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# INTRODUCTION

 This case arises out of an application filed by The Dayton Power and Light Company (“DP&L”) to recover costs incurred to repair damage to its system from storms that struck in 2008, 2011, and 2012. For 2011 and 2012, DP&L sought operation and maintenance (“O&M”) expenses for all major storms including related capital expenditures. For 2011 only, DP&L sought accounting authority to defer O&M expenses at its long-term debt rate. For 2008, it sought to recover O&M expenses for certain storms including related capital expenditures for Hurricane Ike. Finally, DP&L sought authority to establish a storm cost recovery rider to recover major-storm costs going forward. In total, DP&L sought recovery of $64,646,644.[[1]](#footnote-1)

 By entry, the Commission explained that this was not the appropriate proceeding for DP&L to recover capital expenditures, which reduced the amount at issue to $37,021,654 (i.e., $64,646,644 - $27,624,990).[[2]](#footnote-2) Staff later responded to DP&L’s application with a Commission-ordered audit report.[[3]](#footnote-3) Staff’s report recommended that, if recovery is authorized for all storms identified in the application, DP&L should be permitted to recover $23,407,216.[[4]](#footnote-4)

 During this litigation, the parties—DP&L, Staff, Kroger, and OCC— engaged in a series of settlement discussions aimed at resolving this case. These discussions led to a stipulation signed by DP&L, Staff, and Kroger that recommends recovery of $22.3M over one year, with no carrying charges accruing during recovery.[[5]](#footnote-5) The stipulation further recommends that DP&L may seek recovery of capital expenditures in a future distribution rate case.[[6]](#footnote-6) OCC opposes the stipulation. The question for the Commission is whether the stipula­tion is reasonable and should be adopted. For the reasons set forth below, Staff urges the Commission to adopt the stipulation.

# ARGUMENT

 Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-30(A) authorizes two or more parties to enter into a stipula­tion. Though not bound by a stipulation, the Commission should give it substan­tial weight.[[7]](#footnote-7) The Commission conducts a three-factor inquiry to assess whether a stipula­tion is reasonable and should be adopted.[[8]](#footnote-8) The three factors are:

1. Whether the stipulation is a product of serious bargaining among capable, knowledgeable parties;
2. Whether the stipulation, as a package, benefits ratepayers and the public inter­est; and
3. Whether the stipulation violates any important regulatory principal or prac­tice.

The Ohio Supreme Court has endorsed this inquiry.[[9]](#footnote-9) The three factors will now be addressed.

## A. The stipulation is a product of serious bargaining among capable, knowledgeable parties.

 The settlement discussions were marked by an arm’s-length negotiation process. All parties were represented by able counsel and skilled technical advisers, and had ample opportunities to participate in the settlement process.[[10]](#footnote-10) During the pendency of the negotiations, parties circulated proposals to one another which they thought would best achieve their respective interests and objectives. In short, everyone had a seat at the bargaining table; no party was excluded.[[11]](#footnote-11) And even though OCC did not sign the stipulation, this does not mean the stipulation is per se unreasonable. “The Commission has repeatedly determined that [it] will not require any single party, including OCC, to agree to a stipulation, in order to meet the first prong of the three-prong test.”[[12]](#footnote-12)

## B. The stipulation, as a package, benefits ratepayers and the public interest.

 Ratepayers and the public interest benefit from this stipulation. Initially, DP&L came in with a request to recover $64,646,644 in storm-related costs.[[13]](#footnote-13) The Commission then reduced this amount to $37,021,654 by denying DP&L’s request to recover capital expenditures.[[14]](#footnote-14) In its audit report, Staff then recommended that, if recovery is authorized for all storms identified in the application, DP&L should be permitted to recover $23,407,216, adjusted accordingly for carrying charges.[[15]](#footnote-15)

The amount of recovery recommended in the stipulation, $22.3M, is less than DP&L’s request and also less than Staff’s recommended amount.[[16]](#footnote-16) The stipulation also prohibits DP&L from accruing carrying charges on this amount during recovery, further mitigating bill impacts.[[17]](#footnote-17) The reduction to what DP&L asked for and what Staff recommended strongly demonstrates the benefits of this stipulation.[[18]](#footnote-18)

## C. The stipulation does not violate any important regulatory princi­pal or practice.

 The stipulation does not violate any important regulatory principle or practice. The stipulation recommends recovery of DP&L’s prudently-incurred costs.[[19]](#footnote-19) Permitting recovery of prudently-incurred costs is a longstanding principle in the field of utility regulation, which the Commission recently followed in AEP’s storm-cost-recovery case.[[20]](#footnote-20) By providing for recovery of DP&L’s storm costs, the stipulation creates a reasonable expectation that DP&L will recover its storm costs in the future and provides a further incentive for it to “get the lights back on” as expeditiously as possible.[[21]](#footnote-21) This benefits DP&L and it benefits customers.

# CONCLUSION

 For the foregoing reasons the stipulation should be adopted.
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