BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for Authority to Establish a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan, Accounting Modifications and Tariffs for Generation Service.	:::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::	Case No. 11-3549-EL-SSO				
In the Matter of Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for Authority to Amend its Certified Supplier Tariff, P.U.C.O. No. 20. In the Matter of Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for Authority to Amend its Corporate Separation Plan.	:	Case No. 11-3550-EL-ATA Case No. 11-3551-EL-UNC	PUCO	RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV		
MOTION TO INTERVENE AND REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION TO INTERVENE OUT OF TIME OF DOMINION RETAIL, INC.						

By the above-styled applications, Duke Energy Ohio ("Duke") seeks approval of a standard service offer ("SSO") in the form of an electric security plan, authority to amend its certified supplier tariff, and authority to amend its corporate separation plan. As more fully discussed in the accompanying memorandum, Dominion Retail, Inc. ("Dominion Retail") has a real and substantial interest in this proceeding, and is so situated that the disposition of this proceeding may, as a practical matter, impair or impede its ability to protect that interest. Further, Dominion Retail's interest in this proceeding is not represented by any existing party, and its participation in this proceeding will contribute to a just and expeditious resolution of the

issues involved without unduly delaying the proceeding or unjustly prejudicing any existing party. Accordingly, Dominion Retail hereby moves to intervene in this proceeding pursuant to Section 4903.221, Revised Code, and Rule 4901-1-11, Ohio Administrative Code.

Dominion Retail recognizes that the procedural schedule set forth in the entry issued in this proceeding on June 21, 2011 provided that motions to intervene should be filed by July 6, 2011. Although Dominion Retail has intervened in all prior Duke SSO cases brought before the Commission (including Duke's most recent SSO case, Case No. 10-2586-EL-SSO), undersigned counsel was heretofore unaware of the July 6, 2011 due date for motions to intervene in these dockets. Thus, Dominion Retail respectfully requests that the Commission entertain its motion to intervene, notwithstanding that it is being filed three business days after the specified due date. Granting Dominion Retail leave to file its motion to intervene out of time would be consistent with the Commission's policy of encouraging the broadest possible participation in its proceedings,¹ and would also be consistent with the disposition of similar requests to file motions to intervene out of time in other SSO proceedings.² Further, in view of the procedural posture of the case, ³ no party will be prejudiced by granting Dominion Retail's request. If its motion to intervene is granted, Dominion Retail will, of course, accept the record as it finds it. In addition, Dominion Retail has contacted counsel for the applicant, and has been authorized to represent that Duke has no objection to Dominion Retail's request for leave to file out of time and does not oppose the motion to intervene.

¹ See, e.g., Cleveland Elec. Illum. Co., Case No. 85-675-EL-AIR (Entry dated January 14, 1986, at 2).

² See, e.g., Duke Energy Ohio, Case Nos. 08-920-EL-SSO, et al. (Entry dated September 17, 2008, at 4) and The Dayton Power and Light Company, Case Nos. 08-1094-EL-SSO, et al. (Entry dated February 5, 2009, at 2).

³ Pursuant to the June 21, 2011 procedural entry, the cut-off date for written discovery is September 9, 2011, and the hearing will not commence until September 20, 2011.

WHEREFORE, Dominion Retail respectfully requests that the Commission grant its request for leave to file out of time and grant its motion to intervene.

Respectfully submitted,

Barth E. Royer (Counsel of Record) BELL &, ROYER CO., LPA 33 South Grant Avenue Columbus, Ohio 43215-3927 (614) 228-0704 – Phone (614) 228-0201 – Fax BarthRoyer@aol.com – Email

Gary A. Jeffries Assistant General Counsel Dominion Resources Services, Inc. 501 Martindale Street, Suite 400 Pittsburgh, PA 15212-5817 (412) 237-4729 – Phone (412) 237-4782 – Fax Gary.A.Jeffries@dom.com

Attorneys for Dominion Retail, Inc.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for Authority to Establish a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan, Accounting Modifications and Tariffs for Generation Service.	:	Case No. 11-3549-EL-SSO
In the Matter of Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for Authority to Amend its Certified Supplier Tariff, P.U.C.O. No. 20.	: : :	Case No. 11-3550-EL-ATA
In the Matter of Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for Authority to Amend its Corporate Separation Plan.	•	Case No. 11-3551-EL-UNC

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO INTERVENE OF DOMINION RETAIL, INC.

