

BEFORE THE

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

CASE NO. 15-1830-EL-AIR
15-1831-EL-AAM
15-1832-EL-ATA

TESTIMONY OF
SHARON R. SCHRODER
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

TESTIMONY OF
SHARON R. SCHRODER
IN SUPPORT OF THE
STIPULATION AND RECOMMENDATION

ON BEHALF OF
THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	THE STIPULATION AND RECOMMENDATION	3
III.	THE COMMISSION'S CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING STIPULATIONS.....	4
	A. The Stipulation is the Product of Serious Bargaining among Knowledgeable Parties	5
	B. The Stipulation Benefits the Public Interest.....	7
	C. The Stipulation Does Not Violate any Important Regulatory Principle	14
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	16

I. INTRODUCTION

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Sharon Schroder. My business address is 1065 Woodman Drive, Dayton, OH 45432.

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

A. I am employed by The Dayton Power and Light Company ("DP&L" or "Company") as Managing Director of Regulatory Affairs.

Q. How long have you been in your present position?

A. I assumed my present position in November 2015. Prior to that, I served in several leadership roles within DPL Energy Resources, Inc. ("DPLER"), including Director of Community Relations, Director of Sales, and Director of Business Development & Regulatory Affairs.

Q. What are your responsibilities in your current position?

A. In my current position, my responsibilities include evaluating regulatory and legislative initiatives, the Company's retail and wholesale rates, and overall regulatory operations.

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

A. I received a Bachelor of Science degree in International Business from Miami University in Oxford, Ohio in 1989. I earned a Master of Science in Social and Applied Economics from Wright State University in Dayton, Ohio in 1990. Additionally, I earned a Master of Arts in Economics from The Ohio State University

1 in Columbus, Ohio in 1994. Prior to my roles within DPLER, I was Director of Major
2 Accounts for the Service Operations team and Manager of Federal Energy Regulatory
3 Commission ("FERC") Pricing and Policy, both for DP&L. I have been employed by
4 DPL Inc. since 1996.

5 **Q. Have you previously provided testimony before the Public Utilities Commission**
6 **of Ohio ("PUCO" or the "Commission"), any other state commission or the**
7 **FERC?**

8 A. Yes. I have sponsored testimony in Case No. 09-256-EL-UNC before the PUCO
9 regarding the establishment of the Company's Transmission Cost Recovery Rider. I
10 submitted testimony on behalf of the Company before the FERC on (i) August 31,
11 2001 with regard to the Federal Power Act ("FPA") Section 205 filing of the former
12 Alliance Companies in Docket No. RT01-88-006, (ii) December 11, 2002 with regard
13 to the FPA Section 205 filing of the Alliance Companies in Docket No. ER03-262-
14 000, (iii) October 14, 2003 with regard to the elimination of through-and-out rates in
15 Docket Nos. EL03-212, et al., (iv) July 30, 2004 with regard to the FPA Section 205
16 filing of AEP and Dayton to join PJM in Docket No. ER04-1068-000, and (v) April
17 29, 2005, May 13, 2005, and August 29, 2005 with regard to the FPA Section 205
18 filing to support Dayton's lost revenues in the Seams Elimination Charge/Cost
19 Adjustment/Assignment ("SECA") proceedings, Docket Nos. ER05-6, et al. I
20 sponsored testimony on behalf of the Responsible Pricing Alliance ("RPA") on
21 November 22, 2005 in Docket No. EL05-121-000, to review competing proposals for
22 a new PJM transmission rate design, and to present my conclusions concerning the

1 cost shifts and related cost of service issues involved in their proposals. I also
2 sponsored testimony before FERC supporting DPL Energy, LLC's revenue
3 requirement for Reactive Supply under PJM's Tariff in Docket ER08-1039 in May
4 2008. Finally, I sponsored testimony before the PUCO in Case No. 16-395-EL-SSO
5 in support of the March 14, 2017 Amended Stipulation and Recommendation.

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

7 A. The purpose of this testimony is to provide the facts showing that the Commission
8 should approve the Stipulation and Recommendation ("Stipulation") filed in this
9 matter on June 18, 2018, because it is the product of serious negotiations among
10 knowledgeable parties, benefits customers and the public interest, and does not violate
11 any important regulatory principles or practices.

12 **II. THE STIPULATION AND RECOMMENDATION**

13 **Q. Can you provide an overview of the terms of the Stipulation?**

14 A. Yes. The Stipulation is necessary because DP&L's current base rates for electric
15 distribution service are no longer sufficient to yield reasonable compensation for the
16 electric distribution service that DP&L renders and are no longer just or reasonable.
17 The Stipulation recommends that the Commission adopt the findings and
18 recommendations set forth in the March 12, 2018 Staff Report filed in this case,
19 except as otherwise provided in the Stipulation. Specifically, the Stipulation provides
20 for a Stipulated Revenue Requirement of \$247,951,788, which reflects a 9.999% ROE
21 and 4.8% cost of debt, and necessary adjustments to implement the Tax Cuts and Jobs

1 Act of 2017 ("TCJA") with regard to DP&L's federal income tax expense and gross
2 revenue conversion factor. The Stipulation also recommends a process for returning
3 excess accumulated deferred income taxes ("ADIT") resulting from the TCJA and the
4 full balance of the regulatory liability ordered by the Commission effective January 1,
5 2018 in Case No. 18-47-AU-COI to customers. It further recommends methodologies
6 for populating DP&L's Distribution Investment Rider ("DIR") and revenue decoupling
7 through its Distribution Decoupling Rider pursuant to the Commission's Opinion and
8 Order in Case No. 16-395-EL-SSO. The Stipulation also recommends that DP&L be
9 permitted to defer for future recovery annual expenses for vegetation management
10 incremental to a stipulated baseline, subject to an annual cap, among other
11 recommendations.

12 **III. THE COMMISSION'S CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING**
13 **STIPULATIONS**

14 **Q. What criteria does the Commission use to decide whether to approve a**
15 **Stipulation?**

16 **A.** The Commission has applied the following three criteria: First, is the Stipulation a
17 product of serious bargaining among capable, knowledgeable parties? Second, taken
18 as a package, does the Stipulation benefit customers and the public interest? Third,
19 does the Stipulation violate any important regulatory principle or practice?

**A. The Stipulation is the Product of Serious Bargaining
among Knowledgeable Parties**

**Q. Can you describe the interests of the parties that signed the Stipulation as
Signatory Parties or Non-Opposing Parties?**

A. Yes. The Stipulation is supported by parties representing a wide range of interests, including the interests of DP&L's customers. The Stipulation was signed by a diverse group of parties as either Signatory or Non-Opposing Parties that includes the Commission's Staff, DP&L, The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel ("OCC"), two representatives of residential low-income customers, two of the largest supermarket chains in the country, a state-wide organization representing local hospitals in DP&L's service territory, four environmental groups, and three state-wide organizations of large industrial customers.

**Q. Was the Stipulation the product of serious bargaining among capable,
knowledgeable parties?**

A. Yes. All of the intervening parties participated in, or had the opportunity to participate in, the negotiations, and most of them support it. The settlement negotiations involved a diverse group of experienced parties. Negotiation sessions were held at the Commission's offices following the May 3, 2018 Prehearing Conference, following the May 14, 2018 call-and-continue, on June 4, 2018, following the June 6, 2018 Prehearing Conference, and on June 8 and 13, 2018. All parties that intervened in the case were invited to attend these sessions. At the beginning or in advance of these sessions, DP&L or the Commission's Staff circulated to the parties either a settlement

1 term sheet or draft Stipulation. A telephone bridge was established for multiple
2 sessions to accommodate those parties whose counsel could not travel to a particular
3 session. At each session, DP&L answered questions from the parties and asked for
4 feedback on DP&L's proposed settlement terms. Staff and other parties made
5 extensive comments on DP&L's proposals, and all Signatory and Non-Opposing
6 Parties made compromises.

