

does not necessarily reflect the position that any one of the Signatory Parties would have adopted if this matter had been fully litigated. In joining in this Stipulation, the Signatory Parties recognize that it is not in the interest of the public or the parties hereto to delay necessary adjustments to the EDU USF riders by extended litigation when an acceptable outcome can be achieved through settlement negotiations. Thus, the Signatory Parties further agree that this Stipulation shall not be relied upon as precedent for or against any party to this proceeding or the Commission itself in any subsequent proceeding, except as may be necessary to enforce the terms of the Stipulation.

If the Commission rejects or modifies all or any part of this Stipulation or imposes additional conditions or requirements upon the Signatory Parties, a Signatory Party shall have the right, within 30 days of the Commission's order, to file an application for rehearing or to withdraw from the Stipulation by filing a notice with the Commission. If a Signatory Party seeks rehearing, said Signatory Party may withdraw from the Stipulation within 30 days of the Commission's ultimate disposition of its rehearing application. Upon notice of withdrawal by a Signatory Party pursuant to the foregoing provisions, the Stipulation shall immediately be deemed null and void and this matter shall proceed as if the Stipulation had not been submitted; provided, however, that a notice of withdrawal from the Stipulation by an EDU Signatory Party shall void the Stipulation only as to the proposed USF rider rate of that EDU. Any party to this proceeding may become a Signatory Party to the Stipulation subsequent to its filing by submitting a letter to the Commission stating the party's intention to do so.

The Signatory Parties hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

1. This matter is properly before the Commission pursuant to Section 4928.52(B), Revised Code. The Commission has jurisdiction to approve this Stipulation as submitted and to issue an order authorizing adjustments to the current EDU USF riders in the minimum amount necessary to provide the revenues sufficient to cover the administrative costs of the low-income customer assistance programs and the consumer education program and provide adequate funding for those programs.
2. The application and supporting exhibits filed in this docket by ODSA on November 7, 2012, the corrections to the application filed herein on November 15, 2012, the testimony of ODSA witness Randall Hunt filed herein on November 7, 2012, the testimony of ODSA witness Susan M. Moser filed herein on November 7, 2012, and the corrections to the testimony of ODSA witness Moser filed herein on November 15, 2012 shall be admitted into evidence and made a part of the record in this case.
3. If called to testify, an appropriate representative of each EDU would verify that the Kwh sales data and other information supplied by that EDU to ODSA upon which ODSA relied in developing the USF rider revenue requirement and USF rider rate for each EDU as set out in the application, as corrected, is true and accurate to the best of that EDU's knowledge and belief.
4. As set forth in ODSA's application, and as further described in and supported by the testimony of ODSA witnesses Hunt and Moser, the annual USF rider revenue requirement for each EDU shall be as follows:

The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company ("CEI")	\$ 25,997,825
The Dayton Power & Light Company ("DP&L")	56,157,101
Duke Energy Ohio ("Duke")	14,334,900
Ohio Edison Company ("OE")	55,913,908
The Toledo Edison Company ("TE")	14,427,460
Ohio Power Company	
Columbus Southern Power Company Rate Zone ("CSP")	75,834,919
Ohio Power Company Rate Zone ("OP")	94,072,808

5. The methodology for determining the respective USF rider revenue requirements is consistent with the methodology accepted by the Commission in its September 19, 2012 opinion and order in the notice of intent ("NOI") phase of this proceeding. The methodology for refunding the amount of the FY 2012 reduction in the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel assessment as determined by the Commission in Case No. 11-5384-AU-UNC is consistent with the methodology proposed in ODSA's Motion for Approval of an Alternative Refund Methodology filed in that case on November 7, 2012 is reasonable and should be approved.

6. The annual USF rider revenue requirements set forth in Paragraph 4 shall be collected by the respective EDUs through a USF rider which incorporates a declining block rate design consisting of two consumption blocks. The first block of the rate shall apply to all monthly consumption up to and including 833,000 Kwh. The second rate block shall apply to all consumption above 833,000 Kwh per month. For each EDU, the rate per Kwh for the second block shall be set at the lower of the Percentage of Income Payment Plan ("PIPP") charge in effect in October 1999 or the per Kwh rate that would apply if the EDU's annual USF rider revenue requirement were to be recovered through a single block per Kwh rate. The rate for the first block rate shall be set at the level necessary to

produce the remainder of the EDU's annual USF rider revenue requirement. The USF riders for each EDU determined in accordance with this methodology shall be as shown in the following table.

