

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	
Energy Ohio, Inc., for Authority to Establish)	
a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to R.C.)	Case No. 14-841-EL-SSO
4928.143 in the Form of an Electric Security)	
Plan, Accounting Modifications, and Tariffs)	
for Generation Service.)	

In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	
Energy Ohio, Inc., for Authority to Amend)	
its Certified Supplier Tariff, P.U.C.O. No.)	Case No. 14-842-EL-ATA
20.)	

**MOTION OF DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC., TO CONTINUE
THE RIDERS INCLUDED IN THE ELECTRIC
SECURITY PLAN APPROVED HEREIN
AND
MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT**

I. Introduction

On April 2, 2015, the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (Commission) issued an Opinion and Order establishing Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.’s (Duke Energy Ohio or Company) third standard service offer (SSO) in the form of an electric security plan (ESP) for the period commencing June 1, 2015, and ending June 1, 2018. In doing so, the Commission, *inter alia*, approved a competitive procurement process for SSO supply and a series of riders as provided for under R.C. 4928.143. Among such riders is Duke Energy Ohio’s Distribution Capital Investment Rider (Rider DCI) that enables “a more proactive maintenance program,” thereby avoiding outcomes that are detrimental to the state’s economy.¹ In approving Rider DCI, the Commission adopted the recommendations of its Staff concerning rider caps and filing

¹ Opinion and Order, at pg. 71.

requirements applicable to the anticipated quarterly rider submissions.² As to the former recommendation and as approved by the Commission, Rider DCI has a cap of \$35 million for 2018.³ The Opinion and Order, however, did not expressly establish a definite termination date for Rider DCI, as had been recommended by Staff and challenged by the Company.

In its Opinion and Order, the Commission also directed Duke Energy Ohio to file its next application for an SSO no later than June 1, 2017, precisely one year prior to the expiration of the Company's third SSO.⁴ The Company adhered to this requirement, initiating its fourth SSO application under Case No. 17-1263-EL-SSO, *et al.* Therein, Duke Energy Ohio proposed a continuation of certain riders approved in the third SSO, including Rider DCI, albeit in a modified form.⁵ Although continued settlement discussions are occurring in respect of this fourth SSO application, it is uncertain whether an order establishing this next SSO will be issued in advance of the termination date of the third SSO, June 1, 2018.

Previously recognizing the potential for such an occurrence and the lead time needed to conduct effective competitive procurement processes, the Commission has already authorized Duke Energy Ohio to conduct auctions for the competitive procurement of supply for the term beginning June 1, 2018.⁶ But the Company also needs to maintain other aspects of its existing, statutorily mandated SSO. Therefore, it now requests a Commission order, pursuant to R.C. 4928.141, to continue the current riders of its ESP, including Rider DCI, until such time as a new SSO can be implemented. Significantly, Duke Energy Ohio is not, at this time, requesting an

² *Id.*, at pg. 72.

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Id.*, at pg. 51.

⁵ *In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for Authority to Establish a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan, Accounting Modifications and Tariffs for Generation Service*, Case No. 17-1263-EL-SSO, *et al.*, Application, at pp. 12-13 (June 1, 2017).

⁶ *In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for Authority to Establish a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan, Accounting Modifications, and Tariffs for Generation Service*, Case No. 17-1263-EL-SSO, Entry (December 6, 2017).

alteration of the current 2018 cap applicable to Rider DCI and instead submits that it is capable of continuing proactive investments under the rider's 2018 cap of \$35 million through at least July 2018.⁷

II. Argument

R.C. 4928.141 requires Duke Energy Ohio to provide a SSO and further directs the Company to establish an SSO under either R.C. 4928.142 or R.C. 4928.143. R.C. 4928.141 further provides that “[o]nly a standard service offer authorized in accordance with section 4928.142 or 4928.143 of the Revised Code shall serve as the utility’s standard service offer for the purposes of compliance with this section; and that standard service offer shall serve as the utility’s default standard service offer for the purpose of R.C. 4928.14 of the Revised Code.”⁸ Consistent therewith, R.C. 4928.143 makes provision for continuing an existing SSO where the utility either withdraws a pending ESP application or the Commission disapproves of such application. R.C. 4928.143 does not, however, address the possibility that a filed application for a subsequent ESP has not been ruled upon by the Commission within the 275-day period established in R.C. 4928.143(C)(1). Consequently, and to avoid a situation in which it is unable to fulfill its statutory obligation to provide an SSO, Duke Energy Ohio respectfully requests a Commission order continuing all riders currently in effect and approved through its existing ESP until such time as the effective date of its next SSO.⁹ Several riders were found by the

⁷ In the absence of an order approving Duke Energy Ohio’s next SSO effective no later than August 1, 2018, Duke Energy Ohio expressly reserves the right to seek an adjustment to the Rider DCI cap for periods commencing August 1.

