

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio)	
Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric)	
Illuminating Company and The Toledo)	
Edison Company for Authority to)	Case No. 12-1230-EL-SSO
Establish a Standard Service Offer)	
Pursuant to R.C. § 4928.143 in the Form)	
of an Electric Security Plan.)	

**MOTION TO INTERVENE
BY
THE OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL**

The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel ("OCC"), on behalf of residential utility customers, moves the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("PUCO" or "Commission") to grant the OCC's intervention in this proceeding where there is an application by Ohio Edison Company, the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and the Toledo Edison Company (collectively, "Companies" or "FirstEnergy") for approval of their proposed Electric Security Plan ("ESP"). The ESP could result in rate increases and other changes affecting residential utility customers.¹ The OCC's Motion should be granted because the OCC meets the legal standards for intervention, as further explained in the attached Memorandum in Support.

¹ See R.C. Chapter 4911, R.C. 4903.221 and Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-11.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE J. WESTON

/s/ Larry S. Sauer

Larry S. Sauer, Counsel of Record

Terry L. Etter

Melissa R. Yost

Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800

Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

(614) 466-1312 (Telephone - Sauer)

(614) 466-7964 (Telephone - Etter)

(614) 466-1291 (Telephone - Yost)

sauer@occ.state.oh.us

etter@occ.state.oh.us

yost@occ.state.oh.us

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio)	
Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric)	
Illuminating Company and The Toledo)	
Edison Company for Authority to)	Case No. 12-1230-EL-SSO
Establish a Standard Service Offer)	
Pursuant to R.C. § 4928.143 in the Form)	
of an Electric Security Plan.)	

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

I. INTRODUCTION

On April 13, 2012, the Companies filed their application (“Application”), including an attached Stipulation and Recommendation (“Stipulation”), for the approval of their proposed ESP. The Application proposes a process for procuring standard service offer electric generation service that would begin on June 1, 2013,² and proposes significant other changes in rates that customers would have to pay.

The approval of the Application would permit the Companies to increase rates paid by their approximately 1.9 million residential customers, including increases in distribution rates,³ and would change the conditions under which electric service is provided to customers. The OCC is the state agency that represents Ohio’s residential utility consumers. The Commission should grant the OCC’s Motion to Intervene in this proceeding so that it can fully participate in the proceeding and protect the interests of the Companies’ residential customers.

² Stipulation at 13.

³ Id. at 18-24.

II. INTERVENTION

Pursuant to R.C. Chapter 4911, the OCC moves to intervene under its legislative authority to represent residential utility customers of Ohio. The OCC meets the standards for intervention found in Ohio's statutes and the PUCO's rules.

The interests of residential electric customers in areas served by the Companies are "adversely affected" by these cases, pursuant to the intervention standard in R.C. 4903.221. 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 consumers may be "adversely affected" by this proceeding, especially if the customers are unrepresented in a proceeding where the Companies' standard service offer rates, distribution rates, collection of lost revenues and other charges paid by residential customers would increase. Thus, the OCC satisfies the intervention standard in R.C. 4903.221.

The OCC also meets the criteria for intervention in R.C. 4903.221(B), which requires the PUCO, in ruling on motions to intervene, to consider the following:

- (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 the OCC's interest is to represent the Companies' residential customers regarding the rates they pay and the terms for obtaining service,

both of which are likely to be important topics in the above-captioned case. 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, the OCC's legal positions include, without limitation, that the rates paid by residential customers, and the service provided for those rates, should be reasonable and lawful. Furthermore, the Commission's processes for hearing its cases should provide opportunities for the participation of interested parties such as the OCC, and for the participation of the public.⁴ These legal positions directly relate to the merits of the case.

Third, the OCC's intervention will not unduly prolong or delay the proceeding, but should provide insights that will expedite the PUCO's effective treatment of the Application. In fact, the converse situation is occurring where FirstEnergy's proposed process and time line for the case are too abbreviated for adequate development of the record by OCC, the state's consumer advocate. The OCC, with its longstanding expertise and experience in PUCO proceedings that include the Companies' last two proceedings to determine standard service offers, will duly allow for the efficient processing of this proceeding with consideration of the public interest.

Fourth, the OCC's intervention will significantly contribute to the full development and equitable resolution of the factual issues. This case significantly relates to the enactment of Sub. S.B. 221 and the subsequent standard service offer proceedings

⁴ Application at 3 (Companies stated: "Time is of the essence; the Commission must act quickly on this Application by May 2, 2012 * * *.")

under the legislation, of which the OCC has extensive knowledge.⁵ The OCC will obtain and develop information that the PUCO should consider for equitably and lawfully deciding the cases in the public interest.

