

**BEFORE
THE OHIO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	Case No. 17-1263-EL-SSO
Energy Ohio, Inc. for Authority to)	
Establish a Standard Service Offer)	
Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised)	
Code, in the Form of an Electric Security)	Case No. 17-1264-EL-ATA
Plan, Accounting Modifications and)	
Tariffs for Generation Service.)	
)	
In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	Case No. 17-1265-EL-AAM
Energy Ohio, Inc. for Authority to Amend)	
its Certified Supplier Tariff, P.U.C.O. No.)	
20.)	
)	
In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	
Energy Ohio, Inc. for Authority to Defer)	
Vegetation Management Costs.)	
)	

**MOTION TO INTERVENE
OF THE CITY OF CINCINNATI**

Pursuant to Ohio Revised Code § 4903.221 and O.A.C. 4901-1-11, the City of Cincinnati hereby moves to intervene in these proceedings. Cincinnati has a number of real and substantial interests in these proceedings and its interests, which may be prejudiced by the results of these proceedings, are not adequately represented by existing parties. Thus, as set forth more fully in the attached memorandum in support, Cincinnati respectfully requests that the Commission grant this timely request to intervene.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ N. Trevor Alexander

Steven D. Lesser (0020242)

James F. Lang (0059668)

N. Trevor Alexander (0080713)

Mark T. Keaney (0095318)

CALFEE, HALTER & GRISWOLD LLP

41 S. High St.,

1200 Huntington Center

Columbus OH 43215

Telephone: (614) 621-1500

Email: slesser@calfee.com

Email: jlang@calfee.com

Email: talexander@calfee.com

Email: mkeaney@calfee.com

Will accept service via email

ATTORNEYS FOR THE CITY OF
CINCINNATI

**BEFORE THE
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for Authority to Establish a 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.)	Case No. 17-1263-EL-SSO
)	
)	
)	
)	Case No. 17-1264-EL-ATA
)	
)	
In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for Authority to Amend its Certified Supplier Tariff, P.U.C.O. No. 20.)	Case No. 17-1265-EL-AAM
)	
)	
)	
In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for Authority to Defer Vegetation Management Costs.)	

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION TO INTERVENE
OF THE CITY OF CINCINNATI**

I. Introduction

In this proceeding Duke Energy Ohio (“Duke”) seeks to establish a new standard service offer, accounting authority, and approval of revised tariffs (the “Application”). Duke’s Application will significantly impact customers through, among other things, revised rates, new or revised programs, and retail issues. The manner in which this proceeding is resolved could significantly affect both Cincinnati as a purchaser of electricity and Cincinnati residents, including both shopping and non-shopping customers. Cincinnati accordingly has a real and substantial interest in this proceeding, and the Commission’s disposition of this proceeding may impair or impede Cincinnati’s ability to protect that interest. Thus, Cincinnati respectfully requests that the Commission grant its motion to intervene in this proceeding.

II. Legal Standard

R.C. § 4903.221 provides that any “person who may be adversely affected by a public utilities commission proceeding” may intervene in the proceeding. The Commission’s own rules reinforce the right to intervene:

Upon timely motion, any person *shall be* permitted to intervene in a proceeding upon a showing that . . . [t]he person has a real and substantial interest in the proceeding, and the person is so situated that the disposition of the proceeding may, as a practical matter, impair or impede his or her ability to protect that interest, unless the person’s interest is adequately represented by existing parties.

O.A.C. 4901-1-11(A) (emphasis added). “The regulation’s text is very similar to Civ. R. 24 – the rule governing intervention in civil cases in Ohio – which is generally liberally construed in favor of intervention.” *Ohio Consumers’ Counsel v. Pub. Util. Comm.*, 111 Ohio St. 3d 384, 387 (2006) (internal quotations omitted). In considering a motion to intervene, the Commission’s rule directs that the Commission should consider: the nature and extent of the intervenor’s interest; the legal position advanced by the intervenor and its probable relation to the merits of the case; whether intervention will unduly prolong or delay the proceedings; whether the intervenor will significantly contribute to full development and equitable resolution of the factual issues; and the extent to which the intervenor’s interest is represented by existing parties. *See* O.A.C. 4901-1-11(B)(1)-(5); *see also* R.C. § 4903.221(B)(1)-(4). Cincinnati’s motion to intervene satisfies each of these factors.

