

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Fuel Adjustment Clauses for Columbus Southern Power) Case No. 09-872-EL-FAC		
Company and Ohio Power Company) Case No. 09-873-EL-FAC		
In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company to Modify Their Standard Service Offer Rates) Case No. 09-1906-EL-ATA)	2009	KECK
AND OHIO POV MEMORANI ORMET PRIMARY ALU	RN POWER COMPANY'S WER COMPANY'S DUM CONTRA MINUM CORPORATION'S OR HEARING	DEC 15 PH 3:	KECEIVED-DOCKERING .

On December 2, 2009 Ormet Primary Aluminum Corporation (Ormet) filed comments in Case No. 09-1095-EL-UNC, AEP Ohio's application to adjust its Economic Development Cost Recovery Rider (EDR). In those comments Ormet raised its concern that based on the proposed EDR rates it believed that the rate increases AEP Ohio was proposing "appear to be higher that the rate increase permitted under the ESP Case Order." (Ormet's December 2, 2009 Comments, p. 1).

In its reply to those comments, AEP Ohio stated that:

To the extent Ormet's concern is that it might experience a percentage rate increase that exceeds the percentage increase authorized for its customer class, that concern has no merit. The rate increases authorized by the Commission are based on a customer class basis. The unique usage patterns of each customer may well result in individual customers experiencing an increase greater than or less than the increase authorized for the customer class as a whole.

This is he are the first the freeze approving are to accurate at a constant provided the constant and the dominant and provided processed 12-15-09

On December 10, 2009, Staff's Review and Recommendation regarding Case

Nos. 09-872 and 873-EL-FAC and 09-1906-EL-ATA was filed. In those comments, Staff
offered the following recommendations:

It is staff's understanding that the limitations in rate increases ordered by the Commission are to be applied on a customer class basis. In, other words, individual customers, depending on their load and usage, may see increases in their bills which are greater than or less than the 6 percent cap for CSP and the 7 percent cap for OP. However, the annual increases in revenues, per customer class, must not exceed those caps.

It is also important to note that the adjusted FAC rates (from Case Nos. 09-872 and 09-873) must be viewed in conjunction with the adjusted non-FAC generation rates (from Case No. 09-1906-EL-ATA) in order to determine whether the proposed rates comply with the Commission's ESP orders.

The staff finds that the rates proposed in the applications provide for increases no greater than those authorized by the Commission and recommends that the applications be approved and the proposed rates be effective on a bills rendered basis beginning the first billing cycle of 2010.

On December 14, 2009, Ormet filed a motion to intervene in these proceedings (which AEP Ohio does not oppose) and a motion to set the above-captioned matters for hearing. AEP Ohio does oppose that motion. The underlying basis for Ormet's request for a hearing is that AEP Ohio's proposed rates, which Staff has concluded "provide for increases no greater than those authorized by the Commission," (Staff Review and Recommendation) produce a rate increase for Ormet "well above the 6% CSP increase and 7% OP increase allowed under the Commission's orders in AEP's Electric Security Plan Case." (Ormet's Motion, p. 3).

Of course, Ormet is not even going to pay its GS-4 rate. Instead, this year, based on information provided by Ormet, it will pay rates which reflect a \$60 million discount.

A copy of Ormet's motion was faxed to the Commission on December 11, 2009 shortly prior to 5:00.

In any event, Ormet misses the point that clearly is set out by the Staff – "In, other words, individual customers, depending on their load and usage, may see increases in their bills which are greater than or less than the 6 percent cap for CSP and the 7 percent cap for OP. However, the annual increases in revenues, per customer class, must not exceed those caps." (Staff's Review and Recommendation).

Ormet is served as a special contract customer -- fifty percent by Columbus Southern Power Company and fifty percent by Ohio Power Company. As a special contract customer, Ormet's load is not included in calculating the overall increase to each Company's GS4 tariff rates. The amounts disputed by Ormet in Case Nos. 09-872-EL-FAC and 09-873-EL-FAC on Workpaper to Schedule 4, line 19, should in fact be the fuel rate that the special contract requires AEP Ohio to charge Ormet, that is, the GS-4 FAC rate. That approach being used by the Companies in Case Nos. 09-872-EL-FAC and 09-873-FAC was used by the Companies and approved by the Commission in Case Nos. 08-917-EL-SSO and 08-918-EL-SSO.

AEP Ohio requests that the Commission deny Ormet's motion for hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

Marvin I. Resnik, Cousel of Record

Steven T. Nourse

American Electric Power Service Corporation

1 Riverside Plaza, 29th Floor

Columbus, Ohio 43215

Telephone: (614) 716-1606

Fax: (614) 716-2950

Email: <u>miresnik@aep.com</u> stnourse@aep.com

Counsel for Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of Columbus Southern Power Company's and Ohio Power Company's Memorandum Contra Ormet Primary Aluminum Corporation's Motion for Hearing was served by U.S. Mail upon the individuals listed below this 15th day of December 2009.

Marvin I. Resnik

Clinton Vince
Douglas Bonner
Daniel Barnowski
Emma Hand
Keith Nusbaum
Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP
1301 K Street NW
Suite 600, East Tower
Washington, DC 20005

Samuel C. Randazzo Lisa G. McAlister Joseph M. Clark McNees Wallace & Nurick, LLC Fifth Third Center 21 East State Street, 17th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215-4228

Michael Idzkowski Ohio Consumers' Counsel 10 W. Broad Street Suite 1800 Columbus OH 43215-3485