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**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 in which residential customers will be affected by the evaluation of the energy efficiency and peak demand reduction ("EE/PDR") programs of the Ohio Edison Company, the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and the Toledo Edison Company (collectively, "FirstEnergy" or the "Utility"). OCC files this motion on behalf of FirstEnergy's 1.9 million residential electricity customers.[[1]](#footnote-1) The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("PUCO") should grant OCC's motion for the reasons set forth in the attached memorandum in support.
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**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT**

This case affects residential consumers because it involves the review of the reasonableness and lawfulness of FirstEnergy's EE/PDR portfolio programs that customers pay for. Ohio law authorizes OCC to represent the interests of all of FirstEnergy's 1.9 million residential electricity customers.[[2]](#footnote-2) R.C. 4903.221 provides that any person "who may be adversely affected" by a PUCO proceeding is entitled to intervene in that proceeding. The interests of Ohio's residential consumers may be adversely affected by this case because customers pay all program costs for FirstEnergy's EE/PDR portfolio programs and because FirstEnergy reports that customers will pay an additional $10 million to FirstEnergy in profits as a result of these programs.[[3]](#footnote-3) 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:

(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 FirstEnergy's residential consumers and ensuring that the rates that they pay are just and reasonable. This interest is different from 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 consumers will include, among other things, advancing the position that FirstEnergy's customers should not pay excessive profit to FirstEnergy's shareholders on top of the costs of EE/PDR programs that customers pay.[[4]](#footnote-4) OCC's position is therefore directly related to the merits of this case, which 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." *See* Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-11(A)(2). As the residential utility consumer advocate, OCC has a real and substantial interest in this case in which the PUCO must address, among other things, whether FirstEnergy should collect $10 million in profits from customers.

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." Although OCC does not concede that the PUCO must consider this factor, OCC satisfies it because OCC has been uniquely designated as the state representative of the interests of Ohio's residential utility consumers. 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."[[5]](#footnote-5) 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.[[6]](#footnote-6) 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.[[7]](#footnote-7)

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 consumers, the PUCO should grant OCC's Motion to Intervene.
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**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of this Motion to Intervene was served on the persons stated below viaelectric transmission this 13th day of June 2016.

*/s/ Christopher Healey*

Christopher Healey
Assistant Consumers' Counsel
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