

FILE

Hunter, Donielle

From: ContactThePUCO  
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2012 2:21 PM  
To: Docketing  
Subject: Docketing

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio  
Investigation and Audit Division

Memorandum

Date: 9/27/2012

Re: Dale Rogers  
3536 Scanwood Dr  
Richfield, OH 44286

Docketing Case No.:

11-4509-ST-AIR

Notes:

Please docket the following in the case number above. Thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

COMMENT DESCRIPTION:

Case: 11-4509-ST-AIR

Regarding Particulars in the Rehearing: These issues have been asked, answered, opined and ordered. Since the sewer system will be transitioned within the next year, the August 15, 2012 Opinion and Order should stand. Why is the company attempting to further increase rates while all parties are working to transition the service? Date certain of this transition holds all parties to meet expectations in the interest of the public.

The number of customers is impacted by the incessant litigation that is passed onto the small customers. The costs of mailing to customers is minimal (cost of stamp multiplied by the number of customers is approximately \$40.00) Where is the responsibility of the company to assume the "costs of running a business?" Does the company feel that all costs regardless of limit are due to him in through rates? What if the company mismanages funds, do customers bear the burden of bailing him out? I believe PUCO took this into account in the August 15, 2012 Opinion and Order as it protected the consumer and the company. Why would the company assume from the initial filing that the case should have been settled? I find this particularly insulting as one of the company's customers. Does the company feel that PUCO should simply accept all evidence without further due diligence? What is that adage: when you assume... aren't we taught "Never to assume?" As a member of the Briarwood Residents Committee, I have been uniquely involved in the aspects of the filing. I appreciate the extensive and thoughtful work and analysis performed during this rate case application. The thoroughness of the financial forensics, the inclusion of Public Hearing Testimony and evidentiary testimony detailed in the August 15, 2012 Opinion and Order was not careless. These PUCO examiners exacted the truth

PUCO

2012 OCT - 1 AM 8:10

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

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 JS Date Processed 2012 OCT 01 2012

and included the public interest and the consumer in its ruling. What is galling is the assumption by the company that the rate application should have been a slam dunk? Why would the company assume that course corrections are not allowed? Why would the company assume that challenges and repeated rate applications wouldn't be questioned and analyzed? I would answer that the PUCO did its job for the company and the consumer. Why wouldn't this company budget for the additional evidentiary hearing cost? This argument strikes me as disrespectful and highly insulting to the PUCO process. The tone of these arguments seem to be revealing an attitude about the company and calls into question the actual sincerity to transition the sewer system. This is a complete falsehood. Could the company cite dates and the person the company spoke with in order to transition service for the good of public interest? It is a FACT that this company DID NOT initiate discussion regarding the sewer service since 2009.

How is the company adversely impacted when company wants out of the business asap. Why is the company reluctant to follow the Opinion and Order when the company has stated on the record to seek relief by exiting the sewer business as quickly as possible? Why are these comments diametrically in opposition with statements that the company has been trying since 2009 to work with the Village? Isn't this a false argument and incongruent with the company's position on the record of transitioning?

The PUCO Opinion and Order clearly stated that the "company is required to work cooperatively with Richfield to effectuate this result and provide monthly progress reports." This means regular meetings and forward progress since all parties want the same thing; i.e. to alleviate the company's burden of operating a sewer system and provide another sewer system. Does PUCO know that a September 12, 2012 meeting between Richfield and the company was cancelled by the company's request the day after the company's filing for a rehearing?" Isn't this a violation of the Opinion and Order? Does the company feel confident that PUCO will soften the original Opinion and Order? What are the ramifications to the company if the requirement to meeting monthly are not met? Fines? And then does the company apply in three years for another increase and includes that expense? A relaxation from the original Opinion and Order would cause a series of unintended consequences that I don't think PUCO desires. Here are just a few: Provides the company the ability to "run out the clock" as long as possible, Causes the customers (consumers) to pay the increase for an extended period of time, Causes the cost of the project to increase, Causes an increase to the assessments, Adds more real estate and property value issues in an already depressed housing market

I, the consumer, respectfully request PUCO to consider my input and comments. Please uphold your August 15, 2012 Opinion and Order and aggressively monitor the transition of sewer service. Please don't allow a company to disrespect and mock the PUCO process and regulations.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*