	<u>First 833,000 Kwh</u>	<u>Above 833,000 Kwh</u>
CEI	\$ 0.0016007 / Kwh	\$ 0.0005680 / Kwh
DP&L	0.0048579 / Kwh	0.0005700 / Kwh
Duke	0.0007860 / Kwh	0.0004690 / Kwh
OE	0.0026872 / Kwh	0.0010461 / Kwh
TE	0.0022377 / Kwh	0.0005610 / Kwh
CSP	0.0046813 / Kwh	0.0001830 / Kwh
OP	0.0056727 / Kwh	0.0001681 / Kwh

The specific calculations supporting these stipulated USF rider rates are set forth in Exhibits SSM-29 through SSM-34 and corrected Exhibit SSM-Rev-35 to the supplemental testimony of ODSA witness Moser.

7. The rate design methodology utilized in calculating the recommended USF rider rates set forth in Paragraph 6 is identical to the methodology accepted by the Commission in its September 19, 2012 opinion and order in the NOI phase of this proceeding and in all prior USF rider rate adjustment proceedings. Any change in the existing relative customer class revenue responsibility resulting from the use of this rate design methodology is well within the range of estimation error inherent in any customer class cost-of-service analysis and does not violate the Section 4928.52(C), Revised Code, prohibition against shifting the costs of funding low-income customer assistance programs among customer classes. By stipulating to the use of the EDU's October 1999 PIPP charge as a cap on the second block of the rider for purposes of this case, no Signatory Party waives its right to contest the continued use of the October 1999 PIPP charge as a cap on the second block of the rider in any future Section 4928.52(B),

Revised Code, USF rider rate adjustment proceeding.

8. The stipulated USF rider rates for CSP and OP set forth in Paragraph 6 reflect the minimum increases required to produce the additional revenues necessary to satisfy the respective annual USF rider revenue requirements of CSP and OP as set forth in Paragraph 4. The stipulated CEI, DPL, Duke, OE, and TE USF rider rates set forth in Paragraph 6, which are lower than the current USF rider rates of these EDUs, represent the minimum rates necessary to satisfy their respective rider revenue requirements set forth in Paragraph 4. ODSA hereby consents to the resulting USF rider rate decreases for these EDUs as required by Section 4928.52(B), Revised Code.
9. The current USF rider of each EDU shall be withdrawn and cancelled and shall be replaced by USF riders containing the rates provided in Paragraph 6, such riders to be filed within seven days of the Commission order adopting the Stipulation. The new USF riders shall be effective upon filing with the Commission and shall apply on a bills-rendered basis beginning with the first billing cycle of the month following their effective date. The EDUs shall notify customers of the adjustments to their respective USF riders by means of the customer notice attached hereto as Appendix A.
10. Unlike traditional ratemaking, where the objective is to establish rates which will provide the applicant utility with a reasonable earnings opportunity, the USF riders must actually generate sufficient revenues to enable ODSA to meet its specific USF-related statutory and contractual obligations on an ongoing basis. To this end, ODSA shall file, not later than October 31, 2013, an application with the Commission for such adjustments to the USF riders as may be necessary to assure, to the extent possible, that each EDU's USF

rider will generate its associated revenue requirement, but not more than its associated revenue requirement, during the annual collection period following Commission approval of such adjustments. ODSA shall serve copies of such application upon all other parties to this proceeding. In the event ODSA fails to file such application on or before October 31, 2013, ODSA shall notify the Signatory Parties in writing of its intentions with respect to an application for adjustments to the USF riders, including its anticipated filing date. Such notice shall not affect the right of any Signatory Party to pursue such legal recourse against ODSA as may be available for failure to comply with the Stipulation, if any.

