

# THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF  
DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC. FOR  
APPROVAL OF AN ADVANCED METER  
OPT-OUT SERVICE TARIFF

CASE No. 14-1160-EL-UNC  
14-1161-EL-AAM

## ENTRY ON REHEARING

Entered in the Journal on June 15, 2016

### I. SUMMARY

{¶ 1} In this Entry on Rehearing, the Commission grants the application for rehearing filed by the Ohio Consumers' Counsel for the limited purpose of further consideration of the matters specified in the application for rehearing.

### II. DISCUSSION

{¶ 2} Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. (Duke) is a public utility as defined in R.C. 4905.02 and an electric utility as defined in R.C. 4928.01(A)(11) and, as such, is subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission.

{¶ 3} On June 27, 2014, Duke filed an application in this case for approval of advanced meter opt-out service tariffs proposed by Duke pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-10-05(J). Duke's proposed advanced meter opt-out service tariffs would provide customers who are scheduled to receive an advanced meter with the option to retain their traditional meter. Additionally, Duke's proposed tariffs would provide customers who currently have an advanced meter with the option to have it replaced with a traditional meter.

{¶ 4} On April 27, 2016, the Commission issued its Opinion and Order in this case finding that Duke's proposed tariffs should be modified and approved. Accordingly, the Commission found that Duke could implement a one-time charge of \$100.00 and a monthly charge of \$30.00 for advanced meter opt-out service, pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-10-05(J).

{¶ 5} R.C. 4903.10 states that any party who has entered an appearance in a Commission proceeding may apply for rehearing with respect to any matters determined in that proceeding, by filing an application within 30 days after the entry of the order upon the journal of the Commission.

{¶ 6} On May 27, 2016, the Ohio Consumers' Counsel (OCC) filed an application for rehearing in this case. Thereafter, on June 6, 2016, Duke filed a memorandum contra the application for rehearing.

{¶ 7} The Commission finds that the application for rehearing filed by OCC should be granted for the limited purpose of further consideration of the matters specified in the application for rehearing. We find that sufficient reason has been set forth by OCC to warrant further consideration of the matters raised in the application for rehearing.

### III. ORDER

{¶ 8} It is, therefore,

{¶ 9} ORDERED, That the applications for rehearing filed by OCC be granted for further consideration of the matters specified in the application for rehearing. It is, further,

{¶ 10} ORDERED, That a copy of this Entry on Rehearing be served upon each party of record.

**Commissioners Voting: Asim Z. Haque, Chairman; M. Beth Trombold;  
Thomas W. Johnson**

BAM/sc