

In the Matter of the Application of)
The Dayton Power and Light Company) Case No. 14-1080-EL-RDR
to Update its Energy Efficiency Rider.)

The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel ("OCC") moves to intervene in this case where residential customers will be affected by the amount that Dayton Power and Light Company ("DP&L" or "the Utility") seeks to charge for energy efficiency and peak demand reduction ("EE/PDR") programs.¹ OCC is filing on behalf of all the 455,000 residential utility customers of DP&L. The reasons the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("PUCO") should grant OCC's Motion are further set forth in the attached Memorandum in Support.

/s/ Michael J. Schuler
Michael J. Schuler
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

¹ See R.C. Chapter 4911, R.C. 4903.221 and Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-11.

In the Matter of the Application of)
The Dayton Power and Light Company) Case No. 14-1080-EL-RDR
to Update its Energy Efficiency Rider.)

- (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 DP&L's residential customers in this case involving charges for EE/PDR program costs, lost distribution revenues, and shared savings. This interest is different than that of any other party and especially different than that of the utility whose advocacy includes the financial interest of stockholders.

Second, OCC's advocacy for residential customers will include advancing the position that rates should be no more than what is reasonable and lawful under Ohio law, for service that is adequate 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 and service quality 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.

Fourth, OCC's intervention will significantly contribute to the full development and equitable resolution of the factual issues. OCC will obtain and develop information that the PUCO should consider for equitably and lawfully deciding the case in 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 where the PUCO will examine how much DP&L's customers should be charged for EE/PDR programs.

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) that OCC already has addressed and that 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, the Supreme Court of Ohio confirmed OCC's right to intervene in PUCO proceedings, in deciding two appeals in which OCC claimed the PUCO erred by denying its interventions. The Court found that the PUCO abused its discretion in denying OCC's interventions and that OCC should have been granted intervention in both proceedings.²

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.

² See *Ohio Consumers' Counsel v. Pub. Util. Comm.*, 111 Ohio St.3d 384, 2006-Ohio-5853, ¶¶13-20.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE J. WESTON
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Michael J. Schuler
Michael J. Schuler
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485
Telephone [Schuler]: (614) 466-9547
Michael.schuler@occ.ohio.gov

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 22nd day of July, 2014.

/s/ Michael J. Schuler
Michael J. Schuler
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

SERVICE LIST

William Wright
Ohio Attorney General's Office
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
180 E. Broad St., 6th Fl.
Columbus, OH 43215
William.wright@puc.state.oh.us

Judi L. Sobecki
The Dayton Power and Light Company
1065 Woodman Dr.
Dayton, OH 45432
Judi.sobecki@aes.com

Attorney Examiners:

Bryce.mckenney@puc.state.oh.us
Gregory.Price@puc.state.oh.us

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

7/22/2014 1:40:47 PM

in

Case No(s). 14-1080-EL-RDR

Summary: Motion Motion to Intervene by the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel electronically filed by Ms. Deb J. Bingham on behalf of Schuler, Michael J.