

In the Matter of the Application of The Dayton )  
Power and Light Company to Update its Economic ) Case No. 18-0374-EL-RDR  
Development Rider. )

The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel ("OCC") moves to intervene in this case where Dayton Power & Light ("DP&L") seeks to collect subsidies from customers to fund discounted electric rates given to certain DP&L customers.<sup>1</sup> In addition, DP&L proposes to add language to its tariff that, although intended to provide refunds for charges shown to be unreasonable or unlawful, falls short of adequately protecting customers. OCC is filing on behalf of the 456,000 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.

<sup>1</sup> See R.C. Chapter 4911, R.C. 4903.221 and Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-11.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE WESTON (0016973)  
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Zachary E. Woltz

Kevin F. Moore (0089228)

Counsel of Record

Zachary E. Woltz (0096669)

Assistant Consumers' Counsel

**Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel**

65 East State Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor

Columbus, Ohio 43215

Telephone [Moore]: (614) 387-2965

Telephone [Woltz]: (614) 466-9565

[Kevin.moore@occ.ohio.gov](mailto:Kevin.moore@occ.ohio.gov)

[Zachary.woltz@occ.ohio.gov](mailto:Zachary.woltz@occ.ohio.gov)

(Both will accept service via email)

In the Matter of the Application of The Dayton )  
Power and Light Company to Update its Economic ) Case No. 18-0374-EL-RDR  
Development Rider. )

On October 20, 2017, the PUCO approved DP&L’s Economic Development Rider (“EDR Rider”).<sup>2</sup> Under the EDR Rider, DP&L collects charges, from customers, to subsidize “economic development” incentives given to signatory or non-opposing parties of its latest electric security plan stipulation.<sup>3</sup> In this case, DP&L seeks authorization to increase rates associated with the EDR. In addition, DP&L seeks approval of new tariff language that although intended to provide refunds for charges shown to be unreasonable or unlawful, falls short of adequately protecting customers. OCC has authority under law to represent the interests of all the 456,000 residential utility customers of DP&L, pursuant to 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 DP&L seeks to collect increased rates to customers. Thus, this element of the intervention standard in R.C. 4903.221 is satisfied.

<sup>2</sup> *In the Matter of the Application of the Dayton Power and Light Company to Establish a Standard Service Offer in the Form of an Electric Security Plan*, Case No. 16-395-EL-SSO, *et al.*, Opinion and Order (October 20, 2017).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* at pp. 8-9.

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 collecting more money from customers under the EDR Rider. This interest is different from that of any other party and especially different from that of the utility whose advocacy includes the financial interest of stockholders.

Second, OCC's advocacy for residential customers will include advancing the position that rates should be no more than what is reasonable and lawful under Ohio law, for service that is adequate under Ohio law. OCC's position is therefore directly related to the merits of this case that 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 the 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 DP&L seeks to collect charges associated to economic development as well as adjust tariff language.

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) that OCC already has addressed and that 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.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See *Ohio Consumers’ Counsel v. Pub. Util. Comm.*, 111 Ohio St.3d 384, 2006-Ohio-5853, ¶¶13-20.

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.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE WESTON (0016973)  
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Zachary E. Woltz  
Kevin F. Moore (0089228)  
Counsel of Record  
Zachary E. Woltz (0096669)  
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

**Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel**  
65 East State Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
Telephone [Moore]: (614) 387-2965  
Telephone [Woltz]: (614) 466-9565  
[Kevin.moore@occ.ohio.gov](mailto:Kevin.moore@occ.ohio.gov)  
[Zachary.woltz@occ.ohio.gov](mailto:Zachary.woltz@occ.ohio.gov)  
(Both will accept service via email)

**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 3<sup>rd</sup> day of April 2018.

/s/ Zachary E. Woltz

Zachary E. Woltz

Assistant Consumers' Counsel

**SERVICE LIST**

[William.wright@ohioattorneygeneral.gov](mailto:William.wright@ohioattorneygeneral.gov)

[Michael.schuler@aes.com](mailto:Michael.schuler@aes.com)

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

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**4/3/2018 3:52:30 PM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 18-0374-EL-RDR**

Summary: Motion Motion to Intervene by the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel electronically filed by Ms. Deb J. Bingham on behalf of Woltz, Zachary E.