1				
2				
3		R OF THE APPLICATION OF OHIO		
4	COMPANY AND	E CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINAT: THE TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY TITY TO INCREASE RATES FOR	ING	
5	DISTRIBUTIO	ON SERVICE, MODIFY CERTAIN FICES AND FOR TARIFF APPROVALS.	2. ¹	
6	ACCOUNTING PRACE	LICED AND FOR TARTET AFFROMMS.	***	
7		07-551-EL-AIR 07-552-EL-ATA		:
8		07-553-EL-AAM 07-554-EL-UNC		
9		01-224-FT-ONC		
10	* *	* * * * * * * *		
11	DATE OF HEARING:	Wednesday, March 12, 2008		
12	TIME:	1:30 p.m.		
13 14	(One Government Center Council Chambers Toledo, Ohio 43624		
15	REPORTER:	LORI L. UDOWSKI	7664	ACC.
16	*	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	2000 MAY 1.9	WCEINED-BOCKE
17		C	9	
18		O .	9:01	AIG SWIL
19			#	₹.
20	-	IC REPORTING SERVICE	٠,	
21		20 Madison Avenue Suite 1200		
22	То	ledo, Ohio 43604 419.243.1919	. ر	
23	This is to certify	that the images appearing are an		•
24	document delivered	lete reproduction of a case file in the regular course of business.		
25	Technician TM			

1	APPEARANCES:
2	ON BEHALF OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO:
3	180 East Broad Street
4	Columbus, Ohio 43215-3793 614.752.9410 614.752.7999
5	Greg.Price@puc.state.oh.us Kim.Bojko@puc.state.oh.us
6	By: GREGORY A. PRICE KIMBERLY W. BOJKO
7	RINDHAIL W. DOURO
8	ON BEHALF OF FIRST ENERGY:
9	76 South Main Street Akron, Ohio 44308
10	330.761.7735 330.384.5849
11	haydenm@firstenergycorp.com korkosza@firstenergycorp.com
12	By: MARK A. HAYDEN ARTHUR E. KORKOSZ
13	Million B. Romoda
14	ON BEHALF OF THE OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL:
15	RESIDENTIAL UTILITY CONSUMER ADVOCATE 10 West Broad Street
16	18th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485
17	614.466.8574 reese@occ.state.oh.us
18	By: RICK REESE
19	ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF TOLEDO:
20	DEPARTMENT OF LAW 420 Madison Avenue
21	Suite 100 Toledo, Ohio 43604
22	419.245.1893 leslie.kovacik@ci.toledo.oh.us
23	By: LESLIE A. KOVACIK
24	
25	

1	* * * * * * * * * * * *
2	Wednesday Afternoon Session
3	March 12, 2008
4	1:28 p.m.
5	* * * * * * * * * * * *
6	MS. BOJKO: Let's go on the
7	record. Good afternoon. The Public
8	Utilities Commission of Ohio has assigned for
9	public hearing at this time and place Case
10	Nos. 07-551-EL-AIR, 07-552-EL-ATA,
11	07-553-EL-AAM, 07-554-EL-UNC being captioned
12	In the Matter of the Application of Ohio
13	Edison Company, the Cleveland Electric
14	Illuminating Company and the Toledo Edison
15	Company for Authority to Increase Rates for
16	Distribution Service, Modify Certain
17	Accounting Practices and for Tariff
18	Approvals.
19	My name is Kimberly Bojko, with me
20	today is Gregory Price. We are the attorney
21	examiners that have been assigned to this
22	proceeding.
23	At this time I would like to take
24	appearances of the parties that have
25	intervened in this proceeding. We will begin

1	with the company.
2	MR. HAYDEN: On behalf of the
3	Companies Mark A. Hayden, 76 South Main
4	Street, Akron, Ohio, 44308.
5	MS. BOJKO: Thank you.
6	MR. REESE: On behalf of the
7	Ohio Consumers' Counsel on behalf of the
8	residential rate providers, the First Energy
9	Companies and the Office the Ohio Consumers
10	my name is Rick Reese.
11	MS. BOJKO: Thank you.
12	MS. KOVACIK: Thank you. Leslie
13	Kovacik on behalf of the City of Toledo.
14	MS. BOJKO: Thank you. Are
15	there any other intervenors, parties to the
16	proceeding present that would like to give an
17	appearance that this time?
18	Seeing none, at the hearing tonight
19	there are representatives from the
20	Commissions Service Monitoring Enforcement
21	Department which are over, seen by the door
22	and also we have tonight, or this evening, or
23	this afternoon, excuse me, we have
24	representatives from the First Energy
25	Company, They are here to either answer your

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

questions about this case specifically or
they can answer a question about a utility `
matter other than the rate increase
proceeding which is the focus of the case
today. Would this First Energy
representatives please raise your hand. If
you have any questions for them you may
contact one of them after the public hearing
tonight.

