

FILE

Hunter, Donielle

From: ContactThePUCO
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2012 11:02 AM
To: Docketing
Subject: Docketing

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Investigation and Audit Division

Memorandum

Date: 2/7/2012

Re: Kathy McIntire
934 W Market St
Baltimore, OH 43105

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

Notes:

NAME: Mr. Matt McIntire
CONTACT SENDER ? Yes
MAILING ADDRESS:
934 W Market St
Baltimore , Ohio 43105
USA
PHONE INFORMATION:
Home: 7408622323
Alternative: 7408628222
Fax: (no fax number provided?)
E-MAIL: noneyab@hotmail.com
INDUSTRY:Electric
ACCOUNT INFORMATION:
Company: The Artist Within
Name on account: Kathy McIntire
Service address: 934 W Market St
Service phone: 7408628222
(no account number provided?)
COMPLAINT DESCRIPTION:

How can you justify raising our small business rates by 40% for no reason, we are a very small art center in a depressed area that has lost all art in the schools. We provide a valuable service to to the community and this type of expense when we barely pay our bills as it is may just put us out of business. This is a disgrace and unjust. Rebates to large companies while the little guy gets screwed again. Now what are we supposed to do ????

Please docket the attached in the case number above.

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 le Date Processed FEB 07 2012

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
2012 FEB -7 PM 12:09
PUCO

Hunter, Donielle

From: ContactThePUCO
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2012 12:02 PM
To: Docketing
Subject: Docketing

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Investigation and Audit Division

Memorandum

Date: 2/7/2012

Re: Mark Henry
5939 E Main St

Columbus, OH 43213

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

Notes:

Cusotmer is upset due to the doubling of his AEP bills.

Advised I would docket his concerns and informed him "The PUCO is troubled by the affected AEP customers' concerns, and we are currently evaluating bills and exploring possible ways to mitigate rate impacts going forward.

Cusotmer is upset due to the doubling of his AEP bills.

Advised I would docket his concerns and informed him "The PUCO is troubled by the affected AEP customers' concerns, and we are currently evaluating bills and exploring possible ways to mitigate rate impacts going forward.

Please docket the attached in the case number above.

Hunter, Donielle

From: ContactThePUCO
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2012 12:16 PM
To: Docketing
Subject: Docketing
Attachments: 205331.html; 205331.pdf; 205331.txt

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Investigation and Audit Division

Memorandum

Date: 2/7/2012

Re: Keith Matthews
13260 Morse Rd

Pataskala, OH 43062

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

Notes:

To Whom It May Concern:

Jersey Baptist Church is a not-for-profit corporation, seeking to change the lives of the people in the communities we serve through sharing the life-changing message of Jesus Christ, and through our caring ministries.

As a result of the deregulation of the electric industry in Ohio, we entered into an agreement with a third party to provide us with our electric generation in May of 2010. During this process, we worked closely with American Electric Power (AEP) who provides the distribution service for our electric and was our previous supplier of electricity generation. There was no indication at that time of any intent to increase the cost of their distribution service. We changed to a third party provider of electric generation in order to be good stewards of the donations given to our ministries.

In January of this year (2012) we received our bill from AEP and with no prior notice, were hit with an increase in the cost of the distribution services provided by AEP. The rate went from 1.75 cents/kWh (in December 2011) to 5.96 cents/kWh. That is an increase of 243% on one of our bills and the increase on our other bill was 214%. In February, we experienced additional increases in our Deliver Services. The February increases were 1.7% and 10.9% respectively over the January rates. This brings our increases on each account to 249% and 248% respectively year-to-date.

I took a moment to review AEP's earnings (GAAP) for 2011 of \$1,941,000,000; This is a 60% increase in GAAP earnings from 2010. It is difficult to comprehend how they can justify a rate increase of the magnitude we have received considering their increase earnings this year. Furthermore, it is hard to understand why the PUCO would authorize an increase of this magnitude.

When we contacted AEP to ask them how our Distribution Service was calculated, we were told that it is based on our tariff (840) and all applicable riders. When we asked for clarification on what the riders were that impacted us, we were told to go to their website where "all the information was available". In going to the website, we found a page for tariffs and riders. We printed off a stack of papers (195 pages) and somehow we are supposed to know which of those impact our church, and how they are used to calculate our delivery service. Pretty poor customer service considering the cost we are paying for their services.

As a church (not-for-profit corporation), the impact of these increases are significant. We are projecting our AEP Electric distribution service fees to go up \$44,570 for 2012. This will impact not only our local congregation, but also individuals in our community. We seek to assist single parents, and families who are struggling to make ends meet. In the past year we helped hundreds of people with rent, utilities, food, medical expenses, and other basic necessities of life. Additionally, we provide coaching and counseling services to individuals who are struggling with hurts, hang-ups and other issues from their past. This decision impacts families who are already struggling, and also organizations who are trying to help those less fortunate.

We implore you to reconsider the request from AEP to allow these increases. Unfortunately, although there is deregulation for the purchase of electric generation, in reality, there is still a monopoly; since there is no other provider for distribution services.

Please docket the attached in the case number above.