

**BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of )  
The Dayton Power and Light Company ) Case No. 12-426-EL-SSO  
for Approval of Its Market Rate Offer. )

In the Matter of the Application of )  
The Dayton Power and Light Company ) Case No. 12-427-EL-ATA  
for Approval of Revised Tariffs. )

In the Matter of the Application of )  
The Dayton Power and Light Company ) Case No. 12-428-EL-AAM  
for Approval of Certain Accounting )  
Authority. )

In the Matter of the Application of )  
The Dayton Power and Light Company ) Case No. 12-429-EL-WVR  
for Waiver of Certain Commission Rules. )

In the Matter of the Application of )  
The Dayton Power and Light Company ) Case No. 12-672-EL-RDR  
to Establish Tariff Riders. )

---

**JOINT MOVANTS'  
MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO  
THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY'S WAIVER REQUEST**

---

**November 21, 2012**

**BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of The Dayton Power and Light Company for Approval of Its Market Rate Offer.	) ) )	Case No. 12-426-EL-SSO
---	-------------	------------------------

In the Matter of the Application of The Dayton Power and Light Company for Approval of Revised Tariffs.	) ) )	Case No. 12-427-EL-ATA
---	-------------	------------------------

In the Matter of the Application of The Dayton Power and Light Company for Approval of Certain Accounting Authority.	) ) ) )	Case No. 12-428-EL-AAM
---	------------------	------------------------

In the Matter of the Application of The Dayton Power and Light Company for Waiver of Certain Commission Rules.	) ) )	Case No. 12-429-EL-WVR
--	-------------	------------------------

In the Matter of the Application of The Dayton Power and Light Company to Establish Tariff Riders.	) ) )	Case No. 12-672-EL-RDR
--	-------------	------------------------

---

**JOINT MOVANTS'<sup>1</sup>  
MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO  
THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY'S WAIVER REQUEST**

---

**I. BACKGROUND**

On October 5, 2012, the Dayton Power and Light Company ("DP&L") filed an application ("Application") to establish a standard service offer ("SSO") in the form of an electric security plan ("ESP"). DP&L's Application, however, failed to comply with the standard filing requirements for an ESP as established by Rule 4901:1-35-03, Ohio

---

<sup>1</sup> The Joint Movants filing this pleading are Honda of America Manufacturing, Inc. ("Honda"), Industrial Energy Users-Ohio ("IEU-Ohio"), the OMA Energy Group ("OMAEG"), the Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy ("OPAE"), SolarVision, LLC and Wal-Mart Stores East, LP and Sam's East, Inc.

Administrative Code (“O.A.C.”). Accordingly, on October 22, 2012, a joint motion<sup>2</sup> was filed seeking an order from the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (“Commission”) directing DP&L to comply with the standard filing requirements and requested the Commission stay the procedural schedule until DP&L complies.

DP&L responded on November 6, 2012 acknowledging that its Application was not in compliance with several standard filing requirements.<sup>3</sup> DP&L stated that it would remedy some of the violations identified by the joint motion at some point in the future through a supplemental filing. On November 8, 2012, DP&L filed its supplement to its Application (“Supplement”).<sup>4</sup>

Relevant to this pleading, the Supplement also requests a waiver of Commission Rule 4901:1-36-04, O.A.C., which requires an electric distribution utility’s (“EDU”) transmission cost recovery rider (“TCRR”) to be fully bypassable. Although Rule 4901:1-36:02(B), O.A.C., allows the Commission to waive any requirement of Chapter 4901:1-36, O.A.C., for good cause, DP&L failed to offer any reason to justify a waiver of the rule (instead citing to previously filed testimony).<sup>5</sup> Moreover, as discussed below, DP&L cannot demonstrate good cause exists to waive this requirement.

---

<sup>2</sup> The parties to the October 22, 2012 joint motion included Industrial Energy Users-Ohio (“IEU-Ohio”), Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy (“OPAE”), The Kroger Company (“Kroger”), the Ohio Energy Group (“OEG”), Honda of America Manufacturing, Inc. (“Honda”), SolarVision, LLC (“SolarVision”), the OMA Energy Group (“OMAEG”) and the Office of the Ohio Consumers’ Counsel (“OCC”).