On June 7, 2007 Ohio Edison Company, the Toledo Edison Company and the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company collectively known as the First Energy Companies have filed applications with the Commission to increase their electric distribution rates. As part of that rate case proceeding the Commission staff prepared and they filed a staff report for each company on December 4, 2007, and I have a copy, this is the Toledo Edison which is the service territory that we are in. the staff report that our staff at the Commission, independent body, put together and made recommendations about the First Energy rate application. You can obtain this

either by visiting the Commission's website or you can also call the Commission's phone number which is 1.800.686.PUCO, and the website is www.puco.ohio.gov.

There have been twelve local public hearings scheduled in this case and this is only one aspect of the rate case process.

The evidentiary hearing in this case began on January 29, 2008 at the Commission in Columbus, Ohio. That hearing lasted several weeks and the purpose of that hearing was to allow the companies, the Commission staff and the intervenors in this case to present witnesses and evidence either in support of their positions in the case or in opposition to the Companies' rate case filing.

hearing is to receive comments from the public regarding First Energy's proposed rates. We will not be hearing from the companies, the staff or any intervenors in the proceeding today. It is your opportunity, the members of the public, to let the Commission know what you think about the Companies' request to increase its rates.

When you arrived there was a sign up sheet by the door. We are asking that anybody that wishes to offer testimony today sign up and we will go in the order that they sign that, they signed up. If you missed that opportunity, it's still available, please go over and sign your name and you will be called to testify in the order that you have signed up.

Before you begin your statement we would ask your name and your address. Your testimony will be considered a part of the official record of the case to be reviewed by the Commissioners before they make their final decision. All testimony will be under oath and attorneys for the company and other intervenors in the case are allowed to ask you questions about your statement while you are under oath.

Should you decide that you do not want to testify when your name is called, please merely pass to the next witness.

Today's hearing is being transcribed by a court reporter, please speak clearly so that the court reporter can

1	accurately reflect your comments on the
2	record. If you have a prepared written
3	statement it will be helpful for you to
4	provide a copy of that to the court reporter
5	as well.
6	We appreciate your participation in
7	today's hearing and we want everyone who
8	wishes to make a public statement to be able
9	to do so, and there are still many people so
10	at this time we will begin the witnesses'
11	testimony. And if somebody else would like
12	to add their name, you may do so at the door.
13	Our first witness this afternoon
14	will be Bill Koon, Republic Mills,
15	Incorporation. Mr. Koon.
16	MR. KOON: Yes.
17	MS. BOJKO: You're providing
18	your written comments to the court reporter?
19	MR. KOON: Yes. Would you like
20	a, would you like a copy?
21	MS. BOJKO: Yes, that would be
22	wonderful.
23	* * * * * * * * * * *
24	WILLIAM H. KOON
25	Having been first duly sworn, testified

1 as follows: 2 MS. BOJKO: Mr. Koon, you may 3 begin. 4 MR. KOON: Thank you. My name 5 is William Koon. I am president of Republic 6 Mills located in Okolona, Ohio, located about 7 five miles west of Napoleon and eight miles 8 east of Defiance, Ohio. My company is a 9 customer of Toledo Edison. 10 Republic Mills, a family owned and 11 operated business, having its beginnings more 12 than 65 years ago strictly as a livestock 13 feed manufacturer produced under the name of 14 Hudson Feeds. As the years have gone by and 15 the agricultural industry has changed, so has 16 Republic Mills. Today it has a manufacturing 17 facility specializing in various agricultural 18 and non-agricultural capacities with services 19 that include trucking, warehousing and custom 20 milling and pelleting. 21 Our facility, located on 22 approximately five acres, employs 15 people. 23 The company has been a customer of Toledo 24 Edison for more than 35 years and receives

service from three separate electric meters.

