

**BEFORE THE**

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

**THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY**

**CASE NO. 14-831-EL-UNC**

**TESTIMONY OF**  
**DONA R. SEGER-LAWSON**  
**IN SUPPORT OF THE STIPULATION**  
**AND RECOMMENDATION**

- ☐ **MANAGEMENT POLICIES, PRACTICES, AND ORGANIZATION**
- ☐ **OPERATING INCOME**
- ☐ **RATE BASE**
- ☐ **ALLOCATIONS**
- ☐ **RATE OF RETURN**
- ☐ **RATES AND TARIFFS**
- ☒ **OTHER**

**BEFORE THE**  
**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**  
**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF**  
**DONA R. SEGER-LAWSON**  
**ON BEHALF OF**  
**THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>COMMISSION’S CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING STIPULATIONS.....</b>	<b>3</b>

1    **I.    INTRODUCTION**

2    **Q.    Please state your name and business address.**

3    A.    My name is Dona R. Seger-Lawson. My business address is 1065 Woodman Drive,  
4           Dayton, Ohio 45432.

5    **Q.    By whom and in what capacity are you employed?**

6    A.    I am employed by The Dayton Power and Light Company ("DP&L" or "Dayton" or the  
7           "Company") as Director, Regulatory Operations.

8    **Q.    Will you describe briefly your educational and business background?**

9    A.    I received a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration with majors in  
10          Finance and Management from Wright State University in Dayton, Ohio in 1992. I  
11          earned a Masters Degree in Business Administration with a Finance Administration  
12          concentration also from Wright State University in August of 1997. I have been  
13          employed by DP&L in the Regulatory Operations division since 1992.

14   **Q.    How long have you been Director of Regulatory Operations?**

15   A.    I assumed my present position on August 25, 2002. Prior to that time, I held various  
16          positions in the Rates/Pricing Services/Regulatory Operations division, my most recent  
17          prior position being that of Manager, Regulatory Operations, beginning in February 2001.

18   **Q.    What are your responsibilities in your current position?**

19   A.    I have overall responsibility for all base rate development, for both retail and wholesale  
20          electric rates. I am responsible for evaluating regulatory and legislative initiatives, and

commission orders that impact the Company's retail and wholesale rates and overall regulatory operations.

**Q. Have you previously provided testimony before the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("PUCO" or the "Commission")?**

A. Yes. I have sponsored testimony in Case No. 99-220-GA-GCR; Case No. 00-220-GA-GCR; DP&L's Electric Transition Plan Case, No. 99-1687-EL-ETP; DP&L's Extension of the Market Development Period Case, No. 02-2779-EL-ATA; in Opposition to the Complaints in Case Nos. 03-2405-EL-CSS, and 04-85-EL-CSS; in the Company's Rate Stabilization Period Case, No. 05-276-EL-AIR, in the Company's 2008 Electric Security Plan Case, No. 08-1094-EL-SSO, in the Company's 2012 Electric Security Plan Case No. 12-426-EL-SSO, and in the Company's currently pending Storm Cost Recovery Case No. 12-3062-EL-RDR.

**II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY**

**Q. What is the purpose of this testimony?**

A. The purpose of my testimony is to discuss and support the reasonableness of the Stipulation and Recommendation ("Stipulation") entered into by DP&L and the PUCO Staff ("Staff") (collectively the "Signatory Parties"). The Commission should approve the Stipulation filed in this matter on July 22, 2014 and issue its Opinion and Order in accordance with the recommendations made in the Stipulation because the Stipulation is the product of serious negotiations among knowledgeable parties, it benefits customers and the public interest, and it does not violate any important regulatory principle.

**Q. Can you please describe the principle terms of the Stipulation?**

A. Yes. The Stipulation provides that the Company has calculated its earned return on equity for 2013, as adjusted by specific items contemplated by the Commission in Case No. 09-786-EL-UNC, to be 7.8 percent. The Signatory Parties stipulate, agree, and recommend that the Commission find that such returns do not constitute significantly excessive earnings for DP&L with respect to DP&L's ESP in 2013.

**Q. Why should the Commission approve this Stipulation?**

A. As demonstrated below, the Commission should approve the Stipulation because it represents a fair and reasonable resolution to the issues raised in the May 15, 2014 filing concerning DP&L's determination that significantly excessive earnings in 2013 did not occur.

**III. COMMISSION'S CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING STIPULATIONS**

**Q. What criteria does this Commission use to evaluate and approve a Stipulation and Recommendation?**

A. The Commission has applied in the past, and should use in considering this Stipulation, the following three regulatory criteria to evaluate and approve a stipulation: First, is the Stipulation a product of serious bargaining among capable, knowledgeable parties? Second, taken as a package, does the Stipulation benefit ratepayers and the public interest? Third, does the Stipulation violate any important regulatory principle?

**Q. Does this Stipulation meet those criteria used by the Commission to evaluate and approve a Stipulation and Recommendation?**

A. Yes, this Stipulation does meet the criteria applied by the Commission in past proceedings.

**Q. Turning to the first criterion, was the Stipulation the product of serious bargaining among capable, knowledgeable parties?**

A. Yes. No party has moved to intervene in this proceeding. In negotiations leading to the Stipulation, DP&L and Staff were represented by experienced, knowledgeable counsel, who have appeared before the Commission in numerous other proceedings, and are experienced negotiators and are knowledgeable about the subject matter at issue. The Signatory Parties have participated in numerous proceedings before the Commission, are knowledgeable in regulatory matters and represent a broad range of interests. Therefore, the Stipulation represents a product of serious bargaining among capable, knowledgeable parties.

**Q. Turning to the second criterion, does this Stipulation benefit the customers and public interest?**

A. Yes. The Stipulation benefits DP&L customers and the public interest. This Stipulation provides benefits to the public by allowing for a speedy and fair resolution of the case, and avoids an unnecessary hearing when it is undisputed that DP&L's earnings are not excessive.

**Q. With respect to the third criterion, does the Stipulation violate any important regulatory principle?**

A. No. The Stipulation complies with all relevant and important regulatory practices and principles. The Stipulation is consistent with Commission rules and is designed to comply in all material respects with the requirements of Ohio Rev. Code § 4928.143(F). Therefore, the Stipulation does not violate any important regulatory principle.

88    **Q.**     **Does this conclude your testimony?**

89    **A.**     Yes, it does.

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

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**8/29/2014 1:21:55 PM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 14-0831-EL-UNC**

Summary: Testimony of Dona R. Seger-Lawson in Support of the Stipulation and Recommendation electronically filed by Mrs. Claire E Hale on behalf of The Dayton Power & Light Company