#### BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Annual Energy Efficiency Portfolio Status Report of Duke ) Case No. 14-456-EL-EEC Energy Ohio, Inc.

## **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 status of the energy efficiency and peak demand reduction programs of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. ("Duke"), including programs that rely on residential customer participation, is reported for evaluation and comment. Program status reports are important indicators of a utility's efforts to achieve compliance with benchmarks in Ohio law for energy efficiency and peak demand reduction.<sup>1</sup>

OCC is filing on behalf of all of Duke's 660,000 residential utility customers. The reasons the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("PUCO") should grant OCC's Motion are further set forth in the attached Memorandum in Support.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See R.C. Chapter 4911, R.C. 4903.221 and Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-11.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE J. WESTON OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

<u>/s/ Terry L. Etter</u> Terry L. Etter, Counsel of Record Michael J. Schuler Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel 10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800 Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485 Telephone: (614) 466-7964 (Etter direct) Telephone: (614) 466-9547 (Schuler direct) terry.etter@occ.ohio.gov michael.schuler@occ.ohio.gov

#### BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Annual Energy)Efficiency Portfolio Status Report of Duke)Energy Ohio, Inc.)

Case No. 14-456-EL-EEC

## **MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT**

This case involves the review of the reasonableness and lawfulness of Duke's energy efficiency and peak demand reduction program portfolio plans. OCC has authority under law to represent the interests of all of Duke's 660,000 residential utility customers, 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 the energy efficiency programs employed by Duke to meet statutory benchmark requirements are at issue. The energy efficiency programs presented in Duke's status report include programs that involve significant residential customer participation. Thus, this element of the intervention standard in R.C. 4903.221 is satisfied.

R.C. 4903.221(B) requires the PUCO 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 Duke's residential customers in this case where their interest in programs related to controlling customers' energy usage and their costs is at issue. This interest is different from that of any other party and especially different from 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 programs directed at residential customers should be cost-effective and should properly maximize opportunities to achieve significant customer energy savings. 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' energy efficiency and peak demand reduction programs 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

2

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 addressing Duke's residential energy efficiency programs and their effect on customers' ability to control energy costs.

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 PUCO 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.<sup>2</sup>

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 PUCO should grant OCC's Motion to Intervene.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Ohio Consumers' Counsel v. Pub. Util. Comm., 111 Ohio St.3d 384, 2006-Ohio-5853, ¶¶13-20.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE J. WESTON OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

<u>/s/ Terry L. Etter</u> Terry L. Etter, Counsel of Record Michael J. Schuler Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel 10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800 Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485 Telephone: (614) 466-7964 (Etter direct) Telephone: (614) 466-9547 (Schuler direct) terry.etter@occ.ohio.gov michael.schuler@occ.ohio.gov

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of this Motion to Intervene was served on the persons stated below via electronic transmission, this  $2^{nd}$  day of June 2014.

<u>/s/ Terry L. Etter</u>

Terry L. Etter Assistant Consumers' Counsel

# **SERVICE LIST**

William Wright Chief, Public Utilities Section Attorney General's Office 180 East Broad Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215 william.wright@puc.state.oh.us

Amy B. Spiller Elizabeth H. Watts Duke Energy Ohio 139 E. Fourth Street, Suite 1303 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 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

6/2/2014 12:23:18 PM

in

Case No(s). 14-0456-EL-EEC

Summary: Motion Motion to Intervene by the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel electronically filed by Ms. Deb J. Bingham on behalf of Etter, Terry L.