25

_

Electricity comprises about 10% of our operating costs. Annually our business consumes about 450,000 kilowatt hours of electricity and has a demand factor of 320 KW. We are on Toledo Edison's small general service tariff when we use our own generator and on a medium general service tariff when we are not using our own generator.

One would think that, as a fairly substantial customer with a long standing relationship with Toledo Edison, we would be about to resolve service problems easily and efficiently. However, we have not been able to do so. Our service problems with Toledo Edison span almost a decade, and during that period we have been dealing with primarily one unresolved problem - line disturbances.

The purposes of my testimony is to give you a 30-second synopsis of our service problems because, in our view, Toledo Edison should not be able to increase its rates if the company ignores legitimate customer complaints and apparently deliberately strings us along with poor service because, as a monopoly, it can.

2

3

4

5

6

,

g

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

For almost ten years, Republic Mills has been attempting to resolve with Toledo Edison the issue of line disturbances that Toledo Edison has claimed were the result of Republic Mills' operations specifically, the fact that, intermittently, Republic Mills, with Toledo Edison's approval, has attached its 200 horsepower motor to Toledo Edison's lines. We have maintained that our motor has nothing to do with disturbances that Toledo Edison has laid at our feet. After discussing this on and off for years, at one point, both parties agreed to split the cost of a technician, chosen by Toledo Edison, to examine the 200 horsepower motor in question, and to issue his findings with respect to the motor allegedly causing the disturbances. technician concluded that the motor was not the cause of the line disturbances.

Nonetheless Toledo Edison continued to claim that our motor was the cause of its poor line service and insisted that we take it off the Toledo Edison line. Our company was compelled to invest in a 550 kilowatt

24

25

generator that we have used off and on during the long years of our dispute with Toledo Edison. However, at times it is cost efficient to rely on Toledo Edison for most, if not all, of our electricity needs. Because Toledo Edison was apparently not satisfied with its chosen expert's conclusions that our motor was not the cause of line disturbances in our area, we employed a professional engineer to try to get to the bottom of the problem. He concluded that the cause of the disturbances stemmed from the removal by Toledo Edison of a substation around 1989. The 200 horsepower motor in question was first installed in 1976, with Toledo Edison designing our service to handle this particular motor. No complaints about the motor occurred until several years. following the removal of the substation, and more customers came on line which accentuated the quality of service issue.

Throughout the period of the dispute, even though we have had numerous discussions and meetings, Toledo Edison has refused to install a separate line - to

either Republic or one of its other customers served by the present single line - to ameliorate the situation even though Toledo Edison sought easements for a new line and on more than one occasion stated that it would install a new line. At one point in 2006, we were told by Howard Call, of Toledo Edison, that he was scheduling a crew to construct a new line to correct the problem.

Furthermore, Toledo Edison has refused to acknowledge the findings of the technician

acknowledge the findings of the technician hired to investigate the effect of Republic Mills' motor on the Toledo Edison line, and Toledo Edison stated that it will take no further action unless the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio orders it to take specific actions.

Today I am appearing to urge the

Commission that, before it grants Toledo

Edison a rate increase, it order Toledo

Edison to take steps to resolve the

disturbances on their line that do not

involve Republic Mills having to remove our

motor from the Toledo Edison line.

Thank you.

1	MS. BOJKO: Thank you. Next we
2	have Ms. Tina Skeldon Wozniak.
3	* * * * * * * * * * *
4	TINA SKELDON WOZNIAK
5	Having been first duly sworn, testified
6	as follows:
7	MS. BOJKO: Could you please
8	state your name and address for the record.
9	MS. SKELDON WOZNIAK: I'm Tina Skeldon
10	Wozniak, Lucas County Commissioner, One
11	Government Center, Toledo, Ohio.
12	I will be brief. I want to thank
13	the PUCO for coming today to have, giving us
14	the opportunity to have a hearing.
15	I realize today is about the
16	distribution case. Whether it's this case or
17	any other case that comes before, you we
18	continue to fight and express our concerns
19	that our community cannot afford any
20	increases.
21	I'd also like to share with you
22	that oftentimes our community feels neglected
23	when it comes to relief on these energy
24	issues. When it comes to our businesses or
25	when it is about our residents we continue to

feel the neglect and our high prices that we have to consistently feel impacted by.

It's also not a surprise to you to hear it is raining in Lucas County. We need sunshine when it comes to paying high bills. We are here today to urge the PUCO to understand our concern.

We, we're, we believe that utility rates in general cause us to be in a situation, for both residents and businesses to feel the need to move either across the line to Michigan or down to a better rate for them, even as close as thirty miles into the Bowling Green and Wood County area. We believe that this is a constant drain for both our families who are, especially those who are the working families who are the prime numbers of families that live in our local area.

We need relief. We need help. We need to continue to work together to get this job done.

I'm happy to speak for tens of thousands of rate payors and businesses who we believe we are representing, the relief,

1	who deserve relief and who are looking to the
2	PUCO for solutions.
3	Thank you.
4	MS. BOJKO: Thank you.
5	Mr. Chris Hill and Mr. Mark Frye. I'm sorry,
6	Mr. Chris Hill and Mark Frye.
7	* * * * * * * * * * * * *
8	CHRIS HILL and MARK FRYE
9	Having been first duly sworn, testified
10	as follows:
11	MS. BOJKO: Could you please
12	state your name and your address for the
13	record.
14	MR. HILL: I'm Chris Hill, I'm
15	Director of Facility Operations for Toledo
16	Public Schools, and the address is 1701 East
17	Broadway, Toledo, Ohio.
18	I would like to begin by thanking
19	the Commission for having the opportunity to
20	set here you're sitting, I'm standing
21	I'm setting in the hot seat, I guess. But at
22	any rate we appreciate the opportunity to
23	take the time to hear what we have to say.
24	We appreciate it.
25	The Toledo Public Schools have had

the long standing Energy for Education, we've had the whole process, it's been very useful for us. It saves us money. Those dollars are going into the classroom.

We are a large urban school district, we have employees that haven't had raises in five years. Now, when we look at buying vehicles we're up-dating our yellow fleet with pre-owned and used school buses. Every penny, nickel we get is very significant.

It has enormous impact on Toledo
Public Schools. The current Energy for
Education program will expire on December 31,
of 2008. This will cause the electric rates
to go up for Toledo Public School
13.4 percent, that will cost Toledo Public
Schools \$400,000. \$400,000, folks, is a lot
of money to Toledo Public Schools.

Any new distribution rate increase authorized by the Commission will go on top of that. We're looking at, you know, we're, we can't absorb those kinds of costs.

Furthermore, the load characteristics of our school district are

favorable to the utility in the summer, we're at a low when other people, when the demand for electricity is high, that's when we idle back. Also at the end of the day is when the demand for electricity is high, we level back.

We feel as a result of that low profile, the nature of what we do that, you know, special consideration should be given to the school district. This hits the school district hard, with the loss of the Energy for Education Program.

An alternative to that would be to have the schools participate in business distribution credit, this would be a tremendous help for Toledo Public Schools and all the schools in the great State of Ohio. You here all kinds of folks say we in the educational business, we're all about kids. We are all about kids, that's the core of our business. But it's further and deeper than that, we're about building and stabilizing our society. What we do at Toledo Public Schools impacts the City of Toledo, by the citizens that inhabit the community, by the

quality of the people that are our graduates.

The great State of Ohio, it will help the kids.

Thank you for your consideration.

MS. BOJKO:

Thank you.

MR. FRYE:

My name is Mark

Frye, I'm with Palmer Energy Company, 2455 North Reynolds Road, Toledo, Ohio, 43615.

Palmer Energy is a consultant for a number of, a number of large industrial commission operations around Ohio including Toledo Public Schools. My particular comments today are in relation to what impact that would have on just a standard average elementary school for Toledo Public Schools, what kind of increase the distribution rate increase would have on that average school.

Unfortunately, Toledo Edison is
basically asking for a substantial
restructuring of the methodology which
creates rates. They are going from a
consumption and utilization based rate
structure and they have proposed a voltage
rate structure. I understand that one of the
public utilities actually has that type of

structure, I understand they want to move
that forward and put those on the Toledo
Edison system but they need to understand the
impact that would have on somebody like the
Toledo Public Schools.

An average elementary school right now would pay one and a half to two cents a kilowatt hour for the distribution charges. The increase that they would see by switching to a general service rate structure because of the voltage they are being served at is about \$5,500 a year between the general service rate and the general and primary rate structures that Toledo Edison has included. \$5,500 a year is a pretty substantial sum of money and the only difference the Toledo Public Schools would have is whether they own the transformer or whether they don't own the transformer.

