FILE

JGED101111 25

5

The City Of Toronto

State of Ohio

"The Gem City"

416 Clark Street
P.O. Box 189
Toronto, Ohio 43964
740-537-3743
Fax 740-537-5010

Service Director
Larry Coppa

Mayor
John F Geddis

Safety Director
John C Parker

October 7, 2011

Chairman Todd A. Snitchler
180 E. Broad Street
Columbus OH 43215

11-346-EL-SSO

PUCO

2011 NOV -2 AM 8:50

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

Dear Chairman Snitchler:

The City of Toronto is in AEP Ohio's service area. As a community who has the opportunity to provide its residents and small businesses with discounted electricity through a government aggregation program, we are genuinely concerned that the proposed settlement on AEP's Electric Security Plan (ESP) will effectively bring this type of discount program to an end for the next few years.

The proposed settlement includes unreasonable provisions which serve as caps or limitations on shopping and will limit the number of residents allowed to switch electric suppliers each year. Once this cap is hit, our community - and others like ours - will be effectively shut out from enjoying any savings. Hundreds of other Ohio communities in neighboring utilities are receiving savings through their aggregation programs. Why are we being penalized for being AEP customers? And why should AEP be able to dictate which groups of residents and businesses are allowed to save money on their electric bills?

It is the policy of this state to ensure effective competition in the provision of electric service – 4928.02 of the Ohio Revised Code – and it is the PUCO's mission to facilitate an environment that provides competitive choices. We ask that you encourage large-scale governmental aggregation as required by Ohio law – 4928.20(K) – by rejecting or significantly altering this settlement agreement to remove the caps. However, if the shopping caps are going to be implemented, we propose that governmental aggregation communities be exempted from the caps.

The reason our community has the potential for saving money on our electric generation supply is because a competitive generation supplier is competing for our business. It's apparent that AEP is attempting to prevent competitive suppliers from serving the customers in their service area. And if they are successful, the people and businesses in communities like Toronto will miss out on these savings. Other communities in Ohio have this opportunity to save and so should we.

Respectfully,

John Geddis

John Geddis
Mayor

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a case file document delivered in the regular course of business.
Technician [signature] Date Processed 11-02-11

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
Sam Bassitt
W. Dan Reiff
Greg Sneary

Allen County Ohio

ADMINISTRATOR
Becky R. Saine

CLERK
Kelli A. Singhaus

301 N. Main Street . P.O. Box 1243 . Lima, Ohio 45802-1243 . 419-228-3700 Ext 8725 . www.allencountyohio.com

October 17, 2011

Mr. Todd A. Snitchler, Chairman
The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
180 E. Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215

Dear Chairman Snitchler:

During the summer 2011, the Board of Allen County Commissioners determined it wanted to place opt-out governmental aggregation on the November ballot for the voters' consideration. Furthermore our community decided to participate in the County Commissioners Association of Ohio (CCAO) program. From our conversations with the CCAO, townships and cities in eight different counties, representing 45,000 to 50,000 residential and small commercial consumers, are on the November 1st ballot in AEP's distribution service territory. If the voters agree to ratify opt-out governmental aggregation, our community would become part of the CCAO's current nine county programs that already has 70,000 residential and small commercial consumers working together.

Yet despite the effort and the voters' expectations, provisions in AEP's Electricity Security Plan (ESP) proposed settlement effectively caps or limits shopping. Worse yet, the timing of the provisions are very likely to shut out our consumers from enjoying any savings. No settlement should eliminate the opportunity for governmental aggregation to capture savings for consumers after it has already been placed on the ballot.

The policy of this state is to ensure effective competition in the provision of electric service – 4928.02 of the Ohio Revised Code – and it is the PUCO's mission to facilitate an environment that provides competitive choices. The reason our community's consumers have the potential for saving money on our electric generation supply is because a competitive generation supplier is competing for our business. It's apparent that the cap in AEP's proposed settlement is an attempt to prevent competitive suppliers from serving all the customers in their service area that want to save money.

Right now, hundreds of thousands of consumers living in hundreds of other Ohio communities are saving money through their aggregation programs. Why are we being penalized for being AEP customers? And why should AEP be able to dictate which groups of residents and businesses are allowed to save money on their electric bills?

If the PUCO approves the caps, the people and businesses in communities like Allen County will miss out on these savings. Other communities in Ohio have this opportunity to save and so should we.

Sincerely,

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
ALLEN COUNTY, OHIO

Greg Sneary W. Dan Reiff Sam Bassitt

Paris Township

Stark County

Trustees
Michael Stewart
Terry Gram
James Kiko

14220 Freed St SE
Paris, OH 44669
Phone (330) 862-3732
Fax (330) 862-3105

Fiscal Officer
Rudy Evanich

Chairman Todd A. Snitchler
180 E. Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215

Dear Chairman Snitchler:

Paris Township, Stark County is in AEP Ohio's service area. As a community who has the opportunity to provide its residents and small businesses with discounted electricity through a governmental aggregation program, we are genuinely concerned that the proposed settlement on AEP's Electric Security Plan (ESP) will effectively bring this type of discount program to an end for the next few years.

The proposed settlement includes unreasonable provisions which serve as caps or limitations on shopping and will limit the number of residents allowed to switch electric suppliers each year. Once this cap is hit, our community – and others like ours – will be effectively shut out from enjoying any savings. Hundreds of other Ohio communities in neighboring utilities are receiving savings through their aggregation programs. Why are we being penalized for being AEP customers? And why should AEP be able to dictate which groups of residents and businesses are allowed to save money on their electric bills?

It is the policy of this state to ensure effective competition in the provision of electric service – 4928.02 of the Ohio Revised Code – and it is the PUCO's mission to facilitate an environment that provides competitive choices. We ask that you encourage large-scale governmental aggregation as required by Ohio law – 4928.20(K) – by rejecting or significantly altering this settlement agreement to remove the caps. However, if the shopping caps are going to be implemented, we propose that governmental aggregation communities be exempted from the caps.

The reason our community has the potential for saving money on our electric generation supply is because a competitive generation supplier is competing for our business. It's apparent that AEP is attempting to prevent competitive suppliers from serving the customers in their service area. And if they are successful, the people and businesses in communities like Paris Township will miss out on these savings. Other communities in Ohio have this opportunity to save and so should we.

Sincerely,

Rudy Evanich
Paris Township Fiscal Officer

PUCO

General Maintenance & Lighting Products, Ltd.

P.O. Box 95351 Cleveland, Ohio 44101

Phone: (440) 526-2034 Fax: (440) 546-0956 Cell: (216) 509-1537

This letter is about the FIRST ENERGY LIGHTING INCENTIVE PROGRAM for business's .

First Energy in my area includes Illuminating Co. > Ohio Edison > Toledo Edison

First Energy's program paid 80 cents per watt saved to everyone who reduced their energy cost by installing new energy saving fixtures , retrofits , etc. The contracts had to Be submitted to First Energy by October 11 , 2011.

First Energy also implemented a DSE RIDER CHARGE on utility bills of .003% of 1 cent for every KW used . This First Energy charge will go up every year for ten years till it reaches 1% of 1 cent for every KW used. This charge goes till 2024.

First Energy arbitrary cancelled the program on Friday, September 30 , 2011 with no notice retroactive to August 5 , 2011 >> They however did not cancel DSE RIDER CHARGE.

There are thousands of business's who were told about the First Energy Program > Contracts Signed & submitted to First Energy and are now NOT being honored.

We have lighting fixtures ordered > stock in our warehouses which we are stuck with. Also electricians will have to be laid off.

All we are asking is that all contracts in the First Energy System by the date First Energy gave us of October 11 , 2011 be honered.

My E-Mail is jfairgmp726@att.net

THANK YOU
James A. Fair
President

Office of the Governor
RECEIVED
OCT 05 2011
Governor John R. Kasich

PSEH 101111TN

Office of the Mayor

Pete Sehnert

318 Dorney Plaza, Room 310
Findlay, OH 45840
Telephone: 419-424-7137 • Fax: 419-424-7245
www.findlayohio.com

Jim Barker
Safety Director

Bruce Hardy
Service Director

October 6, 2011

Chairman Todd A. Snitchler
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215

Dear Chairman Snitchler:

For the first time in eleven years of electric deregulation the City of Findlay has an opportunity to help its residents and small businesses save money on their electric service through the process of Governmental Aggregation. Findlay is in Ohio Power service area, and we are very concerned that the proposed settlement on AEP's Electric Security Plan (ESP) will effectively prohibit us from starting a program for at least the next several years.

AEP's proposed settlement, which was not approved by all interveners, includes unreasonable provisions which serve as caps or limitations on shopping and will limit the number of residents allowed to switch electric suppliers each year. Once this cap is hit, our community – and others like ours – will be effectively shut out from enjoying any savings. Hundreds of other Ohio communities in neighboring utilities are receiving savings through their aggregation programs. Why are we being penalized for being AEP customers? And why should AEP be able to dictate which groups of residents and businesses are allowed to save money on their electric bills?

It is the policy of Ohio to ensure effective competition in the provision of electric service – 4928.02 of the Ohio Revised Code – and it is the PUCO's mission to facilitate an environment that provides competitive choices. We ask that you encourage large-scale governmental aggregation as required by Ohio law – 4928.20(K) – by rejecting or significantly altering this settlement agreement to remove the caps. However, if the shopping caps are going to be implemented, we propose that governmental aggregation communities be exempted from the caps.

The reason our community has the potential for saving money on our electric generation supply is because competitive generation suppliers are interested in competing for our business. It is apparent that AEP is attempting to prevent competitive suppliers from serving the customers in their service area. And if they are successful, the people and businesses in communities like Findlay will miss out on these savings. Other communities in Ohio have this opportunity to save and so should we.

Sincerely,

Pete Sehnert
Mayor