7 In addition, DP&L invited all of the parties to contact DP&L directly if they wanted to
8 engage in separate settlement discussions with the Company. Numerous parties took
9 advantage of that opportunity, and DP&L had several conversations with individual
10 parties, including but not limited to the Commission's Staff. The Signatory and Non-
11 Opposing Parties to the Stipulation represent a wide spectrum of diverse interests. All
12 of the Signatory and Non-Opposing Parties were represented by attorneys, most if not
13 all of whom have years of experience in regulatory matters before this Commission
14 and who possess extensive information. All of the negotiations were at arm's length.
15 Numerous hours were devoted to the negotiating process and to the exchange of
16 language and information associated with the terms of the Stipulation. The result of
17 the negotiations was a compromise, as explained more fully below. Many parties and
18 customers receive benefits under the Stipulation, but neither DP&L nor any other
19 Signatory or Non-Opposing Party received everything that it may have wanted or
20 desired. The Stipulation strikes a reasonable balance that benefits customers and the
21 public interest.

22 .

B. The Stipulation Benefits the Public Interest

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

A. Yes. As discussed in more detail below, the principal benefits of the Stipulation to DP&L's customers and the public interest are that the Stipulation will: (1) enable DP&L to continue to provide safe and reliable service by promoting its financial condition by implementing just and reasonable rates, which will support DP&L's ability to meet and maintain operational needs; (2) facilitate incremental distribution system investments; (3) improve reliability by authorizing a deferral for future recovery of certain annual expenses for vegetation management; (4) begin to implement the lowered federal income tax rate of the TCJA and establish a framework for returning benefits resulting from the TCJA to customers; (5) institute a new decoupling mechanism; (6) establish a rate of return that incorporates a return on equity below the mid-point of the range proposed in the Staff Report and a cost of debt lower than what was requested by the Company and recommended in the Staff Report; (7) provide direct benefits to members of a state-wide organization representing local hospitals; (8) commit to develop innovative electric vehicle charging infrastructure and a non-wires pilot program; and (9) avoid further costs of litigation.

Q. How does the Stipulation allow DP&L to continue to provide safe and reliable service?

1 A. The Stipulation enables DP&L to continue to provide safe and reliable service in
2 several ways.

3 First, the Stipulation allows DP&L to recover just and reasonable rates based on a Test
4 Year of June 1, 2015 to May 31, 2016 and Date Certain of September 30, 2015.
5 DP&L's current base distribution rates are no longer sufficient to yield reasonable
6 compensation for the electric distribution service that DP&L renders and are no longer
7 just and reasonable. DP&L's base distribution rates have not increased in more than
8 27 years. The rates proposed in the Stipulation promote DP&L's financial condition
9 and, thus, its ability to provide safe and reliable service. The Stipulated Revenue
10 Requirement is reflected in Stipulated Schedule A-1, which is attached to the
11 Stipulation as Exhibit 1.

12 Second, by populating the DIR, the Stipulation enables DP&L to recover incremental
13 distribution capital investments recorded in FERC Plant Accounts 360-374, and
14 address certain known threats to the reliability of DP&L's distribution system. The
15 methodology for populating the initial DIR is attached to the Stipulation as Exhibit 3.
16 To ensure that the DIR expenditures will improve reliability, DP&L has committed to
17 share its annual plan with Staff and OCC.

18 Third, the Stipulation allows DP&L to defer for future recovery costs of vegetation
19 management expenses incremental to a baseline, subject to an annual cap of \$4.6
20 million, the need for which is shown in the Supplemental Direct Testimony of Barry J.
21 Bentley.

1 **Q. Can you explain the benefits of the Stipulation relating to the TCJA?**

2 A. Yes. The Stipulation recommends a Stipulated Revenue Requirement that
3 incorporates necessary adjustments to implement the TCJA, which lowered the federal
4 corporate income tax rate from 35% to 21%, with regard to DP&L's federal income
5 tax expense and gross revenue conversion factor. The Stipulation also recommends
6 that DP&L commence a proceeding not later than March 1, 2019 to return to
7 customers the distribution-related, eligible excess ADIT resulting from the TCJA and
8 the full balance of the regulatory liability ordered by the Commission effective
9 January 1, 2018 in Case No. 18-47-AU-COI.

10 DP&L has agreed to return to customers distribution-related, eligible unprotected
11 excess ADIT and the full balance of the regulatory liability ordered by the
12 Commission effective January 1, 2018 in Case No. 18-47-AU-COI over an
13 amortization period no greater than 10 years. It further has agreed to provide to
14 customers no less than \$4.0 million per year of that combined amount for the first five
15 years of that amortization period unless that combined amount is fully returned within
16 that first five years. The distribution-related protected excess ADIT will be returned
17 to customers in accordance with Federal law.

18 By agreeing to waive numerous legal arguments and committing to commence a
19 proceeding to return to customers all excess ADIT resulting from the TCJA and the
20 full balance of the regulatory liability ordered by the Commission effective January 1,
21 2018 in Case No. 18-47-AU-COI, DP&L's customers likely will begin to receive those

1 benefits more quickly than if DP&L had waited for the Commission to decide the
2 treatment of those issues as part of Case No. 18-47-AU-COI or some other
3 proceeding. Further, intervening parties are spared the costs associated with
4 protracted legal proceedings.

5 **Q. Can you explain the benefits of the Stipulation's recommendations relating to the**
6 **Distribution Decoupling Rider?**

7 A. Yes. Pursuant to the Commission's Opinion and Order in Case No. 16-395-EL-SSO,
8 the Stipulation recommends a methodology for revenue decoupling that shifts DP&L
9 away from a lost distribution revenues mechanism to a more holistic decoupling
10 mechanism. The purpose of decoupling is to separate a utility's revenue from
11 customer usage, so that it can recover the fixed costs of infrastructure, which do not
12 vary based on customer usage. The methodology proposed in the Stipulation
13 recognizes that reductions in base distribution revenues can be caused by decreases in
14 kWh sales due to energy efficiency savings that result from DP&L's approved energy
15 efficiency programs, but also weather, economic upswings and downturns, and
16 improvements in technology. The methodology also incorporates a revenue-per-
17 customer component calculated as shown in Exhibit 4 to the Stipulation. The
18 stipulated decoupling mechanism incentivizes DP&L to provide and encourage usage
19 management tools, such as energy efficiency programs, for the benefit of its customers
20 while also reducing the need for frequent costly rate cases. It also creates stability for
21 both the Company and customers by requiring a rate or credit to customers based upon
22 the decoupling calculation.

1 **Q. How does the Stipulation address DP&L's rate of return?**

2 A. The Stipulation recommends a Stipulated Rate of Return of 7.27%, which incorporates
3 a return on equity of 9.999% and a cost of debt of 4.8%. This return on equity is
4 lower than the 10.5% proposed by DP&L in its Application in this proceeding, and
5 also is lower than the mid-point of the 9.59% to 10.61% range recommended in the
6 Staff Report. In addition, the cost of debt is lower than the 5.29% cost of debt
7 contained in both DP&L's Application and the Staff Report. DP&L's customers will
8 benefit directly from this lower rate of return through a lower Stipulated Revenue
9 Requirement.

10 **Q. How does the Stipulation address DP&L's customer charge for residential**
11 **customers?**

12 A. The Stipulation recommends a \$7.00 customer charge for DP&L's residential
13 customers, which is lower than both the \$13.73 customer charge recommended in
14 DP&L's Application and the \$7.88 customer charge recommended in the Staff Report.
15 By recommending a lower customer charge, the Stipulation may provide a greater
16 financial incentive for energy conservation. Additionally, this change incorporates
17 gradualism in ratemaking by having a minimal change to the rate structure. It further
18 moderates bill impacts for very low-usage residential customers.

19 **Q. Are there other commitments that will benefit customers in the region?**

20 A. Yes. In the Stipulation, DP&L has agreed to waive the Contract Capacity Charge
21 related to Redundant Service (which is also known as "alternate feed service") for

1 hospital customers until a final order is issued in DP&L's next base distribution rate
2 case, thereby allowing customers who serve the public interest to benefit from reduced
3 rates for redundant services. In addition, the Stipulation provides a process for
4 collaboration among DP&L, Staff, various environmental parties, and other interested
5 stakeholders regarding the deployment of electric vehicle charging infrastructure and a
6 non-wires alternative pilot program. The Stipulation promotes the availability of its
7 distribution system to customer-generators by funding with shareholder dollars a
8 distribution interconnect feasibility study for a low-income community of Dayton.
9 Finally the Stipulation avoids the necessity of a fully-litigated proceeding, thus saving
10 time, energy, and resources of the Commission and its Staff, DP&L, and the
11 intervening parties.

12 **Q. Can you describe the rate impacts that the Stipulation will have on DP&L's**
13 **customers, as compared to DP&L's current rates?**

14 A. Yes. A rate and revenue summary is provided as Exhibit 5 to the Stipulation. In
15 addition, DP&L's typical rate impact analysis is attached as Exhibit A to my
16 testimony. That analysis shows that a typical residential customer in the DP&L
17 service territory, using 1,000 kWh on the Company's standard service offer, can
18 expect a monthly bill increase of \$2.64 per month, representing a 2.47% increase.
19 Even with this change, DP&L's residential customers will continue to pay the lowest
20 rates for electric distribution service in Ohio.

1 **Q. Does the Stipulation represent a compromise from DP&L's filed application that**
2 **benefits the public interest?**

3 A. Yes. Various interests were addressed as part of the negotiations. In addition to the
4 many commitments described above, other DP&L compromises in this Stipulation
5 include:

6 1. DP&L's as-filed Application supported a \$65.8 million increase in its
7 revenue requirement. DP&L agreed instead to a \$29.8 million increase
8 in its revenue requirement.

9 2. DP&L's as-filed Application supported a \$13.73 customer charge.
10 DP&L agreed instead to collect a customer charge of \$7.00.

11 2. DP&L initially objected to various aspects of the plant-in-service
12 findings and recommendations in the Staff Report. DP&L agreed to
13 accept those findings and recommendations in the Stipulation.

14 3. DP&L agreed to begin implementing the TCJA in this proceeding.

15 4. DP&L agreed to a framework for returning to customers excess ADIT
16 resulting from the TCJA and the full balance of the regulatory liability
17 ordered by the Commission effective January 1, 2018 in Case No. 18-
18 47-AU-COI, even though Case No. 18-47-AU-COI has not yet been
19 resolved by the Commission.

20 4. DP&L proposed a DIR without annual caps, without a penalty for
21 failing to meet reliability standards, and calculated at then-existing tax
22 rates, and agreed instead to annual caps for the DIR, a \$2.0 million
23 reduction in the annual cap for the DIR for failure to meet certain
24 reliability standards, and the use of tax rates enacted as part of the
25 TCJA to calculate it.

26 5. DP&L supported the annual recovery of \$11.2 million in vegetation
27 management expenses in addition to the recommended allowance for
28 those expenses in the Staff Report. DP&L agreed instead to a deferral
29 for future recovery of such expenses incremental to a baseline, subject
30 to a \$4.6 million annual cap. As set forth in the Supplemental Direct
31 Testimony of Barry J. Bentley, this is necessary to allow DP&L to
32 continue to provide safe and reliable service.

1 6. DP&L agreed to accept numerous disallowances recommended in the
2 Staff Report and the Stipulation, totaling an approximately \$35 million
3 reduction of the revenue requirement proposed in DP&L's Application.

4 **C. The Stipulation Does Not Violate Any Important**
5 **Regulatory Principle or Practice**

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

8 A. No. The Stipulation does not violate any important regulatory principle or practice.
9 On the contrary, it encourages compromise as an alternative to litigation and allows
10 DP&L to recover just and reasonable rates as provided in Ohio Rev. Code § 4909.18.
11 The Stipulation promotes DP&L's financial condition and its ability to provide safe
12 and reliable service to its customers.

13 **Q. Does the Stipulation advance any other state policies?**

14 A. Yes. In addition to allowing DP&L to recover just and reasonable rates, the
15 Stipulation advances several policies described in Ohio Revised Code 4928.02,
16 including but not limited to:

17 "(A) Ensure the availability to consumers of adequate, reliable, safe, efficient,
18 nondiscriminatory, and reasonably priced retail electric service;

19 ...

20 (F) Ensure that an electric utility's transmission and distribution systems are
21 available to a customer-generator or owner of distributed generation, so that
22 the customer-generator or owner can market and deliver the electricity it
23 produces;

24 ...

1 (L) Protect at-risk populations, including, but not limited to, when considering
2 the implementation of any new advanced energy or renewable energy resource;
3 [and]

4 ...

5 (N) Facilitate the state's effectiveness in the global economy."

6 For example, the Stipulation makes safe and reliable electric distribution service
7 available to customers by enabling DP&L to recover just and reasonable rates and to
8 make necessary incremental distribution capital investments and then recover those
9 investments through the DIR. It also allows for vegetation management to be
10 conducted in a timely and efficient manner by allowing DP&L to defer for future
11 recovery such expenses incremental to those incurred during the Test Year.

12 In addition, the Stipulation promotes the availability of its distribution system to
13 customer-generators by funding with shareholder dollars a distribution interconnect
14 feasibility study for the solar farm in the Edgemont community of Dayton.

15 The Stipulation further protects at-risk populations through a reduced customer
16 charge. It also waives the Contract Capacity Charge related to Redundant Service for
17 local hospitals in DP&L's service territory.

18 Finally, the Stipulation facilitates the state's effectiveness in the global economy by
19 recommending a Stipulated Revenue Requirement that (a) is significantly less than
20 what DP&L proposed in its initial Application, (b) promotes DP&L's financial
21 condition and, thus, its ability to provide safe and reliable service, and (c) begins to
22 implement the TCJA and the attendant reduction in both base distribution rates and the
23 DIR.

1 **IV. CONCLUSION**

2 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony in support of the Stipulation?**

3 **A. Yes, it does.**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing Testimony of Sharon R. Schroder in Support of the Stipulation and Recommendation has been served via electronic mail upon the following counsel of record, this 26th day of June, 2018:

Thomas McNamee
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
30 East Broad Street, 16th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215-3793
Email: thomas.mcnamee@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

Attorney for PUCO Staff

Christopher Healey (Counsel of Record)
Terry Etter
Assistant Consumers' Counsel
Office of The Ohio Consumers' Counsel
65 East State Street, 7th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215-4203
Email: christopher.healey@occ.ohio.gov
terry.etter@occ.ohio.gov

Attorneys for Appellant
Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

Frank P. Darr (Counsel of Record)
Matthew R. Pritchard
McNees Wallace & Nurick
21 East State Street, 17th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
Email: fdarr@mwncmh.com
mpritchard@mwncmh.com

Attorneys for Appellant
Industrial Energy Users - Ohio

Angela Paul Whitfield
Stephen E. Dutton
Carpenter Lipps & Leland LLP
280 North High Street, Suite 1300
Columbus, OH 43215
Email: paul@carpenterlipps.com
dutton@carpenterlipps.com

Attorneys for The Kroger Company

David F. Boehm
Michael L. Kurtz
Kurt J. Boehm
Jody Kyler Cohn
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry
36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510
Cincinnati, OH 45202
Email: dboehm@BKLawfirm.com
mkurtz@BKLawfirm.com
kboehm@BKLawfirm.com
jkylercohn@BKLawfirm.com