⁸ R.C. 4928.141.

⁹ These riders are: Rider RC, Rider RE, Rider UE-GEN, Rider NM, Rider DDR, Rider DSR, Rider DCI, Rider DR-ECF, Rider PSR, Rider LFA, Rider BDP, and Rider SCR.

Commission to have no changes since initially approved and should reasonably continue.¹⁰ Rider DR-IM was initially approved in Case No. 08-920-EL-SSO, *et al.*, (ESP I) and continued throughout subsequent ESP cases but was not referenced in those subsequent orders.¹¹

As mentioned above, the Company complied with the Commission's order in Case No. 14-841-EL-SSO, filing its Application in Case No. 17-1263-EL-SSO, on June 1, 2017. On July 21, 2017, the Attorney Examiner established a procedural schedule leading up to a hearing date of November 13, 2017. The Company has been engaged in settlement discussions with Staff and the Intervenors over several months, as evidenced by six unopposed motions, filed by Staff, to extend the procedural schedule.¹² In each of its motions, Staff noted that the parties were continuing settlement discussions and were exploring "whether partial or complete settlement may be reached." The Company, Staff, and Intervenors, are acting in good faith to achieve this outcome and desire to continue pursuing a settlement. However, as evidenced by the numerous extensions of the procedural schedule, the process requires additional time to ensure a fair and reasonable outcome for all stakeholders.

Given the delays in the procedural schedule, it is unlikely that the Company will have an approved fourth SSO by June 1, 2018; therefore, Duke Energy Ohio requests that the

¹⁰ *In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for Authority to Establish a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan, Accounting Modifications and Tariffs for Generation Service*, Case No. 11-3549-EL-SSO, *et al.*, (ESP II) Opinion and Order, at pp. 12-13, pp. 18-20 (November 22, 2011). (Rider UE-GEN, Rider AER-R and Rider BTR were approved in ESP II and found reasonable to be continued in ESP III.)

¹¹ *In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for Authority to Establish a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan, Accounting Modifications and Tariffs for Generation Service*, Case No. 08-920-EL-SSO, *et al.*, Opinion and Order, at pp. 42 (December 17, 2008).

¹² See Entries Granting Staff's Motions for Extensions on November 14, 2017; November 27, 2017; December 18, 2017; January 4, 2018; January 31, 2018; and February 15, 2018.

Commission find that the provisions, terms, and conditions of the current ESP, continue until a subsequent SSO is approved and implemented.¹³

As it relates to the “provisions, terms, and conditions of the current ESP,” the Company is seeking explicit approval to extend Rider DCI, as well. It is undeniable that the Company’s proactive investment in its distribution system advances the state’s economy, facilitates improved service reliability, and further aligns the expectations of Duke Energy Ohio and its customers. Indeed, the Commission has approved, and for many EDUs has reapproved, such rider mechanisms for all of the state’s electric distribution utilities.¹⁴ A temporary suspension of the rider would delay these important objectives and unnecessarily complicate the completion of projects that involve substantial resource coordination. Temporary suspension of Rider DCI also has the potential to undermine the Commission’s worthy goal of promoting “proactive” rather than “reactive” investment in modernization of Duke Energy Ohio’s distribution grid. Such detrimental impacts can be readily avoided by confirmation that Rider DCI shall continue, in its current form and subject to the existing \$35 million cap, until the earlier of August 1, 2018, or the effective date of the Company’s fourth SSO. Notably, no party would be prejudiced by the sought-after confirmation, given that Duke Energy Ohio is not currently seeking relief from the existing cap. And, on the contrary, prejudicial impacts are avoided by allowing the Company to advance the rider’s beneficial outcomes as observed by the Commission.

¹³ See R.C. 4928.143(C)(2)(b).

¹⁴ *In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company for Authority to Establish a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan*, Case No. 10-388-EL-SSO, Opinion and Order, at pp. 11-12, 46 (August 25, 2010); *see also In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company for Authority to Establish a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan*, Case No. 12-1230-EL-SSO, Opinion and Order, at pp. 10-11, 57 (July 18, 2012); *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 Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan*, Case No. 11-346-EL-SSO, *et al.*, Opinion and Order, at pp. 46-47 (August 8, 2012); *In the Matter of the Application of The Dayton Power and Light Company to Establish a Standard Service Offer in the Form of an Electric Security Plan*, Case No. 16-395-EL-SSO, *et al.*, Opinion and Order, at pg. 54 (Oct. 20, 2017).

