

In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for Approval to Establish an Infrastructure Development Rider.)	Case No. 17-1197-GA-ATA
)	
In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for Approval to Establish an Infrastructure Development Rider.)	Case No. 17-1198-GA-IDR
)	

The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel ("OCC") moves to intervene in this case to make recommendations on behalf of residential customers regarding the process by which the proposed economic development projects are considered.¹ OCC is filing on behalf of all the 400,000 residential utility customers of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. ("Duke or Utility"). The reasons the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("PUCO") should grant OCC's Motion are further set forth in the attached Memorandum in Support.

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

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE WESTON (0016973)
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Jodi Bair

Jodi Bair (0062921) Counsel of Record
Ajay Kumar (0092208)
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485
Telephone [Bair] (614) 466-9559
Telephone [Kumar]: (614) 466-1292
Jodi.bair@occ.ohio.gov
Ajay.kumar@occ.ohio.gov
(will accept service via email)

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	
Energy Ohio, Inc., for Approval to Establish)	Case No. 17-1197-GA-ATA
an Infrastructure Development Rider.)	

In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	
Energy Ohio, Inc., for Approval to Establish)	Case No. 17-1198-GA-IDR
an Infrastructure Development Rider.)	

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

On May 5, 2017, Duke filed an application to create a new Infrastructure Development Rider (“IDR”). The IDR will allow Duke to collect certain infrastructure costs for future economic development projects. Duke proposes to establish the IDR with the initial rate set at \$0 per customers. Duke advises that it will file with the PUCO, annually, starting in 2018, to seek approval to adjust the IDR rate.

OCC has authority under law to represent the interests of all the Duke’s residential utility customers of Duke, 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. In this proceeding, the Utility seeks authority to establish a mechanism to charge customers for infrastructure development costs. The interests of Ohio’s residential customers may be “adversely affected” by this case, especially if the customers were unrepresented in a proceeding that establishes the ground rules for future charges to customers.

Thus, this element of the intervention standard in R.C. 4903.221 is satisfied.

R.C. 4903.221(B) requires the PUCO 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 customers of Duke to ensure that the economic development costs are just and reasonable and prudently incurred before being collected from the Utility's customers. 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 any costs charged consumers should be reasonable, prudent, and lawful. 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 economic development costs could be passed on to 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 PUCO 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 deciding two appeals in which OCC claimed the PUCO erred by denying its interventions. The Court found that the PUCO abused its discretion in denying OCC's interventions and that OCC should have been granted intervention in both

proceedings.²

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 customers, the PUCO should grant OCC's Motion to Intervene.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE WESTON (0016973)
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Jodi Bair

Jodi Bair (0062921) Counsel of Record
Ajay Kumar (0092208)
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485
Telephone [Bair] (614) 466-9559
Telephone [Kumar]: (614) 466-1292
Jodi.bair@occ.ohio.gov
Ajay.kumar@occ.ohio.gov
(will accept service via email)

² See *Ohio Consumers' Counsel v. Pub. Util. Comm.*, 111 Ohio St.3d 384, 2006-Ohio-5853, ¶¶13-20.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of this *Motion to Intervene* was served on the persons stated below *via* electronic transmission, this 2nd day of June 2017.

/s/ *Jodi Bair* _____

Jodi Bair

Assistant Consumers' Counsel

SERVICE LIST

William.wright@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

Amy.spiller@duke-energy.com

Jeanne.kingery@duke-energy.com

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

6/2/2017 11:21:02 AM

in

Case No(s). 17-1197-GA-ATA, 17-1198-GA-IDR

Summary: Motion Motion to Intervene by The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel electronically filed by Ms. Jamie Williams on behalf of Bair, Jodi Mrs.