BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of)	
Vectren Energy Delivery of Ohio, Inc. for)	Case No. 18-0762-GA-RDR
Authority to Adjust its Distribution)	
Replacement Rider Charges.)	

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

The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel ("OCC") moves to intervene in this case where Vectren Energy Delivery of Ohio, Inc. ("VEDO") proposes to charge customers through its Distribution Replacement Rider ("DRR") for pipeline replacement costs incurred in 2017. OCC is filing on behalf of the 295,000 residential utility customers of VEDO. 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/ Bryce McKenney_

Bryce McKenney (0088203) Counsel of Record Assistant Consumers' Counsel Amy Botschner-O'Brien Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

65 East State Street, 7th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215-4213 Telephone [McKenney]: (614) 466-9585 Telephone [Botschner O'Brien]: (614) 466-9575 Bryce.mckenney@occ.ohio.gov Amy.botschner.obrien@occ.ohio.gov (will accept service via email)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of)	
Vectren Energy Delivery of Ohio, Inc. for)	Case No. 18-0762-GA-RDR
Authority to Adjust its Distribution)	
Replacement Rider Charges.)	

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

In this case, VEDO proposes to charge its customers through the DRR for pipeline replacement costs incurred in 2017. However, while VEDO proposes to charge its customers for 2017 pipeline replacement costs, VEDO concurrently seeks in Case No. 18-298-GA-AIR to include within its rate base all DRR investments through December 31, 2017.² OCC will advocate in this case to ensure that residential customers are not double-charged through both the DRR and base distribution rates. OCC has authority under law to represent the interests of all the 295,000 residential utility customers of VEDO, 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. The interests of Ohio's residential customers may be "adversely affected" by this case, especially if the customers were unrepresented in a proceeding where the PUCO will determine if VEDO can charge customers through the DRR for pipeline replacement costs incurred in 2017. 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:

_

² See Application at 5.

- (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;
- Whether the intervention by the prospective intervenor will unduly prolong or delay the proceedings;
- (4) Whether the prospective intervenor will significantly contribute to full development and equitable resolution of the factual issues.

First, the nature and extent of OCC's interest is representing the residential customers of VEDO in this case involving charging customers for pipeline replacement costs incurred in 2017. This interest is different from any other party and especially different from the utility whose advocacy includes the financial interest of stockholders.

Second, OCC's advocacy for residential customers will include advancing the position that rates should be no more than what is reasonable and lawful under Ohio law and ensuring that customers are not double-charged through both the DRR and base distribution rates. 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 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 VEDO seeks to charge customers for pipeline replacement.

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.³

3

³ See Ohio Consumers' Counsel v. Pub. Util. Comm., 111 Ohio St.3d 384, 2006-Ohio-5853, ¶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/ Bryce McKenney
Bryce McKenney (0088203)
Counsel of Record
Assistant Consumers' Counsel
Amy Botschner-O'Brien
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

65 East State Street, 7th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215-4213 Telephone [McKenney]: (614) 466-9585 Telephone [Botschner O'Brien]: (614) 466-9575 Bryce.mckenney@occ.ohio.gov Amy.botschner.obrien@occ.ohio.gov (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 31st day of May 2018.

/s/ Bryce McKenney
Bryce McKenney
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

SERVICE LIST

william.wright@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

Attorney Examiner:

Kerry.sheets@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

5/31/2018 5:22:42 PM

in

Case No(s). 18-0762-GA-RDR

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