

# McCauley, Betty

From:

Bell, Terry

Sent:

Friday, August 24, 2012 6:48 AM

To:

McCauley, Betty

Subject:

Betty, I'm thinking this should be docketed under this case. Thanks!

From: webmaster@puc.state.oh.us

To: ContactThePUCO

Subject: 69114

Received: 8/22/2012 5:47:48 PM

Message:

WEB ID: 69114 AT:08-22-2012 at 05:47 PM

Related Case Number:

TYPE: comment

NAME: Mr. Jayma Davis

**CONTACT SENDER? Yes** 

### **MAILING ADDRESS:**

- 14 East Gay St
- Columbus, Ohio 43215
- USA

#### PHONE INFORMATION:

Home: 614.228.8366

• Alternative: (no alternative phone provided?)

• Fax: (no fax number provided?)

E-MAIL: jaymadavis@yahoo.com

INDUSTRY: Electric

### ACCOUNT INFORMATION:

- (no utility company name provided?)
- (no account name provided?)
- (no service address provided?)
- (no service phone number provided?)
- (no account number provided?)

## COMMENT DESCRIPTION:

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 ProcesseAUG 2 4 2012

2012 AUG 24 AM 7: 41
PUCO

KECEI AED - COCNET ING OF

Re: AEP Ohio Capacity Pricing Case (10-2929-EL-UNC) and AEP-Ohio Electric Security Plan Cases (11-346-EL-SSO, et al.)

We are asking for your assistance in avoiding electric bill increases at a time when electric prices should be decreasing. The following points are a concern of business customers of AEP-Ohio.

Conditions in the wholesale electric market presently provide opportunities for consumers to reduce their electric bills. The PUCO's unique authorization of rate increases for AEP-Ohio in the form of above-market capacity prices and the earnings guarantee mechanism authorized by the PUCO in the ESP case (otherwise known as the RSR) impose a competitive disadvantage on Ohio businesses that compete for their customers.

The PUCO's decisions hold Ohio's businesses hostage to above-market electric prices through non-bypassable charges and result in a form of regulatory interference that suggests that the PUCO is not committed to fair and full implementation of Ohio's pro-competitive and pro-consumer electricity laws.

The PUCO's decisions operate to punish consumers in AEP-Ohio's service area with a "shopping tax" simply because AEP-Ohio demands above-market compensation for its generation business which was deregulated in 2001.

These additional costs for Electric have been and will be a severe financial burden on our small business. Please re-consider your decision on this matter.

Jayma Davis Cafe Brioso

Terry S. Bell
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Service Monitoring and Enforcement Department
Chief, Customer Education and Contact Division
(614) 995-9087
PUCO.ohio.gov



This message and any response to it may constitute a public record and thus may be available to anyone who requests it