

BEFORE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio)
Power Company to Update Its Enhanced) Case No. 12-3285-EL-RDR
Service Reliability Rider.)

In the Matter of the Commission's Review)
of Ohio Power Company's Revised) Case No. 12-3320-EL-ESS
Vegetation Management Program.)

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio)
Power Company to Update Its Enhanced) Case No. 13-1063-EL-RDR
Service Reliability Rider.)

ENTRY

The attorney examiner finds:

- (1) Ohio Power Company (AEP Ohio or the Company) is a public utility as defined in R.C. 4905.02 and, as such, is subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission.
- (2) In Case No. 08-917-EL-SSO, et al., the Commission modified and approved AEP Ohio's application for an electric security plan (ESP), which included approval of the enhanced service reliability rider (ESRR) through which the Company recovers costs associated with its enhanced vegetation management program. The ESRR is subject to Commission review and reconciliation on an annual basis. *In re Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company*, Case No. 08-917-EL-SSO, et al., Opinion and Order (Mar. 18, 2009) at 34.
- (3) In Case No. 11-346-EL-SSO, et al., the Commission modified and approved a second ESP for AEP Ohio, including the continuance of the ESRR, and directed the Company to file a revised vegetation management program by December 31, 2012. *In re Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company*, Case No. 11-346-EL-SSO, et al., Opinion and Order (Aug. 8, 2012) at 65.
- (4) On December 21, 2012, in Case No. 12-3285-EL-RDR (2011 ESRR Case), AEP Ohio filed an application to reconcile its

ESRR rates for 2011, along with a motion to hold the application in abeyance and consolidate the proceeding with a subsequent proceeding in which the Company planned to file its ESRR update for 2012. In the motion, AEP Ohio states that the Company decided, following consultation with Staff, to file its 2012 ESRR update in April 2013, in order to better coordinate workloads. AEP Ohio asserts that, in light of this filing in April 2013, it would be efficient for the Commission to process the 2011 and 2012 applications on a consolidated basis. No memoranda contra AEP Ohio's motion were filed. The attorney examiner finds that the motion is reasonable and should be granted.

- (5) On December 28, 2012, AEP Ohio filed an amended application in the *2011 ESRR Case*. On that same date, AEP Ohio also filed its revised vegetation management program in Case No. 12-3320-EL-ESS.
- (6) On April 29, 2013, in Case No. 13-1063-EL-RDR (*2012 ESRR Case*), AEP Ohio filed an application to update its ESRR rates for 2012.
- (7) On May 9, 2013, the Ohio Consumers' Counsel (OCC) filed a motion to intervene in the *2012 ESRR Case*. No memoranda contra were filed. The attorney examiner finds that OCC's motion to intervene in the *2012 ESRR Case* is reasonable and should be granted.
- (8) On September 6, 2013, Staff filed comments and recommendations in both the *2011 ESRR Case* and *2012 ESRR Case*. AEP Ohio filed a response to Staff's comments and recommendations in the *2012 ESRR Case* on November 13, 2013.
- (9) In order to assist the Commission in its review of AEP Ohio's applications in the *2011 ESRR Case* and *2012 ESRR Case*, as well as the Company's revised vegetation management program, the attorney examiner finds that the following procedural schedule should be established:
 - (a) December 27, 2013 – Deadline for the filing of motions to intervene in the above-captioned cases.

- (b) January 3, 2014 – Deadline for the filing of initial comments in the above-captioned cases.
- (c) January 17, 2014 – Deadline for the filing of reply comments in the above-captioned cases.

It is, therefore,

ORDERED, That AEP Ohio's motion to consolidate the 2011 *ESRR* Case with the 2012 *ESRR* Case be granted. It is, further,

ORDERED, That OCC's motion to intervene in the 2012 *ESRR* Case be granted. It is, further,

ORDERED, That the procedural schedule set forth in finding (9) be adopted. It is, further,

ORDERED, That a copy of this Entry be served upon all interested persons and parties of record in these proceedings.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

s/Sarah Parrot

By: Sarah J. Parrot
Attorney Examiner

SEF/sc

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

12/4/2013 3:58:06 PM

in

Case No(s). 12-3285-EL-RDR, 12-3320-EL-ESS, 13-1063-EL-RDR

Summary: Attorney Examiner Entry grants AEP Ohio's motion to consolidate the 2011 ESRR Case with the 2012 ESRR Case, grants OCC's motion to intervene in the 2012 ESRR Case, and sets a procedural in accordance with finding (9). - electronically filed by Sandra Coffey on behalf of Sarah Parrot, Attorney Examiner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio