

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| In the Matter of the Application of |) | |
| Columbus Southern Power Company to |) | Case No. 11-530-EL-ATA |
| Establish New Experimental Critical |) | |
| Peak Pricing Schedule for Residential |) | |
| Customers Participating in the |) | |
| gridSMART sm Program. |) | |

**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 Columbus Southern Power Company ("CSP" or "Company") has proposed to implement experimental peak pricing rates for residential customers participating in CSP's gridSMART program.¹ OCC is filing on behalf of all of CSP's approximately 670,000 residential customers.² 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.

¹ Application (February 2, 2011).

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

Respectfully submitted,

JANINE L. MIGDEN-OSTRANDER
CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Terry L. Etter

Terry L. Etter, Counsel of Record
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800

Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

Telephone: (614) 466-8574

etter@occ.state.oh.us

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

| | | |
|--|---|------------------------|
| In the Matter of the Application of |) | |
| Columbus Southern Power Company to |) | Case No. 11-530-EL-ATA |
| Establish New Experimental Critical Peak |) | |
| Pricing Schedule for Residential |) | |
| Customers Participating in the |) | |
| gridSMART sm Program. |) | |

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

This case involves the review of the reasonableness and lawfulness of CSP's proposals to establish a new experimental critical peak pricing schedule for residential customers participating in the Company's gridSMART program. OCC has authority under law to represent the interests of all of CSP's approximately 670,000 residential customers, 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 customers may be "adversely affected" by this case, especially if the customers were unrepresented in a proceeding where CSP is offering critical peak pricing that could have a significant impact on the adequacy of service provided to customers and the rates charged to them. 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 CSP's residential customers toward ensuring that the critical peak pricing program provides adequate service for the rates charged. This interest is different than that of any other party and especially different than that of the utility whose advocacy includes the financial interest of stockholders.

Second, OCC's advocacy for residential customers will include advancing the position that the CSP's rates should be no more than what is reasonable and lawful under Ohio law and that service provided by the Company should be 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 advocate for residential utility customers, OCC has a very real and substantial interest in this case where the outcome will have an effect on the service quality experienced by CSP’s residential customers and service rates paid by CSP’s residential customers.

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 customers. 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.³

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

JANINE L. MIGDEN-OSTRANDER
CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Terry L. Etter

Terry L. Etter, Counsel of Record
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800

Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

Telephone: (614) 466-8574

etter@occ.state.oh.us

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of this Motion to Intervene was served on the persons listed below via electronic mail, this 16th day of March 2011.

/s/ Terry L. Etter _____
Terry L. Etter
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

SERVICE LIST

William Wright
Assistant Attorney General
Chief, Public Utilities Section
180 East Broad Street, 6th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793
William.wright@puc.state.oh.us

Steven T. Nourse
Matthew J. Satterwhite
American Electric Power Corporation
1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-2373
stnourse@aep.com
mjsatterwhite@aep.com

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

3/16/2011 12:16:29 PM

in

Case No(s). 11-0530-EL-ATA

Summary: Motion Motion to Intervene by the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel electronically filed by Ms. Deb J. Bingham on behalf of Etter, Terry L.