

From: webmaster@puc.state.oh.us
To: ContactThePUCO
Subject: 64590
Received: 2/17/2012 1:30:06 PM
Message:
WEB ID: 64590 AT:02-17-2012 at 01:30 PM

11-346-EL-SSO
11-351-EL-AIR

Related Case Number: 11-0351

TYPE: complaint

NAME: Mrs. JILL ALDRIDGE

CONTACT SENDER ? No

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 2841 Marsh AV NW
- Canton , oh 44708
- USA

PHONE INFORMATION:

- Home: 330-479-9914
- Alternative: *(no alternative phone provided?)*
- Fax: 330-455-1191

E-MAIL: jaldridge@ustechnology.com

INDUSTRY:Electric

ACCOUNT INFORMATION:

- Company: American Electric Power
- Name on account: Robert Aldridge
- Service address: 2641 Marsh AV NW, Canton , OH 44708
- Service phone: 330-479-9914
- Account Number: not available

COMPLAINT DESCRIPTION:

Regarding rate increases especially for residential and small business. In this economy it is outrageous to increase rates at all, especially at these rate increases. Small business in Ohio will diminish and disappear with rate increases like this. How are we, the residents, to get along without small businesses? How is the state of Ohio going to get along without the taxes that small businesses pay? That will mean tax increases for residents...all so you can make a bigger profit?

Think about it.

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 Sm Date Processed FEB 22 2012

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

2012 FEB 22 PM 5:28

PUCO

Hunter, Donielle

From: ContactThePUCO
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2012 4:57 PM
To: Docketing
Subject: Docketing

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Investigation and Audit Division

Memorandum

Date: 2/22/2012

Re: Robert Kramer
1415 N Main St

Delphos, OH 45833

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

Notes:

Callers bill went from \$75 to \$190 and that's for transmission only. This is in one month and makes absolutely no sense. they can not afford this and something must be done. They will have to send home employees at this rate. Small business can not take the greed PUCO is allowing.
Please docket the attached in the case number above.

Hunter, Donielle

From: ContactThePUCO
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2012 4:14 PM
To: Docketing
Subject: Docketing

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Investigation and Audit Division

Memorandum

Date: 2/22/2012

Re: Rebecca Patterson
2315 41st St NE

Canton, OH 44705

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

Notes:

What has happend to my bill!! My electric bill is now more than any other utility in my house. I have well water, which takes electricity, and I have 3 family members living with me "temporarily" due to the horrible financial situation of our counrty...I simply cannot afford this recent increase! Guess I will be buying more candles.

Please docket the attached in the case number above.

Eastern Avenue Lumber Co. Inc.
804 Eastern Ave.
Chillicothe, OH 45601

Office of the Governor
RECEIVED

FEB 14 2012

February 13, 2012

Governor John R. Kasich

Governor John Kasich
Riffe Center-30th Floor
77 S. High St.
Columbus, OH 43215-6117

Re: Ohio PUCO Case #11-346-EL-SSO and 11-351-EL-AIR

Dear Governor Kasich:

It is with great anger and frustration that I write this letter concerning the recent increase in electric rates that are unfairly and specifically targeted at the small business community of Ohio. For example:

AEP Ohio Statement – Date: 12/12/11 – Total: \$1096.77 – Metered: 12379 kW
AEP Ohio Statement – Date: 01/16/12 – Total: \$1691.63 – Metered: 13180 kW

$\$1096.77 / 12379\text{Kw} = .0886 \text{ cents per kW}$
 $\$1691.63 / 13180\text{Kw} = .1284 \text{ cents per kW}$

These figures represent our one month increase of 54.2%.

As a second generation, half-owner of a hardware and lumber retail operation in a small southern Ohio town, I am astounded and appalled by the severity of these increases. I sincerely wish that I could increase my prices in this fashion and to this degree, but as a business owner, I understand that it would be unfair to the consumer and would prevent us from generating any business. How do the electric suppliers of Ohio, the PUCO, and the government in general expect any small *business to absorb these ridiculous increases in the face of this floundering economy?* Not to mention a small business in an industry already specifically struggling on behalf of the dire banking and housing situations. Why are these increases specifically targeted at small business? They reportedly do not apply to large users and individual consumers, which I find very troubling. Of equal concern is the reported “unanimous” decision by PUCO to allow these increases. Who exactly is looking out for the people and businesses of Ohio?