Attorneys for Ohio Energy Group

Kimberly W. Bojko (Counsel of Record)
Brian W. Dressel
Carpenter Lipps & Leland LLP
280 North High Street, Suite 1300
Columbus, OH 43215
Email: bojko@carpenterlipps.com
dressel@carpenterlipps.com

Attorneys for The Ohio Manufacturers'
Association Energy Group

Madeline Fleisher
Kristin Field
Environmental Law & Policy Center
21 West Broad Street, Suite 500
Columbus, OH 43215
Email: mfleisher@elpc.org
kfield@elpc.org

Robert Kelter (Senior Attorney)
Justin Vickers (Staff Attorney)
Environmental Law & Policy Center
55 East Wacker Drive, Suite 1600
Chicago, IL 60601
Email: rkelter@elpc.org
jvickers@elpc.org

Attorneys for the Environmental Law &
Policy Center

Steven D. Lesser
James F. Lang
N. Trevor Alexander
Calfee, Halter & Griswold LLP
41 South High Street
1200 Huntington Center
Columbus, OH 43215
Email: slesser@calfee.com
jlang@calfee.com
talexander@calfee.com

Attorneys for Honda America Mfg., Inc. and
The City of Dayton

Stephanie M. Chmiel
Thompson Hine LLP
41 South High Street, Suite 1700
Columbus, OH 43215-6101
Email: stephanie.chmiel@thompsonhine.com

Attorneys for Buckeye Power, Inc.

Derrick Price Williamson
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC
1100 Bent Creek Blvd., Suite 101
Mechanicsburg, PA 17050
Email: dwilliamson@spilmanlaw.com

Carrie M. Harris
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC
310 First Street, Suite 1100
P.O. Box 90
Roanoke, VA 24002-0090
Email: charris@spilmanlaw.com

Trent Dougherty (Counsel of Record)
Miranda Leppla
1145 Chesapeake Avenue, Suite 1
Columbus, OH 43212-3449
Email: tdougherty@theoec.org
mleppla@theoec.org

John Finnigan
Senior Regulatory Attorney
Environmental Defense Fund
128 Winding Brook Lane
Terrace Park, OH 45174
Email: jfinnigan@edf.com

Attorneys for the Ohio Environmental Council
and Environmental Defense Fund

Robert Dove
P.O. Box 13442
Columbus, OH 43213
Email: rdove@attorneydove.com

Samantha Williams (Staff Attorney)
Natural Resources Defense Council
20 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 1600
Chicago, IL 60606
Email: swilliams@nrdc.org

Attorneys for Natural Resources
Defense Council

Colleen L. Mooney
Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy
231 West Lima Street
P.O. Box 1793
Findlay, OH 45839-1793
Email: cmooney@ohiopartners.org

Attorney for Ohio Partners for
Affordable Energy

Joseph Olikier
Michael Nugent
Interstate Gas Supply, Inc.
6100 Emerald Parkway
Dublin, OH 43016
Email: joliker@igsenergy.com
mnugent@igsenergy.com

Attorneys for Interstate Gas Supply, Inc.

Lisa M. Hawrot
Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC
Century Centre Building
1233 Main Street, Suite 4000
Wheeling, WV 26003
Email: lhawrot@spilmanlaw.com

Steve W. Chriss
Senior Manager, Energy Regulatory Analysis
Greg Tillman
Senior Manager, Energy Regulatory Analysis
Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.
2001 SE 10th Street
Bentonville, AR 72716-0550
Email: stephen.chriss@walmart.com
greg.tillman@walmart.com

Attorneys for Wal-Mart Stores East, LP
and Sam's East, Inc.

Matthew W. Warnock
Dylan F. Borchers
Devin D. Parram
Bricker & Eckler LLP
100 South Third Street
Columbus, OH 43215-4291
Email: mwarnock@bricker.com
dborchers@bricker.com
dparram@bricker.com

Attorneys for The Ohio Hospital Association

Mark A. Whitt
Andrew J. Campbell
Rebekah J. Glover
Whitt Sturtevant LLP
The KeyBank Building, Suite 1590
88 East Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215
Email: whitt@whitt-sturtevant.com
campbell@whitt-sturtevant.com
glover@whitt-sturtevant.com

Attorneys for Retail Energy Supply Association

Ellis Jacobs
Advocates for Basic Legal Equality, Inc.
130 West Second Street, Suite 700 East
Dayton, OH 45402
Email: ejacobs@ablelaw.org

Attorney for The Edgemont Neighborhood Coalition

John R. Doll
Doll, Jansen & Ford
111 West First Street, Suite 1100
Dayton, OH 45402-1156
Email: jdoll@djflawfirm.com

Attorneys for Utility Workers of
America Local 175

Michael J. Settineri (Counsel of Record)
Gretchen L. Petrucci
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP
52 East Gay Street
P.O. Box 1008
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008
Email: mjsettineri@vorys.com
glpetrucci@vorys.com

Attorneys for Constellation NewEnergy, Inc.

Katie Johnson Treadway
One Energy Enterprises, LLC
12385 Township Rd. 215
Findley, OH 45840
Email: ktreadway@oneenergyllc.com

Attorney for One Energy Enterprises, LLC

/s/ Jeffrey S. Sharkey
Jeffrey S. Sharkey

EXHIBIT A

The Dayton Power and Light Company
Case No 15-1830-EL-AIR

Typical Bill Comparison
Residential

Exhibit A
Page 1 of 11
Witness Responsible: Sharon R. Schroder

Work Paper Reference No(s): None

Line No.	Rate Code	Level of Demand (kW)	Level of Usage (kWh)	Current Bill (January 1, 2018)	Base Distribution Increase / (Decrease)	Decoupling Rider Increase / (Decrease)	Distribution Investment Rider	Current Total Bill Increase / (Decrease)	Proposed Total Bill	% Change	Current Bill at time of DRC Filing
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I) = Sum (F) to (H)	(J) = (E) + (I)	(K) = (I) / (E)	(L)
1	RNH	0.0	50	\$9.97	\$2.79	(\$0.12)	\$0.41	\$3.08	\$13.05	30.89%	\$13.29
2		0.0	100	\$15.18	\$2.82	(\$0.24)	\$0.47	\$3.05	\$18.23	20.09%	\$19.82
3		0.0	200	\$25.53	\$2.89	(\$0.47)	\$0.58	\$3.00	\$28.53	11.75%	\$32.27
4		0.0	400	\$46.29	\$3.04	(\$0.94)	\$0.82	\$2.92	\$49.21	6.31%	\$57.50
5		0.0	500	\$56.67	\$3.11	(\$1.18)	\$0.94	\$2.87	\$59.54	5.06%	\$70.17
6		0.0	750	\$82.59	\$3.29	(\$1.76)	\$1.23	\$2.76	\$85.35	3.34%	\$101.76
7		0.0	1,000	\$106.79	\$3.47	(\$2.35)	\$1.52	\$2.64	\$109.43	2.47%	\$129.98
8		0.0	1,200	\$126.15	\$3.61	(\$2.82)	\$1.75	\$2.54	\$128.69	2.01%	\$152.53
9		0.0	1,400	\$145.52	\$3.75	(\$3.29)	\$1.99	\$2.45	\$147.97	1.68%	\$175.10
10		0.0	1,500	\$155.21	\$3.82	(\$3.53)	\$2.10	\$2.39	\$157.60	1.54%	\$186.40
11		0.0	2,000	\$203.61	\$4.18	(\$4.70)	\$2.69	\$2.17	\$205.78	1.07%	\$242.82
12		0.0	2,500	\$251.77	\$4.54	(\$5.88)	\$3.27	\$1.93	\$253.70	0.77%	\$299.03
13		0.0	3,000	\$299.93	\$4.90	(\$7.05)	\$3.86	\$1.71	\$301.64	0.57%	\$355.23
14		0.0	4,000	\$396.27	\$5.61	(\$9.40)	\$5.03	\$1.24	\$397.51	0.31%	\$467.59
15		0.0	5,000	\$492.62	\$6.33	(\$11.76)	\$6.19	\$0.76	\$493.38	0.15%	\$580.02
16		0.0	7,500	\$733.50	\$8.12	(\$17.63)	\$9.12	(\$0.39)	\$733.11	-0.05%	\$861.03

