

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

IN THE MATTER OF THE REVIEW OF DUKE
ENERGY OHIO, INC.'S APPLICATION FOR
APPROVAL OF MCMANN BATTERY
STORAGE PROJECT.

CASE NO. 19-2223-EL-UNC

ENTRY

Entered in the Journal on April 7, 2020

{¶ 1} Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. (Duke or the Company) is an electric distribution utility 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} On December 19, 2018, the Commission approved a stipulation and recommendation (Stipulation) filed by Duke and other parties that, among other things, permitted the Company to install one or more battery storage projects for the purpose of deferring circuit investments or addressing distribution reliability issues. *In re Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.*, Case No. 17-32-EL-AIR, et al., Opinion and Order (Dec. 19, 2018). In the Opinion and Order, the Commission approved the concept as a pilot and stated that the initiative is subject to ongoing monitoring. Accordingly, the Commission determined that the project be subject to pre-approval and directed the Company to file its application detailing its proposed battery storage project in a separate proceeding. As a final matter, the Commission authorized cost recovery of the project will be eligible and recoverable through the distribution capital investment rider (Rider DCI). Opinion and Order at ¶ 208.

{¶ 3} On December 20, 2019, Duke filed an application for authority to establish its battery storage pilot project under the terms of the Stipulation. Specifically, Duke proposes to install a lithium ion battery adjacent to the existing McMann substation (McMann) in Union Township, Ohio. Duke represents that the primary purpose of the project will be to reduce the peak load on the circuit in order to defer the need for an additional transformer and other distribution upgrades at the McMann location. Duke clarifies that, if authorized by the Commission, the battery will also participate in the PJM regulation market when it is not otherwise needed to reduce peak load on the circuit. Duke estimates that the total cost

of the project is approximately \$11.7 million and that the project will be in service by September 2021. Additionally, Duke seeks to recover the costs of the project through Rider DCI and requests authority for the battery to participate in the PJM regulation market, with all net revenues therefrom being credited back to customers through Rider DCI.

{¶ 4} Motions to intervene were filed by Interstate Gas Supply, Inc. (IGS), Ohio Energy Group (OEG), and the Ohio Consumers Counsel (OCC), on January 7, 15, and 27, 2020, respectively. No memorandum contra the motions to intervene were filed. The Commission finds that the motions to intervene filed by IGS, OEG, and OCC comply with the requirements set forth in R.C. 4903.221 and Ohio Adm.Code 4901-1-11, and should, therefore, be granted.

{¶ 5} The attorney examiner now finds it appropriate to invite comments regarding Duke's application for authority to establish a battery storage pilot project. The procedural schedule shall be as follows:

- (a) Motions to intervene shall be filed by May 19, 2020;
- (b) Comments shall be filed by May 19, 2020;

{¶ 6} It is, therefore,

{¶ 7} ORDERED, That the procedural schedule set forth in Paragraph 5 be adopted.
It is, further,

{¶ 8} ORDERED, That IGS, OEG, and OCC's motions to intervene be granted. It is, further,

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

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

/s/Lauren L. Augostini

By: Lauren L. Augostini
Attorney Examiner

GAP/hac

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

4/7/2020 3:33:59 PM

in

Case No(s). 19-2223-EL-UNC

Summary: Attorney Examiner Entry setting forth procedural schedule electronically filed by Heather A Chilcote on behalf of Lauren L. Augostini, Attorney Examiner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio