

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of The East Ohio)
Gas Company d/b/a Dominion Energy Ohio for) Case No. 17-2514-GA-ATA
Authority to Revise its Tariffs.)

In the Matter of the Application of The East Ohio)
Gas Company d/b/a Dominion Energy Ohio for) Case No. 17-2515-GA-IDR
Authority to Establish an Infrastructure)
Development Rider.)

**MOTION TO INTERVENE
BY
THE OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL**

The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel ("OCC") moves to intervene in this case where Dominion Energy Ohio, Inc. ("Dominion" or "Utility") seeks to establish a new Infrastructure Development Rider ("IDR") to charge customers for future economic development projects. OCC is filing on behalf of all the 1.1 million residential utility customers of Dominion.¹ The reasons the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("PUCO") should grant OCC's Motion are further set forth in the attached Memorandum in Support

¹ See R.C. Chapter 4911.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE WESTON (0016973)
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Kevin F. Moore

Kevin F. Moore (0089228)

Counsel of Record

Terry Etter (0067445)

Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

65 East State Street, 7th Floor

Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

Telephone: Moore (614) 387-2965

Telephone: Etter (614) 466-7964

kevin.moore@occ.ohio.gov

Terry.Etter@occ.ohio.gov

(Will accept service via email)

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of The East Ohio)
Gas Company d/b/a Dominion Energy Ohio for) Case No. 17-2514-GA-ATA
Authority to Revise its Tariffs.)

In the Matter of the Application of The East Ohio)
Gas Company d/b/a Dominion Energy Ohio for) Case No. 17-2515-GA-IDR
Authority to Establish an Infrastructure)
Development Rider.)

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

This case seeks to establish a new charge on customers' bills for the collection of costs from customers for Dominion's Infrastructure Development Rider. Through the rider, Dominion will be allowed to charge customers for the costs of future economic development projects that it implements. While Dominion seeks to establish the rider at an initial rate of \$0.00, Dominion could ask for approval in a future proceeding to charge customers up to \$1.50 per month (or \$18 per year) per customer.² OCC has authority under law to represent the interests of all of Dominion's approximately 1.1 million residential natural gas customers, pursuant to 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 establishes a new mechanism for Dominion to charge costs to customers. Thus, this element of the intervention standard in R.C. 4903.221 is satisfied.

² See R.C. 4929.162(A); Application at C1 & C2.

R.C. 4903.221(B) requires the PUCO 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 Dominion's residential customers in this case involving Dominion's application to implement a rider to charge customers for costs it plans to spend under its IDR. OCC's interest is different than that of any other party and especially different than that of Dominion whose advocacy includes the financial interest of stockholders.

Second, OCC's advocacy for residential customers will include advancing the position that the rates that Dominion's customers should pay are reasonable 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 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.

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 in which the PUCO is addressing Dominion's request to implement a rider to collect costs from customers related to Dominion's economic development projects.

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), which OCC already has addressed and which OCC satisfies.

Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-11(B)(5) states that the PUCO 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, in deciding two consolidated appeals regarding OCC's right to intervene, the Supreme Court of Ohio has confirmed that "intervention ought to be liberally allowed."³ In those cases, OCC explained in its motion to intervene that the proceeding could negatively impact residential consumers, and OCC established that the interests of consumers would not be represented by existing parties.⁴ Because there was no evidence disputing OCC's position, nor any evidence that OCC's intervention would unduly delay the proceedings, the Supreme Court found that the PUCO could not deny OCC the right to intervene.⁵

³ See *Ohio Consumers' Counsel v. Pub. Util. Comm.*, 111 Ohio St. 3d 384, 2006-Ohio-5853, ¶ 20 (2006).

⁴ *Id.* ¶¶ 18-20.

⁵ *Id.* ¶¶ 13-20.

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 PUCO should grant OCC's Motion to Intervene.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE WESTON (0016973)
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Kevin F. Moore

Kevin F. Moore (0089228)
Counsel of Record
Terry Etter (0067445)
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

65 East State Street, 7th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485
Telephone: Moore (614) 387-2965
Telephone: Etter (614) 466-7964
kevin.moore@occ.ohio.gov
Terry.Etter@occ.ohio.gov
(Will accept service via 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 4th day of January 2018.

/s/ Kevin F. Moore

Kevin F. Moore

Assistant Consumers' Counsel

SERVICE LIST

William.wright@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

whitt@whitt-sturtevant.com

campbell@whitt-sturtevant.com

glover@whitt-sturtevant.com

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

1/4/2018 4:27:04 PM

in

Case No(s). 17-2514-GA-ATA, 17-2515-GA-IDR

Summary: Motion Motion to Intervene by The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel electronically filed by Ms. Jamie Williams on behalf of Moore, Kevin F. Mr.