The Dayton Power and Light Company
Case No 15-1830-EL-AIR

Typical Bill Comparison
Residential Heating (Winter)

Exhibit A
Page 2 of 11
Witness Responsible: Sharon R. Schroder

Work Paper Reference No(s): None

Line No.	Rate Code	Level of Demand (kW)	Level of Usage (kWh)	Current Bill (January 1, 2018)	Base Distribution Increase / (Decrease)	Decoupling Rider Increase / (Decrease)	Distribution Investment Rider	Current Total Bill Increase / (Decrease)	Proposed Total Bill	% Change	Current Bill at time of DRC Filing
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I) = Sum (F) to (H)	(J) = (E) + (I)	(K) = (I) / (E)	(L)
1	RH-W	0.0	50	\$9.97	\$2.79	(\$0.12)	\$0.41	\$3.08	\$13.05	30.89%	\$13.29
2		0.0	100	\$15.18	\$2.82	(\$0.24)	\$0.47	\$3.05	\$18.23	20.09%	\$19.62
3		0.0	200	\$25.53	\$2.89	(\$0.47)	\$0.58	\$3.00	\$28.53	11.75%	\$32.27
4		0.0	400	\$46.29	\$3.04	(\$0.94)	\$0.82	\$2.92	\$49.21	6.31%	\$57.50
5		0.0	500	\$56.67	\$3.11	(\$1.18)	\$0.94	\$2.87	\$59.54	5.06%	\$70.17
6		0.0	750	\$82.59	\$3.29	(\$1.76)	\$1.23	\$2.76	\$85.35	3.34%	\$101.76
7		0.0	1,000	\$103.07	\$3.47	(\$2.35)	\$1.52	\$2.64	\$105.71	2.56%	\$123.98
8		0.0	1,200	\$119.44	\$3.61	(\$2.82)	\$1.75	\$2.54	\$121.98	2.13%	\$141.73
9		0.0	1,400	\$135.84	\$3.75	(\$3.29)	\$1.99	\$2.45	\$138.29	1.80%	\$159.52
10		0.0	1,500	\$144.04	\$3.82	(\$3.53)	\$2.10	\$2.39	\$146.43	1.66%	\$168.41
11		0.0	2,000	\$184.98	\$4.18	(\$4.70)	\$2.69	\$2.17	\$187.15	1.17%	\$212.84
12		0.0	2,500	\$225.71	\$4.54	(\$5.88)	\$3.27	\$1.93	\$227.64	0.86%	\$257.04
13		0.0	3,000	\$266.41	\$4.90	(\$7.05)	\$3.86	\$1.71	\$268.12	0.64%	\$301.26
14		0.0	4,000	\$347.86	\$5.61	(\$9.40)	\$5.03	\$1.24	\$349.10	0.36%	\$389.64
15		0.0	5,000	\$429.31	\$6.33	(\$11.76)	\$6.19	\$0.76	\$430.07	0.18%	\$478.06
16		0.0	7,500	\$632.94	\$8.12	(\$17.63)	\$9.12	(\$0.39)	\$632.55	-0.06%	\$699.09

The Dayton Power and Light Company
Case No 15-1830-EL-AIR

Typical Bill Comparison
Residential Heating (Summer)

Exhibit A
Page 3 of 11
Witness Responsible: Sharon R. Schroder

Work Paper Reference No(s): None

Line No.	Rate Code	Level of Demand (kW)	Level of Usage (kWh)	Current Bill (January 1, 2018)	Base Distribution Increase / (Decrease)	Decoupling Rider Increase / (Decrease)	Distribution Investment Rider	Current Total Bill Increase / (Decrease)	Proposed Total Bill	% Change	Current Bill at time of DRC Filing
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I) = Sum (F) to (H)	(J) = (E) + (I)	(K) = (I) / (E)	(L)
1	RH-S	0.0	50	\$9.97	\$2.79	(\$0.12)	\$0.41	\$3.08	\$13.05	30.89%	\$13.29
2		0.0	100	\$15.18	\$2.82	(\$0.24)	\$0.47	\$3.05	\$18.23	20.09%	\$19.62
3		0.0	200	\$25.53	\$2.89	(\$0.47)	\$0.58	\$3.00	\$28.53	11.75%	\$32.27
4		0.0	400	\$46.29	\$3.04	(\$0.94)	\$0.82	\$2.92	\$49.21	6.31%	\$57.50
5		0.0	500	\$56.67	\$3.11	(\$1.18)	\$0.94	\$2.87	\$59.54	5.06%	\$70.17
6		0.0	750	\$82.59	\$3.29	(\$1.76)	\$1.23	\$2.76	\$85.35	3.34%	\$101.76
7		0.0	1,000	\$106.79	\$3.47	(\$2.35)	\$1.52	\$2.64	\$109.43	2.47%	\$129.98
8		0.0	1,200	\$126.15	\$3.61	(\$2.82)	\$1.75	\$2.54	\$128.69	2.01%	\$152.53
9		0.0	1,400	\$145.52	\$3.75	(\$3.29)	\$1.99	\$2.45	\$147.97	1.68%	\$175.10
10		0.0	1,500	\$155.21	\$3.82	(\$3.53)	\$2.10	\$2.39	\$157.60	1.54%	\$186.40
11		0.0	2,000	\$203.61	\$4.18	(\$4.70)	\$2.69	\$2.17	\$205.78	1.07%	\$242.82
12		0.0	2,500	\$251.77	\$4.54	(\$5.88)	\$3.27	\$1.93	\$253.70	0.77%	\$289.03
13		0.0	3,000	\$299.93	\$4.90	(\$7.05)	\$3.86	\$1.71	\$301.64	0.57%	\$355.23
14		0.0	4,000	\$396.27	\$5.61	(\$9.40)	\$5.03	\$1.24	\$397.51	0.31%	\$467.59
15		0.0	5,000	\$492.62	\$6.33	(\$11.76)	\$6.19	\$0.76	\$493.38	0.15%	\$580.02
16		0.0	7,500	\$733.50	\$8.12	(\$17.63)	\$9.12	(\$0.39)	\$733.11	-0.05%	\$861.03

