BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company for Authority to Merge and Related Approvals.)))	Case No. 10-2376-EL-UNC
In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company for Authority to Establish a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to §4928 143, Ohio Rev. Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan))))	Case No. 11-346-EL-SSO Case No. 11-348-EL-SSO
In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company for Approval of Certain Accounting Authority)))	Case No. 11-349-EL-AAM Case No. 11-350-EL-AAM
In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company to Amend its Emergency Curtailment Service Riders)	Case No. 10-343-EL-ATA
In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to Amend its Emergency Curtailment Service Riders)))	Case No. 10-344-EL-ATA
In the Matter of the Commission Review of the Capacity Charges of Ohio Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company)	Case No. 10-2929-EL-UNC
In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company for Approval of a Mechanism to Recover Deferred Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio Revised Code 4928 144)))	Case No. 11-4920-EL-RDR
In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company for Approval of a Mechanism to Recover Deferred Fuel Costs Ordered Under Ohio Revised Code 4928 144))))	Case No. 11-4921-EL-RDR

COLUMBUS SOUTHERN POWER COMPANY'S AND OHIO POWER COMPANY'S MEMORANDUM CONTRA INTERSTATE GAS SUPPLY, INC.'S APPLICATION FOR INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL

Columbus Southern Power Company (CSP) and Ohio Power Company (OPCo) (collectively, the "Companies" or "AEP Ohio") oppose the application of Interstate Gas Supply, Inc. (IGS) for interlocutory appeal of the Attorney Examiner's October 26, 2011 decision to deny IGS intervention in this nearly-final proceeding.

As the Commission is aware, on September 7, 2011, the Companies filed a Stipulation joined by numerous intervenors, the Companies, and Commission Staff, which resolves these varied pending proceedings. A hearing on the Stipulation commenced October 3 and ended on October 27. The Attorney Examiner therefore properly denied IGS's untimely motion to intervene, filed two weeks into the hearing on a Stipulation, which in turn was filed in a case that has been pending for nearly eleven months.

The Attorney Examiner's Ruling is Supported by the Commission's Rules and Should be Affirmed

Pursuant to Rule 4901-1-11(D), Ohio Admin. Code, a motion to intervene "will not be considered timely if it is filed later than five days prior to the scheduled date of hearing or any specific deadline established by order of the commission..." Division (F) of that rule provides that "[a] motion to intervene which is not timely will be granted only under extraordinary circumstances."

IGS's motion to intervene was premised on the fact that because it recently became a certified retail electric supplier, it is now entitled to a seat at the table for purposes of participating in this proceeding and any subsequent meetings of stakeholders.

IGS does not claim that it has any unique concerns, such that its interests are not adequately represented by the numerous CRES providers who did timely intervene. In fact, CRES providers are adequately represented on both sides of the Stipulation, opposing and supporting. CRES providers will likewise be well-represented at the stakeholder processes contemplated by the filed Stipulation.

That IGS failed to realize in a timely fashion that its interests might be affected by AEP Ohio's ESP proceeding – filed in January – is not a reason to reopen the proceeding to intervention after the record has closed, and does not constitute an "extraordinary circumstance" warranting late intervention. IGS states that it should be allowed to intervene because late intervention was permitted for five other parties in this proceeding that filed motions to intervene out-of-time in April and May. But the circumstances must be considered as part of the context and timing of the late request. In this case, IGS' request was not only late (more than five months after the final late intervention request) but was actually made after-the-fact. Specifically, IGS moved to intervene after the record was closed, after the Stipulation was negotiated and filed, and after a full week of hearings. For these reasons, the Attorney Examiner properly denied IGS's motion to intervene out-of-time.

Moreover, to the extent IGS seeks intervention not because of its interests in this proceeding, but in the "stakeholder and collaborative process unveiled in the Stipulation" it would cause chaos and be patently unfair to those parties who participated in good faith to negotiate a comprehensive Stipulation, to suddenly open the door to new parties

IGS's Interlocutory Appeal is Without Merit and Should be Dismissed

In addition to the reasons stated above in support of affirming the Attorney Examiner's ruling, Commission Rule 4901-1-15(E)(2) states that the Commission can dismiss an interlocutory appeal when the issues at stake are moot, and where there is no prejudice demonstrated. The complex issues raised in the Companies' ESP and related filings have been resolved through a comprehensive Stipulation, currently under consideration by the Commission. In the event the Commission accepts the Stipulation, the issues in these proceedings will be resolved and IGS' concerns would be moot. It is not reasonable for IGS to seek intervention in order to participate in subsequent meetings arising out of the Stipulation, when it admittedly had no interest in participating in the underlying negotiation of the Stipulation.

IGS has also failed to demonstrate any prejudice from being denied intervention.

It does not claim to have any unique interests that will not continue to be adequately represented by the numerous existing intervenors that are also CRES providers.

