

Date: _____

RECEIVED

DEC 3 2012

Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 615
Frankfort, Kentucky 40602

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

Re: **Kentucky Utilities Company**
Case No. 2012-00221

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am a customer of the Kentucky Utilities Company ("KU"), and I oppose the proposed 8.03% rate increase requested by the KU.

PSC Director of Communications Andrew Melnkovych says that if the Commission went strictly by public comments then every time we'd have a proposed rate increase and people said they didn't want a rate increase then the utilities would go bankrupt. We are saying to the PSC that residential customers are bankrupt with utility increases and high food and gas costs. With mining companies closing and unemployment in our area at a recorded 13.1%, we cannot afford another increase of any kind. Organizations that help with utility bills have more requests than they can meet. With the increase the KU desires, a family can be fed for another day or gas can be purchased to get to work or to the doctor.

Our economy needs to improve greatly before any kind of increase. Please do not approve this increase and place the burden on the backs of those who can least afford it.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

Name:

Address:

W. Wayne Way
Cumberland, KY - 40823

Mary Way
P.O. Box 333
Cumberland, Ky 40823

TO: Commissioners
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Blvd.
Frankfort, KY 40601

Fax 502-564-3460

RECEIVED

DEC 03 2012

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

RE: Case No. 2012-00221 – Opposition to **Kentucky Utilities'** Proposed Rate
Increases and Improper Structure

Dear Commissioners:

I am a residential customer of KU. I write to oppose KU's rate increases on electric service. Present rates are fair, just and reasonable. In these difficult times, KU already enjoys a secure and generous rate of return on its capital.

If any increase is due, I oppose increasing the monthly service charges. KU wants to raise the monthly electric service charge by 53% (from \$8.50 to \$13.00) and the kWh rate by only 3.5% (from 6.987 cents to 7.253 cents). This follows a 70% increase in 2010, from \$5.00 to \$8.50.

Any rate increase should be put on the kilowatt-hour, not the monthly service charge. KU enjoys a monopoly and guaranteed profit. It doesn't need a higher monthly service charge to ensure adequate revenues. Increasing the monthly service charge instead of the kilowatt-hour:

- Unfairly and unjustly lowers the returns of prior private investors in efficiency;
- Unreasonably discourages future private investments in efficiency;
- Unreasonably rewards wasteful users of energy;
- Unjustly and unfairly impacts those who use energy sparingly (i.e. – the poor, the elderly and the efficiency-minded), and;
- Unreasonably impairs deployment of renewables and distributed generation;

In short, KU's proposed structure is bad public policy. A public utility with monopoly and guaranteed profit should not employ such structure. I pray the Commission will not allow it, either after hearing or in any proposed settlement.

Very truly yours,

Signature



(Please print clearly)

Name

Jordan Marshall

Address

802 Regency Point Path
Lexington, KY 40503

TO: Commissioners
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Blvd.
Frankfort, KY 40601

Fax 502-564-3460

RECEIVED
DEC 03 2012
PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

RE: Case No. 2012-00221 – Opposition to **Kentucky Utilities'** Proposed Rate
Increases and Improper Structure

Dear Commissioners:

I am a residential customer of KU. I write to oppose KU's rate increases on electric service. Present rates are fair, just and reasonable. In these difficult times, KU already enjoys a secure and generous rate of return on its capital.

If any increase is due, I oppose increasing the monthly service charges. KU wants to raise the monthly electric service charge by 53% (from \$8.50 to \$13.00) and the kWh rate by only 3.5% (from 6.987 cents to 7.253 cents). This follows a 70% increase in 2010, from \$5.00 to \$8.50.

Any rate increase should be put on the kilowatt-hour, not the monthly service charge. KU enjoys a monopoly and guaranteed profit. It doesn't need a higher monthly service charge to ensure adequate revenues. Increasing the monthly service charge instead of the kilowatt-hour:

- Unfairly and unjustly lowers the returns of prior private investors in efficiency;
- Unreasonably discourages future private investments in efficiency;
- Unreasonably rewards wasteful users of energy;
- Unjustly and unfairly impacts those who use energy sparingly (i.e. – the poor, the elderly and the efficiency-minded), and;
- Unreasonably impairs deployment of renewables and distributed generation;

In short, KU's proposed structure is bad public policy. A public utility with monopoly and guaranteed profit should not employ such structure. I pray the Commission will not allow it, either after hearing or in any proposed settlement.

Very truly yours,

Signature Martha Thompson

(Please print clearly) Name Martha G. Thompson

Address 887 Edgewater Drive

Lexington, KY 40502-3159