It's difficult for me to believe
that there's a \$5,500 a year difference
between a general service rate which they
don't own the transformer and a primary rate
when they do own the transformer. That may
put somebody in the business of buying

1	transformers, but the net result, this is a		
2	substantial increase to Toledo Public		
3	Schools. They have about sixty elementary		
4	schools, as Mr. Hill has informed me, and		
5	obviously are in the process of building more		
6	with the Ohio Schools Facility Council		
7	monies.		
8	There's an awful lot of money at		
9	stake here, not just Energy for Education		
10	Program but also for the distribution		
11	charges.		
12	Thank you very much.		
13	MS. BOJKO: Do you have any		
14	other comments?		
15	MR. FRYE: No.		
16	MS. BOJKO: Thank you.		
17	Mr. George Davis, Jr.		
18	* * * * * * * * * * * *		
19	GEORGE DAVIS, JR.		
20	Having been first duly sworn, testified		
21	as follows:		
22	MR. DAVIS: My name is George		
23	Davis, Jr. I live at 3545 Victory Avenue,		
24	Toledo, Ohio. I'm 16 year retiree. I		
25	understand we have the highest rates in the		

1	country right now, you want to increase it
2	some more? First Energy, Toledo Edison wants
3	to increase their rates. What they need to
4	do is decrease them. Rates are going up,
5	it's not fair for people that are living on a
6	fixed income like I am. I don't get any
7	raises or anything. I can still get Social
8	Security, that doesn't mean a thing. I'm
9	trying to keep my head above water.
10	Now, where I live mostly are all
11	retirees, we're all catching it. We're all
12	catching heck. It's just not right. So,
13	appreciate it, the PUCO rubber stamp for the
14	utility companies, they bend over backwards
15	and give it to them. Give us, give us
16	something for a change, decrease the rates,
17	not increase them.
18	Thank you very much.
19	MS. BOJKO: Mr. Richard Eppard.
20	* * * * * * * * * * *
21	RICHARD EPPARD
22	Having been first duly sworn, testified
23	as follows:
24	MR. EPPARD: My name is Richard
25	Eppard, I live at 5222 West Bancroft Street,

Toledo, 43615.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have a bill right here, it's from First Energy Solutions. I have a transmission rate of 3 percent right on this bill and it says from 2006. If anybody wants to see it they can see it right now. with the way the retirees, just like George Davis said, all the retirees who have the low income in the City of Toledo right here, we are paying the highest not only on the electricity but gas and everything else. People can't afford it anymore. Somebody has got to start cutting back. Your gas prices just went up, and that's going to help out a lot with what they are trying to do right here? You're going to set these people back so they will have to choose either to eat or to move out of their homes or something else because of what you're trying to do right. here in this paper.

It's already been raised in 2006

3 percent. Now, if anybody wants to see it,
like I said, I have it right here in black
and white. Thank you.

MS. BOJKO:

Thank you. Next we

1	have Councilman George Sarantou.
2	MR. SARANTOU: I apologize in
3	advance if I do not say your names properly.
4	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
5	GEORGE SARANTOU
6	Having been first duly sworn, testified
7	as follows:
8	MS. BOJKO: Please state your
9	name and address.
10	MR. SARANTOU: I am George
11	Sarantou, I'm a Toledo City Councilman at
12	Large. I'm here today to talk about the
13	distribution costs. First, I'd like to read
14	into the record a letter from the Honorable
15	Mayor from the City of Toledo who could not
16	be here, then I'll have a short statement
17	addressed to the Public Utilities Commission
18	of Ohio.
19	Chairman Schriber and Members of
20	the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio:
21	Thank you for holding a public
22	hearing in Toledo to receive comments
23	regarding the proposed Toledo Edison
24	distribution rate increase. I would have
25	anneared in nerson but I amout of the state

2

4

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and would instead like to have these remarks read into the record on this important matter.

We are facing challenging times in northwestern Ohio due to the subprime mortgage crisis and the credit crunch that is gripping the nation. Our region, with its declining manufacturing base, has been hit hard by the real estate downturn which has caused the number of foreclosures to double in one year. As home values decrease and energy costs rise, our low-income families and senior citizens are squeezed to the breaking point. As they tighten their belts, they want to see that their public servants are doing everything they can to minimize the cost increases that affect basic services. As the Mayor of Toledo, it is my duty to protect the interests of our citizens. As members of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, it is your duty as well.

My review of Toledo Edison's rate request leads me to conclude that the increase is not warranted. For starters, the Commission's own staff report showed that the

1

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

request is 35% too high. In addition, we are not receiving nearly the level of service that justifies the current high rates, let alone substantially higher rates. The number of Toledo Edison employees in the city has been decimated and maintenance has suffered. Streetlights are not repaired within the time periods mandated by the Commission in the company's tariffs and there are persistent outages. On March 1st, my wife and I counted fifty street lights out in the brief stretch between the University of Toledo's Scott Park and main campuses. Utility poles are also neglected and rusting. Response to complaints is woefully slow.

At the same time we are facing inadequate service, we read that the pay of First Energy's CEO totaled \$13.9 million last year. This is an unjustifiable amount for the head of a regulated monopoly. First Energy recently announced record 2007 profits of \$1.31 billion. It is clear that neither First Energy executives nor its shareholders are suffering. On the contrary, they are making record amounts in a bad economy.

2

4

5

7

6

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Despite these windfall profits, the company now wants to exact higher rates from the very customers who are facing financial hardships.

To make matters worse, the Senate Bill 221 re-regulation bill is pending before the General Assembly. Rather than allow the multi-billion dollar transition charges to fall off as originally intended, the proposed legislation will give the charges new life despite the face that the transition costs have been paid and we still do not have the competition promised by Senate Bill 3. As a result, customers will pay for First Energy's generation facilities a second or third time. Why hasn't the Commission asked for an accounting of the transition charges? Do you know ow much has been collected and how much more will be collected if the re-regulation passes?

I understand the re-regulation legislation involves generation issues and is separate from the distribution rate case before the Commission. However, it involves dollars that will flow to the company's bottom line and is a factor that should be

taken into account when setting the company's rate of return. The windfall that First Energy will receive from re-regulation should offset the need for a distribution rate increase.

First Energy's record corporate profits should also be considered when evaluating the rate case request. Companies that provide exemplary service at low rates should be awarded a high rate of return. However, our citizens receive substandard service and pay unaffordable rates. The Commission should set First Energy's rate of return at the lowest possible level. Additionally, fairness demands that the PUCO declare the First Energy's shareholders, not its customers, must foot the bill for the CEO's exorbitant pay.

Regulatory proceedings cannot be left solely to an accounting of costs. There are equitable issues that must be part of the equation. In deciding this case, you must take into account Ohio's poor economy, the upcoming re-regulation charges along with First Energy's shoddy service, exorbitant

executive pay and excessive corporate profits. Those factors weigh heavily against an increase in distribution rates.

The whole point of utility
regulation is to prevent a monopolistic
service from earning monopolistic returns.
The granting of an increase to First Energy,
at a time of record profits, will signal that
Ohio does not intend to regulate monopolies
or, more importantly, protect the public
interest. For the sake of our citizens and
the state's economic well-being, that must
not be allowed to occur. The First Energy
request for a rate increase must be denied.

From Toledo - an International
Award Winning City! Carlton S. Finkbeiner,
Mayor.

Now, as an at large City Councilman

I have just a couple of brief comments.

I, too, am concerned, as all of us at Toledo City Council, regarding these rates. And for several decades unfortunately the residents of Toledo, Lucas County and northwestern Ohio have been burdened with the fact that we pay some of the highest

electrical rates in the State of Ohio. For example, as of the February 15, 2008 PUCO Ohio Utility Rate Survey the Electric Rate for Residential Customers Survey indicated for residential that the average cost in February of '08 in Canton, Ohio was \$64 per month, it was \$78 in Columbus, it was \$76 in Dayton, it was \$82 in Cincinnati and \$86 in Cleveland, but in Toledo, as usual, our residential electric rates average \$91 per month.

Also for decades our commercial electric rates have been some of the highest in Ohio. As of the February 15, 2008 report from the Public Utilities Commission the average First Energy customer in Toledo commercial customer paid double, double the rate that a Canton, Ohio commercial customer paid. And, in fact, out of the eight major cities in Ohio Toledo continues to have the highest commercial rates.

These high commercial and residential rates have affected not just the business owners but also the typical business person who's just trying to make a living to

support his or her family.

