the rates of residential utility customers could

be affected in the immediate future depending on the deferral and/or recovery requested.

In addition, OCC meets the criteria of Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-11(B)(1)-(4). These criteria mirror the statutory criteria in R.C. 4903.221(B) that OCC already has addressed and that OCC satisfies.

Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-11(B)(5) states that the Commission shall consider the “extent to which the person’s interest is represented by existing parties.” While OCC does not concede the lawfulness of this criterion, OCC satisfies this criterion in that it uniquely has been designated as the state representative of the interests of Ohio’s residential utility consumers. That interest is different from, and not represented by, any other entity in Ohio.

Moreover, the Supreme Court of Ohio confirmed OCC’s right to intervene in PUCO proceedings, in ruling on an appeal in which OCC claimed the PUCO erred by denying its intervention. The Court found that the PUCO abused its discretion in denying OCC’s intervention and that OCC should have been granted intervention.<sup>13</sup>

OCC meets the criteria set forth in R.C. 4903.221, Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-11, and the precedent established by the Supreme Court of Ohio for intervention. On behalf of Ohio residential consumers, the Commission should grant OCC’s Motion to Intervene.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

OCC should be granted intervention in this case. The cost deferral or cost recovery, as requested by the Applicants, has the potential to--or will--adversely affect the residential customers who are asked to pay the costs. The PUCO should not approve

---


<sup>13</sup> See *Ohio Consumers’ Counsel v. Pub. Util. Comm.*, 111 Ohio St.3d 384, 2006-Ohio-5853, ¶¶13-20 (2006).



the Application unless the Companies can meet their burden of proof that the Application is allowed under the terms of the rate plan and the alleged costs are lawful, reasonable and prudently incurred. The process for the Applications should include ample discovery under R.C. 4903.082 with the opportunity for developing a record for the PUCO to consider under R.C. 4903.09. Therefore, the PUCO should grant intervention for OCC, and allow for a transparent and public record to be fully developed regarding the facts and circumstances of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

JANINE L. MIGDEN-OSTRANDER  
CONSUMERS' COUNSEL




Richard C. Reese, Counsel of Record  
Melissa R. Yost  
Gregory J. Poulos  
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

**Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel**  
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485  
Telephone: (614) 466-8574  
Email: [reese@occ.state.oh.us](mailto:reese@occ.state.oh.us)  
[yost@occ.state.oh.us](mailto:yost@occ.state.oh.us)  
[poulos@occ.state.oh.us](mailto:poulos@occ.state.oh.us)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of this *Motion to Intervene* was served on the persons stated below via electronic service and regular U.S. Mail Service, postage prepaid, this 18<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2008.

  
Richard C. Reese  
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

**SERVICE LIST**

Duane Luckey  
Attorney General's Office  
Public Utilities Section  
180 East Broad Street  
Columbus, OH 43215-3793

Samuel C. Randazzo  
Lisa G. McAlister  
Joseph M. Clark  
McNees, Wallace & Nurick LLC  
21 East State St., 17th Fl.  
Columbus, OH 43215

Attorney for Industrial Energy Users-Ohio

Marvin I. Resnik  
Steven T. Nourse  
American Electric Power Service  
Corporation  
1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215