11. The Signatory Parties recognize that the EDU USF rider rates proposed in ODSA's annual USF rider adjustment applications are predicated on the assumption that the new USF riders authorized by the Commission will be effective on a bills-rendered basis during the January billing cycle of the following year. Although the October 31, 2013 filing deadline established in Paragraph 10 of this Stipulation for the filing of next year's application will provide adequate time for the Commission to act upon the application prior to January 1, 2014 if the application is not contested, the Signatory Parties recognize that this two-month interval may not be sufficient in the event that a party to the proceeding objects to the application and wishes to litigate the issue(s) raised in its objection(s).² To address this concern, the Signatory Parties propose and agree that ODSA should again follow the NOI process first adopted in Case Nos. 04-1616-EL-UNC. Specifically, this process shall be as follows: On or before May 31, 2013, ODSA

² In so stating, the Signatory Parties are referring to an objection relating to something other than the mathematical accuracy of ODSA's calculations, as an objection to the accuracy of an ODSA calculation can almost certainly be resolved informally in a time frame that will permit the Commission to issue a final order on the application in advance of the January billing cycles.

shall file with the Commission a notice of its intent to submit its annual USF rider adjustment application, and shall serve the NOI on all parties to this proceeding. The NOI shall set forth the methodology ODSA intends to employ in calculating the USF rider revenue requirement and in designing the USF rider rates in preparing its 2013 USF rider rate adjustment application, and may also include such other matters as ODSA deems appropriate. Upon the filing of the NOI, the Commission will open the 2013 USF rider adjustment application docket and will establish a schedule for the filing of objections or comments, responses to the objections or comments, and, if a hearing is requested, a schedule for discovery, the filing of testimony, and the commencement of the hearing. The Commission will use its best efforts to issue its decision with respect to any objections raised not later than September 30, 2013. ODSA will conform its 2013 USF rider adjustment application to any directives set forth in the Commission's decision. If the order is not issued sufficiently in advance of the October 31, 2013 filing deadline to permit ODSA to incorporate such directives, ODSA will file an amended application conforming to the Commission's directives as soon as practicable after the order is issued.

12. The Signatory Parties support initiatives intended to control the costs that ultimately must be recovered through the USF riders. In furtherance of this objective, the Signatory Parties agree to the continuation of the USF Rider Working Group (the "Working Group") formed pursuant to the stipulation approved by the Commission in Case No. 03-2049-EL-UNC, which is charged with developing, reviewing, and recommending such cost-control measures. Although recommendations made by the Working Group shall not be binding upon any Signatory Party, the Signatory Parties shall give due

consideration to such recommendations and shall not unreasonably oppose the implementation of such recommendations.

WHEREFORE, the Signatory Parties respectfully request that the Commission issue an order adopting this Stipulation and directing each EDU to file new USF riders in accordance therewith, said riders to be effective with the January 2013 billing cycle on a bills-rendered basis.

Respectfully submitted,

Ohio Development Services Agency

By: 

Duke Energy Ohio

By: _____

Industrial Energy Users – Ohio

By: Frank P. Darr / per
Per 11/27/12 email authorization

The Dayton Power and Light Company

By: Judi L. Sobel / per
Per 11/28/12 email authorization

Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company

By: Cara M. Drennon / per
Per 11/28/12 email authorization

Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy*

By: Colleen Mooney / per
Per 11/29/12 email authorization

Ohio Power Company

By: Matthew Sutterwhite / per
Per 11/30/12 telephone authorization

*Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy does not join in Paragraphs 6 and 7 of this Joint Stipulation and Recommendation.

APPENDIX A

Pursuant to state law, the Universal Service Fund rider rate has been adjusted effective with this bill.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing has been served upon the following parties by first class mail, postage prepaid, and/or by electronic mail this 30th day of November 2012.



Barth E. Royer

Steven T. Nourse
Matthew J. Satterwhite
AEP Service Corporation
1 Riverside Plaza
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Randall V. Griffin
Judi L. Sobecki
The Dayton Power & Light Company
MacGregor Park
1065 Woodman Avenue
Dayton, Ohio 45432

Elizabeth H. Watts
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.
155 East Broad Street
21st Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Carrie Dunn
FirstEnergy Corp.
76 South Main Street
Akron, Ohio 44308

Joseph P. Serio
Ohio Consumers' Counsel
10 West Broad Street
Suite 1800
Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

Frank Darr
Gretchen J. Hummel
McNees, Wallace & Nurick
Fifth Third Center
Suite 910
21 East State Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Colleen L. Mooney
Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy
PO Box 1793
231 West Lima Street
Findlay, Ohio 45839-1793