

In the Matter of the Distribution )  
Investment Rider Contained in the Tariffs ) Case No. 15-66-EL-RDR  
of Ohio Power Company. )

The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel ("OCC") moves to intervene in this case where the distribution infrastructure investment ("DIR") Rider that customers pay and the benefits that customers are supposed to receive from making those payments to Ohio Power Company ("AEP-Ohio" or "Utility") will be reviewed and audited. OCC is filing on behalf of all the 1.2 million residential utility customers of AEP-Ohio.<sup>1</sup> 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/ Jodi Bair

Jodi Bair, Counsel of Record  
(0062921)

Joseph P. Serio (0036959)  
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

**Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel**

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800

Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

Telephone: Bair Direct – 614-466-9559

Telephone: Serio Direct – 614-466-9565

[Jodi.bair@occ.ohio.gov](mailto:Jodi.bair@occ.ohio.gov)

(will accept service via email)

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

(will accept service vial email)

In the Matter of the Distribution )  
Investment Rider Contained in the Tariffs ) Case No. 15-66-EL-RDR  
of Ohio Power Company. )

This case will include the review and audit of the distribution investment recovery costs that AEP-Ohio charged to customers taking service under the Utility's standard service offer.<sup>2</sup> OCC has authority under law to represent the interests of all the 1.2 million residential utility customers of AEP-Ohio, under 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 that includes review of costs that are collected from residential customers. This is of particular importance in this case where the auditor will be reviewing whether AEP-Ohio’s distribution expenses, collected from customers through the DIR rider, were prudently incurred.<sup>3</sup> Thus, this element of the intervention standard in R.C. 4903.221 is satisfied.

*<sup>2</sup> In the Matter of the Applications of Ohio Power Company for Authority to Establish a Standard Service Offers Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan, Case No. 11-346-EL-SSQ.*

<sup>3</sup> *In the Matter of the Applications of Ohio Power Company for Authority to Establish a Standard Service Offers Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form of an Electric Security Plan*, Case No. 11-346-EL-SSO, Stipulation and Recommendation, pp. 9-10; *See also, In the Matter of the Review of Delivery Capital Recovery Rider Contained in the Tariff of Ohio Power Company*, Entry (Feb. 20, 2013).

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 AEP-Ohio in this case involving a review of the Utility's DIR rider and the benefits customers are expecting to receive as a result of the rider. 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 rates 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 Utility’s DIR rider will be reviewed by an independent auditor.

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.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> 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/ Jodi Bair

Jodi Bair, Counsel of Record  
(0062921)  
Joseph P. Serio (0036959)  
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

**Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel**

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485  
Telephone: Bair Direct – 614-466-9559  
Telephone: Serio Direct – 614-466-9565  
[Jodi.bair@occ.ohio.gov](mailto:Jodi.bair@occ.ohio.gov)  
(will accept service via email)  
[Joseph.serio@occ.ohio.gov](mailto:Joseph.serio@occ.ohio.gov)  
(will accept service vial email)

## **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 21st day of July, 2015.

/s/ Jodi Bair

Jodi Bair

Assistant Consumers' Counsel

## **SERVICE LIST**

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

Steven T. Nourse  
AEP Service Corp.  
1 Riverside Plaza, 29<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
[stnourse@aep.com](mailto:stnourse@aep.com)

Attorney Examiners:

[Sarah.parrot@puc.state.oh.us](mailto:Sarah.parrot@puc.state.oh.us)  
[Greta.see@puc.state.oh.us](mailto:Greta.see@puc.state.oh.us)

Mark S. Yurick  
Devin D. Parram  
Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP  
65 East State Street, Suite 1000  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
[myurick@taftlaw.com](mailto:myurick@taftlaw.com)  
[dparram@taftlaw.com](mailto:dparram@taftlaw.com)

*Attorneys for The Kroger Co.*

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

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**7/21/2015 4:32:20 PM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 15-0066-EL-RDR**

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