#### BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

)

)

)

In The Matter of the Demand Side Management Tariff Filing of the East Ohio Gas Co. d/b/a Dominion East Ohio.

Case No. 17-1372-GA-RDR

# MOTION TO INTERVENE BY THE OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

In this case, the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("PUCO") Staff audited the demand side management ("DSM") programs of the East Ohio Gas Company ("Dominion" or the "Utility") for the period October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016.<sup>1</sup> According to the PUCO Staff's filing, Dominion is authorized to charge its customers up to \$4.0 million per year through a DSM rider.<sup>2</sup>

The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel ("OCC") files this motion on behalf of Dominion's 1.1 million residential natural gas customers. The PUCO should grant OCC's motion to intervene for the reasons set forth in the attached memorandum in support.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> PUCO Staff Letter (June 5, 2017), Case No. 17-1372-GA-RDR.

Respectfully submitted,

## BRUCE WESTON (0016973) OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

<u>/s/ Christopher M. Healey</u> Christopher M. Healey (0086027) Counsel of Record

### **Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel** 10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800 Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485 Telephone: 614-466-9571

christopher.healey@occ.ohio.gov (will accept service via email)

#### BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

)

)

)

In The Matter of the Demand Side Management Tariff Filing of the East Ohio Gas Co. d/b/a Dominion East Ohio.

Case No. 17-1372-GA-RDR

#### **MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT**

The PUCO Staff performed an audit of Dominion's DSM programs from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016. In this proceeding, the PUCO Staff filed a letter providing a brief overview of the audit.<sup>3</sup> In its letter, the PUCO Staff made two recommendations. First, it recommended that Dominion's DSM rider be approved as Dominion proposed in a different docket.<sup>4</sup> Second, it recommended that Dominion file an annual application for approval to adjust its DSM rider rather than merely filing an updated tariff each year.<sup>5</sup> Dominion's customers pay \$0.0332 per Mcf for Dominion's DSM programs and up to \$4.0 million per year.

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 regarding the PUCO Staff's audit of expenses that are charged to customers. Thus, this element of the intervention standard in R.C. 4903.221 is satisfied.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> See supra note 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Id.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Id.

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 Dominion in this case where the PUCO Staff audited Dominion's charges to customers for DSM programs. 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 the rates consumers pay for natural gas service (including charges for DSM programs) should be no more than what is reasonable and lawful 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 real and substantial interest in this case involving the Utility's DSM programs, which affect the rates residential customers pay for natural gas 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."<sup>6</sup> In those cases, OCC explained in its motion to intervene that the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> See Ohio Consumers' Counsel v. Pub. Util. Comm., 111 Ohio St. 3d 384, 2006-Ohio-5853, ¶ 20 (2006).

proceeding could negatively impact residential consumers, and OCC established that the interests of consumers would not be represented by existing parties.<sup>7</sup> Because there was no evidence disputing 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.<sup>8</sup>

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

<u>/s/ Christopher M. Healey</u> Christopher M. Healey (0086027) Counsel of Record

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel 10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800 Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485 Telephone: 614-466-9571 christopher.healey@occ.ohio.gov (will accept service via email)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Id. ¶¶ 18-20.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Id. ¶¶ 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 26th day of June 2017.

/s/ Christopher M. Healey Christopher M. Healey Assistant Consumers' Counsel

## SERVICE LIST

William.wright@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

Attorney Examiner: Greta.see@puc.state.oh.us whitt@whitt-sturtevant.com campbell@whitt-sturtevant.com glover@whitt-sturtevant.com This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

6/26/2017 12:04:35 PM

in

Case No(s). 17-1372-GA-RDR

Summary: Motion Motion to Intervene by The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel electronically filed by Ms. Jamie Williams on behalf of Healey, Christopher Mr.