

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Annual Application of)
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for an) Case No. 12-3028-GA-RDR
Adjustment to Rider AMRP Rates.)

In the Matter of the Application of Duke) Case No. 12-3029-GA-ATA
Energy Ohio for Tariff Approval.)

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

The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel ("OCC") moves to intervene in this case where the Accelerated Mains Replacement Program ("AMRP") rider rate for the residential customers of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. ("Duke") will be reviewed and established.¹ OCC is filing on behalf of all of Duke's 365,000 residential utility customers. The reasons the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("Commission" or "PUCO") should grant OCC's Motion are further set forth in the attached Memorandum in Support.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE J. WESTON
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Joseph P. Serio

Joseph P. Serio, Counsel of Record
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485
Telephone: Serio (614) 466-9565
serio@occ.state.oh.us

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

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Annual Application of)
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for an) Case No. 12-3028-GA-RDR
Adjustment to Rider AMRP Rates.)

In the Matter of the Application of Duke) Case No. 12-3029-GA-ATA
Energy Ohio for Tariff Approval.)

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

In its Notice of Intent, Duke is asking the PUCO to decrease its residential customer AMRP rider rate from \$5.73 to \$1.08.² This decrease reflects the fact that the investment underlying the prior AMRP charge has been rolled into base rates as part of Duke’s current natural gas base rate case, which would then reset the AMRP charge to \$0.00. In this case Duke is proposing an AMRP charge of \$1.08 for residential customers. OCC has authority under law to represent the interests of all of Duke’s 365,000 residential utility customers of, pursuant to 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 Duke’s AMRP rider rate will be reviewed and established. Thus, this element of the intervention standard in R.C. 4903.221 is satisfied.

² Duke Notice of Intent, at Tab 5, PFN.

R.C. 4903.221(B) requires the Commission 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 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 OCC's interest is representing the residential customers of Duke in this case involving the Company's AMRP rider rate. 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 advancing the position that the residential customer AMRP rider rate 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 that 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 the 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 the AMRP rider rate will be reviewed and established.

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) that OCC already has addressed and that 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 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 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.³

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

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 Commission should grant OCC's Motion to Intervene.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE J. WESTON
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Joseph P. Serio

Joseph P. Serio, Counsel of Record
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800

Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

Telephone: Serio (614) 466-9565

serio@occ.state.oh.us

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of this *Motion to Intervene* was served on the persons stated below *via* electronic mail this 16th day of January 2013.

/s/ Joseph P. Serio _____
Joseph P. Serio
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

SERVICE LIST

William Wright
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
180 E. Broad St., 6th Fl.
Columbus, OH 43215
William.wright@puc.state.oh.us

Amy B. Spiller
Elizabeth H. Watts
139 East Fourth Street, 1303-Main
Cincinnati, OH 45201
Amy.spiller@duke-energy.com
Elizabeth.watts@duke-energy.com

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

1/16/2013 11:15:05 AM

in

Case No(s). 12-3028-GA-RDR, 12-3029-GA-ATA

Summary: Motion Motion to Intervene by the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel electronically filed by Ms. Gina L Brigner on behalf of Serio, Joseph P. Mr.