

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

November 27, 2006

In Reply Refer To:
Docket Nos. ER05-6-086
EL04-135-089
EL02-111-106
EL03-212-102

Leonard, Street and Deinard
Attn: Steven A Weiler, Esq.
Attorney for The Dayton Power and Light Company
The Army Navy Club Building
1627 Eye Street, N.W.
Suite 610
Washington, DC 20006

Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP
Attn: Glen Bernstein, Esq.
Attorney for Duquesne Light Company
1440 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Dear Messrs. Weiler and Bernstein:

1. On September 12, 2006, you filed a Stipulation and Agreement (Settlement) on behalf of Dayton Power and Light Company (Dayton) and Duquesne Light Company (Duquesne). The Settlement fully resolves all obligations as a result of the seams elimination cost adjustment (SECA) charges between Dayton and Duquesne. Specifically, under the Settlement, Duquesne's total SECA-related obligations to Dayton shall be \$153,056, and Dayton's total SECA-related obligations to Duquesne shall be \$400.60.

2. The Settlement is fair and reasonable and in the public interest and is hereby approved. Under the Settlement, the standard of review for any modifications to this Settlement requested by a party that are not agreed to by all parties shall be the public interest standard under the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine. The standard of review for any modifications to this Settlement requested by a non-party to the Settlement and the

Commission will be the most stringent standard permissible under applicable law.¹ The Commission's approval of the Settlement does not constitute approval of, or precedent regarding, any principle or issue in this proceeding.

3. This letter order terminates Docket Nos. ER05-6-086, EL04-135-089, EL02-111-106, and EL03-212-102.

By direction of the Commission. Commissioner Kelly concurring with a separate statement attached.
Commissioner Wellinghoff dissenting in part with a separate statement attached.
Commissioner Moeller not participating.

Magalie R. Salas,
Secretary.

¹ *United Gas Pipe Line Co. v. Mobile Gas Service Corp.*, 350 U.S. 332 (1956); *FPC v. Sierra Pacific Power Co.*, 350 U.S. 348 (1956). As a general matter, parties may bind the Commission to a public interest standard of review. *Northeast Utilities Service Co. v. FERC*, 993 F.2d 937, 960-62 (1st Cir. 1993). Under limited circumstances, such as when the agreement has broad applicability, the Commission has discretion to decline to be so bound. *Maine Public Utilities Commission v. FERC*, 454 F.3d 278, 286-87 (D.C. Cir. 2006). In this case we find that the public interest standard should apply.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Midwest Independent Transmission System Operator, Inc.	Docket Nos. ER05-6-086
Midwest Independent Transmission System Operator, Inc. PJM Interconnection, LLC, <i>et al.</i>	EL04-135-089
Midwest Independent Transmission System Operator, Inc. PJM Interconnection, LLC, <i>et al.</i>	EL02-111-106
Ameren Services Company, <i>et al.</i>	EL03-212-102

(Issued November 27, 2006)

KELLY, Commissioner, *concurring*:

The settling parties request that the Commission apply the “most stringent standard permissible under applicable law” with respect to any future modifications requested by a non-settling party or the Commission. With respect to such modifications, the order states that the *Mobile-Sierra* “public interest” standard of review should apply. This settlement resolves issues related to the Seams Elimination Cost Adjustment (SECA) monetary obligations between the parties for the period ending March 31, 2006. It is uncontested, does not affect non-settling parties, and resolves the amount of the claimed SECA obligations between the parties for the relevant prior period. The settlement does not contemplate ongoing performance under the settlement into the future, which would raise the issue of what standard the Commission should apply to review any possible future modifications sought by non-parties or the Commission. Indeed, in a sense, the standard of review is irrelevant here. Therefore, while I do not agree with the order’s statements regarding the applicability of the *Mobile-Sierra* “public interest” standard of review (*see* footnote 1), I concur with the order’s approval of this settlement agreement.

Suedeem G. Kelly

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Dayton Power and Light Company,
and Duquesne Light Company

Docket Nos. ER05-6-086,
ER04-135-089,
EL02-111-106,
and EL03-212-102

(Issued November 27, 2006)

WELLINGHOFF, Commissioner, dissenting in part:

The parties in this case have asked the Commission to apply the “public interest” standard of review when it considers future changes to the instant settlement that may be sought by any of the parties, a non-party, or the Commission acting *sua sponte*.

Because the facts of this case do not satisfy the standards that I identified in *Entergy Services, Inc.*,¹ I believe that it is inappropriate for the Commission to grant the parties’ request and agree to apply the “public interest” standard to future changes to the settlement sought by a non-party or the Commission acting *sua sponte*. In addition, for the reasons that I identified in *Southwestern Public Service Co.*,² I disagree with the Commission’s characterization in this order of case law on the applicability of the “public interest” standard.

For these reasons, I respectfully dissent in part.

Jon Wellinghoff
Commissioner

¹ 117 FERC ¶ 61,055 (2006).

² 117 FERC ¶ 61,149 (2006).