

**THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF  
THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT  
COMPANY FOR APPROVAL OF ITS PLAN  
TO MODERNIZE ITS DISTRIBUTION GRID.**

**CASE No. 18-1875-EL-GRD**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF  
THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT  
COMPANY FOR APPROVAL OF A LIMITED  
WAIVER OF OHIO ADM.CODE 4901:1-18-  
06(A)(2).**

**CASE No. 18-1876-EL-WVR**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF  
THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT  
COMPANY FOR APPROVAL OF CERTAIN  
ACCOUNTING METHODS.**

**CASE No. 18-1877-EL-AAM**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF  
THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT  
COMPANY FOR ADMINISTRATION OF THE  
SIGNIFICANTLY EXCESSIVE EARNINGS  
TEST UNDER R.C. 4928.143(F) AND OHIO  
ADM.CODE 4901:1-35-10 FOR 2018.**

**CASE No. 19-1121-EL-UNC**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF  
THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT  
COMPANY FOR A FINDING THAT ITS  
CURRENT ELECTRIC SECURITY PLAN  
PASSES THE SIGNIFICANTLY EXCESSIVE  
EARNINGS TEST AND MORE FAVORABLE  
IN THE AGGREGATE TEST IN R.C.  
4928.143(E).**

**CASE No. 20-680-EL-UNC**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF  
THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT  
COMPANY FOR ADMINISTRATION OF THE  
SIGNIFICANTLY EXCESSIVE EARNINGS  
TEST UNDER R.C. 4928.143(F) AND OHIO  
ADM.CODE 4901:1-35-10 FOR 2019.**

**CASE No. 20-1041-EL-UNC**

**ENTRY**

Entered in the Journal on July 22, 2021

## I. SUMMARY

{¶ 1} In this Entry, the attorney examiner grants a four-day extension of time in which to file memoranda contra the applications for rehearing filed on July 16, 2021.

## II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

### A. *General Procedural History*

{¶ 2} The Dayton Power and Light Company (DP&L or Company) is an electric distribution utility (EDU), an electric light company, and a public utility as defined in R.C. 4928.01(A)(6), R.C. 4905.03(C), and R.C. 4905.02, respectively. As such, DP&L is subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission.

{¶ 3} R.C. 4928.141 provides that an EDU shall provide consumers within its certified territory a standard service offer (SSO) of all competitive retail electric services necessary to maintain essential electric services to customers, including a firm supply of electric generation service. The SSO may be either a market rate offer (MRO) in accordance with R.C. 4928.142 or an electric security plan (ESP) in accordance with R.C. 4928.143.

{¶ 4} Pursuant to R.C. 4928.143(F), following the end of each annual period of an approved ESP, the Commission is required to evaluate if any adjustments resulted in significantly excessive earnings for the electric utility. This determination is measured by whether the earned return on common equity of the utility is significantly in excess of the return on common equity that was earned during the same period by publicly traded companies (including other utilities) that face comparable business and financial risk, with adjustments for capital structure as may be appropriate.

{¶ 5} Pursuant to R.C. 4928.143(E), if a Commission-approved ESP has a term that exceeds three years from the effective date of the plan, the Commission must test the plan in the fourth year to determine whether the ESP, including its then-existing pricing and all other terms and conditions, including any deferrals and any future recovery of deferrals,

continues to be more favorable in the aggregate and during the remaining term of the plan as compared to the expected results that would otherwise apply under R.C. 4928.142, i.e., under an MRO. The Commission must also determine the prospective effect of the ESP to determine if that effect is substantially likely to provide the EDU with a return on common equity that is significantly in excess of the return on common equity that is likely to be earned by publicly traded companies, including utilities, that face comparable business and financial risk, with adjustments for capital structure as may be appropriate. The administration of these two tests—the more favorable in the aggregate test and the significantly excessive earnings test (SEET)—is referred to herein as the quadrennial review.

{¶ 6} On October 20, 2017, the Commission approved, with modifications, DP&L’s application for its third ESP (ESP III) under R.C. 4928.143. *In re the Application of Dayton Power and Light Co. to Establish a Std. Serv. Offer in the Form of an Electric Security Plan*, Case No. 16-395-EL-SSO (*ESP III Case*), Opinion and Order (Oct. 20, 2017).