Conclusion

The Commission should dismiss IGS's application for interlocutory appeal because IGS has not established any prejudice as a result of the Attorney Examiner's denial of its motion to intervene. In the alternative, the Commission should affirm the order of the Attorney Examiner, because allowing IGS's motion for leave to intervene out of time, absent extraordinary circumstances or any justification whatsoever would be disruptive and distracting, and would set bad precedent.

Respectfully Submitted,

s/ Steven Nourse

Steven T. Nourse, Counsel of Record Matthew J. Satterwhite Anne M. Vogel

American Electric Power Service Corporation 1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor

Columbus, Ohio 43215 Telephone: (614) 716-1606

Геlephone: (614) 716-1608

Fax: (614) 716-2950

Email: stnourse@aep.com

Daniel R. Conway Porter Wright Morris & Arthur Huntington Center 41 South High Street Columbus, Ohio 42315 Fax: (614) 227-2100

dconway@porterwright.com

Counsel for Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of Columbus Southern Power Company's and Ohio Power Company's Memorandum Contra Interstate Gas Supply, Inc.'s Application for Interlocutory Appeal was served by electronic mail upon the individuals listed below this 2nd day of November, 2011

s/	Steven	Nourse	
S/	Steven	Nourse	

"Bair, Jodi" < Jodi Bair@puc state oh us> "Bentine, John" <jbentine@cwslaw.com> "Fortney, Bob" <Bob.Fortney@puc.state.oh.us> "McCarter, Doris" <Doris McCarter@puc.state.oh.us> "Montgomery, Christopher" <cmontgomery@bricker.com> "O'Donnell, Terrence" <todonnell@bricker.com> "Randazzo, Sam" <sam@mwncmh.com> "Reilly, Stephen" <Stephen Reilly@puc.state.oh.us> "Sineneng, Philip" < Philip Sineneng@thompsonhine.com> "Wright, Bill" < bill wright@puc.state.oh.us> aaragona@eimerstahl.com ahaque@szd.com Amy Spiller@duke-energy.com barthroyer@aol.com callwein@williamsandmoser.com cmiller@szd.com cmooney2@columbus_rr_com cvince@sonnenschein.com cynthia brady@constellation.com dakutik@jonesday.com david fein@constellation.com dbarnowski@sonnenschein.com dboehm@bkllawfirm.com dclark1@aep com dconway@porterwright com dmeyer@kmklaw.com doug bonner@snrdenton.com drinebolt@aol.com dstahl@eimerstahl.com emma hand@snrdenton.com etter@occ.state.oh.us fdarr@mwncmh.com gary a jeffries@dom.com gdunn@szd.com gpoulos@enernoc.com

grady@occ state oh.us gthomas@gtpowergroup.com gwgaber@jonesday.com haydenm@firstenergycorp.com henryeckhart@aol.com holly@raysmithlaw.com jejadwin@aep.com jesse rodriguez@exeloncorp.com jestes@skadden.com ilang@calfee.com jmaskovyak@ohiopovertylaw.org john_jones@puc_state_oh_us joliker@mwncmh.com jroberts@enernoc.com kbowman@mwncmh.com keith nusbaum@snrdenton.com korenergy@insight.rr.com kpkreider@kmklaw.com laurac@chappelleconsulting.net lmcalister@bricker.com lmcbride@calfee.com malina@wexlerwalker.com mhpetricoff@vorys.com mjsatterwhite@aep.com mjsettineri@vorys.com mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com msmalz@ohiopovertylaw.org mwarnock@bricker.com myurick@cwslaw.com ned ford@fuse net nolan@theoec.org paul_wight@skadden.com pfox@hilliardohio.gov rgannon@mwncmh.com ricks@ohanet.org rplawrence@aep.com sandy grace@exeloncorp.com sfisk@nrdc org small@occ.oh us smhoward@vorys.com stephen.chriss@wal-mart.com stnourse@aep.com talexander@calfee com Terrance Mebane @thompsonhine.com> Thomas Lindgren < thomas lindgren@puc state oh us tobrien@Bricker.com

trent@theoec.org tsantarelli@elpc org Werner Margard@puc state oh us will@theoec.org wmassey@cov.com zkravitz@cwslaw.com afreifeld@viridityenergy.com aehaedte@jonesday.com amvogel@aep.com carolyn.flahive@thompsonhine.com bingham@occ.state.oh.us dorothy corbett@duke-energy com jkooper@hess.com BAKahn@vorys.com lkalepsclark@vorys.com kguerry@hess.com msinfelt@akllp.com swolfe@veridityenergy.com ssolberg@eimerstahl com camille@theoec.org Daniel Shields@puc state oh us dsullivan@nrdc.org joseph dominguez@exeloncorp.com Tammy Turkenton@puc state oh us mallarnee@occ state oh us cathy@theoec.org

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

11/2/2011 12:49:50 PM

in

Case No(s). 10-2376-EL-UNC, 11-0346-EL-SSO, 11-0348-EL-SSO, 11-0349-EL-AAM, 11-0350-EL-AAM

Summary: Memorandum Contra Interstate Gas Supply, Inc.'s Application for Interlocutory electronically filed by Anne M Vogel on behalf of American Electric Power Company, Inc.