The Dayton Power and Light Company
Case No 15-1830-EL-AIR

Typical Bill Comparison
Secondary Unmetered

Exhibit A
Page 4 of 11
Witness Responsible: Sharon R. Schroder

Work Paper Reference No(s): None

Line No.	Rate Code	Level of Demand (kW)	Level of Usage (kWh)	Current Bill (January 1, 2018)	Base Distribution Increase / (Decrease)	Decoupling Rider Increase / (Decrease)	Distribution Investment Rider	Current Total Bill Increase / (Decrease)	Proposed Total Bill	% Change	Current Bill at time of DRC Filing
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I) = Sum (F) to (H)	(J) = (E) + (I)	(K) = (I) / (E)	(L)
1	UM-SEC	5.0	50	\$13.90	\$25.15	(\$0.02)	\$0.71	\$25.84	\$39.74	185.90%	\$23.21
2		5.0	100	\$19.09	\$24.52	(\$0.03)	\$0.71	\$25.20	\$44.29	132.01%	\$29.36
3		5.0	150	\$24.29	\$23.90	(\$0.05)	\$0.71	\$24.56	\$48.85	101.11%	\$35.48
4		5.0	200	\$29.49	\$23.27	(\$0.06)	\$0.71	\$23.92	\$53.41	81.11%	\$41.64
5		5.0	300	\$39.89	\$22.03	(\$0.10)	\$0.71	\$22.84	\$62.53	56.76%	\$53.89
6		5.0	400	\$50.30	\$20.78	(\$0.13)	\$0.71	\$21.36	\$71.66	42.47%	\$66.16
7		5.0	500	\$60.69	\$19.53	(\$0.16)	\$0.71	\$20.08	\$80.77	33.09%	\$78.44
8		5.0	600	\$71.08	\$18.28	(\$0.19)	\$0.71	\$18.80	\$89.88	26.45%	\$90.69
9		5.0	800	\$91.88	\$15.79	(\$0.26)	\$0.71	\$16.24	\$108.12	17.68%	\$115.21
10		5.0	1,000	\$112.67	\$13.29	(\$0.32)	\$0.71	\$13.88	\$126.35	12.14%	\$139.75
11		5.0	1,200	\$133.48	\$10.79	(\$0.38)	\$0.71	\$11.12	\$144.60	8.33%	\$164.31
12		5.0	1,400	\$154.26	\$8.30	(\$0.45)	\$0.71	\$8.56	\$162.82	5.55%	\$188.82
13		5.0	1,600	\$170.26	\$7.05	(\$0.51)	\$0.71	\$7.25	\$177.51	4.26%	\$207.07
14		5.0	2,000	\$192.72	\$7.05	(\$0.64)	\$0.71	\$7.12	\$199.84	3.69%	\$230.84
15		5.0	2,200	\$203.85	\$7.05	(\$0.70)	\$0.71	\$7.06	\$210.91	3.46%	\$242.64
16		5.0	2,400	\$214.98	\$7.05	(\$0.77)	\$0.71	\$6.99	\$221.97	3.25%	\$254.43

The Dayton Power and Light Company
Case No 15-1830-EL-AIR

Typical Bill Comparison
Secondary Single Phase

Exhibit A
Page 5 of 11
Witness Responsible: Sharon R. Schroder

Work Paper Reference No(s): None

Line No.	Rate Code	Level of Demand (kW)	Level of Usage (kWh)	Current Bill (January 1, 2018)	Base Distribution Increase / (Decrease)	Decoupling Rider Increase / (Decrease)	Distribution Investment Rider	Current Total Bill Increase / (Decrease)	Proposed Total Bill	% Change	Current Bill at time of DRC Filing
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I) = Sum (F) to (H)	(J) = (E) + (I)	(K) = (I) / (E)	(L)
1	1PSEC	5	750	\$88.67	\$17.00	(\$0.24)	\$1.76	\$18.52	\$107.19	20.89%	\$111.09
2		5	1,500	\$166.66	\$7.64	(\$0.48)	\$1.76	\$8.92	\$175.58	5.35%	\$203.11
3		10	1,500	\$190.02	\$6.43	(\$0.46)	\$2.67	\$8.62	\$198.64	4.54%	\$272.77
4		25	5,000	\$478.56	\$2.82	(\$1.60)	\$5.42	\$6.64	\$485.20	1.39%	\$688.45
5		25	7,500	\$617.64	\$2.82	(\$2.39)	\$5.42	\$5.85	\$623.49	0.95%	\$835.96
6		25	10,000	\$756.72	\$2.82	(\$3.19)	\$5.42	\$5.05	\$761.77	0.67%	\$983.43
7		50	15,000	\$1,181.08	(\$3.21)	(\$4.79)	\$10.00	\$2.00	\$1,183.08	0.17%	\$1,626.72
8		50	25,000	\$1,731.81	(\$3.21)	(\$7.98)	\$10.00	(\$1.19)	\$1,730.62	-0.07%	\$2,211.08
9		200	50,000	\$3,985.85	(\$39.37)	(\$15.97)	\$37.50	(\$17.84)	\$3,968.01	-0.45%	\$5,761.85
10		200	100,000	\$6,739.46	(\$39.37)	(\$31.93)	\$37.50	(\$33.80)	\$6,705.66	-0.50%	\$8,683.62
11		300	125,000	\$8,701.08	(\$63.48)	(\$39.91)	\$55.83	(\$47.56)	\$8,653.52	-0.55%	\$11,537.76
12		500	200,000	\$13,745.31	(\$111.70)	(\$63.86)	\$92.48	(\$83.08)	\$13,662.23	-0.60%	\$18,321.12
13		1,000	300,000	\$21,835.50	(\$232.24)	(\$95.79)	\$184.13	(\$143.90)	\$21,691.60	-0.66%	\$30,616.51
14		1,000	500,000	\$32,167.78	(\$232.24)	(\$159.65)	\$184.13	(\$207.76)	\$31,960.02	-0.65%	\$41,274.81
15		2,500	750,000	\$53,855.29	(\$593.88)	(\$239.48)	\$459.06	(\$374.30)	\$53,480.99	-0.70%	\$75,496.48
16		2,500	1,000,000	\$66,770.63	(\$593.88)	(\$319.30)	\$459.06	(\$454.12)	\$66,316.51	-0.68%	\$88,531.63

The Dayton Power and Light Company
Case No 15-1830-EL-AIR

Typical Bill Comparison
Secondary Three Phase

Exhibit A
Page 6 of 11
Witness Responsible: Sharon R. Schroder

Work Paper Reference No(s): None

Line No.	Rate Code	Level of Demand (kW)	Level of Usage (kWh)	Current Bill (January 1, 2018)	Base Distribution Increase / (Decrease)	Decoupling Rider Increase / (Decrease)	Distribution Investment Rider	Current Total Bill Increase / (Decrease)	Proposed Total Bill	% Change	Current Bill at time of DRC Filing
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I) = Sum (F) to (H)	(J) = (E) + (I)	(K) = (I) / (E)	(L)
1	3PSEC	5	500	\$70.02	\$21.81	(\$0.16)	\$2.21	\$23.86	\$93.88	34.08%	\$87.77
2		5	1,500	\$174.00	\$9.33	(\$0.48)	\$2.21	\$11.06	\$185.06	6.36%	\$210.45
3		10	1,500	\$197.36	\$8.13	(\$0.48)	\$3.12	\$10.77	\$208.13	5.46%	\$280.11
4		25	5,000	\$485.90	\$4.51	(\$1.60)	\$5.87	\$8.78	\$494.68	1.81%	\$695.79
5		25	7,500	\$624.98	\$4.51	(\$2.39)	\$5.87	\$7.99	\$632.97	1.28%	\$843.30
6		25	10,000	\$764.06	\$4.51	(\$3.19)	\$5.87	\$7.19	\$771.25	0.94%	\$990.77
7		50	25,000	\$1,739.15	(\$1.52)	(\$7.98)	\$10.46	\$0.96	\$1,740.11	0.06%	\$2,218.42
8		200	50,000	\$3,993.19	(\$37.68)	(\$15.97)	\$37.95	(\$15.70)	\$3,977.49	-0.39%	\$5,769.19
9		200	125,000	\$8,123.62	(\$37.68)	(\$39.91)	\$37.95	(\$39.64)	\$8,083.98	-0.49%	\$10,151.85
10		500	200,000	\$13,752.65	(\$110.01)	(\$63.86)	\$92.94	(\$80.93)	\$13,671.72	-0.59%	\$18,328.46
11		1,000	300,000	\$21,842.84	(\$230.55)	(\$95.79)	\$184.58	(\$141.76)	\$21,701.08	-0.65%	\$30,623.85
12		1,000	500,000	\$32,175.12	(\$230.55)	(\$159.65)	\$184.58	(\$205.62)	\$31,969.50	-0.64%	\$41,282.15
13		2,500	750,000	\$53,862.63	(\$592.18)	(\$239.48)	\$459.51	(\$372.15)	\$53,490.48	-0.69%	\$75,503.82
14		2,500	1,000,000	\$66,777.97	(\$592.18)	(\$319.30)	\$459.51	(\$451.97)	\$66,326.00	-0.68%	\$88,538.97
15		5,000	1,500,000	\$107,228.91	(\$1,194.91)	(\$478.95)	\$917.73	(\$756.13)	\$106,472.78	-0.71%	\$149,154.59
16		5,000	2,000,000	\$133,059.61	(\$1,194.91)	(\$638.60)	\$917.73	(\$915.78)	\$132,143.83	-0.69%	\$174,938.94

