

From: webmaster@puc.state.oh.us  
To: ContactThePUCO  
Subject: 65379  
Received: 3/7/2012 10:17:53 AM  
Message:  
WEB ID: 65379 AT:03-07-2012 at 10:17 AM

Related Case Number:

TYPE: comment

NAME: Ms. Brenda Maksimovic

CONTACT SENDER ? Yes

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 1608 Waltham Rd
- Upper Arlington , Ohio 43221
- USA

PHONE INFORMATION:

- Home: (614) 716-3296
- Alternative: (614) 288-4528
- Fax: *(no fax number provided?)*

E-MAIL: bnmaksimovic@aep.com

INDUSTRY:Electric

ACCOUNT INFORMATION:

- Company: American Electric Power
- *(no account name provided?)*
- *(no service address provided?)*
- *(no service phone number provided?)*
- *(no account number provided?)*

COMMENT DESCRIPTION:

Dear PUCO. I have worked for AEP for over 30 years. All I have to say it is the best company to work for ever. The folks at AEP are my family. I have to pay my electric bill just like everyone else does. With that said, it is my hope for Ohio that the PUCO and AEP can come to a reasonable solution for the greater good of all. Thank you.

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 AN Date Processed APR 02 2012

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV  
2012 APR -2 PM 3:58  
PUCO

From: webmaster@puc.state.oh.us  
To: ContactThePUCO  
Subject: 65367  
Received: 3/7/2012 10:02:03 AM  
Message:  
WEB ID: 65367 AT:03-07-2012 at 10:01 AM

Related Case Number:

TYPE: comment

NAME: Mrs. Sarah Miller

CONTACT SENDER ? No

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 1695 Waltham Rd
- Columbus , Ohio 43221
- USA

PHONE INFORMATION:

- Home: 614-488-8072
- Alternative: *(no alternative phone provided?)*
- Fax: *(no fax number provided?)*

E-MAIL: sarah\_p\_miller@yahoo.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:

Please respond quickly and favorably to AEP Ohio's petition submitted last week. Your unprecedented move to reverse the original ESP has put the company and its employees at risk. Not to mention, the number of organizations who benefit from AEP's charitable giving are also feeling the pain of your reversal. The least you can do is resolve this quickly so that all parties can move on in their best interests.

Respectfully, Sarah Miller (AEP customer)

**Hunter, Donielle**

---

**From:** Sierra Club Ohio Chapter <natalie.fox@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Sally Coe <sac0808@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 30, 2012 3:44 PM  
**To:** Docketing  
**Subject:** Tell Duke: Clean & Green for New Richmond!

Mar 30, 2012

Public Utilities Commission

Duke ratepayers want clean energy!

Duke Energy should move forward with energy efficiency and renewables like wind and solar. Ohio ratepayers would like to see the economic development fund for New Richmond include clean energy to create jobs in the community. We would also like to see Duke replace the Beckjord coal plant with clean energy instead of natural gas.

We have a responsibility to provide green jobs to workers in communities affected by coal plant retirement. Duke can make this transition easier for the New Richmond community by focusing their economic development fund on clean energy.

Sincerely

Mrs. Sally Coe  
1005 Richwood Ave  
Cincinnati, OH 45208-4414  
(513) 871-1586

From: webmaster@puc.state.oh.us  
To: ContactThePUCO  
Subject: 65353  
Received: 3/7/2012 9:52:12 AM  
Message:  
WEB ID: 65353 AT:03-07-2012 at 09:52 AM

Related Case Number:

TYPE: comment

NAME: Mr. Tollison Lawrence

CONTACT SENDER ? No

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 47201 county road 273
- conesville , Ohio 43811
- USA

PHONE INFORMATION:

- Home: 7408293165
- Alternative: *(no alternative phone provided?)*
- Fax: *(no fax number provided?)*

E-MAIL: thlawrence@aep.com

INDUSTRY:Other

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:

Why give a competitive advantage to the middleman when the company that is generating electricity is responsible for providing uninterrupted service. I agree with the editorial from the Columbus Dispatch 3/7/2012 that I have copied below.

