

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the 2018 Review of the)
Distribution Investment Rider Contained) Case No. 19-0439-EL-RDR
in the Tariff of The Dayton Power and)
Light Company.)

**MOTION TO INTERVENE
BY
THE OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL**

The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel ("OCC") moves to intervene in this case where an audit will be performed on the distribution investment rider costs for the protection of consumers who are asked to pay such charges on their electric bills.¹ OCC is filing on behalf of the 460,000 residential utility customers of The Dayton Power and Light Company ("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.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Weston (0016973)
Ohio Consumers' Counsel

/s/ Terry L. Etter

Terry L. Etter (0067445), Counsel of Record
Ambrosia Logsdon (0096598)
Amy Botschner-O'Brien (0074423)
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

65 East State Street, 7th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4213
Telephone [Etter]: (614) 466-7964
Telephone [Logsdon]: (614) 466-1292
Telephone [O'Brien]: (614) 466-9575
terry.etter@occ.ohio.gov
ambrosia.logsdon@occ.ohio.gov
amy.botschner.obrien@occ.ohio.gov
(Will accept service via email)

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the 2018 Review of the)
Distribution Investment Rider Contained) Case No. 19-0439-EL-RDR
in the Tariff of The Dayton Power and)
Light Company.)

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

This case examines whether consumers have paid more than they should through DP&L's distribution investment rider. Under the distribution investment rider customers are charged for distribution capital investment incurred by DP&L since September 30, 2015,² not counting distribution plant investment collected through base rates or other riders. OCC has authority under law to represent the interests of all 460,000 residential utility customers of DP&L, pursuant to R.C. Chapter 4911.

R.C. 4903.221 provides, in part, that any person "who may be adversely affected" by a PUCO proceeding is entitled to seek intervention in that proceeding. The interests of Ohio's residential customers may be "adversely affected" by this case, especially if the customers were unrepresented in a proceeding affecting costs that they are charged through a rider on their electric bills. Thus, this element of the intervention standard in R.C. 4903.221 is satisfied.

R.C. 4903.221(B) requires the PUCO to consider the following criteria in ruling on motions to intervene:

- (1) The nature and extent of the prospective intervenor's interest;

² This is the date certain established in DP&L's last rate case. *See* Case No. 15-1580-EL-AIR, Opinion and Order (September 26, 2018), ¶3.

- (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 proceedings;
- (4) Whether the prospective intervenor will significantly contribute to 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 of in this case involving a prudency audit of costs that are charged to customers through a rider on their bills. This interest is different from that of any other party and especially different from 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 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 involving an audit of costs that are charged to customers on their electric bills.

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 (“Court”) 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.³

OCC meets the criteria set forth in R.C. 4903.221 and 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.

Respectfully submitted,

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

Bruce Weston (0016973)
Ohio Consumers' Counsel

/s/ Terry L. Etter

Terry L. Etter (0067445), Counsel of Record
Ambrosia Logsdon (0096598)
Amy Botschner-O'Brien (0074423)
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

65 East State Street, 7th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4213
Telephone [Etter]: (614) 466-7964
Telephone [Logsdon]: (614) 466-1292
Telephone [O'Brien]: (614) 466-9575
terry.etter@occ.ohio.gov
ambrosia.logsdon@occ.ohio.gov
amy.botschner.obrien@occ.ohio.gov
(Will accept service via email)

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 5th day of March 2019.

/s/ Terry L. Etter
Terry L. Etter
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

SERVICE LIST

john.jones@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

michael.schuler@aes.com

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

3/5/2019 4:23:15 PM

in

Case No(s). 19-0439-EL-RDR

Summary: Motion Motion to Intervene by The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel electronically filed by Ms. Jamie Williams on behalf of Etter, Terry Mr.