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# INTRODUCTION

 This case presents a simple question with a clear answer on a review of the record. The principal, and dispositive, issue is whether the Amended Stipulation satisfies the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio’s (Commission’s) three-pronged tests for approving and adopting stipulations. It does and its Staff recommends the Commission adopt and approve it.

# STATEMENT OF THE FACTS AND CASE

 Promoting competition in natural gas sales is the policy of the state of Ohio.[[1]](#footnote-1) Fol­lowing that policy, the Commission has issued orders providing for gradually increasing the competitive environment in natural gas sales in Columbia Gas of Ohio’s (Columbia’s) service territory. In 2009, the Commission approved and adopted a stipulation directing Columbia to hold an auction to secure natural gas through a standard service offer (SSO) structure initially, and, subsequently, through a standard choice offer (SCO) structure. The Commission also approved a Program Outline implementing the SSO structure.[[2]](#footnote-2) In 2011, the Commission approved and adopted a stipulation revising that Program Outline to implement the initial SCO auction, occurring in 2012.[[3]](#footnote-3)

 In the present case, Joint Movants[[4]](#footnote-4) seek to continue that progression of gradually improving the competitive environment for natural gas sales.[[5]](#footnote-5) The Joint Movants ask the Commission to modify its previous orders identified above together with approving and adopting an Amended Stipulation and Recommendation to improve the competitive envi­ronment in natural gas sales in a controlled fashion.[[6]](#footnote-6) The Commission conducted a hear­ing on the motion and Amended Stipulation and Recommendation and it has provided this opportunity for the parties to brief the issues.

# DISCUSSION

## The Amended Stipulation and Recommendation satisfies the Commission’s three-pronged test for evaluating stipula­tions and Staff recommends the Commission approve and adopt it.

 The principal issue in this case is whether the Commission should approve the Amended Stipulation and Recommendation. Many parties, including Staff, have recom­mended the Commission do so in an effort to further Ohio’s policy of promoting compe­tition in natural gas sales. The parties ask the Commission to revise prior orders and adopt a process leading to Columbia’s possible exit from the merchant function.[[7]](#footnote-7) Staff endorses that process and recommends the Commission approve and adopt the Amended Stipulation and Recommendation because of its demonstrated satisfaction of the Com­mission’s three-part test for analyzing stipulations.

 As the Commission is aware, it has long applied a three-part test for analyzing whether to approve a stipulation. The Commission approves and adopts stipulations, such as the present one, if the stipulation:

1. is the result of serious bargaining between capable and knowledgea­ble parties;
2. as a package, benefits customers and the public interest;
3. does not violate any important regulatory principle or practice.

Staff believes the Amended Stipulation and Recommendation, Jt. Ex. 2, meets these cri­teria as many other parties also believe.[[8]](#footnote-8)

The Amended Stipulation and Recommendation results from serious bargaining between capable and knowledgeable parties.[[9]](#footnote-9) A mere perusal of the signatories to the Amended Stipulation and Recommendation establishes the bargaining was among capa­ble and knowledgeable parties. Those parties and/or their counsel are well known to the Commission through many years of case participation, including cases involving Columbia. Many are actively involved in Columbia’s stakeholder group, which regularly meets to discuss issues involving Columbia’s natural gas service. There cannot be any question that the signatories are capable and knowledgeable.

There also cannot be any question that the Amended Stipulation and Recom­mendation resulted from serious bargaining among those parties. The signatories repre­sent diverse and competing interests. They include: the regulated utility (Columbia), the regulator (Staff), gas marketers (OGMG & RESA), and consumers (OCC). They did not agree quickly. The Amended Stipulation and Recommendation evolved from a never-say-die process of negotiation and re-negotiation that sought an as-broad-as-possible sig­natory base. The Amended Stipulation and Recommendation represents changes from an earlier stipulation filed in this case that continued, serious bargaining produced.

The Amended Stipulation and Recommendation, as a package, benefits consumers and the public interest.[[10]](#footnote-10) The Amended Stipulation and Recommendation provides many benefits that include, but are not limited to:

1. advancing Ohio’s energy policy;
2. providing for the extension of the SCO program, while also providing a structure for Columbia to make a controlled and supervised possible two-phase exit from the commodity merchant function.
3. as part of a possible two-phase exit, requiring specified criteria to be met prior to Columbia’s exit for non-residential customers. In addition to meeting specified criteria prior to any possible exit for residential custom­ers, the Amended Stipulation and Recommendation also includes additional due process requirements comprising, among other things, Columbia’s fil­ing an application and including a request to the Commission to hold an evidentiary hearing.
4. Ensuring Columbia customers will not be double-billed for Columbia’s bal­ancing fee;
5. providing for lowering the Choice\SCO Reconciliation Rider (CSRR), which benefits Columbia’s ratepayers financially;
6. providing the public additional opportunities to participate in Commission proceedings, including at least six local public hearings.[[11]](#footnote-11)

Because of these benefits, if no others, the Amended Stipulation and Recommendation benefits consumers and the public interest and it satisfies the second prong of the Com­mission’s three-pronged test.

 Finally, the Amended Stipulation and Recommendation does not violate any important regulatory principle or practice. Staff agrees with many others that it does not.[[12]](#footnote-12)

 The Amended Stipulation and Recommendation satisfies the Commission’s three-pronged test and Staff recommends the Commission approve it.

## Staff supports bifurcation of these proceedings, if the Commis­sion decides to do so.

 During these proceedings some parties moved for bifurcation of the Commission’s consideration of certain issues because of time constraints associated with the SCO auc­tion’s process. That motion was denied.[[13]](#footnote-13) In denying the motion, the Attorney Examiner noted the Commission might consider the bifurcating the issues subsequent to the hear­ing.[[14]](#footnote-14) Staff supports bifurcation if the Commission decides to do so.

# CONCLUSION

 In sum, Staff recommends the Commission approve and adopt the Amended Stipula­tion and Recommendation.
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