

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

IN THE MATTER OF THE REVIEW OF DUKE
ENERGY OHIO, INC.'S DISTRIBUTION
CAPITAL INVESTMENT RIDER.

CASE NO. 16-1437-EL-RDR

ENTRY

Entered in the Journal on November 28, 2016

{¶ 1} Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. (Duke) is an electric distribution utility (EDU) as defined by R.C. 4928.01(A)(6) and a public utility as defined in R.C. 4905.02, and, as such, is subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission.

{¶ 2} R.C. 4928.141 provides that an EDU shall provide consumers within its certified territory a standard service offer (SSO) of all competitive retail electric services necessary to maintain essential electric services to customers, including a firm supply of electric generation services. The SSO may be either a market rate offer in accordance with R.C. 4928.142 or an electric security plan (ESP) in accordance with R.C. 4928.143.

{¶ 3} On April 2, 2015, the Commission modified and approved an application for an ESP filed by Duke for the period June 1, 2015, through May 31, 2018. *In re Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.*, Case No. 14-841-EL-SSO, et al., Opinion and Order (April 2, 2015). In the Opinion and Order, the Commission established a distribution capital investment (DCI) rider to allow for the recovery of capital costs for distribution infrastructure investments. The rider is to be reviewed annually for accounting accuracy, prudence, and compliance with the Commission's Order. Further, the Commission found that a compliance audit of the DCI rider is to be completed annually to ensure conformance with the Opinion and Order.

{¶ 4} On July 13, 2016, the Commission issued an Entry directing Staff to issue a request for proposal for the audit services necessary to assist with the review of Duke's DCI rider. On August 17, 2016, the Commission selected Rehmann Consulting to conduct the audit. The resulting audit report was to be completed and filed by November 28, 2016.

{¶ 5} On November 28, 2016, Staff filed a motion for an extension of the deadline to file the audit report. Staff asserts that additional time is necessary to complete the audit. Thus, Staff requests that the deadline be extended to December 9, 2016. According to Staff, Duke does not object to the extension.

{¶ 6} Pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-13, the attorney examiner may grant a request for an extension of time for good cause shown. Accordingly, the attorney examiner finds Staff's motion for an extension should be granted. The audit report should be filed by December 9, 2016.

{¶ 7} It is, therefore,

{¶ 8} ORDERED, That Staff's motion for an extension of time be granted. It is, further,

{¶ 9} ORDERED, That the audit report be filed by December 9, 2016. It is, further,

{¶ 10} ORDERED, That a copy of this Entry be served upon all parties of record.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

/s/ Nicholas Walstra

By: Nicholas Walstra
Attorney Examiner

jrj/vrm

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

11/28/2016 2:10:54 PM

in

Case No(s). 16-1437-EL-RDR

Summary: Attorney Examiner Entry granting Staff's motion for an extension of time;
electronically filed by Vesta R Miller on behalf of Nicholas Walstra, Attorney Examiner, Public
Utilities Commission of Ohio