



Legal Department

American Electric Power  
1 Riverside Plaza  
Columbus, OH 43215-2373  
AEP.com

Honorable Examiners Parrot and See  
The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio  
180 East Broad Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

August 26, 2014

RE: *In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company to update the Energy Efficiency and Peak Demand Reduction Rider*  
Case No. 14-0873-EL-RDR

Yazen Alami  
Regulatory Services  
(614) 716-2920 (P)  
(614) 716-2950 (F)  
yalami@aep.com

Dear Examiners Parrot and See:

The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel's ("OCC") Reply Comments filed in this docket on August 22, 2014, are procedurally improper on several grounds and should be ignored. First, OCC's Reply Comments were filed nearly eight weeks after Ohio Power Company's July 1, 2014 comments and should be considered untimely. Considering OCC's late Reply Comments could establish an undesirable precedent of parties filing comments at the last minute in an attempt to get the last word on the subject – a practice that thwarts the Commission's desire for considering all sides of an issue before it.

Second, OCC's Reply Comments were filed only two business days after the Commission announced its agenda for the August 27, 2014 meeting considering OCC's Application for Rehearing in Case Nos. 12-1557-EL-RDR and 13-1201-EL-RDR. As such and based on the content of the pleading, OCC's Reply Comments are procedurally defective because they are clearly an attempt to reply to AEP Ohio's Memorandum Contra filed in response to OCC's Application for Rehearing. No reply memoranda in support of an application for rehearing are permitted under OAC 4901-1-35. Yet, OCC makes the same arguments in its "Reply Comments" as it did in its Application for Rehearing. The fact that OCC's "Reply Comments" are nothing more than an improper attempt to reply to AEP Ohio's Memorandum Contra is also made clear by the relief OCC requests in its "Reply Comments". Because the Commission has already approved updated EE/PDR rider rates for AEP Ohio in Case Nos. 12-1557-EL-RDR and 13-1201-EL-RDR, the relief requested by OCC is plainly an attack on the Commission's order in those proceedings and an extension of OCC's Application for Rehearing. OCC clearly filed its "Reply Comments" as an attempt to circumvent the Commission's rules. Such an attempt should not be rewarded by considering OCC's "Reply Comments" in this case. For the foregoing reasons, OCC's "Reply Comments" are procedurally improper and should be ignored.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Yazen Alami

cc: Parties of Record

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

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**8/26/2014 11:59:56 AM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 14-0873-EL-RDR**

Summary: Correspondence to Attorney Examiners electronically filed by Mr. Yazen Alami on behalf of Ohio Power Company