{¶ 7} On November 26, 2019, DP&L filed a notice of withdrawal of its application for ESP III under R.C. 4928.143(C)(2)(a). *ESP III Case*, Notice of Withdrawal (Nov. 26, 2019). Additionally, citing to R.C. 4928.143(C)(2)(b), DP&L filed proposed revised tariffs seeking to implement its most recent SSO, which was its first ESP (ESP I). *In re Application of The Dayton Power and Light Company to Establish a Standard Service Offer in the Form of an Electric Security Plan*, Case No. 08-1094-EL-SSO (*ESP I Case*), Proposed Revised Tariffs (Nov. 26, 2019). On December 18, 2019, the Commission issued a Finding and Order approving DP&L’s withdrawal of its application, thereby terminating ESP III. *ESP III Case*, Finding and Order (Dec. 18, 2019).

{¶ 8} On December 18, 2019, the Commission also issued a Second Finding and Order approving, with modifications, DP&L’s proposed revised tariffs to continue the provisions, terms, and conditions of ESP I. *ESP I Case*, Second Finding and Order (Dec. 18, 2019). In addition to restoring ESP I, the Commission acknowledged that the term of ESP I had cumulatively exceeded three years and was thus subject to mandatory review under

R.C. 4928.143(E). Accordingly, the Commission directed DP&L to open a docket by April 1, 2020, in which the Commission would conduct the quadrennial review detailed in R.C. 4928.143(E). *ESP I Case, Second Finding and Order* (Dec. 18, 2019) at ¶ 41.

**B. Relevant Proceedings**

{¶ 9} On December 21, 2018, the Company filed an application for approval of its plan to modernize its distribution grid together with a request for a limited waiver of Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-18-06(A)(2) and for approval of certain accounting methods necessary to implement its plan. *In re Application of The Dayton Power and Light Company for Approval of Its Plan to Modernize Its Distribution Grid*, Case No. 18-1875-EL-GRD; *In re Application of The Dayton Power and Light Company for Approval of a Limited Waiver of Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-18-06(A)(2)*, Case No. 18-1876-EL-WVR; *In re Application of The Dayton Power and Light Company for Approval of Certain Accounting Methods*, Case No. 18-1877-EL-AAM (combined, *Smart Grid Case*).

{¶ 10} On May 15, 2019, DP&L filed an application and supporting documents for the administration of the SEET for calendar year 2018. *In re Application of The Dayton Power and Light Company for Administration of the Significantly Excessive Earnings Test Under R.C. 4928.143(F) and Ohio Adm.Code 4901:1-35-10 for 2018*, Case No. 19-1121-EL-UNC (*2018 SEET Case*).

{¶ 11} On April 1, 2020, pursuant to the Commission's Second Finding and Order in the *ESP I Case*, DP&L filed an application for a finding that its current ESP passes the administration of the quadrennial review for the forecast period of 2020-2023. *In re Application of The Dayton Power and Light Company for a Finding that Its Current Electric Security Plan Passes the Significantly Excessive Earnings Test and More Favorable in the Aggregate Test in R.C. 4928.143(E)*, Case No. 20-680-EL-UNC (*Quadrennial Review Case*).

{¶ 12} On May 15, 2020, in Case No. 20-1041-EL-UNC, DP&L filed an application and supporting documents for the administration of the SEET for calendar year 2019. *In re Application of The Dayton Power and Light Company for Administration of the Significantly*

*Excessive Earnings Test Under R.C. 4928.143(F) and Ohio Adm.Code R.C. 4901:1-35-10 for 2019, Case No. 20-1041-EL-UNC (2019 SEET Case).*

{¶ 13} Throughout the procedural history of these cases, the following entities have sought and been granted intervention in the *2018 SEET Case*, *2019 SEET Case*, and/or the *Quadrennial Review Case*: the City of Dayton; Honda of America Mfg., Inc.; Industrial Energy Users-Ohio; Interstate Gas Supply, Inc.; Kroger Co.; Ohio Consumers' Counsel (OCC); Ohio Energy Group; Ohio Hospital Association; Ohio Manufacturers' Association Energy Group; and University of Dayton. Further, pursuant to the attorney examiner's Entry issued on October 27, 2020, the following additional entities were granted intervention in the *Smart Grid Case*: Armada Power, LLC; ChargePoint, Inc.; Direct Energy Services, LLC and Direct Energy Business, LLC (together, Direct Energy); Environmental Law & Policy Center; IGS Solar, LLC; Mission:data Coalition; Natural Resources Defense Council; Ohio Environmental Council; Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy; Sierra Club; and The Smart Thermostat Coalition.

