

## THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

IN THE MATTER OF THE REVIEW OF THE  
DISTRIBUTION INVESTMENT RIDER  
CONTAINED IN THE TARIFF OF OHIO  
POWER COMPANY.

CASE NO. 14-255-EL-RDR

IN THE MATTER OF THE 2014 REVIEW OF  
THE DISTRIBUTION INVESTMENT RIDER  
CONTAINED IN THE TARIFF OF OHIO  
POWER COMPANY.

CASE NO. 15-66-EL-RDR

IN THE MATTER OF THE REVIEW OF THE  
DISTRIBUTION INVESTMENT RIDER  
CONTAINED IN THE TARIFF OF OHIO  
POWER COMPANY.

CASE NO. 16-21-EL-RDR

### ENTRY

Entered in the Journal on November 3, 2017

{¶ 1} Ohio Power Company d/b/a AEP Ohio (AEP Ohio or Company) is an electric distribution utility, as defined in 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 electric distribution utility 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} In Case No. 11-346-EL-SSO, et al., the Commission modified and approved, pursuant to R.C. 4928.143, AEP Ohio's application for an ESP, to be effective with the first billing cycle of September 2012 through May 31, 2015. Among other provisions of the ESP, the Commission modified and approved AEP Ohio's proposed distribution investment rider (DIR) to allow for the recovery of capital costs for distribution infrastructure investments in order to facilitate improved service reliability. The

Commission required that the DIR be reviewed annually for accounting accuracy, prudence, and compliance with the DIR plan developed by Staff and AEP Ohio. *In re Columbus Southern Power Co. and Ohio Power Co.*, Case No. 11-346-EL-SSO, et al., Opinion and Order (Aug. 8, 2012) at 42-43, 47, Entry on Rehearing (Jan. 30, 2013).

{¶ 4} In Case No. 13-2385-EL-SSO, et al., the Commission modified and approved an ESP for AEP Ohio, including modification and approval of the Company's request to continue the DIR, for the period of June 1, 2015, through May 31, 2018. *In re Ohio Power Co.*, Case No. 13-2385-EL-SSO, et al., Opinion and Order (Feb. 25, 2015) at 45-47, Second Entry on Rehearing (May 28, 2015) at 23-25, Fourth Entry on Rehearing (Nov. 3, 2016) at 50-51, Seventh Entry on Rehearing (Apr. 5, 2017) at 14.

{¶ 5} On various dates, audit reports were filed in the above-noted cases regarding the annual audit of AEP Ohio's DIR for 2013, 2014, and 2015.

{¶ 6} Pursuant to Entry issued on June 29, 2017, the attorney examiner determined, upon review of the audit reports and the comments and reply comments filed by the parties, that an evidentiary hearing should be held. To facilitate the Commission's efficient review of the issues raised by the parties and in the audit reports, the cases were consolidated and a procedural schedule was established.

{¶ 7} On October 25, 2017, AEP Ohio filed a motion for an extension of the procedural schedule such that the Company's testimony would be due on November 8, 2017, intervenor testimony would be due on November 16, 2017, Staff testimony would be due on November 21, 2017, and the hearing would be continued to commence on November 28, 2017. By Entry dated October 26, 2017, AEP Ohio's motion was granted.

{¶ 8} On November 2, 2017, AEP Ohio, Staff, Ohio Consumers' Counsel, The Kroger Co., and Ohio Manufacturers' Association Energy Group filed a joint motion for a suspension of the procedural schedule and a request for an expedited ruling. In support of the motion, the parties state that the requested suspension will enable them to complete

settlement negotiations, which are expected to resolve the issues in these cases between some or all of the parties. The parties further state that, following suspension of the procedural schedule, they commit to either file a settlement agreement in these dockets or to file a notice indicating that their settlement efforts have otherwise concluded. Noting that AEP Ohio's testimony is currently due on November 8, 2017, the parties request an expedited ruling on the motion pursuant to Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-12(C). The parties represent that no party objects to the issuance of an immediate ruling or to the requested suspension of the procedural schedule.

{¶ 9} The attorney examiner finds that the joint motion for a suspension of the procedural schedule is reasonable and should be granted. However, if the parties have not filed, by December 15, 2017, either a settlement agreement or a notice indicating that their settlement efforts have otherwise concluded in these cases, the parties shall contact the attorney examiner with an update on their progress in reaching a settlement agreement.

{¶ 10} It is, therefore,

{¶ 11} ORDERED, That the joint motion for a suspension of the procedural schedule be granted. It is, further,

{¶ 12} ORDERED, That a copy of this Entry be served upon all parties and other interested persons of record.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

s/Sarah Parrot

---

By: Sarah J. Parrot  
Attorney Examiner

JRJ/sc

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

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**11/3/2017 11:26:34 AM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 14-0255-EL-RDR, 15-0066-EL-RDR, 16-0021-EL-RDR**

Summary: Attorney Examiner Entry granting joint motion for suspension of the procedural schedule. - electronically filed by Sandra Coffey on behalf of Sarah Parrot, Attorney Examiner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio