

Hunter, Donielle

From: ContactThePUCO
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2012 5:48 PM
To: Docketing; Adkins, Kerry
Subject: Docketing
Attachments: [Untitled].pdf

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Investigation and Audit Division

Memorandum

Date: 2/3/2012

Re: Bruce Mcpherson
5626 Groveport Rd

Groveport, OH 43125

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
2012 FEB -6 AM 9:23
PUCO

Docketing Case No.: 11-346-EL-SSO and 11-351-EL-AIR

Notes:

Please docket the attached in the case number above.

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a case document delivered in the regular course of business.
Technician le Date Processed FEB 06 2012

RECEIVED FEB 02 2012

TO: PUCO

DATE: 01-31-12

FROM: CHURCH OF CHRIST OF GROVEPORT (AEP ACCOUNT #100-231-797-1-5)

5626 GROVEPORT RD., GROVEPORT OH 43125

SUBJECT: RECENT AEP DISTRIBUTION RATE INCREASE

This is sent as a complaint and appeal on our behalf of the PUCO approved distribution rate increase for AEP in reference to Case No. 11-351-EL-AIR as it effects our church congregation. The distribution rate of increase for our account exceeds 300%. This is far above the increase alluded to by AEP in their advance notices and unfair for the medium class service. Churches are not businesses and therefore cannot pass on these increased costs to our customers. We are a small congregation of 70-75 members and typical of many churches located within AEP's service area. We don't operate a school or day care. We hold worship services twice on Sunday and have a Wednesday evening Bible class. Our electrical use is what I believe the industry calls "low load factor", higher usage for short periods and lower usage the rest of the time. This increase comes at a time when church member contributions are lower due to economic hardships faced by members.

Secondly, the approved rate increase is disproportionately larger for those customers who have selected an alternate electric supplier to realize a cost savings. This seems like an unfair practice in regard to the intent of the original "apples to apples" choice provider legislation.

Thirdly, soon after our church building was built in December 2000, AEP started billing us a surcharge that lasted approximately four years that we were told was to recover service line and distribution costs for our building. If that was the case, we have already paid for our share of distribution costs and should therefore be exempted from this new recovery rider increase. We are in essence paying twice for the same service!

We request that a review of this increase be investigated as it relates to our church account, particularly, and others that are typical of us.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bruce E. McPherson

On Behalf of the Elders of the Church of Christ of Groveport

cc. AEP