

Decatur County REMC Rules and Regulations for Electric Service

Appendix A – Formal Complaint Form

I hereby submit a formal complaint to Decatur County REMC and acknowledge the nature of my complaint is per the Decatur County REMC Rules and Regulations, Rule 16.

Signature: Kenneth Peters

Printed Full Name: Kenneth Peters

Address: 4618 So. Co Rd. 550E Grb. IN.

Contact Phone Number: _____

Describe the nature of the complaint and any details to help with the investigation (dates, times, etc):

* SEE ATTACHED

Step 1: Rule 16.2.b - Requesting CEO Response (YES) ☒ (NO)

Step 2: Rule 16.2.c - Requesting CEO Conference (YES) ☒ (NO)

Step 3: Rule 16.2.d - Requesting Board Review ☒ (YES) (NO)

If the DCREMC administration ensures safe and reliable power to its members; shouldn't all members be entitled to that same safe and reliable power, even those serviced by the New Point Substation?

Since March of 2013, there were 10 known brown-outs/partial outages that were related to "high side fuse failure" at the New Point Substation. These outages were not caused by vehicle accidents, storms fallen trees or animals. The following is a list of dates and times of these outages:

- 1) 03/05/2013 21:43
- 2) 07/01/2013 18:51
- 3) 08/03/2015 06:40
- 4) 07/14/2016 19:11
- 5) 04/16/2017 21:31
- 6) 05/19/2017 14:45
- 7) 08/25/2018 18:49
- 8) 08/29/2018 14:45
- 9) 03/17/2022 The AMI system did not record this outage on all members.
- 10) 03/17/2022 21:15

During that same period, we know of only two other "high side fuse failures" at the other seven substations; both occurred at the Greensburg Center Substation. Brett Abplanalp (DCREMC CEO) and the Hoosier Energy representative acknowledged there were safety and reliability issues with the New Point Substation at the DCREMC Board Meeting in March 2022.

This leads to additional questions:

- 1) What was the actual cost presented by Hoosier Energy in 2022 to install equipment on the New Point Substation to prevent future brown-outs/partial power outages?
- 2) Was the cost of this safety and reliability project presented to all eight Board of Directors? If not, how was the decision made that it was "too costly and unreasonable"?

- 3) What is the limit that DCREMC has set on the cost of safety and who determines that value, DCREMC Management or Board of Directors?
- 4) Why were the safety and reliability projects that were approved in the annual budgets for the New Point Substation from the 2019 to 2022 Work Plan not completed?
- 5) Why is Hoosier Energy currently approaching landowners in the New Point area to purchase ground for a new substation?

We ask the DCREMC Board of Directors, who were supposedly elected to represent ALL members of the DCREMC, to do their own due diligence and respond to this complaint; not the CEO, not the Chairman of the Board, not the Board's attorney. All seven current directors have an obligation and responsibility to answer the above questions and sign their names to their responses.

Signatures

- 01) William F. Wellisbach
- 02) William S. Wellisbach
- 03) 412 N. C. Rd. 600 E Greensburg IN 47240
- 04) William E. Snover
- 05) Joyce Kessens
- 06) Lawrence A. Sidell
- 07) Charles D. D. Beckmann
- 08) Sam J. (Sandy) (Sandy)
- 09) Theodore L. Hahn
- 10) ~~Fred~~ Hahn

Sign
Print

11) _____

12) _____

Address

13) _____

March 28, 2025

Via Electronic and Certified Mail

William Wietlisbach; 412 N Co Rd 600 E Greensburg, IN 47240

Kenneth Peters; 4620 S Co Rd 550 E Greensburg, IN 47240

Theodore Hahn; 5528 S US Highway 421 Greensburg, IN 47240

Charles Dieckmann; 27080 Mid Road Batesville, IN 47006

William Graves; 7583 E Co Rd 600 S Greensburg, IN 47240

Joyce Kessens; 13701 N Co Rd 100 W Batesville, IN 47006

Lawrence Sidell; 1048 W Co Rd 1300 N Batesville, IN 47006

Leo Fullenkamp; 579 S Co Rd 700 E Greensburg, IN 47240

RE: Response to Second Member Complaint regarding reliability performance of New Point Substation

Dear William Wietlisbach, Kenneth Peters, Theodore Hahn, Charles Dieckmann, William Graves, Joyce Kessens, Lawrence Sidell, Leo Fullenkamp:

DCREMC reviewed your member complaint dated March 26, 2025 regarding ten incidents of “brown-outs/partial outages” experienced by members between 2013 and 2022 (“Second Complaint”).

