

In the Matter of the Application of)
The Dayton Power and Light Company to) Case No. 18-447-EL-RDR
Update its Transmission Cost Recovery)
Rider – Non-Bypassable.)

The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel ("OCC") moves to intervene in this case where The Dayton Power and Light Company ("DP&L") proposes to charge consumers more for electricity.¹ OCC is filing on behalf of DP&L's 460,000 residential utility customers. The reasons the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("PUCO") should grant OCC's Motion are further set forth in the attached Memorandum in Support.

BRUCE WESTON (0016973)
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

Terry L. Etter (0067445), Counsel of Record
Amy Botschner O'Brien (0074423)
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

65 East State Street, 7th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4213
Telephone [Etter]: (614) 466-7964
Telephone [Botschner O'Brien]: (614) 466-9575
terry.etter@occ.ohio.gov
amy.botschner.o'brien@occ.ohio.gov
(Will accept service via email)

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

In the Matter of the Application of)
The Dayton Power and Light Company to) Case No. 18-447-EL-RDR
Update its Transmission Cost Recovery)
Rider – Non-Bypassable.)

- (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 DP&L's residential customers in this case where DP&L wants to charge them more for electric service. 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 that customers pay 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 pending case 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 to equitably and lawfully decide 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 that involves the potential to increase customers' electric bills.

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 “[t]he 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 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.²

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.

² See *Ohio Consumers’ Counsel v. Pub. Util. Comm.*, 111 Ohio St.3d 384, 2006-Ohio-5853, ¶¶13-20.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE WESTON (0016973)
OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

/s/ Terry L. Etter

Terry L. Etter (0067445), Counsel of Record
Amy Botschner O'Brien (0074423)
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

65 East State Street, 7th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4213
Telephone [Etter]: (614) 466-7964
Telephone [Botschner O'Brien]: (614) 466-9575
terry.etter@occ.ohio.gov
amy.botschner.o'brien@occ.ohio.gov
(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 3rd day of April 2018.

/s/ Terry L. Etter
Terry L. Etter
Assistant Consumers' Counsel

SERVICE LIST

William.wright@ohioattorneygeneral.gov michael.schuler@aes.com

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

4/3/2018 5:07:20 PM

in

Case No(s). 18-0447-EL-RDR

Summary: Motion Motion to Intervene by The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel electronically filed by Ms. Jamie Williams on behalf of Etter, Terry Mr.