The OCC also satisfies the intervention criteria in the Ohio Administrative Code (which are subordinate to the criteria that the 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 residential utility consumer advocate for the State of Ohio, the OCC has a real and substantial interest in this proceeding where the outcome will have an effect on the service rates paid by residential consumers.

In addition, the 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) that the OCC already has addressed and that the OCC satisfies.

Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-11(B)(5) states that the Commission shall consider the “extent to which the person’s interest is represented by existing parties.” While the OCC does not concede the lawfulness of this criterion, the OCC satisfies this criterion in that it uniquely has been 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, the Supreme Court of Ohio confirmed the OCC’s right to intervene in PUCO proceedings, in deciding two appeals in which the OCC claimed the PUCO erred by denying its interventions. The Court found that the PUCO abused its discretion in

⁵ *In re Initial SSO Cases After S.B. 221*, Case Nos. 08-935-EL-SSO, et al., Application (July 31, 2008); also *In re FirstEnergy 2009 MRO Proceeding*, Case No. 09-906-EL-SSO, Application (October 20, 2009); also *First Energy ESP II Case*, Case No. 10-388-EL-SSO, Application (March 23, 2010).

denying the OCC's interventions and that the OCC should have been granted intervention in both proceedings.⁶

III. CONCLUSION

The 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's residential consumers, the Commission should grant the OCC's Motion to Intervene.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE J. WESTON

/s/ Larry S. Sauer

Larry S. Sauer, Counsel of Record

Terry L. Etter

Melissa R. Yost

Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800

Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

(614) 466-1312 (Telephone - Sauer)

(614) 466-7964 (Telephone - Etter)

(614) 466-1291 (Telephone - Yost)

sauer@occ.state.oh.us

etter@occ.state.oh.us

yost@occ.state.oh.us

⁶ See *Ohio Consumers' Counsel v. Pub. Util. Comm.*, 111 Ohio St.3d 384, 2006-Ohio-5853, ¶¶13-20 (2006).

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of this Motion to Intervene was served on the persons stated below, via First Class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, this 16th day of April 2012.

/s/ Larry S. Sauer

Larry S. Sauer
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

SERVICE LIST

James W. Burk
Arthur E. Korkosz
Mark A. Hayden
Ebony L. Miller
FirstEnergy Service Company
76 South Main Street
Akron, OH 44308
burkj@firstenergycorp.com
haydenm@firstenergycorp.com
korkosza@firstenergycorp.com
elmiller@firstenergycorp.com

William Wright
Attorney General's Office
Public Utilities Section
180 East Broad Street, 6th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
William.wright@puc.state.oh.us

Colleen L. Mooney
Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy
231 West Lima Street
Findlay, OH 45839-1793
cmooney2@columbus.rr.com

Attorney for Ohio partners for Affordable
Energy

Joseph M. Clark
6641 North High St., Suite 200
Worthington, OH 43085
jmclark@vectren.com

Attorney for Direct Energy Services, LLC
and Direct Energy Business LLC

Asim Z Haque
Christopher L. Miller
Gregory H. Dunn
Alan G. Starkoff
Ice Miller LLP
250 West Street
Columbus, OH 43215
Asim.haque@icemiller.com

Attorneys for Direct Energy Services, LLC
and Direct Energy Business LLC

David A. Kutik
Jones Day
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114

Attorney For Applicants, Ohio
Edison Company, The Cleveland
Electric Illuminating Company, And
The Toledo Edison Company

James F. Lang
Laura C. McBride
Calfee, Halter & Griswold LLP
1405 East Sixth Street
Cleveland, OH 44114
jlang@calfee.com
lmcbride@calfee.com

Attorneys For Applicants, Ohio
Edison Company, The Cleveland
Electric Illuminating Company, And
The Toledo Edison Company

Vincent Parisi
Matthew White
Interstate Gas Supply, Inc.
6100 Emerald Parkway
Dublin, OH 43016
vparisi@igsenergy.com
mwhite@igsenergy.com

Attorneys for
Interstate Gas Supply, Inc.

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

4/16/2012 4:42:45 PM

in

Case No(s). 12-1230-EL-SSO

Summary: Motion Motion to Intervene by the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel electronically filed by Ms. Deb J. Bingham on behalf of Sauer, Larry S.