

In The Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to Amend its Tariffs.) Case No. 17-1234-EL-ATA
)

In this case, the Ohio Power Company (“AEP Ohio” or the “Utility”) submitted an application to provide an optional two-tiered Time-of-Use Rate (“TOU Rate”) for residential customers with Advanced Meter Infrastructure (“AMI”) meters.¹ OCC files this motion on behalf of AEP Ohio’s approximately 1.3 million residential consumers, who would be the intended customers of this rate. The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (“PUCO”) should grant OCC's motion to intervene for the reasons set forth in the attached Memorandum in Support.

(Both will accept service via email)

¹ Application at 10 (April 25, 2017).

- (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 AEP Ohio in this case where AEP Ohio is creating another option for how it charges residential customers for base distribution rates. OCC's 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 how rates are paid for by consumers is important. 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 involving the Utility's base distribution rates, which affect the rates residential customers pay for electric service.

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), which OCC already has addressed and which 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, in deciding two consolidated appeals regarding OCC's right to intervene, the Supreme Court of Ohio has confirmed that "intervention ought to be liberally allowed."³ In those cases, OCC explained in its motion to intervene that the proceeding could negatively impact residential consumers, and OCC established that the interests of consumers would not be represented by existing parties.⁴ Because there was no evidence disputing neither OCC's position, nor any evidence that OCC's intervention would unduly delay the proceedings, the Supreme Court found that the PUCO could not deny OCC the right to intervene.⁵

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

⁴ *Id.* ¶¶ 18-20.

⁵ *Id.* ¶¶ 13-20.

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/ Ajay Kumar

Ajay Kumar (0092208)
Counsel of Record
Christopher Healey (0086027)
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485
Telephone: Kumar (614) 466-1292
Telephone: Healey (614) 466-9571
ajay.kumar@occ.ohio.gov
christopher.healey@occ.ohio.gov
(Both will accept service via email)

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 5th day of June, 2017.

/s/ Ajay Kumar

Ajay Kumar

Assistant Consumers' Counsel

SERVICE LIST

William Wright
Ohio Attorney General's Office
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
30 E. Broad St., 16th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
william.wright@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

Steven T. Nourse
AEP Service Corporation
1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
stnourse@aep.com

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

6/5/2017 3:11:11 PM

in

Case No(s). 17-1234-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 Kumar, Ajay K. Mr.