By the above-styled applications filed herein on June 20, 2011, Duke seeks approval of an ESP-based SSO pursuant to Sections 4928.143, Revised Code, and Chapter 4901:1-35, Ohio Administrative Code ("OAC"), authority to amend its certified supplier tariff, and authority to amend it corporate separation plan. Section 4903.221, Revised Code, provides that any "person who may be adversely affected by a public utilities commission proceeding may intervene in such proceeding." Dominion Retail is a Commission-certified CRES provider authorized to offer competitive retail electric service to customers within Duke's service territory. As such, Dominion Retail must compete against the Duke SSO to attract and retain customers. In addition, Dominion Retail is subject to Duke's certified supplier tariff, and has an obvious interest in any proposal to amend the provisions of this tariff. Thus, there can be no question that Dominion Retail may be adversely affected by this proceeding. Further, not only does Dominion Retail satisfy the underlying statutory test for intervention in Commission proceedings, but it also satisfies the standards governing intervention set forth in the Commission's rules.

Rule 4901-1-11(A), OAC, provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

(A) Upon timely motion, any person shall be permitted to intervene in a proceeding upon a showing that:

(2) The person has a real and substantial interest in the proceeding, and the person is so situated that the disposition of the proceeding may, as a practical matter, impair or impede his ability to protect that interest, unless the person's interest is adequately represented by existing parties.

As a CRES supplier, Dominion Retail plainly has a real and substantial interest in a proceeding in which the Commission is being asked to determine how the price against which it must compete will be established, as well as in the terms and conditions of the Duke certified supplier tariff to which it is subject. As a potential wholesale supplier, Dominion Retail clearly has a real and substantial interest in a proceeding in which the Commission is being asked to determined how the competitive bidding process to secure generation supply for the SSO will be conducted. At this juncture, none of the pending motions to intervene in this proceeding have been granted. Thus, by definition, no existing parties adequately represent Dominion Retail's interest.

Although Dominion Retail does not believe this to be a close question, each of the specific considerations that the Commission may, by rule, take into account in applying the Rule 4901-1-11(A)(2), OAC, standard, also fully support granting Dominion Retail's motion to intervene. Rule 4901-1-11(B), OAC, provides as follows:

In deciding whether to permit intervention under paragraph (A)(2) of this rule, the commission, the legal director, the deputy legal director, or an attorney examiner case shall consider:

(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.

(5) The extent to which the person's interest is represented by existing parties.

First, as previously explained, Dominion Retail's interest in connection with these proposals is obviously direct and substantial. Second, although Dominion Retail must necessarily await further developments before determining the specific positions it will adopt with respect to the issues in these proceedings, Dominion Retail will certainly advocate that any process or supplier tariff amendments adopted as a result of the applications be fair, reasonable, non-discriminatory, and designed to promote competition. Third, although Dominion Retail's motion is filed pursuant to a request for leave to file out of time, only three business have elapsed since the otherwise applicable July 6, 2011 deadline for intervention. In view of the procedural posture of this case and Dominion Retail's representation that it will take the record as it finds it, granting Dominion Retail has been a frequent participant in cases involving the establishment of competitive electric and gas markets in Ohio and the numerous other states in which it does business, and was a party to both Case No. 08-920-EL-SSO in which Duke's current SSO was established, and Case No. 10-2586-EL-SSO, Duke's most recent SSO proceeding. In addition,

Dominion Retail is an intervenor in Case No. 09-1026-EL-ATA, which addresses the provisions of Duke's supplier tariff governing the purchase of accounts receivable of CRES suppliers operating on its system, a matter also at issue here. As a result, Dominion Retail will bring substantial experience to bear on the issues raised in this proceeding. Finally, not only are there no existing parties that represent Dominion Retail's interest, but it would be inconsistent with the Commission's stated policy "to encourage the broadest possible participation in its proceedings" (*see, e.g., Cleveland Elec. Illum. Co.*, Case No. 85-675-EL-AIR, Entry dated January 14, 1986, at 2) to deny Dominion Retail's motion to intervene. Thus, granting Dominion Retail intervenor status is consistent with all the considerations set out in Rule 4901-1-11(B), OAC.

WHEREFORE, Dominion Retail respectfully requests that the Commission grant its motion to intervene.

Respectfully submitted,

Barth E. Royer (Counsel of Record) Bell & Royer Co., LPA 33 South Grant Avenue Columbus, Ohio 43215-3927 (614) 228-0704 – Phone (614) 228-0201 – Fax BarthRoyer@aol.com – Email

Gary A. Jeffries Senior Counsel Dominion Resources Services, Inc. 501 Martindale Street, Suite 400 Pittsburgh, PA 15212-5817 412-237-4729 – Phone 412-237-4782 -- Fax Gary.A.Jeffries@dom.com

Attorneys for Dominion Retail, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing has been served upon the following parties by electronic mail this 11th day of July 2011.

35ER Barth E. Rover

Vince Parisi Matthew White Interstate Gas Supply, Inc. 6100 Emerald Parkway Dublin, Ohio 43016

Trent A. Dougherty Nolan Moser E. Camille Yancey **Ohio Environmental Council** 1207 Grandview Avenue, Suite 201 Columbus, Ohio 43212-3449

Mark A. Hayden FirstEnergy Service Company 76 South Main Street Akron, Ohio 44308

Douglas E. Hart 441 Vine Street, Suite 4192 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

M. Howard Petricoff Michael J. Settineri Stephen M. Howard Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP 52 East Gay Street P. O. Box 1008 Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008

William L. Massey Covington & Burling, LLP 1201 Pennsylvania Ave., NW Washington, DC. 20004

Amy Spiller Rocco D'Ascenzo Elizabeth H. Watts **Duke Energy Ohio** 139 Fourth Street, 1303-Main Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Samuel C. Randazzo Frank Darr Joseph C. Oliker McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC 21 East State Street, 17th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215

David F. Boehm Michael L. Kurtz Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry 36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Colleen L. Mooney Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy 231 West Lima Street Findlay, Ohio 45839-1793

John W. Bentine Chester, Willcox & Saxbe LLP 65 East State Street, Suite 1000 Columbus, Ohio 43215-4213

Mark S. Yurick Zachary D. Kravitz Chester, Willcox & Saxbe LLP 65 East State Street, Suite 1000 Columbus, Ohio 43215-4213

Janine L. Migden-Ostrander Jeffrey L. Small Joseph P. Serio Melissa R. Yost Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel 10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800 Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

Thomas J. O'Brien Bricker & Eckler LLP 100 South Third Street Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291

Lisa McAlister Bricker & Eckler LLP 100 South Third Street Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291

Mary W. Christensen Christensen & Christensen LLP 8760 Orion Place, Suite 300 Columbus OH 43240

Christopher J. Allwein Williams, Allwein and Moser, LLC 1373 Grandview Ave., Suite 212 Columbus, Ohio 43212

Kevin J. Osterkamp Roetzel & Andress, LPA 155 E. Broad Street, 12th Floor Columbus. Ohio 43215

Rick D. Chamberlain Behrens, Wheeler & Chamberlain 6 N.E. 63rd Street, Suite 400 Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Anne M. Vogel American Electric Power Service Corporation 1 Riverside Plaza, 29th' Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215 Matthew J. Satterwhite Erin C. Miller American Electric Power Service Corporation 1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215

Joseph M. Clark Vectren Source 6641 North High Street, Suite 200 Worthington, Ohio 43085

Dane Stinson Bailey Cavalieri LLC 10 West Broad Street, Suite 2100 Columbus, Ohio 43215

Andrew J. Sonderman Margeaux Kimbrough Kegler Brown Hill & Ritter LPA Capitol Square, Suite 1800 65 East State Street Columbus, Ohio 43215

Gregory J. Poulos EnerNOC, Inc. 101 Federal Street, Suite 1100 Boston, MA 02110

Tara C. Santarelli Environmental Law & Policy Center 1207 Grandview Ave., Suite 201 Columbus, Ohio 43212