"Editorial: Reasonable request

A competitive electricity marketplace in Ohio requires as many strong electricity suppliers as possible. A market in which one player has an advantage is not in the best interests of customers.

At present, one of the state's major electricity suppliers, American Electric Power, is in a particularly vulnerable competitive position because of the recent revocation of its rate plan by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio. Without action by the PUCO to give AEP the breathing space and rates it needs to continue to do business, electricity competition in the state could be harmed for years to come.

For a decade, Ohio's electric utilities have been transitioning away from a highly regulated marketplace for electricity toward a competitive market system. That transition is incomplete, with some utilities further along in the process than others. AEP is not as far along as, for example, FirstEnergy, one of its primary competitors.

Until a few days ago, AEP was operating under a new rate plan designed to help it transition to market competition in four years. That plan, which went into effect in December, imposed sharp rate increases on small businesses, schools, churches and some homeowners, leading to more than 1,000 complaints to the PUCO. In an unprecedented move, the PUCO simply revoked the rate plan and announced that a new plan would have to be devised, a process that could take the better part of a year.

Not surprisingly, AEP officials felt that the rug had been pulled out from under them. Their planning for years to come was based on the terms of the now-revoked rate plan.

In response, AEP has asked that the PUCO allow it to raise the rate that its competitors are charged to make use of AEP's infrastructure. This rate, called the capacity charge, is what AEP is allowed to charge its competitors for the use of AEP's infrastructure when an AEP customer decides to switch to a competing power company. At present, the capacity charge is lower than AEP's cost to provide the electricity, resulting in a financial hemorrhage for AEP and a gift to its competitors.

The company has warned that unless such losses are stemmed, it could result in job cuts among the 7,000 Ohioans who work for the company.

Also, without the capacity-charge increase, AEP's competitors will be able to make deep inroads into the company's customer base, so that even after AEP completes the transition to a market-based system, it will do so with diminished strength that will make it a less effective competitor in the future. Less competition is bad news for Ohio's electricity users.

At some point soon, AEP will have to sink or swim on its own in a competitive electricity market. But the crisis it now faces is not the result of fair competition.

The PUCO should take the steps necessary to allow AEP to hold its own against competitors until a new rate plan is agreed upon."

From: webmaster@puc.state.oh.us  
To: ContactThePUCO  
Subject: 65402  
Received: 3/7/2012 10:49:48 AM  
Message:  
WEB ID: 65402 AT:03-07-2012 at 10:49 AM

Related Case Number:

TYPE: comment

NAME: Mr. Thomas McCartney

CONTACT SENDER ? Yes

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 72 Hiawatha Ave
- Westerville , Ohio 43081
- USA

PHONE INFORMATION:

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

E-MAIL: tmccartney@sprynet.com

INDUSTRY:Electric

ACCOUNT INFORMATION:

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

COMMENT DESCRIPTION:

I strongly urge the PUCO to approve the motion for relief AEP filed on 2/27. This motion relates to the charge paid by alternative suppliers for use of AEP's generating assets. The action the PUCO recently took to revoke its December 2011 approval of AEP's ESP plan seems to me to be both unprecedented and outrageous. AEP entered into this agreement in good faith, with the assumption that this rate plan would be in place for years to come. AEP would have made major financial decisions based on the now revoked ESP plan, but the PUCO pulled the rug out from

under AEP in abruptly reversing course.

If the PUCO does not approve the 2/27 AEP request, this will leave AEP in a severely unfair competitive position. Not approving the request would create an unlevel playing field, leaving AEP in a severely eroded financial condition. This would clearly not create a stable climate for business investment in Ohio.

Regulatory entities have historically been reliable and trustworthy, but this recent reversal by the PUCO is quite the opposite. I suppose the PUCO might look like heroes to many ratepayers because 'the PUCO is covering their backs', however, on the other side of the coin, industry decision makers will correctly question whether the regulatory unpredictability in Ohio might not harm them down the road.

It is imperative that the PUCO take immediate action in approving AEP's 2/27 petition.