

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC. FOR TARIFF
APPROVAL REGARDING CUSTOMER
ENERGY USAGE DATA.

CASE NO. 14-2209-EL-ATA

ENTRY

Entered in the Journal on November 1, 2019

{¶ 1} Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. (Duke or the Company) is a public utility as defined in R.C. 4905.02, and, as such, is subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission.

{¶ 2} On December 16, 2014, Duke filed an application requesting approval of tariff language regarding customer energy usage data (CEUD). Duke explains this application is being filed pursuant to Commission orders from Case No. 12-3151-EL-COI, which required Duke to submit an amended tariff specifying the terms, conditions, and charges associated with providing interval CEUD. In this application, Duke proposes to amend its tariff to provide details related to exactly what certified retail electric service (CRES) providers may request, how such data will be provided, and at what cost.

{¶ 3} By Entry on December 16, 2015, the Commission granted the motions to intervene by IGS Energy, the Ohio Consumers' Counsel (OCC), Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy (OPAE), Retail Energy Supply Association, Direct Energy Business, LLC and Direct Energy Services, LLC, the Environmental Defense Fund, and Ohio Environmental Council.

{¶ 4} Also on December 16, 2015, the Commission issued a procedural schedule. The schedule required Duke to file testimony by January 22, 2016, intervenors to file testimony by February 5, 2016, and a hearing to begin February 17, 2016. Since that time, the attorney examiner granted several requests to continue the procedural schedule.

{¶ 5} On May 4, 2017, OCC and OPAE filed a joint motion to suspend the procedural schedule. OCC and OPAE contend that many of the issues being discussed in

this case overlap with issues in Duke's distribution rate case, Case No. 17-32-EL-AIR, et al (*Duke Rate Case*). According to OCC and OPAE, the rate case is a better forum to resolve many of the issues and it would be unnecessarily duplicative to deal with the issues in this case at this time. Thus, OCC and OPAE requested the case be held in abeyance until the rate case is resolved. The attorney examiner granted the motion on May 5, 2017, and, accordingly, the procedural schedule was suspended.

{¶ 6} Subsequently, on December 19, 2018, the Commission issued an Opinion and Order in the *Duke Rate Case*, approving a stipulation between Duke and other parties. The order was affirmed in a Second Entry on Rehearing issued July 17, 2019.

{¶ 7} At this time, the attorney examiner seeks comments as to whether the issues in this proceeding are now moot, as they are addressed in the *Duke Rate Case* or another forum, or if this matter should be set for hearing. Comments should be filed by December 6, 2019.

{¶ 8} It is, therefore,

{¶ 9} ORDERED, That interested parties file comments by December 6, 2019, in accordance with Paragraph 7. It is, further,

{¶ 10} ORDERED, That a copy of this Entry be served upon all parties of record.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

/s/Nicholas J. Walstra

By: Nicholas J. Walstra
Attorney Examiner

JRJ/hac

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

11/1/2019 10:39:11 AM

in

Case No(s). 14-2209-EL-ATA

Summary: Attorney Examiner Entry ordering interested parties to file comments by December 6, 2019 electronically filed by Heather A Chilcote on behalf of Nicholas Walstra, Attorney Examiner, Public Utilities Commission