

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of the Dayton)	
Power and Light Company for an Increase in)	Case No. 15-1830-EL-AIR
Electric Distribution Rates.)	

In the Matter of the Application of the Dayton)	
Power and Light Company for Approval to Change)	Case No. 15-1831-EL-AAM
Accounting Methods.)	

In the Matter of the Application of the Dayton)	Case No. 15-1832-EL-ATA
Power and Light Company for Tariff Approval.)	

**MOTION TO STRIKE OBJECTION TO
THE PUCO STAFF'S REPORT OF INVESTIGATION
BY
THE OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL**

The Dayton Power and Light Company (“DP&L”) filed an objection (Objection 36) to the Staff Report¹ to charge consumers -- for amounts previously unrequested in its Application -- for tree trimming expenses that DP&L did not incur during the test period or after the test period.² Moreover, under Ohio Admin. Code 4901-7, DP&L should not be allowed to present any new evidence on this issue (which we will address in a separate motion for striking testimony of Barry Bentley). To protect consumers from paying unlawful and unreasonable utility charges, the Office of the Ohio Consumers’ Counsel moves to strike Objection 36.³ The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (“PUCO”) should strike this objection.

¹ Report of Investigation of the PUCO Staff (Mar. 12, 2018) (the “Staff Report”).

² The Dayton Power and Light Company’s Objections to the Staff Report at 12 (Apr. 11, 2018) (the “DP&L Objections”).

³ Entry ¶6 (Mar. 14, 2018).

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE WESTON (0016973)
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Christopher Healey
Christopher Healey (0086027)
Counsel of Record
Terry L. Etter (0067445)
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

65 East State Street, 7th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Telephone [Healey]: 614-466-9571
Telephone [Etter]: 614-466-7964
christopher.healey@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 Dayton)	
Power and Light Company for an Increase in)	Case No. 15-1830-EL-AIR
Electric Distribution Rates.)	

In the Matter of the Application of the Dayton)	
Power and Light Company for Approval to Change)	Case No. 15-1831-EL-AAM
Accounting Methods.)	

In the Matter of the Application of the Dayton)	Case No. 15-1832-EL-ATA
Power and Light Company for Tariff Approval.)	

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO STRIKE
OBJECTIONS TO THE PUCO STAFF'S REPORT OF INVESTIGATION
BY
THE OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL**

I. INTRODUCTION

In its Objection 36, DP&L objects to the Staff Report because it “did not address the fact that DP&L’s tree trimming expenses have increased by \$9.6 million since the test period.”⁴ And DP&L relies in its objection on supplemental testimony it filed on the same date.

The PUCO should strike this objection because it lacks the specificity required under Ohio Admin. Code 4901-1-28(B). And the Office of the Ohio Consumers’ Counsel (“OCC”) will soon be filing a motion to strike DP&L’s supplemental testimony, which DP&L relies upon for its objection, because the testimony is not allowed at this late date under Ohio Admin. Code 4901-7, Appendix A (Chapter 2, Section A(6)(c)).

⁴ DP&L Objections at 12.

II. ARGUMENT

The PUCO should strike DP&L's objection 36 because it lacks the specificity required under Ohio Admin. Code 4901-1-28(B). DP&L merely objects that the PUCO Staff did not "address" its new tree trimming expense issue. It is not knowable by the PUCO Staff what result DP&L intends by merely objecting to the failure to "address" an issue.

And the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel ("OCC") will soon be filing a motion to strike DP&L's supplemental testimony (Barry Bentley). DP&L relies upon that testimony for supporting its objection. But the objection should stand alone with specificity. And the testimony is not allowed at this late date under Ohio Admin. Code 4901-7, Appendix A (Chapter 2, Section A(6)(c)). That rule generally limits supplemental testimony to matters "which the applicant could not reasonably expect to be raised in the case." And DP&L does not meet any exceptions in the rule.

III. CONCLUSION

The PUCO should strike DP&L's Objection 36.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE WESTON (0016973)
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Christopher Healey
Christopher Healey (0086027)
Counsel of Record
Terry L. Etter (0067445)
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel
65 East State Street, 7th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Telephone [Healey]: 614-466-9571
Telephone [Etter]: 614-466-7964
christopher.healey@occ.ohio.gov
terry.etter@occ.ohio.gov
(willing to accept service by e-mail)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of this Motion to Strike was served on the persons stated below via electronic transmission, this 18th day of April 2018.

/s/ Christopher Healey
Christopher Healey
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

SERVICE LIST

Thomas.mcnamee@ohioattorneygeneral.gov	Michael.schuler@aes.com
Bojko@carpenterlipps.com	djireland@ficlaw.com
ORourke@carpenterlipps.com	jsharkey@ficlaw.com
ghiloni@carpenterlipps.com	Kurt.Helfrich@ThompsonHine.com
sechler@carpenterlipps.com	Stephanie.Chmiel@ThompsonHine.com
dboehm@BKLlawfirm.com	Michael.Austin@ThompsonHine.com
mkurtz@BKLlawfirm.com	mfleisher@elpc.org
jkylerncohn@BKLlawfirm.com	dparram@taftlaw.com
sam@mwncmh.com	thomas.jernigan.3@us.af.mil
fdarr@mwncmh.com	cmooney@ohiopartners.org
mpritchard@mwncmh.com	dborchers@bricker.com
jlang@calfee.com	mwarnock@bricker.com
talexander@calfee.com	ejacobs@ablelaw.org
slesser@calfee.com	joliker@igsenergy.com
jvickers@elpc.org	lhawrot@spilmanlaw.com
tdougherty@theOEC.org	dwilliamson@spilmanlaw.com
mleppla@theOEC.org	charris@spilmanlaw.com
jfinnigan@edf.org	mjsettineri@vorys.com
swilliams@nrdc.org	glpetrucci@vorys.com
rdove@attorneydove.com	whitt@whitt-sturtevant.com
kfield@elpc.org	campbell@whitt-sturtevant.com
mfleisher@elpc.org	glover@whitt-sturtevant.com
	jdoll@djflawfirm.com
Attorney Examiners:	
gregory.price@puc.state.oh.us	
patricia.schabo@puc.state.oh.us	

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

4/18/2018 5:23:41 PM

in

Case No(s). 15-1830-EL-AIR, 15-1831-EL-AAM, 15-1832-EL-ATA

Summary: Motion Motion to Strike Objection to The PUCO Staff's Report of Investigation by The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel electronically filed by Ms. Jamie Williams on behalf of Healey, Christopher Mr.