

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC. FOR TARIFF
APPROVAL REGARDING CUSTOMER
ENERGY USAGE DATA.

CASE NO. 14-2209-EL-ATA

ENTRY

Entered in the Journal on May 5, 2017

{¶ 1} Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. (Duke or the Company) is a public utility as defined in R.C. 4905.02, and, as such, is subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission.

{¶ 2} On December 16, 2014, Duke filed an application requesting approval of tariff language regarding customer energy usage data (CEUD). Duke explains this application is being filed pursuant to Commission orders from Case No. 12-3151-EL-COI, which required Duke to submit an amended tariff specifying the terms, conditions, and charges associated with providing interval CEUD. In this application, Duke proposes to amend its tariff to provide details related to exactly what certified retail electric service (CRES) providers may request, how such data will be provided, and at what cost.

{¶ 3} By Entry on December 16, 2015, the Commission granted the motions to intervene by IGS Energy, the Ohio Consumers' Counsel (OCC), Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy (OPAE), Retail Energy Supply Association, Direct Energy Business, LLC and Direct Energy Services, LLC, the Environmental Defense Fund, and Ohio Environmental Council (OEC).

{¶ 4} Also on December 16, 2015, the Commission issued a procedural schedule. The schedule required Duke to file testimony by January 22, 2016, intervenors to file testimony by February 5, 2016, and a hearing to begin February 17, 2016. Since that time, the attorney examiner has granted several requests to continue the procedural schedule. On March 14, 2017, the attorney examiner issued a procedural scheduling an evidentiary hearing for May 24, 2017.

{¶ 5} On May 3, 2017, OCC and OP&E filed a joint motion to extend the procedural schedule and a request for expedited treatment. OCC and OP&E contend that many of the issues being discussed in this case overlap with issues being handled in Duke's distribution rate case, Case No. 17-32-EL-AIR, et al. According to OCC and OP&E, the rate case is a better forum to resolve many of the issues and it would be unnecessarily duplicative to deal with the issues in this case at this time. Thus, OCC and OP&E request the case be held in abeyance until the rate case is resolved. OCC and OP&E assert that Staff and OEC do not oppose the motion.

{¶ 6} Upon review, the attorney examiner finds that the procedural schedule should be suspended. A new procedural schedule will be established in a future entry. As not all parties have had an opportunity to respond to OCC and OP&E's motion, parties seeking to comment may do so.

{¶ 7} It is, therefore,

{¶ 8} ORDERED, That the procedural schedule be suspended. It is, further,

{¶ 9} ORDERED, That a copy of this Entry be served upon all parties of record.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

s/Nicholas Walstra

By: Nicholas J. Walstra
Attorney Examiner

JRJ/sc

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

5/5/2017 3:51:07 PM

in

Case No(s). 14-2209-EL-ATA

Summary: Attorney Examiner Entry suspending procedural schedule. - electronically filed by Sandra Coffey on behalf of Nicholas Walstra, Attorney Examiner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio