DOCKETING DIU CASE NO. 14-1963 JAN 19 2016 To whom it MAY CONCERN AT P. U. CO. AMERICAN ELECTRIC POWER REQUEST FOR PROFIT GUARANTEE WOULD COST ME AN APRITIONAL 100 DOLLARS PER YEAR. HOW DOES THAT SAVE ME MOWEY? EUERY TIME WE TURN AROUND = A.E.P. IS ADDING ANOTHER SURCHOPRED To OUR BILL. IF A.E.P. AND P.U.C.O FEELS THIS IS CORRECT FOR THE CONSUMER TO PAY FOR A.E.P. MISMANAGEMENT AND CORPORATE GREED THE MAYBE A REPEAL OF O.R.C 4933.83 IS IN ORDER. I BUY GASOLINE WHERE I CHOOSE. I BUY FOOD FROM THE SUPERMARKET THAT I WANT TO. TELEPHONE, T.U., INTERNET is ALL OF MY CHOICE. THIS LAW WAS PASSED IN 1978. ALOT HAS CHANGED IN SO YEARS. A. E.P. IS A BULLY AND TREATS ITS CUSTOMERS BECAUSE THEY CANNOT CHANGE ELECTRIC SERVICE PROUPERS. 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 for Date Processed JAN 2 2 2016

	<b>,,</b>
	ONLY ELECTRIC COMPANIES HAVE
	MONOPLIES AND NO WAY FOR CONSUMERS
·	TO SAY NO THANKS, I" WILL GET MINE
	FROM SOMEONE ELSE.
	SOMEHOW GIVING PROFIT GUARANTEES
	SURCHARGES, OR RIDERS TO A COMPANY WITH
	SUCH POOR CUSTOMER SATISFATION OR
	SERVICE, WOULD BE WRONG
	JENVICE, WOULD DE WING
	Dary Kickler
	7930 CU RD 26
	MARENGO OHIO
	43334
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
<u> </u>	

Utilities

## AEP plan will cost consumers, PUCO told

By Dan Gearino
THE COLUMBUS DISPATCH

AEP Ohio customers would pay about \$5 to \$8 more each month if the utility receives its proposed profit guarantee for certain power plants, according to a consumer group's estimate.

That stands in contrast to the company's assertion that the plan would lead to a net savings for consumers.

At a time when households are struggling to keep up with the ever-increasing cost of living, the astronomical costs of college tuition, the increasing cost of housing and flat-todeclining real wages, saddling AEP Ohio's customers and businesses with a litany of additional riders, surcharges and taxes is most certainly not in the public interest," said testimony from Noah Dormady, a Columbus economist who served as an expert witness for the Office of the Ohio

See AEP plan Page C4

## AEP Ohio profit proposal costly, PUCO is told

An expert witness for the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Council says AEP Ohio customers would pay \$5 to \$8 more each month if the utility wins its proposed profit guarantee for certain power plants, Reporter Dan Gearino writes. \* Page C1

## **AEP** plan

FROM PAGE C1

Consumers' Counsel.

The office, which is a consumer advocate on utility issues, filed a detailed response to the proposal ahead of a hearing that begins Monday before the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.

AEP is seeking an eight-year profit guarantee for certain coal-fired power plants.

The company says the plan will make prices more stable and help to retain the jobs and reliable service from plants that might otherwise close. The proposal includes many other provisions, including environmental commitments that have helped to gain the support of the Sierra Club.

AEP says the profit guarantee will make electricity bills slightly lower, with monthly savings of less than \$1 per household next year, and net savings of \$721 million for the AEP territory as a whole over the life of the deal.

Jeff Rennie, an AEP spokesman, said his company stands by its forecast and thinks that the counsel's analysis is "flawed." He did not go into specifics.

Critics say AEP's forecast is based on outdated and otherwise faulty numbers. They say a company would never support a plan that hurts its bottom line. AEP says a profit guarantee will stabilize prices and save jobs at plants that might close.

To make this case, the counsel has its own estimate of the costs, which it says are based on a more current and more realistic forecast. It shows that consumers' bills would increase by \$1.9 billion during the life of the deal.

The counsel's testimony estimates the impact of its take on the overall cost on consumer bills. For example, an AEP customer using 1,000 kilowatt-hours per month—which is close to typical usage—would pay an additional \$82.62 in 2016. The extra charges vary by year, ranging from a high of \$99.05 in 2018 to a low of \$64.79 in 2023.

In terms of monthly bills, the charges would range roughly from \$5 to \$8.

Columbus-based AEP has 1.5 million customers in Ohio.

The PUCO will need to assess the competing forecasts as it reviews the AEP plan and decides whether to approve it.

Another Ohio-based utility, FirstEnergy, has a similar profit-guarantee plan that has been the subject of its own dueling forecasts, with the company projecting a savings for consumers and others saying the opposite is true.

dgearino@dispatch.com