The Commission has, in at least one prior SSO proceeding, approved an extension of a rider that was to expire. In its December 19, 2012, entry , the Commission granted a request by The Dayton Power & Light Company (DP&L) to extend its SSO, including a rate stabilization charge, beyond its scheduled expiration date.¹⁵ Although the cause for delayed approval of DP&L's SSO was different than the cause for the delay in Duke Energy Ohio's pending SSO proceeding, the rationale and legal basis for granting the extension of the "provisions, terms, and conditions" of the current ESP are no different.

III. Conclusion

For the reasons stated herein, Duke Energy Ohio respectfully requests that the Commission issue an order confirming that riders currently in effect under its existing ESP, including Rider DCI, shall continue during the pendency of the Company's pending SSO application and until the earlier of August 1, 2018, or the effective date of its fourth SSO.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeanne W. Kingery
Rocco O. D'Ascenzo (0077651)
Deputy General Counsel
Jeanne W. Kingery (0012172)
Associate General Counsel
Elizabeth H. Watts (0031092)
Associate General Counsel
DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC.
Room 1303 Main
139 E. Fourth Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
Rocco.d'ascenzo@duke-energy.com
Jeanne.kingery@duke-energy.com
Elizabeth.watts@duke-energy.com

¹⁵ *In the Matter of the Application of The Dayton Power and Light Company for Approval of its Market Rate Offer*, Case No. 12-426-EL-SSO, *et al.*, Entry, at pp. 3-4 (Dec. 19, 2012).

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was served on the following parties via ordinary mail delivery, postage prepaid, and/or electronic mail delivery on this 9th day of March, 2018.

/s/ Jeanne W. Kingery
Jeanne W. Kingery

Steven Beeler
Thomas Lindgren
Assistant Attorneys General
Public Utilities Section
180 East Broad St., 6th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Steven.beeler@ohioattorneygeneral.gov
Thomas.lindgren@ohioattorneygeneral.gov
Counsel for Staff of the Commission

David F. Boehm
Michael L. Kurtz
Jody M. Kyler Cohn
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry
36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
dboehm@BKLawfirm.com
mkurtz@BKLawfirm.com
jkylercohn@BKLawfirm.com

Counsel for the Ohio Energy Group

Kevin R. Schmidt
88 East Broad Street, Suite 1770
Columbus, Ohio 43215
schmidt@sppgrp.com

Mark A. Hayden
Jacob A. McDermott
Scott J. Casto
FirstEnergy Service Company
76 South Main Street
Akron, Ohio 44308
haydenm@firstenergycorp.com
jmcdermott@firstenergycorp.com
scasto@firstenergycorp.com

**Counsel for the Energy Professionals of
Ohio**

**Counsel for FirstEnergy Solutions
Corp.**

Maureen R. Willis
Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel
65 East State Street, 7th floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4203
Maureen.willis@occ.ohio.gov

Counsel for the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

Kimberly W. Bojko
James Perko
Carpenter Lipps & Leland LLP
280 Plaza, Suite 1300
280 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Bojko@carpenterlipps.com
perko@carpenterlipps.com

Counsel for the Ohio Manufacturers' Association

Judi L. Sobecki
The Dayton Power and Light Company
1065 Woodman Drive
Dayton, Ohio 45432
Judi.sobecki@aes.com

Counsel for The Dayton Power and Light Company

Dane Stinson
Bricker & Eckler LLP
100 S. Third Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
dstinson@bricker.com

Counsel for the Ohio Developmental Services Agency

Joseph Olikier
6100 Emerald Parkway
Dublin, Ohio 43016
joliker@igsenergy.com

Counsel for Interstate Gas Supply, Inc.

Mark J. Whitt
Andrew J. Campbell
Rebekah J. Glover
Whitt Sturtevant LLP
88 East Broad Street, Suite 1950
Chicago, Illinois 60601
whitt@whitt-sturtevant.com
campbell@whitt-sturtevant.com
glover@whitt-sturtevant.com

Counsel for Direct Energy Services, LLC and Direct Energy Business, LLC

Samuel C. Randazzo
Frank P. Darr
Matthew R. Pritchard
McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC
21 East State Street, 17th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
sam@mwncmh.com
fdarr@mwncmh.com
mpritchard@mwncmh.com

Counsel for Industrial Energy Users-Ohio

Trent Dougherty
1207 Grandview Avenue, Suite 201
Columbus, Ohio 43212-3449
tdougherty@theOEC.org

Counsel for the Ohio Environmental Council

Andrew J. Sonderman
Margeaux Kimbrough
Kegler Brown Hill & Ritter LPA
Capitol Square, Suite 1800
65 East State Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4294
asonderman@keglerbrown.com
mkimbrough@keglerbrown.com

Counsel for People Working Cooperatively, Inc.

Colleen L. Mooney
Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy
P.O. Box
Columbus, Ohio 43264
cmooney@ohiopartners.org

Counsel for Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy

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

Counsel for Ohio Power Company

Richard Sahli
Richard Sahli Law Office, LLC
981 Pinewood Lane
Columbus, Ohio 43230
rsahli@columbus.rr.com

Counsel for the Sierra Club

Angela Paul Whitfield
Carpenter Lipps & Leland LLP
280 Plaza, Suite 1300
280 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
paul@carpenterlipps.com

Counsel for The Kroger Company

Douglas E. Hart
441 Vine Street
Suite 4192
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
dhart@douglasshart.com

**Counsel for The Greater Cincinnati
Health Council**

Michael J. Settineri
Gretchen L. Petrucci
Vorys, Sater, Seymour, and Pease, LLP
52 East Gay Street
P.O.Box 1008
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008
mjsettineri@vorys.com
glpetrucci@vorys.com

Cynthia Fonner Brady
Exelon Business Services Company
4300 Winfield Road
Warrenville, Illinois 60555
Cynthia.brady@constellation.com

**Counsel for Constellation NewEnergy, Inc.
and Exelon Generation Company,
LLC**

**For Exelon Generation Company,
LLC**

David I. Fein
Vice President, State Government
Affairs - East
Exelon Corporation
10 South Dearborn Street, 47th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60603
David.fein@exeloncorp.com

Lael Campbell
Exelon
101 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 2001
Lael.Campbell@constellation.com

For Exelon Corporation

For Constellation NewEnergy, Inc.

Michael J Settineri
Vorys, Sater, Seymour, and Pease, LLP
52 East Gay Street
P.O. Box 1008
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008

mjsettineri@vorys.com

**Counsel for Miami University and the
University of Cincinnati**

Justin Vickers
Environmental Law & Policy Center
35 East Wacker Drive, Suite 1600
Chicago, Illinois 60601
jvickers@elpc.org

**Counsel for the Environmental Law &
Policy Center**

Samantha Williams
Natural Resources Defense Council
20 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 1600
Chicago, Illinois 60606

swilliams@nrdc.org

**Counsel for the Natural Resources Defense
Council**

Michael J. Settineri
Gretchen L. Petrucci
Vorys, Sater, Seymour, and Pease,
LLP
52 East Gay Street
P.O.Box 1008
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008
mjsettineri@vorys.com
glpetrucci@vorys.com

**Counsel for the Retail Energy
Supply Association**

Joel E. Sechler
Carpenter Lipps & Leland LLP
280 North High Street, Suite 1300
Columbus, Ohio 43215
sechler@carpenterlipps.com

Counsel for EnerNOC, Inc.

Tony Mendoza
Sierra Club
2101 Webster Street, Suite 1300
Oakland, CA 94612

Tony.mendoza@sierraclub.org

Counsel for the Sierra Club

Rick D. Chamberlain
Behrens, Wheeler, & Chamberlain
6 N.E. 63rd Street, Suite 400
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
rchamberlain@okenergyllaw.com

**Counsel for Wal-Mart Stores East, LP and
Sam's East, Inc.**

Donald L. Mason
Michael R. Traven
Roetzel & Andress, LPA
155 E. Broad Street, 12th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
dmason@ralaw.com
mtraven@ralaw.com

**Counsel for Wal-Mart Stores East,
LP and Sam's East, Inc.**

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

3/9/2018 3:38:14 PM

in

Case No(s). 14-0841-EL-SSO, 14-0842-EL-ATA

Summary: Motion of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., to Continue the Riders Included in the Electric Security Plan Approved Herein and Memorandum in Support electronically filed by Ms. Emily Olive on behalf of Duke Energy Ohio and D'Ascenzo, Rocco O. Mr. and Kingery, Jeanne W. Ms.