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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 where Dominion Energy Ohio (“Dominion” or the “Utility”) seeks to charge residential customers more than $50 million per year[[1]](#footnote-2) under its Capital Expenditure Program (“CEP”) Rider[[2]](#footnote-3) for deferred expenses and capital investments outside of a base rate case. OCC is filing on behalf of the 1.1 million residential utility customers of Dominion. The reasons the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (“PUCO”) should grant OCC’s motion are further set forth in the attached memorandum in support.
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## MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

Dominion seeks to charge each of its 1.1 million residential customers $3.89 per month under a Capital Expenditure Program Rider.[[3]](#footnote-4) These charges relate to investments that Dominion made from October 1, 2011 through December 31, 2018 and are in addition to the base rates and other riders that customers currently pay for natural gas utility service from Dominion. Dominion proposes to charge consumers for deferred expenses and recovery of capital investments outside of a base rate proceeding. OCC has authority under law to represent the interests of all the 1.1 million residential utility customers of Dominion, under 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 Utility seeks to charge them more than $50 million over the next year under a rider. 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 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 Dominion involving proposed charges for Dominion’s capital investments. This interest is different than 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 residential customers will include, among other things, advancing the position that rates should be no more than what is reasonable and lawful under Ohio law, for service that is adequate under Ohio law. 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 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 Dominion seeks to charge every residential customer a flat charge of nearly $4 per month under its CEP Rider.

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.” 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 (“Court”) 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.[[4]](#footnote-5)

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.
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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 via electronic transmission, this 8th day of May 2019.

*/s/ Christopher Healey*

Christopher Healey

Assistant Consumers’ Counsel

**SERVICE LIST**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [John.jones@ohioattorneygeneral.gov](mailto:John.jones@ohioattorneygeneral.gov)  Attorney Examiner:  [Anna.sanyal@puco.ohio.gov](mailto:Anna.sanyal@puco.ohio.gov)  [Greta.see@puco.ohio.gov](mailto:Greta.see@puco.ohio.gov) | [whitt@whitt-sturtevant.com](mailto:whitt@whitt-sturtevant.com)  [kennedy@whitt-sturtevant.com](mailto:kennedy@whitt-sturtevant.com)  [glover@whitt-sturtevant.com](mailto:glover@whitt-sturtevant.com)  [andrew.j.campbell@dominionenergy.com](mailto:andrew.j.campbell@dominionenergy.com) |

1. *See* Application, Ex. A at 5 ($3.89 per month charge for residential customers \* 12 months \* 1.1 million residential customers). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. *See* R.C. Chapter 4911, R.C. 4903.221 and Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-11. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Application, Ex. A at 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. *See Ohio Consumers’ Counsel v. Pub. Util. Comm*., 111 Ohio St.3d 384, 2006-Ohio-5853, ¶¶13-20. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)