

**BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of Duke	)	
Energy Ohio for Authority to Establish a	)	Case No. 14-841-EL-SSO
Standard Service Offer Pursuant to	)	
Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the	)	
Form of an Electric Security Plan,	)	
Accounting Modifications and Tariffs for	)	
Generation Service.	)	

In the Matter of the Application of Duke	)	
Energy Ohio for Authority to Amend its	)	Case No. 14-842-EL-ATA
Certified Supplier Tariff, P.U.C.O.	)	
No. 20.	)	

---

**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 Duke Energy Ohio ("Duke") proposes an Electric Security Plan ("ESP") that will affect the rates that Duke's residential customers pay for electric service.<sup>1</sup> OCC is filing on behalf of all the 615,000 residential utility customers of Duke. 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>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

/s/ Maureen R. Grady

Maureen R. Grady, Counsel of Record

Joseph P. Serio

Edmund "Tad" Berger

Assistant Consumers' Counsel

**Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel**

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800

Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

Telephone [Grady Direct] - (614) 466-9567

Telephone [Serio Direct] - (614) 466-9565

Telephone [Berger Direct] - (614) 466-1292

[Maureen.grady@occ.ohio.gov](mailto:Maureen.grady@occ.ohio.gov)

[Joseph.serio@occ.ohio.gov](mailto:Joseph.serio@occ.ohio.gov)

[Edmund.berger@occ.ohio.gov](mailto:Edmund.berger@occ.ohio.gov)

**BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of Duke	)	
Energy Ohio for Authority to Establish a	)	Case No. 14-841-EL-SSO
Standard Service Offer Pursuant to	)	
Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the	)	
Form of an Electric Security Plan,	)	
Accounting Modifications and Tariffs for	)	
Generation Service.	)	

In the Matter of the Application of Duke	)	
Energy Ohio for Authority to Amend its	)	Case No. 14-842-EL-ATA
Certified Supplier Tariff, P.U.C.O.	)	
No. 20.	)	

---

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT**

---

On May 29, 2014, Duke filed its third ESP for charging a standard service offer to Ohio consumers and businesses, under R.C. 4928.143. In its plan Duke seeks among other things, to establish standard service offer and implement a number of riders which will be charged to residential customers for electric service. OCC has authority under law to represent the interests of all the 615,000 residential utility customers of Duke, 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 which sets the rates that they will pay for electric service. 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 the residential customers of Duke in this case involving an ESP that will set rates residential customers pay for electric service. 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 utility rates should be no more than what is just and reasonable, 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 Duke proposes rates to charge residential customers for electric service.

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>

---

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

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.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE J. WESTON  
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Maureen R. Grady  
Maureen R. Grady, Counsel of Record  
Joseph P. Serio  
Edmund "Tad" Berger  
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

**Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel**  
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485  
Telephone [Grady Direct] - (614) 466-9567  
Telephone [Serio Direct] - (614) 466-9565  
Telephone [Berger Direct] - (614) 466-1292  
[Maureen.grady@occ.ohio.gov](mailto:Maureen.grady@occ.ohio.gov)  
[Joseph.serio@occ.ohio.gov](mailto:Joseph.serio@occ.ohio.gov)  
[Edmund.berger@occ.ohio.gov](mailto:Edmund.berger@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 6<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2014.

/s/ Maureen R. Grady

Maureen R. Grady  
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

## **SERVICE LIST**

William Wright  
Attorney General's Office  
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio  
180 E. Broad St., 6<sup>th</sup> Fl.  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
[William.wright@puc.state.oh.us](mailto:William.wright@puc.state.oh.us)

Amy B. Spiller, Counsel of Record  
Elizabeth H. Watts  
Rocco O. D'Ascenzo  
139 E. Fourth Street, 1303-Main  
P.O. Box 961  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45201-0960  
[Amy.Spiller@duke-energy.com](mailto:Amy.Spiller@duke-energy.com)  
[Elizabeth.watts@duke-energy.com](mailto:Elizabeth.watts@duke-energy.com)  
[Rocco.dascenzo@duke-energy.com](mailto:Rocco.dascenzo@duke-energy.com)

Counsel for Duke Energy-Ohio

David F. Boehm  
Michael L. Kurtz  
Jody Kyler Cohn  
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry  
36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
[dboehm@BKLawfirm.com](mailto:dboehm@BKLawfirm.com)  
[mkurtz@BKLawfirm.com](mailto:mkurtz@BKLawfirm.com)  
[jkylercohn@BKLawfirm.com](mailto:jkylercohn@BKLawfirm.com)

Mark A. Hayden  
Jacob McDermott  
Scott J. Casto  
FirstEnergy Service Company  
76 South Main Street  
Akron, Ohio 44308  
[haydenm@firstenergycorp.com](mailto:haydenm@firstenergycorp.com)  
[jmcdermott@firstenergycorp.com](mailto:jmcdermott@firstenergycorp.com)  
[scasto@firstenergycorp.com](mailto:scasto@firstenergycorp.com)

Counsel for the Ohio Energy Group

Counsel for FirstEnergy Solutions Corp.

Kevin R. Schmidt  
88 E. Broad St., Ste. 1770  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
[Schmidt@sppgrp.com](mailto:Schmidt@sppgrp.com)

Counsel for the Energy Professionals of  
Ohio

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities**

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**6/6/2014 3:39:44 PM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 14-0841-EL-SSO, 14-0842-EL-ATA**

Summary: Motion Motion to Intervene by the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel electronically filed by Ms. Deb J. Bingham on behalf of Grady, Maureen R. Ms.