<sup>3</sup> See The Dayton Power and Light Company’s Memorandum in Opposition to the Joint Movants’ Motion Seeking an Order Directing the Dayton Power and Light Company to Comply with the Standard Filing Requirements for an Electric Security Plan and Memorandum in Support and Memorandum Contra the Dayton Power and Light Company’s Request for Waivers at 2 (Nov. 6, 2012) (refiled with docketing on Nov. 8, 2012) (hereinafter “DP&L Memorandum in Opposition”).

<sup>4</sup> The Dayton Power and Light Company’s Supplement to its ESP Application (Nov. 8, 2012) (“Supplement”).

<sup>5</sup> Supplement at 2.

## II. ARGUMENT

### A. **DP&L's request for a waiver of Rule 4901:1-36-04, O.A.C., should be denied because DP&L has not and cannot demonstrate good cause for a waiver of the rule.**

Although the Commission may waive any requirement in Chapter 4901:1-36, O.A.C., the Commission may only do so upon "good cause shown."<sup>6</sup> DP&L's Supplement, however, fails to offer any reason for a waiver of Rule 4901:1-36-04, O.A.C. Instead, to support its request for a waiver, DP&L simply includes a generic citation to the pre-filed testimony of DP&L witness Hale. For this reason alone, the Commission should deny DP&L's waiver request.

If, however, the Commission decides to undertake DP&L's invitation to search through DP&L's pre-filed testimony for a demonstration of "good cause shown," the Commission will still not find that requisite support. Ms. Hale's testimony does not specifically request or address a waiver of Rule 4901:1-36-04, O.A.C. Rather, her testimony only offers vague and conclusory reasons for establishing the TCRR on a partly non-bypassable basis.

First, Ms. Hale claims that network integration transmission service ("NITS") charges already practically function as non-bypassable charges. According to Ms. Hale's testimony, DP&L currently charges SSO customers NITS charges, while competitive retail electric service ("CRES") providers serving shopping customers in DP&L's territory pay DP&L, through PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. ("PJM"), their share of

---

<sup>6</sup> Rule 4901:1-36-02, O.A.C.

NITS costs.<sup>7</sup> Ms. Hale then extends the costs to be collected on a non-bypassable basis to other cost categories that Ms. Hale describes as non-market based.<sup>8</sup>

Ms. Hale's testimony describing NITS charges as effectively being non-bypassable, which has not been subject to cross-examination, is factually incorrect. Although Ms. Hale is correct that DP&L and CRES providers are assessed NITS charges in the same manner, there is no symmetry between how DP&L and CRES providers recover those costs from customers. For instance, DP&L allocates its annual NITS revenue requirement between customer classes based upon the class's proportional contribution to DP&L's single coincident peak. Once the individual class annual revenue requirement is allocated, for customers served under commercial and industrial rate schedules (e.g., High Voltage, Primary-Substation, Secondary, Primary), this NITS-related revenue requirement is then collected from individual customers based upon a demand charge applied to the customer's maximum monthly billing demand.

Shopping commercial and industrial customers, however, are not required to pay a NITS charge to their CRES provider based upon their maximum monthly billing demand. Because NITS charges are assessed upon CRES providers by PJM on behalf of the customers they are serving, the price that shopping customers pay for NITS is a function of their negotiated price with their CRES supplier. For example, a shopping customer may elect to negotiate an all-in delivery fixed price for generation and transmission with their CRES provider. In such a case, the CRES provider will assume all risk associated with the movement up or down in the rate charged by PJM for NITS.

---

<sup>7</sup> Direct Testimony of Claire E. Hale at 4 (Oct. 5, 2012).

<sup>8</sup> *Id.*

Alternatively, a shopping customer could contract with a CRES provider and agree to pay a price for NITS that reflects their contribution to PJM's single coincident peak. Such an arrangement would be consistent with how PJM determines billing determinants for transmission service and would provide a price signal to the customer to reduce demand during peak load conditions. Thus, although there is symmetry between the rate that PJM charges DP&L and CRES providers for NITS (among other transmission services billed by PJM), there simply will never be symmetry between how DP&L bills non-shopping customers for transmission service and how a CRES provider may bill a customer for transmission service. Taking away a customer's ability to negotiate a pricing structure that is best suited for its individual needs simply is not a benefit to customers.