III. Argument

A. The Nature And Extent Of Cincinnati’s Interest

Cincinnati is directly affected by the Application as a customer in Duke’s service territory. Cincinnati is also impacted by the Application on behalf of its residents, who are all customers in Duke’s service territory and who are accordingly affected by the proposals in the

Application. This indirect impact includes, among other things, the impact of the Application on economic development and low-income customers. The structure and pricing of Duke's Application will directly impact both Cincinnati and its residents. As such, Cincinnati has a substantial interest in the outcome of this proceeding and in ensuring that the rates are established appropriately. That interest cannot be represented by any other party to this proceeding, as no other party to this proceeding represents Cincinnati's interest as a customer and on behalf of its residents.

B. The Legal Position Asserted By Cincinnati

Cincinnati supports Duke's goals of providing safe and reliable service. However, the specific details regarding how the Application is implemented may have a significant impact on Cincinnati and its residents. As such, Cincinnati seeks to intervene to ensure that Duke's Application is implemented in an orderly manner consistent with all relevant legal principles.

C. Cincinnati's Intervention Will Not Unduly Prolong Or Delay The Proceedings.

The Application was filed on June 1, 2017. The Attorney Examiners have established an intervention deadline of September 11, 2017.¹ As a result, Cincinnati's Motion to Intervene is timely and will not prejudice any existing parties or unduly prolong or delay the proceedings.²

D. Cincinnati Will Contribute To The Full Development Of Factual Issues And Cincinnati's Interests Are Not Already Represented By Existing Parties.

Cincinnati is uniquely situated to contribute to the full development of factual issues in this case as one of the largest municipalities in Duke's service territory. Cincinnati has substantial experience in Commission proceedings, which experience may benefit the

¹ Entry dated July 21, 2017, p. 2.

²See O.A.C. 4901:1-11(E) (providing that a motion to intervene "will not be considered timely if it is filed later than five days prior to the scheduled date of hearing or any specific deadline established by order of the commission for purposes of a particular proceeding").

Commission's review of the Application.³ Cincinnati's participation will significantly contribute to the full development and resolution of the issues raised by the Application.

Cincinnati's interests are not already represented by existing parties, as no other party currently involved in this proceeding currently represents Cincinnati's interests as a customer and municipality.

IV. Conclusion

WHEREFORE, Cincinnati respectfully requests that the Commission grant this Motion to Intervene and allow Cincinnati to be made a party of record to this proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ N. Trevor Alexander

Steve Lesser (0020242)

James F. Lang (0059668)

N. Trevor Alexander (0080713)

Mark T. Keaney (0095318)-

CALFEE, HALTER & GRISWOLD LLP

41 S. High St.,

1200 Huntington Center

Columbus OH 43215

Telephone: (614) 621-1500

Email: slesser@calfee.com

Email: jlang@calfee.com

Email: talexander@calfee.com

Email: mkeaney@calfee.com

Will accept service via email

ATTORNEYS FOR THE CITY OF
CINCINNATI

³ See, e.g., Case No. 16-1975-EL-CSS; Case No. 14-0841-EL-SSO.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that the foregoing was filed electronically through the Docketing Information System of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio on this 4th day of August 2017. The PUCO's e-filing system will electronically serve notice of the filing of this document on counsel for all parties.

/s/ N. Trevor Alexander

One of the Attorneys for the City of
Cincinnati

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

8/4/2017 4:54:06 PM

in

Case No(s). 17-1263-EL-SSO, 17-1264-EL-ATA, 17-1265-EL-AAM

Summary: Motion Motion to Intervene of the City of Cincinnati electronically filed by Mr. Trevor Alexander on behalf of City of Cincinnati