The Dayton Power and Light Company
Case No 15-1830-EL-AIR

Typical Bill Comparison
Primary Service

Exhibit A
Page 7 of 11
Witness Responsible: Sharon R. Schroder

Work Paper Reference No(s): None

Line No.	Rate Code	Level of Demand (kW)	Level of Usage (kWh)	Current Bill (January 1, 2018)	Base Distribution Increase / (Decrease)	Decoupling Rider Increase / (Decrease)	Distribution Investment Rider	Current Total Bill Increase / (Decrease)	Proposed Total Bill	% Change	Current Bill at time of DRC Filing
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I) = Sum (F) to (H)	(J) = (E) + (I)	(K) = (I) / (E)	(L)
1	PRI	5	1,000	\$179.22	\$149.76	(\$0.23)	\$12.73	\$162.26	\$341.48	90.54%	\$225.82
2		5	2,500	\$265.32	\$149.76	(\$0.57)	\$12.73	\$161.92	\$427.24	61.03%	\$307.73
3		10	5,000	\$432.68	\$152.39	(\$1.13)	\$13.32	\$164.58	\$597.26	38.04%	\$509.12
4		25	7,500	\$649.33	\$160.37	(\$1.70)	\$15.11	\$173.78	\$823.11	26.76%	\$841.87
5		25	10,000	\$792.07	\$160.37	(\$2.27)	\$15.11	\$173.21	\$965.28	21.87%	\$977.61
6		50	20,000	\$1,483.39	\$173.62	(\$4.53)	\$18.08	\$187.17	\$1,670.56	12.62%	\$1,846.07
7		50	30,000	\$2,048.73	\$173.62	(\$6.80)	\$18.08	\$184.90	\$2,233.63	9.03%	\$2,383.48
8		200	50,000	\$3,918.53	\$253.20	(\$11.34)	\$35.90	\$277.76	\$4,196.29	7.09%	\$5,427.90
9		200	75,000	\$5,331.88	\$253.20	(\$17.00)	\$35.90	\$272.10	\$5,603.98	5.10%	\$6,771.40
10		200	100,000	\$6,745.22	\$253.20	(\$22.67)	\$35.90	\$266.43	\$7,011.65	3.95%	\$8,114.89
11		500	250,000	\$16,703.54	\$412.30	(\$56.68)	\$71.55	\$427.17	\$17,130.71	2.56%	\$20,115.13
12		1,000	500,000	\$33,300.67	\$677.40	(\$113.35)	\$130.96	\$695.01	\$33,995.68	2.09%	\$40,115.42
13		2,500	1,000,000	\$68,958.63	\$1,472.86	(\$226.70)	\$309.19	\$1,555.35	\$70,513.98	2.26%	\$86,393.72
14		5,000	2,500,000	\$166,077.94	\$2,798.60	(\$566.75)	\$606.25	\$2,838.10	\$168,916.04	1.71%	\$197,246.26
15		10,000	5,000,000	\$332,049.54	\$5,450.08	(\$1,133.50)	\$1,200.36	\$5,516.94	\$337,566.48	1.66%	\$392,942.69
16		25,000	7,500,000	\$547,293.85	\$13,404.60	(\$1,700.25)	\$2,982.71	\$14,687.06	\$561,980.91	2.68%	\$719,945.01
17		25,000	10,000,000	\$688,629.10	\$13,404.60	(\$2,267.00)	\$2,982.71	\$14,120.31	\$702,749.41	2.05%	\$849,988.51
18		50,000	15,000,000	\$1,094,481.32	\$26,662.01	(\$3,400.50)	\$5,953.28	\$29,214.79	\$1,123,696.11	2.67%	\$1,438,340.18

The Dayton Power and Light Company
Case No 15-1830-EL-AIR

Typical Bill Comparison
Primary Substation

Exhibit A
Page 8 of 11
Witness Responsible: Sharon R. Schroder

Work Paper Reference No(s): None

Line No.	Rate Code	Level of Demand (kW)	Level of Demand (kVar)	Level of Usage (kWh)	Current Bill (January 1, 2018)	Base Distribution Increase / (Decrease)	Decoupling Rider Increase / (Decrease)	Distribution Investment Rider	Current Total Bill Increase / (Decrease)	Proposed Total Bill	% Change	Current Bill at time of DRC Filing
(A)	(B)	(C)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I) = Sum (F) to (H)	(J) = (E) + (I)	(K) = (I) / (E)	(L)
1	PRI-SUB	3,000	1,453	1,000,000	\$88,393.14	\$869.76	(\$200.60)	\$130.62	\$799.78	\$69,192.92	1.17%	\$89,251.78
2		5,000	2,422	2,000,000	\$132,547.75	\$1,253.94	(\$401.20)	\$202.21	\$1,054.95	\$133,602.70	0.80%	\$164,644.48
3		5,000	2,422	3,000,000	\$188,588.05	\$1,253.94	(\$601.80)	\$202.21	\$854.35	\$189,442.40	0.45%	\$215,588.68
4		10,000	4,843	4,000,000	\$264,914.14	\$2,214.42	(\$802.40)	\$381.19	\$1,793.21	\$266,707.35	0.68%	\$327,664.10
5		10,000	4,843	5,000,000	\$320,954.44	\$2,214.42	(\$1,003.00)	\$381.19	\$1,592.61	\$322,547.05	0.50%	\$378,588.30
6		15,000	7,265	6,000,000	\$397,280.54	\$3,174.89	(\$1,203.60)	\$560.18	\$2,531.47	\$399,812.01	0.64%	\$490,683.75
7		15,000	7,265	7,000,000	\$453,320.84	\$3,174.89	(\$1,404.20)	\$560.18	\$2,330.87	\$455,651.71	0.51%	\$541,607.95
8		15,000	7,265	8,000,000	\$509,361.14	\$3,174.89	(\$1,604.80)	\$560.18	\$2,130.27	\$511,491.41	0.42%	\$592,532.15
9		25,000	12,108	9,000,000	\$605,973.09	\$5,095.85	(\$1,805.40)	\$918.14	\$4,208.59	\$610,181.68	0.69%	\$765,798.85
10		25,000	12,108	10,000,000	\$662,013.39	\$5,095.85	(\$2,006.00)	\$918.14	\$4,007.99	\$666,021.38	0.61%	\$816,723.05
11		30,000	14,530	12,500,000	\$822,399.93	\$6,056.33	(\$2,507.50)	\$1,097.12	\$4,645.95	\$827,045.88	0.56%	\$1,005,204.78
12		30,000	14,530	15,000,000	\$962,500.68	\$6,056.33	(\$3,009.00)	\$1,097.12	\$4,144.45	\$966,645.13	0.43%	\$1,132,515.28
13		50,000	24,216	17,500,000	\$1,183,744.62	\$9,898.22	(\$3,510.50)	\$1,813.05	\$8,200.77	\$1,191,945.39	0.69%	\$1,504,510.75
14		50,000	24,216	20,000,000	\$1,323,845.37	\$9,898.22	(\$4,012.00)	\$1,813.05	\$7,699.27	\$1,331,544.64	0.58%	\$1,631,821.25
15		50,000	24,216	25,000,000	\$1,604,046.87	\$9,898.22	(\$5,015.00)	\$1,813.05	\$6,896.27	\$1,610,743.14	0.42%	\$1,886,442.25

