

BEFORE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of       )  
Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc., for       )  
Approval of an Alternative Form of       )  
Regulation.                                )  
Case No. 11-5515-GA-ALT

ENTRY

The attorney examiner finds:

- (1) On December 3, 2008, the Commission approved and adopted a stipulation regarding applications filed by Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc. (Columbia), for approval of an increase in gas distribution rates, an alternative rate plan for its gas distribution service, and an application to modify certain accounting methods, as well as for authority to revise its depreciation accrual rates. *See Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc., Case Nos. 08-72-GA-AIR, et al. (October 24, 2008) (Columbia Rate Case).*
- (2) On December 9, 2011, Columbia filed a notice of intent to file an application for approval of an alternative rate plan pursuant to Rule 4901:1-19-05, Ohio Administrative Code (O.A.C.). According to the filing, Columbia sought authority to implement an alternative rate plan consisting of a five-year extension of the infrastructure replacement program (IRP) portion of its alternative rate plan, which was originally approved pursuant to the stipulation in the *Columbia Rate Case*, as well as a new economic development cost recovery mechanism.
- (3) On March 5, 2012, Columbia filed an amended notice of intent to file an application for approval of an alternative rate plan. In its amended notice, Columbia stated that it intends to file its application pursuant to Section 4929.051(B), Revised Code. Columbia explained that its application will seek authority to continue the IRP portion of its alternative regulation plan for another five-year period and will clarify the scope of its IRP.
- (4) On May 8, 2012, Columbia filed an application, along with supporting exhibits and schedules, pursuant to Sections

4929.051(B) and 4929.11, Revised Code, requesting authority to continue the IRP portion of its alternative regulation plan for another five-year period.

- (5) By entry of May 22, 2012, the attorney examiner established the following procedural schedule:
  - (a) June 1, 2012 – Deadline for the filing of motions to intervene.
  - (b) June 14, 2012 – Deadline for the filing of comments on Columbia's May 8, 2012, application.
  - (c) June 25, 2012 – Deadline for the filing of reply comments.
- (6) On June 8, 2012, Commission Staff (Staff) filed a motion for an extension of time requesting that the due date for the filing of comments by all parties be extended to August 31, 2012. Staff stated that it will require additional time to conduct a thorough investigation and properly evaluate the application and supporting testimony filed by Columbia. On June 11, 2012, Staff filed a letter indicating that it had contacted all of the parties to this case and that all parties have stated that they have no objections to this motion and that they consent to expedited consideration of the motion.
- (7) Upon review, the attorney examiner finds that good cause exists to grant Staff's motion. Accordingly, the deadline for filing comments should be extended from June 14, 2012, to August 31, 2012, and the deadline for filing reply comments should be extended from June 25, 2012, to September 11, 2012.

It is, therefore,

ORDERED, That Staff's motion for an extension of time be granted. It is, further,

ORDERED, That the deadline for filing comments be extended from June 14, 2012, to August 31, 2012, and the deadline for filing reply comments be extended from June 25, 2012, to September 11, 2012. It is, further,

ORDERED, That a copy of this entry be served upon all parties of record.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO



By: Scott Farkas  
Attorney Examiner

JSJ/sc

Entered in the Journal  
JUN 12 2012



Barcy F. McNeal  
Secretary