The only other rationale for making a significant portion of the TCRR non-bypassable is a question and answer on page 5 of Ms. Hale's pre-filed testimony:

**Q. How will the non-bypassable charge TCRR-N benefit customers?**

A. When the Company becomes responsible for these costs for all customers, DP&L removes the requirement for wholesale or retail suppliers to include them in their product. Excluding these costs should lower the generation price that suppliers charge to their customers. Additionally, moving these costs to a non-bypassable charge should cause less variation in the price to compare, making it easier for customers to compare offers from alternative retail electric generation suppliers.

While it is mathematically true that if all other factors are held constant, removing NITS charges from the product bidders are requested to provide in an auction (to establish prices for DP&L's ESP) should result in a lower bid price, this does not necessarily support a conclusion that customers will benefit. First, as discussed at page 25 of the pre-filed testimony of DP&L witness Chambers, the majority (62%) of DP&L

customers are presently shopping. Therefore, as discussed above, these customers pay for NITS transmission service through their CRES provider and there is no evidence to show how forcing shopping customers to pay DP&L for transmission services rather than their CRES providers is a benefit. As discussed previously, it may have a negative effect on some customers by shifting risk to them or preventing them from negotiating with CRES providers to craft solutions to meet their individual needs.

Second, Ms. Hale's testimony fails to demonstrate how a non-bypassable TCRR will stabilize the price-to-compare: all DP&L plans to do is require shopping customers to pay DP&L a cost that they would otherwise pay to their CRES provider. While this will have the effect of lowering the price-to-compare, since the charge is no longer bypassable, it will not lower the amount customers ultimately end up paying. And furthermore, simply removing transmission charges from the calculation of the price-to-compare will not in and of itself stabilize the price-to-compare. The price-to-compare will be largely outside the scope of DP&L's control as it will be largely dictated by the price established by the competitive bid process ("CBP") auctions to establish the ESP rates. And other bypassable charges will continue to fluctuate and alter the price-to-compare as they have in the past. For instance DP&L's FUEL Rider, the Reliability Pricing Model ("RPM") Rider, the bypassable portion of the TCRR, and the Alternative Energy Rider ("AER") will all vary over the term of the ESP (as they are eventually phased out).

Third, DP&L has failed to detail how it plans to ensure that shopping customers do not pay twice for the same transmission services. Customers that are currently taking service from a CRES provider compensate the CRES provider in accordance

with the terms of their contract. DP&L's decision that it wants to bill those shopping customers directly does not change the terms of those customers' contracts with CRES providers; rather, those customers must continue paying their CRES provider an agreed-upon price. For example, a customer who has an all-in price with its CRES provider will continue to pay that all-in price to its CRES provider regardless of whether or not the CRES provider's costs have gone up or down. If these customers then have to pay the non-bypassable TCRR charge to DP&L as well, they will effectively pay for the same transmission service twice. Since the majority of DP&L customers are presently shopping, if those customers have fixed price contracts with their CRES providers, DP&L's proposed change to make NITS a non-bypassable charge could result in a higher overall price for electricity, which is certainly not a benefit.

In summary, DP&L's testimony fails to demonstrate good cause exists for a waiver of Rule 4901:1-36-04, O.A.C. DP&L's waiver request was not accompanied by any supporting rationale for the waiver request. Providing a citation to pre-filed testimony falls well short of demonstrating good cause. And furthermore, the vague rationales for making part of the TCRR non-bypassable contained in Ms. Hale's testimony are either factually incorrect or simply not a benefit to customers; and for some customers could result in unjustly being billed twice for the same service. For these reasons, the Commission should deny DP&L's waiver request.

**B. In any event, the Commission should not grant DP&L's waiver request until after the evidentiary hearing in this proceeding.**

If the Commission does not deny DP&L's waiver request due to its failure to demonstrate good cause, the Commission should not, in any event, grant DP&L's waiver request until after the evidentiary hearing. The factual assertions contained in



Ms. Hale's testimony have not been subjected to the rigors of cross-examination and parties have not been provided an opportunity to present their own evidence on the unreasonableness of DP&L's request. Accordingly, should the Commission not deny DP&L's waiver request outright at this time, it should hold its ruling in abeyance until it issues its final decision in this proceeding.

### **III. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, the Commission should deny DP&L's request for a waiver of Rule 4901:1-36-04, O.A.C., or at least withhold its decision until after the evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Matthew R. Pritchard  
Samuel C. Randazzo  
Frank P. Darr  
Joseph E. Olikier  
Matthew R. Pritchard  
McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC  
21 East State Street, 17th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
sam@mwncmh.com  
fdarr@mwncmh.com  
joliker@mwncmh.com  
mpritichard@mwncmh.com

**ATTORNEYS FOR INDUSTRIAL ENERGY USERS-OHIO**

/s/ Colleen L. Mooney  
Colleen L. Mooney  
Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy  
231 West Lima Street  
Findlay, OH 45839  
cmooney2@columbus.rr.com

**ATTORNEY FOR OHIO PARTNERS FOR AFFORDABLE ENERGY**

/s/ Kimberly W. Bojko  
Kimberly W. Bojko  
CARPENTER LIPPS & LELAND LLP  
280 Plaza, Suite 1300  
280 N. High Street  
Columbus, OH 43215  
bojko@carpenterlipps.com

**ATTORNEY FOR SOLARVISION, LLC**

/s/ Steven M. Sherman  
Steven M. Sherman  
Joshua D. Hague  
Grant E. Chapman  
Krieg DeVault, LLP  
One Indiana Square, Suite 2800  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2079  
ssherman@kdlegal.com  
jhague@kdlegal.com  
gchapman@kdlegal.com

**ATTORNEYS FOR WAL-MART STORES EAST, LP AND SAM'S EAST, INC.**

/s/ M. Anthony Long

M. Anthony Long  
Honda of America Mfg., Inc.  
24000 Honda Parkway  
Marysville, OH 43040  
tony\_long@ham.honda.com

**ATTORNEY FOR HONDA OF AMERICA  
MANUFACTURING, INC.**

/s/ J. Thomas Siwo

J. Thomas Siwo  
Matthew W. Warnock  
BRICKER & ECKLER LLP  
100 South Third Street  
Columbus, OH 43215  
tsiwo@bricker.com  
mwarnock@bricker.com

**ATTORNEYS FOR THE OMA ENERGY GROUP**

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing *Joint Movants' Memorandum in Opposition to The Dayton Power and Light Company's Waiver Request* was served upon the following parties of record this 21<sup>st</sup> day of November 2012, *via* electronic transmission, hand-delivery or first class U.S. mail, postage prepaid.

/s/ Matthew R. Pritchard

Matthew R. Pritchard

Judi L. Sobecki  
The Dayton Power and Light Company  
1065 Woodman Drive  
Dayton, OH 45432  
judi.sobecki@dplinc.com

Charles J. Faruki  
Jeffrey S. Sharkey  
Faruki, Ireland and Cox PLL  
500 Courthouse Plaza, SW  
10 North Ludlow Street  
Dayton, OH 45402  
cfaruki@ficlaw.com  
jsharkey@ficlaw.com

**On Behalf of the Dayton Power and Light Company**

Lisa G. McAlister  
Matthew W. Warnock  
J. Thomas Siwo  
Bricker & Eckler LLP  
100 South Third Street  
Columbus, OH 43215  
lmcAlister@bricker.com  
mwarnock@bricker.com  
tsiwo@bricker.com

**On Behalf of the OMA Energy Group**

Mark A. Whitt  
Andrew J. Campbell  
Whitt Sturtevant LLP  
PNC Plaza, Ste. 2020  
155 East Broad St.  
Columbus, OH 43215  
whitt@whitt-sturtevant.com  
campbell@whitt-sturtevant.com

Vincent Parisi  
Matthew White  
Interstate Gas Supply, Inc.  
6100 Emerald Parkway  
Dublin, OH 43016  
vparisi@igsenergy.com  
mswhite@igsenergy.com