{¶ 14} On October 23, 2020, DP&L filed a stipulation and recommendation (Stipulation) executed by the Company, Staff, and 19 intervening parties that purports to resolve all issues raised in the *Smart Grid Case*, the *2018 SEET Case*, the *2019 SEET Case*, and the *Quadrennial Review Case*.<sup>1</sup>

{¶ 15} By Entry dated October 27, 2020, the attorney examiner consolidated the *Smart Grid Case*, the *2018 SEET Case*, the *2019 SEET Case*, and the *Quadrennial Review Case* for purposes of considering the Stipulation and established a procedural schedule, which included deadlines for filing testimony regarding the Stipulation.

{¶ 16} Following an evidentiary hearing, the Commission issued an Opinion and Order in the consolidated cases on June 16, 2021.

---

<sup>1</sup> There are 24 parties involved in these consolidated cases: DP&L, Staff, and 22 intervenors. Of these parties, only Direct Energy and OCC are not signatory parties to the Stipulation.

{¶ 17} On July 16, 2021, applications for rehearing were filed by DP&L and OCC.

{¶ 18} On July 19, 2021, DP&L filed a motion for extension of time and for an expedited ruling, seeking a four-day extension to file memoranda in opposition to OCC's application for rehearing. Among other representations, DP&L states that OCC objected to both the requested extension of time and expedited treatment.

{¶ 19} On July 20, 2021, the attorney examiner issued an Entry directing that all memoranda contra DP&L's motion be filed by July 21, 2021.

{¶ 20} On July 21, 2021, OCC filed a memorandum contra DP&L's motion for an extension of time to file in opposition to OCC's application for rehearing.

### III. DISCUSSION

{¶ 21} In support of its request for a four-day extension of the time to file memoranda in opposition to OCC's application for rehearing, DP&L cites to three factors: (1) the various issues raised by OCC, (2) summer travel schedules, and (3) the need to simultaneously respond to OCC's application for rehearing in Case No. 08-1094-EL-SSO, et al. In rebutting these factors, OCC claims that the requested extension, however brief, (1) will result in real prejudice to consumers, and (2) is not supported by "good cause" such that the ten-day period for filing memoranda in opposition to OCC's application for rehearing need not be extended.

### IV. CONCLUSION

{¶ 22} The attorney examiner finds that, subject to modification, DP&L's motion for an extension of time is reasonable and should be granted. The attorney examiner modifies the extension request to clarify that the four-day extension applies to the time for responding to any application for rehearing in this case. As modified, the extension will allow all parties sufficient additional time to respond to arguments made on rehearing. Further, the extension will not prejudice any party, as (1) R.C. 4903.10 continues to require that the Commission grant or deny rehearing within 30 days of the filing of the application for

rehearing, and (2) the extension applies equally to all parties in these proceedings. Accordingly, the attorney examiner directs all parties to file memoranda in opposition to any application for rehearing in this case by July 30, 2021.

**V. ORDER**

{¶ 23} It is, therefore,

{¶ 24} ORDERED, That DP&L's motion for an extension of time to file memoranda contra applications for rehearing be granted as described in Paragraph 22. It is, further,

{¶ 25} ORDERED, That memoranda contra any application for rehearing be filed by July 30, 2021. It is, further,

{¶ 26} ORDERED, That a copy of this Entry be served upon each party of record.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

/s/ Michael L. Williams

By: Michael L. Williams  
Attorney Examiner

SJP/hac

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

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**7/22/2021 10:44:10 AM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 18-1875-EL-GRD, 18-1876-EL-WVR, 18-1877-EL-AAM, 19-1121-EL-UNC, 20-0680-EL-UNC**

Summary: Attorney Examiner Entry ordering that DP&L's motion for an extension of time to file memoranda contra applications for rehearing be granted as described in Paragraph 22 and that memoranda contra any application for rehearing be filed by July 30, 2021 electronically filed by Heather A. Chilcote on behalf of Michael L. Williams, Attorney Examiner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio