FILE

5

Hunter, Donielle

From:	ContactThePUCO
Sent:	Tuesday, April 10, 2012 1:08 PM
To:	Docketing
Subject:	Docketing
Attachments:	211863.html

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Investigation and Audit Division

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
2012 APR 10 PM 1:30
PUCO

Memorandum

Date: 4/10/2012

Re: Charles Guarino

,

Docketing Case No.:11-346-EL-SSO

Notes:
The Highland County Case Number: case number 11-346-EL-SSO My Case Number: CGUA020912FT
To Whom it May Concern:
I have read the recent AEP information*
* "Vegas said if the plan is approved, most residential customers in the Columbus Southern Power zone, which includes the Hillsboro region, will see an average increase in 2012 of $7.40 per month, a hike of about five percent. Starting in June 2013, residential customers will experience another four percent hike. In 2014, the increase would be only about a quarter of a percent." (Times Gazette, March 29, 2012) Even though the rate of 9% for three years seems reasonable, you have to consider this; in negotiating contracts the person who wants the raise is also trying to get most of the raise in the beginning years of the contract, so they can get the "biggest bang for the buck".
AEP wants to raise the rate by 5% in the first year, which is over half (55.5%) of the 9% total increase, then 3.75% (41.7%) of the 9% increase in the second year. Now if the PUCO accepted the plan, beginning in year two, customers will be paying over 97.2% of the 9 percent increase. The remaining 2.8% of the 9 percent rate which is only .25% increase is in the last (third) year. AEP is trying their best to get their 9% increase in the first two years.
If everyone thinks that fronting 97% of the 9 percent raise in the beginning the first two years of a three year contract is good, yes for AEP, but not good for the residential customer. A fairer approach for everyone would be 3% (33.3%) each year that way the costs are not all fronted in the beginning of the first two years. In the second year the increase would be a total of 6% of the 9 percent increase. That would be a little over 66% that AEP would front in the two years and not the 97% that is being purposed by the company.
It is really negotiations 101, but sometimes it gets missed. I believe AEP should receive their increase, but it should be fair to all concern for the company and its customers alike.
Charlie Guarino Hillsboro, OH cguarino@cinci.rr.com 937-515-3322

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 _____ Date Processed APR 10 2012

To: cguarino@cinci.rr.com
CC:
BCC:
Subject: Follow-up E-mail. Case: CGUA020912FT

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Investigation and Audit Division

Memorandum

Re: Charles Guarino

,
(937) 393-8555

CASE ID: CGUA020912FT

Notes:
======
Hello Mr. Guarino.....

This is the case in question.

http://dis.puc.state.oh.us/CaseRecord.aspx?CaseNo=11-346&x=10&y=12

From: Stephen Watson

Compliance Investigator
PUCO/SMED/IAD
Please docket the attached in the case number above.

Hunter, Donielle

From: ContactThePUCO
Sent: Tuesday, April 10, 2012 12:14 PM
To: Docketing
Subject: Docketing

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Investigation and Audit Division

Memorandum

Date: 4/10/2012

Re: Jerry Leard
2287 Indiana Ave

Columbus, OH 43202

Docketing Case No.:11-346-348-el-SSO

Notes: My comments & COMPLAINT are concerned with Case# 11-346-348-el-SSO. I am disappointed to find out that the GREEN PRICING Program or the GREEN POWER Portfolio Rider WAS NOT Included in AEP OHIO NEW SSO Plan. A Lott of AEP OHIO Customers like Me DO NOT have SPACE for RENUABLE ENERGY EQUIPMENT! The INCENTIVE For Electric Vehicles Should BE Included in the AEP OHIO SSO,it is a PROGRESIVE Program That Benefits The Company & Customers by PROVIDING a ENABALING & CONVEANENT Service Please ADVISE The INCLUSION of THESE Important Provisions in Case# 11-346-348-el-SSO! Sincerely Yours, JERRY LEARD

Please docket the attached in the case number above.

From: webmaster@puc.state.oh.us
To: ContactThePUCO
Subject: 66088
Received: 4/9/2012 1:04:43 PM
Message:
WEB ID: 66088 AT:04-09-2012 at 01:04 PM

Related Case Number:

TYPE: complaint

NAME: Mr. Jim Ebert

CONTACT SENDER ? Yes

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 1800 Forest Park
- Findlay , Ohio 45840
- USA

PHONE INFORMATION:

- Home: 419-424-8834
- Alternative: 419-957-8087
- Fax: *(no fax number provided?)*

E-MAIL: jebert1@woh.rr.com

INDUSTRY:Electric

ACCOUNT INFORMATION:

- Company: AEP-OP
- Name on account: James A Ebert
- Service address: 1800 Forest Park
- *(no service phone number provided?)*
- *(no account number provided?)*

COMPLAINT DESCRIPTION:

This complaint corresponds with case numbers 11-346-EL-SSO and 11-348-EL-SSO. It is our understanding AEP-Ohio is still requesting Commission approval of EXCESSIVE CAPACITY FEES ($255 per megawatt day) for the post June 1st, 2012 period, so while competitive markets have revealed a price of ~$16 per megawatt day, AEP continues to expect shopping customers to pay a PREMIUM that is fast-approaching a 1500% mark-up. All things considered, if AEP's request is granted by the PUCO, such an unfavorable outcome will "effectively" eliminate shopping opportunities for the foreseeable future. At a time when there may never be a better opportunity to shop and save on electric spend behind AEP's service territories, the collective efforts of AEP and the PUCO exhibit a

determination for eliminating that opportunity, which is perplexing to say the least. There was absolutely no justification for the Commission to grant AEP EXCESSIVE CAPACITY FEES ($255 per megawatt day) on an interim basis (i.e. through May 31st, 2012), but to learn now that AEP expects more of the same for a much longer-term, is nothing short of AEP requesting a MONOPOLY. Words cannot adequately describe how inherently flawed this proposition is at face-value, but please understand AEP customers do not intend to stand idly by and allow the Commission to continue putting forth ANTI-COMPETITIVE decisions; nor should Ohio's certified retail electric suppliers. It is difficult to comprehend why AEP's unregulated marketing arm (AEP Retail Energy) is being extended the opportunity to compete in other Ohio service territories (i.e. Duke, DP&L, and FirstEnergy), whereas AEP is currently being granted protection from certified suppliers trying to compete in its service territories? This political nonsense needs to come to an end, and it needs to end now! Customers should be granted access to market-prices for capacity; hence, the purpose for deregulating Ohio's electricity markets.

Thank you for your time and consideration.