**On Behalf of Interstate Gas Supply, Inc.**

Joseph P. Serio  
Melissa R. Yost  
Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel  
10 West Broad St., Ste. 1800  
Columbus, OH 43215-3485  
serio@occ.state.oh.us  
yost@occ.state.oh.us

**On Behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel**

Amy B. Spiller  
Jeanne W. Kingery  
139 East Fourth Street  
1303-Main  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
Amy.spiller@duke-energy.com  
Jeanne.kingery@duke-energy.com

Philip B. Sineneng  
Thompson Hine LLP  
41 S. High Street, Suite 1700  
Columbus, OH 43215  
Philip.Sineneng@ThompsonHine.com

**On Behalf of Duke Energy Retail Sales, LLC and Duke Energy Commercial Asset Management, Inc.**

Robert A. McMahon  
Eberly McMahon, LLC  
2321 Kemper Lane, Ste. 100  
Cincinnati, OH 45206  
bmcMahon@emh-law.com

Rocco D'Ascenzo  
Elizabeth Watts  
139 East Fourth Street  
1303-Main  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
Elizabeth.Watts@duke-energy.com  
Rocco.D'Ascenzo@duke-energy.com

**On Behalf of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.**

David F. Boehm  
Michael L. Kurtz  
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry  
36 East 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Ste. 1510  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
dboehm@BKLLawfirm.com  
mkurtz@BKLLawfirm.com

**On Behalf of Ohio Energy Group.**

M. Anthony Long  
Honda of America Mfg., Inc.  
24000 Honda Parkway  
Marysville, OH 43040  
tony\_long@ham.honda.com

**On Behalf of Honda of America  
Manufacturing, Inc.**

Mark A. Hayden  
FirstEnergy Service Company  
76 South Main Street  
Akron, OH 44308  
haydenm@firstenergycorp.com

James F. Lang  
Laura C. McBride  
N. Trevor Alexander  
Calfee, Halter & Grisswold LLP  
1400 KeyBank Center  
800 Superior Avenue  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
jlang@calfee.com  
lmcbride@calfee.com  
talexander@calfee.com

David A.  
Jones Day  
North Point  
901 Lakeside Avenue  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
dakutik@jonesday.com

Allison E. Haedt  
Jones Day  
325 John H. McConnell Blvd., Ste. 600  
PO Box 165017  
Columbus, OH 43216-5017  
aehaedt@jonesday.com

**On Behalf of FirstEnergy Solutions Corp.**

Jay E. Jadwin  
155 W. Nationwide Blvd., Ste. 500  
Columbus, OH 43215  
jejadwin@aep.com

**On Behalf of AEP Retail Energy Partners LLC**

Richard L. Sites  
155 E. Broad Street, 15<sup>th</sup> Flr.  
Columbus, OH 43215-3620  
ricks@ohanet.org

Thomas J. O'Brien  
Bricker & Eckler LLP  
100 S. Third St.  
Columbus, OH 43215-4291  
tobrien@bricker.com

**On Behalf of Ohio Hospital Association**

Joseph M. Clark  
Direct Energy  
6641 North High Street, Suite 200  
Worthington, OH 43085  
jmclark@directenergy.com

Christopher L. Miller  
Gregory H. Dunn  
Asim Z. Haque  
Alan G. Starkoff  
Ice Miller LLP  
250 West Street  
Columbus, OH 43215  
christopher.miller@icemiller.com  
gregory.dunn@icemiller.com  
asim.haque@icemiller.com  
alan.starkoff@icemiller.com

**On Behalf of Direct Energy Services, LLC  
and Direct Energy Business, LLC**

M. Howard Petricoff  
Stephen M. Howard  
Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease LLP  
52 East Gay Street  
PO Box 1008  
Columbus, OH 43215  
mhpetricoff@vorys.com  
smhoward@vorys.com

Scott C. Solberg  
Eimer Stahl LLP  
224 S. Michigan Ave., Suite 1100  
Chicago, IL 60604  
ssolberg@EimerStahl.com

**On Behalf of the Retail Energy Supply Association, Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Exelon Energy Company, Inc. Constellation Energy Commodities Group, Inc. and Constellation NewEnergy, Inc.**