The Dayton Power and Light Company
Case No 15-1830-EL-AIR

Typical Bill Comparison
High Voltage Service

Exhibit A
Page 9 of 11
Witness Responsible: Sharon R. Schroder

Work Paper Reference No(s): None

Line No.	Rate Code	Level of Demand (kW)	Level of Usage (kWh)	Current Bill (January 1, 2018)	Base Distribution Increase / (Decrease)	Decoupling Rider Increase / (Decrease)	Distribution Investment Rider	Current Total Bill Increase / (Decrease)	Proposed Total Bill	% Change	Current Bill at time of DRC Filing
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I) = Sum (F) to (H)	(J) = (E) + (I)	(K) = (I) / (E)	(L)
1	HV	1,000	500,000	\$31,663.17	\$854.11	(\$97.00)	\$56.34	\$813.45	\$32,476.62	2.57%	\$38,338.46
2		2,000	1,000,000	\$63,045.00	\$854.11	(\$194.00)	\$56.34	\$716.45	\$63,761.45	1.14%	\$76,099.47
3		3,000	1,500,000	\$94,426.87	\$854.11	(\$291.00)	\$56.34	\$619.45	\$95,046.32	0.66%	\$113,286.84
4		3,500	2,000,000	\$124,125.52	\$854.11	(\$388.00)	\$56.34	\$522.45	\$124,647.97	0.42%	\$144,392.15
5		5,000	2,500,000	\$157,190.51	\$854.11	(\$485.00)	\$56.34	\$425.45	\$157,615.96	0.27%	\$187,661.49
6		7,500	3,000,000	\$193,621.76	\$854.11	(\$582.00)	\$56.34	\$328.45	\$193,950.21	0.17%	\$243,094.79
7		7,500	4,000,000	\$249,652.86	\$854.11	(\$776.00)	\$56.34	\$134.45	\$249,787.31	0.05%	\$293,141.49
8		10,000	5,000,000	\$314,099.66	\$854.11	(\$970.00)	\$56.34	(\$59.55)	\$314,040.11	-0.02%	\$373,598.14
9		10,000	6,000,000	\$370,130.76	\$854.11	(\$1,164.00)	\$56.34	(\$253.55)	\$369,877.21	-0.07%	\$423,644.84
10		12,500	7,000,000	\$434,577.57	\$854.11	(\$1,358.00)	\$56.34	(\$447.55)	\$434,130.02	-0.10%	\$504,101.49
11		12,500	8,000,000	\$490,608.67	\$854.11	(\$1,552.00)	\$56.34	(\$641.55)	\$489,967.12	-0.13%	\$554,148.19
12		15,000	9,000,000	\$555,055.47	\$854.11	(\$1,746.00)	\$56.34	(\$835.55)	\$554,219.92	-0.15%	\$634,604.85
13		20,000	10,000,000	\$627,917.98	\$854.11	(\$1,940.00)	\$56.34	(\$1,029.55)	\$626,888.43	-0.16%	\$745,471.44
14		40,000	20,000,000	\$1,255,554.67	\$854.11	(\$3,880.00)	\$56.34	(\$2,969.55)	\$1,252,585.12	-0.24%	\$1,489,218.11
15		60,000	30,000,000	\$1,883,191.30	\$854.11	(\$5,820.00)	\$56.34	(\$4,909.55)	\$1,878,281.75	-0.26%	\$2,232,964.74

The Dayton Power and Light Company
Case No 15-1830-EL-AIR

Typical Bill Comparison
Private Outdoor Lighting

Exhibit A
Page 10 of 11
Witness Responsible: Sharon R. Schroder

Work Paper Reference No(s): None

Line No.	Rate Code	Level of Demand (kW)	Level of Usage (kWh)	Current Bill (January 1, 2018)	Base Distribution Increase / (Decrease)	Decoupling Rider Increase / (Decrease)	Distribution Investment Rider	Current Total Bill Increase / (Decrease)	Proposed Total Bill	% Change	Current Bill at time of DRC Filing
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I) = Sum (F) to (H)	(J) = (E) + (I)	(K) = (I) / (E)	(L)
1	POL	7000 Mercury	75	\$11.08	\$	4.94	(\$0.07)	\$0.51	\$16.46	48.55%	\$10.91
3		21000 Mercury	154	\$22.55	\$	(0.57)	(\$0.15)	\$0.51	\$22.34	-0.93%	\$21.33
5		2500 Incandescent	64	\$9.50	\$	5.71	(\$0.06)	\$0.51	\$15.66	64.80%	\$10.04
7		7000 Fluorescent	66	\$9.78	\$	5.57	(\$0.06)	\$0.51	\$15.80	61.52%	\$11.07
9		4000 Mercury	43	\$6.45	\$	7.17	(\$0.04)	\$0.51	\$14.09	118.46%	\$10.10
11		9500 High Pressure Sod.	39	\$8.67	\$	4.64	(\$0.04)	\$0.51	\$13.78	58.99%	\$8.80
13		28000 High Pressure Sod.	96	\$13.22	\$	4.37	(\$0.09)	\$0.51	\$18.01	36.26%	\$12.67

The Dayton Power and Light Company
Case No 15-1830-EL-AIR

Typical Bill Comparison
Street Lighting

Exhibit A
Page 11 of 11
Witness Responsible: Sharon R. Schroder

Work Paper Reference No(s): None

Line No.	Rate Code	Level of Demand (kW)	Level of Usage (kWh)	Current Bill (January 1, 2018)	Base Distribution Increase / (Decrease)	Decoupling Rider Increase / (Decrease)	Distribution Investment Rider	Current Total Bill Increase / (Decrease)	Proposed Total Bill	% Change	Current Bill at time of DRC Filing
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I) = Sum (F) to (H)	(J) = (E) + (I)	(K) = (I) / (E)	(L)
1	SL	0	50	\$7.70	\$6.73	(\$0.02)	\$0.47	\$7.18	\$14.88	93.25%	\$15.92
2		0	100	\$11.38	\$6.85	(\$0.03)	\$0.51	\$7.33	\$18.71	64.41%	\$19.44
3		0	200	\$18.74	\$7.11	(\$0.07)	\$0.58	\$7.62	\$26.36	40.66%	\$26.45
4		0	400	\$33.44	\$7.61	(\$0.13)	\$0.74	\$8.22	\$41.66	24.58%	\$40.47
5		0	500	\$40.81	\$7.86	(\$0.17)	\$0.81	\$8.50	\$49.31	20.83%	\$47.49
6		0	750	\$59.18	\$8.49	(\$0.25)	\$1.00	\$9.24	\$68.42	15.61%	\$65.02
7		0	1,000	\$77.57	\$9.13	(\$0.33)	\$1.19	\$9.99	\$87.56	12.88%	\$82.55
8		0	1,200	\$92.28	\$9.63	(\$0.40)	\$1.35	\$10.58	\$102.86	11.47%	\$96.56
9		0	1,400	\$106.98	\$10.14	(\$0.46)	\$1.50	\$11.18	\$118.16	10.45%	\$110.58
10		0	1,600	\$121.69	\$10.64	(\$0.53)	\$1.65	\$11.76	\$133.45	9.66%	\$124.61
11		0	2,000	\$151.10	\$11.65	(\$0.66)	\$1.96	\$12.95	\$164.05	8.57%	\$152.65
12		0	2,500	\$187.66	\$12.91	(\$0.83)	\$2.34	\$14.42	\$202.08	7.68%	\$187.50
13		0	3,000	\$224.19	\$14.18	(\$1.00)	\$2.72	\$15.90	\$240.09	7.09%	\$222.33
14		0	4,000	\$297.25	\$16.70	(\$1.33)	\$3.49	\$18.86	\$316.11	6.34%	\$291.95
15		0	5,000	\$370.33	\$19.23	(\$1.66)	\$4.25	\$21.82	\$392.15	5.89%	\$361.63

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

6/26/2018 4:48:18 PM

in

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

Summary: Testimony Testimony of Sharon R. Schroder in Support of the Stipulation and Recommendation electronically filed by Mr. Jeffrey S Sharkey on behalf of The Dayton Power and Light Company