The governments of Ohio and the United States seem to be unable to comprehend the fact that literally all government revenues are directly or indirectly generated by the business community of this country. Yet, the government continues to allow and directly facilitates the increased taxation, regulation, and, therefore, the eradication of small business. These increases will certainly negate any progress that Governor Kasich has been able to make towards retaining existing business and obtaining new ones in our state. Outside investors and corporate structures will begin, yet again, to view Ohio as the jewel of the “Rust Belt” and a “high cost of business”

state and look elsewhere. When AEP has no more customers to sell electricity to, they should not complain! AEP will be the ones who drove the customers away or businesses out of business altogether while our government stood idly by and let them do it.

Although our company has been able to survive up to this point in time, it is rapidly approaching the juncture that some very difficult decisions will have to be made. These difficult decisions will directly and adversely affect the general welfare of at least fifteen full-time and four part-time employees, not to mention their dependents and families. Also affected would be seasonal employees we would normally hire for the upcoming "busy" season and the income, real estate, corporate, and sales taxes generated by all full-time, part-time, and seasonal positions in our company. These ludicrous and unfair rate increases may very well prove to be the proverbial "last straw" in our case as well as for many other small businesses in our area that are being unfairly targeted.

I strongly encourage the PUCO and AEP to revisit these issues, keeping in mind what is actually fair and realistic. I urge Ohio's elected officials to honestly consider what the ramifications of allowing these increases are now and will be in the future. Continued misguided energy policy decisions by our elected officials and regulators, both state and federal, portend a very dim recovery. Whatever recent improvements there have been in the general economy and the unemployment situation will certainly be adversely affected by these unjust and untimely increases.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Craig Thornton". The signature is fluid and cursive, written over a horizontal line.

Craig Thornton
Vice President



FAMILY OWNED AND OPERATED SINCE 1957

Office of the Governor
RECEIVED

FEB 13 2012

Governor John R. Kasich

February 9, 2012

Ohio Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Attn: IAD
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Re: Case numbers 11-346-EL-SSO and 11-351-EL-AIR

I have been fortunate enough to remain in business throughout this economy and have done so by investing my retirement savings back into the company to cover payroll. That money is gone and I now must make a profit with this business or close the doors that my father opened in 1957.

I urge you to reconsider this matter for the obvious reasons I have listed to enable small business owners the ability to continue to employ Ohio workers and provide products and services within our state and nation.

I respectfully thank you for your time and opportunity to voice my opinion.

Barbara Breckenridge Bloxam

Barbara Breckenridge Bloxam, Owner

Cc: Ohio Supreme Court

NEFB

Governor John Kasich

AEP

We need your help!

1992-1993

1993-1994

1994-1995


1995-1996

1996-1997

1997-1998

[SCO HOME](#) » [PIO](#) » [SUMMARIES](#) » [2011](#) » [0524](#) » SUPREME COURT OF OHIO CASE SUMMARIES

 [Sign up to Receive E-mail Updates](#)  [Subscribe to This Feed](#)
Upcoming Cases

Select an archive 

Court Affirms PUCO Order Allowing AEP to Recoup Revenue Lost Due to Improved Efficiency, Peak Demand Reduction

*Please note: Opinion summaries are prepared by the Office of Public Information for the general public and news media. Opinion summaries are not prepared for every opinion released by the Court, but only for those cases considered noteworthy or of great public interest. Opinion summaries are not to be considered as official headnotes or syllabi of Court opinions. The full text of this and other Court opinions from 1992 to the present are available online from the **Reporter of Decisions**. In the Full Text search box, enter the eight-digit case number at the top of this summary and click "Submit."*

2010-1533 In re Application of Columbus S. Power Co. Slip

Plan" through which AEP proposed various actions to improve energy efficiency and reduce peak demand. Included in the order was a stipulation between AEP and a number of industrial, commercial and residential user groups that permitted CSP to recoup revenues that would otherwise have been lost as a result of improved efficiency and reduced peak demand.

Writing for the Court, Justice Stratton noted that the state's electric utilities were required by law to implement programs to increase energy efficiency and reduce peak demand. She explained that "Energy-efficiency measures reduce the amount of energy required to perform tasks. ... 'Peak demand' refers to the measure of electricity usage at the time when the most energy is being consumed simultaneously. Reducing peak demand, other things being equal, lowers the price of power and forestalls the need to add new generation plants. ... The statute imposes annual goals in both categories, ... and if an electric-distribution utility does not meet the goals, the law authorizes forfeitures ... The statute also allows the commission to approve 'a revenue decoupling mechanism.' Such mechanisms separate (or 'decouple') the recovery of fixed distribution costs from the volume of sales."

In rejecting the legal arguments advanced by IEU as grounds to vacate the commission's order, Justice Stratton pointed out that although the stipulation between AEP and the user groups allowed charges for the utilities' lost revenues to be collected from their customers for a three-year period, the PUCO significantly reduced the time during which those charges could be assessed to a period beginning in May 2010 and ending Jan. 1,

2011.

She wrote: "In its first proposition of law, IEU challenges the commission's approval of CSP's requested decoupling mechanism. The commission actually agreed with IEU's contention that 'the record fails to establish what revenue is necessary to provide AEP-Ohio with the opportunity to recover its costs and to earn a fair and reasonable return.' But rather than disapprove the decoupling mechanism altogether, the commission shortened its lifespan from three years to about seven months.

"R.C. 4928.66(D) contains two requirements that an application for a revenue-decoupling mechanism must meet before the commission may approve it, but IEU does not explain which one it alleges was not met, and we fail to see any statutory violation. The first requirement is that the decoupling mechanism provide only for 'the recovery of revenue that otherwise may be foregone by the utility as a result of or in connection with the implementation by the electric distribution utility of any energy efficiency or energy conservation programs.' This clause does not require the commission to find that the recovery of the lost revenue is necessary to recover costs and to ensure a fair rate of return."

lessened when the commission is reviewing a stipulation. For example, the commission stated in its entry on rehearing that 'in a litigated case,' it 'would have required more information to find that AEP-Ohio had met its burden of proof.' Contrary to the commission's statement, this was 'a litigated case' – IEU contested the stipulation. When the commission reviews a contested stipulation, the requirement of evidentiary support remains operative. While the commission 'may place substantial weight on the terms of a stipulation,' it 'must determine, *from the evidence*, what is just and reasonable.'"

"Here, however, no one challenges the legality of the commission's specific decision to cut short CSP's decoupling mechanism. And IEU has not shown that the law required the commission to go any further. While the commission may have erred in its reasoning, that error is harmless."


Contacts

Samuel C. Randazzo, 614.469.8000, for Industrial Energy Users - Ohio.

Thomas McNamee, 614.466.4396, for the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio.


Requires the free Adobe Flash Player.

View system requirements, download instructions, and download the free Adobe Flash Player.




central ohio's news leader

Chris Bradley, Jerry Nevins, Andrea Conburn, Doree Tabor



OHIO UNIVERSITY
College of Business

LEARN MORE >>



Professional
MBA accredited
By AACSB

Business Owners In Shock Over New Electricity Rates

Wednesday February 8, 2012 6:43 PM
UPDATED: Wednesday February 8, 2012 9:22 PM

COLUMBUS, Ohio - Some small business owners are trying to figure out how they will keep their businesses afloat after seeing recent utility bills, 10TV's Kevin Landers

AEP: 1-800-277-2177

Landers reported.

"A recent increase in electric rates by AEP could put our local mills out of business. It would be devastating to our county to lose even one of the mills," the letter said.

The Public Utilities Commission, which unanimously approved the rate hike in December, said that it had received 140 complaints from business owners and school districts outraged over the decision.

"We understand what we're hearing from our customers, and it's serious," PUCO said.

AEP officials said that the rate increase was the result of deferred payments that the company did not pass along to small businesses for years but were paid for by bigger electric consumers.

"This case has allowed customers to choose a supplier that could provide them cheaper electricity," AEP spokesperson Terri Flora said.

AEP said that it encouraged customers to contact them with concerns, and the Public Utilities Commission asked that people contact them in writing and include the specific case number.