Cathryn N. Loucas  
Trent A. Dougherty  
Ohio Environmental Council  
1207 Grandview Avenue, Ste. 201  
Columbus, OH 43215-3449  
trent@theoec.org  
cathy@theoec.org

**On Behalf of the Ohio Environmental Council**

Stephanie M. Chmiel  
Michael L. Dillard, Jr.  
Philip B. Sineneng  
Thompson Hine LLP  
41 South High Street, Ste. 1700  
Columbus, OH 43215  
Stephanie.Chmiel@ThompsonHine.com  
Michael.Dillard@ThompsonHine.com  
Philip.sineneng@ThompsonHine.com

**On Behalf of Border Energy Electric, Inc.**

Matthew J. Satterwhite  
Steven T. Nourse  
American Electric Power Service Corp.  
1 Riverside Plaza, 29<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Columbus, OH, 43215  
mjsatterwhite@aep.com  
stnourse@aep.com

**On Behalf of the Ohio Power Company**

Kimberly W. Bojko  
Joel E. Sechler  
Carpenter Lipps & Leland LLP  
280 Plaza, Suite 1300  
280 North High Street  
Columbus, OH 43215  
Bojko@carpenterlipps.com  
sechler@carpenterlipps.com

**On Behalf of SolarVision, LLC**

Mark S. Yurick  
Zachary D. Kravitz  
Taft, Stettinius & Hollister LLP  
65 East State Street, Ste. 1000  
Columbus, OH 43215  
myurick@taftlaw.com  
zkravitz@taftlaw.com

**On Behalf of Kroger Company**

Matthew R. Cox  
Matthew Cox Law, Ltd.  
4145 St. Theresa Blvd.  
Avon, OH 44011  
matt@matthewcoxlaw.com

**On Behalf of the Council of Smaller Enterprises**

Colleen L. Mooney  
Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy  
231 West Lima Street  
P.O. Box 1793  
Findlay, OH 45839-1793  
cmooney2@columbus.rr.com

**On Behalf of Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy**

Gregory J. Poulos  
EnerNoc, Inc.  
471 E. Broad Street  
Columbus, OH 43215  
gpoulos@enernoc.com

**On Behalf of EnerNOC, Inc.**

Steven M. Sherman  
Joshua D. Hague  
Grant E. Chapman  
Krieg DeVault, LLP  
One Indiana Square, Suite 2800  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2079  
ssherman@kdlegal.com  
jhague@kdlegal.com  
gchapman@kdlegal.com

**On Behalf of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP and  
Sam's East, Inc.**

Ellis Jacobs  
Advocates for Basic Legal Equality, Inc.  
333 W. First Street, Suite 500B  
Dayton, OH 45402  
ejacobs@ablelaw.org.

**On Behalf of Edgemont Neighborhood  
Coalition**

Thomas McNamee  
Devin Parram  
Assistant Attorney's General  
Attorney General's Office  
180 East Broad Street  
Columbus, OH 43215  
Thomas.mcnamee@puc.state.oh.us  
Devin.parram@puc.state.oh.us

**On Behalf the Staff of the Public Utilities  
Commission of Ohio**

Mandy Willey  
Gregory Price  
Bryce McKenney  
Attorney Examiners  
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio  
180 East Broad Street  
Columbus, OH 43215  
Mandy.willey@puc.state.oh.us  
Gregory.price@puc.state.oh.us  
Bryce.mckenney@puc.state.oh.us

**Attorney Examiners**

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities**

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**11/21/2012 1:58:47 PM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 12-0426-EL-SSO, 12-0427-EL-ATA, 12-0428-EL-AAM, 12-0429-EL-WVR, 12-0672-EL-RDR**

Summary: Memorandum in Opposition to The Dayton Power and Light Company's Waiver Request of Joint Movants [Honda of America Manufacturing, Inc. ("Honda), Industrial Energy Users-Ohio ("IEU-Ohio"), the OMA Energy Group ("OMAEG"), the Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy ("OPAE"), SolarVision, LLC and Wal-Mart Stores East, LP and Sam's East, Inc.] electronically filed by Mr. Matthew R. Pritchard on behalf of Industrial Energy Users-Ohio