

FILE

From: webmaster@puc.state.oh.us
 To: ContactThePUCO
 Subject: 65382
 Received: 3/7/2012 10:23:09 AM
 Message:
 WEB ID: 65382 AT:03-07-2012 at 10:23 AM

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
 2012 MAR 19 PM 2:05
 PUCO

Related Case Number:

TYPE: comment

NAME: Mr. Tom OConnor

CONTACT SENDER ? No

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 2014 Samada Ave
- Worthington , Ohio 43085
- USA

PHONE INFORMATION:

- Home: *(no home phone provided?)*
- Alternative: *(no alternative phone provided?)*
- Fax: *(no fax number provided?)*

E-MAIL: toconnor@columbus.rr.com

INDUSTRY:Electric

ACCOUNT INFORMATION:

- Company: AEP
- *(no account name provided?)*
- *(no service address provided?)*
- *(no service phone number provided?)*
- *(no account number provided?)*

COMMENT DESCRIPTION:

On case nos. 11-346-EL-SSO & 11-348-EL-SSO, I believe the PUCO has erred in it's decision to have AEP start from scratch for its new rate plan and should be allowed an interim rate ruling concerning attachment charges for competitors. The settlement was reviewed in detail by many groups last year and a proposal was agreed to and forwarded for a final PUCO decision. If there was something incorrect in the ruling, it should be either rejected or reviewed (what ever is allowed by law), but not returned for another year of negotiations. Also, the interim ruling needs

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 JD Date Processed 3-19-12

to be favorable to AEP so as not to give unfair advantage to its competitors.

Thanks you far having a web page that allows comments.

Tom O'Connor AEP Retiree