

BEFORE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of ) Case No. 08-1094-EL-SSO  
The Dayton Power and Light Company for )  
Approval of Its Electric Security Plan. )

In the Matter of the Application of ) Case No. 08-1095-EL-ATA  
The Dayton Power and Light Company for )  
Approval of Revised Tariffs. )

In the Matter of the Application of ) Case No. 08-1096-EL-AAM  
The Dayton Power and Light Company for )  
Approval of Certain Accounting Authority )  
Pursuant to Section 4905.13, Revised Code. )

In the Matter of the Application of ) Case No. 08-1097-EL-UNC  
The Dayton Power and Light Company for )  
Approval of Its Amended Corporate )  
Separation Plan. )

ENTRY

The attorney examiner finds:

- (1) Dayton Power and Light Company (DP&L) is a public utility as defined in Section 4905.02, Revised Code, and, as such, is subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission.
- (2) On October 10, 2008, DP&L filed an application for a standard service offer (SSO) pursuant to Section 4928.141, Revised Code. As part of its filing, DP&L filed its application for approval of its Customer Conservation and Energy Management (CCEM) programs. The CCEM application included a combined business case for DP&L's Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) and Smart Grid proposals.
- (3) By Opinion and Order issued on June 24, 2009, the Commission approved a stipulation that, *inter alia*, required DP&L to develop independent business cases demonstrating a positive cost-benefit analysis for its AMI and Smart Grid proposals. The stipulation

required DP&L to consult with interested signatory parties about the costs and benefits of DP&L's AMI and Smart Grid business cases. The business cases that demonstrate a positive cost-benefit analysis were to be filed by September 1, 2009.


- (4) In order to comply with the Commission's June 24, 2009 Opinion and Order, DP&L filed the requisite business cases for its AMI and Smart Grid proposals on August 4, 2009. This filing was amended on August 13, 2009, and September 15, 2009.
- (5) On October 22, 2009, a technical conference was held in this matter.
- (6) By entry issued November 4, 2009, a procedural schedule for the filing of comments and reply comments was established. The November 4, 2009, entry required that comments about DP&L's revisions be filed by November 24, 2009, while setting December 1, 2009, as the deadline for the filing of reply comments.
- (7) On November 12, 2009, DP&L filed a motion for a three-day extension of time in which to file reply comments. DP&L's motion requests that December 4, 2009, be set as the deadline for the filing of reply comments. In its motion, DP&L notes that the Thanksgiving holiday falls between the deadlines for filing comments and reply comments. DP&L argues that the intervening holiday leaves parties only two full working days in which to prepare reply comments. Based on the fact that the deadlines for filing comments and reply comments are approaching and the fact that DP&L is requesting only a three-day extension, DP&L also requests expedited consideration of its motion.
- (8) On November 19, 2009, Staff filed a motion requesting that the deadline for the filing of initial comments be extended until December 15, 2009, and that the deadline for filing reply comments be extended until December 22, 2009. Staff states that the additional time is needed in order to allow DP&L to respond to currently pending discovery requests and for planned additional discovery to be completed.
- (9) The attorney examiner finds that the motions for extensions are reasonable and should be granted. Accordingly, the procedural schedule for this proceeding should be revised as follows:
  - (a) Comments should be filed by December 15, 2009.
  - (b) Reply comments should be filed by December 22, 2009.

It is, therefore,

ORDERED, That the revised procedural schedule for this proceeding be adopted as set forth in Finding (9). It is, further,

ORDERED, That a copy of this entry be served upon all parties of record.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

  
By: Gregory A. Price  
Attorney Examiner

/dah <sup>FJD</sup>

Entered in the Journal

NOV 19 2009



Renee J. Jenkins  
Secretary