**BEFORE**

**THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| In the Matter of the Application of Dayton Power and Light Company for Approval to Establish a Legacy Generation Rider. | ))) | Case No.19-2133-EL-ATA |

**MOTION TO INTERVENE**

**BY**

**THE OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMERS’ COUNSEL**

The Office of the Ohio Consumers’ Counsel (“OCC”) moves to intervene where Dayton Power and Light Company (“DP&L”) seeks to charge customers, under recently-passed House Bill 6, to subsidize two uneconomic coal plants, one in Indiana and one in Ohio.[[1]](#footnote-2) DP&L projects it will charge residential customers about $2.8 million in coal plant subsidies in 2020.[[2]](#footnote-3)

OCC is filing on behalf of the 465,000 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.
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## MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

With this case (and the related cases for Ohio’s other electric distribution utilities), the House Bill 6 saga continues. Unfortunately for consumers, this is the part of the saga where they actually start paying the House Bill 6 coal plant subsidies. DP&L residential customers will pay 50 cents each per month in 2020, a total of about $2.8 million in subsidies. The competitive wholesale electric market was not allowed to work. Instead, the government picked winners and losers. The winners are big-business utilities, and the losers are Bob and Betty Buckeye, the consumers that OCC represents (as well as other power plant owners, who now have to try to compete in the market against these propped-up power plants).

OCC has authority under law to represent the interests of all the 465,000 residential utility customers of DP&L, under 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 where they will be charged millions of dollars per year in coal plant subsidies under House Bill 6. 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) 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 the residential customers of DP&L in this case involving charges to monopoly utility customers to subsidize unregulated power plants. 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 shareholders.

Second, OCC’s advocacy for residential customers will include, among other things, advancing the position that customers should not pay any more than what is absolutely required under House Bill 6 and that any charges to consumers to bail out coal power plants be calculated accurately and fairly in a way that does not force residential customers to shoulder an unfair portion of the burden. OCC’s position is therefore directly related to the merits of this case, which 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 where customers will be charged millions of dollars per year to subsidize unregulated, dirty old coal power plants.

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), which OCC already has addressed, and which 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]](#footnote-4)

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.
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**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 17th day of December 2019.

 */s/ Christopher Healey*

 Christopher Healey

 Assistant Consumers’ Counsel

The PUCO’s e-filing system will electronically serve notice of the filing of this document on the following parties:

**SERVICE LIST**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| John.jones@ohioattorneygeneral.gov | Michael.schuler@aes.com |
|  |  |

1. *See* R.C. Chapter 4911, R.C. 4903.221 and Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-11. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. 50 cents per customer per month, for each of about 465,000 residential customers. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. *See Ohio Consumers’ Counsel v. Pub. Util. Comm*., 111 Ohio St.3d 384, 2006-Ohio-5853, ¶¶13-20. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)