Given that this Second Complaint (i) simply restates the same concerns you previously submitted in a March 14, 2025 Complaint (“First Complaint”) relating to an incident of single-phasing that occurred more than three (3) years ago and (ii) ignores the process set forth in Rule 16 and demands to escalate to the Board of Directors a **March 2022** operational issue, which was thoroughly investigated and resolved **three years ago**, it is clear that this Second Complaint is merely another attempt to fabricate a problem that does not exist for publicity purposes and to harass and distract the DCREMC staff and Board.

Pursuant to Rule 16 of the DCREMC Rules and Regulations for Electric Service, DCREMC promptly, thoroughly and completely investigated your First Complaint and provided a response on March 20, 2025, which is attached hereto. The Second Complaint raises no new issues or concerns, and the March 20, 2025 written response to the First Complaint serves as the written response to this Second Complaint under Rule 16.

In addition, we note that data from a Distribution Power Quality (DPQ) Phase II study prepared by the Electric Power Research shows that the ten incidents of “brown-outs/partial outages” that you experienced over a 12 year period is **far below** industry averages for these types of events.

**Table 2-1
SARFI Site Medians**

	Transmission Sites (N=53)	Substation Sites (N=183)	Feeder Sites (N=217)
SARFI ₈₀	9.0	20.8	30.8
SARFI _{ITIC}	6.3	12.6	21.5
SARFI ₇₀	5.8	10.3	20.4
SARFI _{SEMI}	4.8	8.4	16.1
SARFI ₅₀	3.3	3.8	10.9

In general, feeder sites had more voltage sags than distribution substation sites, which had more voltage sags than transmission sites. Table 2-2 shows how the site median and upper and lower quartiles changed with location and with survey. Note the wide variation measured at different sites. Figure 2-1 shows this variability with cumulative distributions by monitoring location. With this graph, we see that 80% of distribution feeder sites have a SARFI_{ITIC} of at least 10 events per year. But just 60% of distribution substation sites had SARFI_{ITIC} > 10/year, and only 35% of transmission sites had 10 events below the ITI curve per year.

Voltage Sag Prediction Model Using Distribution Power Quality Phase II Data, Technical Report, EPRI Project Manager, A. Sundaram, Final Report, December 2003.

Rule 16(2)(b) states that if you are not satisfied with the written response to the First Complaint, you may ask to meet with me to discuss the complaint. You ignored this step and instead submitted the Second Complaint and demanded that it be escalated directly to the Board of Directors. DCREMC rejects your attempt to circumvent the member complaint process set forth in Rule 16. Rule 16 includes escalation steps for a reason. Member complaints involving operational issues (e.g. reliability, capacity, design) routinely require analysis by subject matter experts, which could include DCREMC employees, consultants, or industry partners. Often the subject matter expert and member are able to work together to troubleshoot and find solutions and there is no need to escalate an issue further. It would be inefficient to escalate every operational concern directly to the CEO or Board of Directors.

Your consistent refusal to follow the process set forth in Rule 16 causes unnecessary work for the entire DCREMC team and is therefore detrimental to the DCREMC membership as a whole.



Decatur County REMC

1430 W. Main Street
Greensburg, IN 47240

OFFICE 812.663.3391

TOLL FREE 800.844.7362

www.dcremc.com

DCREMC's reliability metrics demonstrate that members receiving service from the New Point Sub-Station receive electric service that is more reliable than customers of industry peers and more reliable than the average DCREMC member. Pursuant to Rule 16(2)(b), if you are not satisfied with this response, you may ask to meet with me to discuss the complaint. Otherwise, our records and further action on this matter will be completed and closed.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brett Abplanalp", written over a horizontal line.

Brett Abplanalp, CEO

cc: Matthew Land (via email)
DCREMC Board of Directors (via email)
Don Wickens (via email)
Robert Wickens (via email)
Erin Borissov (via email)