For example, I'm talking about the business person that owns a barber shop, a small diner, a tavern, a dry cleaning, a coffee shop, these people are the backbone of the great American free enterprise system.

These fine people of Toledo and vicinity have been burdened with these high electrical rates far more than the people of Columbus, Cincinnati and Dayton. And when you look at Toledo or Lucas County we have approximately 450,000 people who have shared this burden for years.

Furthermore, we know that First
Energy is making huge profits. And when you
look at the reports you'll find that 2006
First Energy had an operating income net
income of \$1,254 million. And, of course, in
'07 they moved up a little bit and they made
\$1,309 million. Boil that down to just the
Toledo Edison area and their net income in
'07 was \$91 million. So, the question
becomes why should we have to pay higher
distribution costs when they are making so
much more money? They are not hurting, they

1 are doing very, very well.

statistic. We believe that the average residential user in Toledo who uses about 750 kilowatts per month will basically receive about a 17 percent increase if these distribution costs are raised to about \$57 more a year. Look at the small business

Let me just conclude with this

the street. They use on average maybe 8,000 kilowatts per month. Their bill will raise

owner, let's look at the Coney Island across

nearly \$800 a year, that's a 29 percent

increase.

Let me finally conclude as was stated earlier, public Toledo schools, the average elementary school, they have a 285 percent increase in their bill.

The bottom line is this, the business community, the labor community, residential customers, democrats, republicans, independents all want lower electric rates in Toledo. We want more competition and we want more choice. We believe if distribution rates are raised this is overall going to hurt every single citizen

1 including all the good economic development 2 efforts we're making to attract new jobs in 3 this community. 4 We ask for the Public Utilities 5 Commission to represent consumers for a 6 change and not grant this huge increase. 7 Thank you very much. В MS. BOJKO: We have Councilman 9 D. Michael Collins. 10 11 D. MICHAEL COLLINS 12 Having been first duly sworn, testified 13 as follows: 14 MR. COLLINS: My name is D. 15 Michael Collins. I'm a Councilman with the 16 City of Toledo, I represent District Two. 17 I'm not going to go into great 18 detail in terms of the data that has just 19 been presented from the Mayor of our City and 20 my colleague at Council, Councilman Sarantou. 21 I believe the numbers are there and the 22 effects are there. 23 But I would like to make the 24 following comments for the record and I have 25 a series of E-mails here that I would like to

1 introduce for the record but not necessarily 2 read for the constraints of time. 3 Would that be acceptable? 4 You'd just like to MS. BOJKO: 5 attach them to the record? 6 I would like to MR. COLLINS: 7 attach them to the record rather than just 8 read them into the record. They speak for 9 themselves. 10 MS. BOJKO: Yes, we will mark 11 them as exhibits to the record today. 12 MR. COLLINS: Thank you. To begin 13 with the City of Toledo has 91,000 14 households. Of those 91,000, one-third are 15 on fixed incomes. They certainly do not have 16 the opportunity to have the ability to raise 17 their fixed income situations by such 18 astronomical percentages as being now put, 19 voiced upon them by a monopolistic energy 20 source that realistically in my opinion fails 21 to meet many of the standards the way 22 business should be run. 23 The nature of a monopoly is to 24 engage in a business and provide fair and 25 equitable rates for service. Their profit

24

25

and loss statements clearly define that their profit is beyond what could be normally expected. And I understand the nature of private industry is to produce a profit to satisfy the existence of the stake holders who are basically the shareholders, but in the case of a utility, the municipality, the residents, they are also stake holders because they have allowed this condition to The lobbying efforts that are voiced exist. upon the folks in Columbus that make these laws which create for them the ability to come after the consumer realistically must be placed in balance to what is the better. service to the State of Ohio and its residents, in this particular case Toledo and northwestern Ohio at large.

The world of private sector the bottom line is the goal. Councilman Sarantou and the Mayor very effectively defined how they are responding to this goal.

However, there's one thing different in the private sector or in a monopolized business. In the private sector there is not an offload of costs directed to

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the consumer of those services or goods in order to protect their profitability. I'd like to repeat that. There isn't an offload. Ford cannot say we are going to increase the price of our car because we have to increase our profit margin by X percent per anum, that wouldn't fly in that market. We all know it wouldn't fly in that market. However, the utility can because they are a monopoly. They didn't worry about these problems in terms of their distribution costs when they should have prorated them a long time ago and they should have probably looked at a more pragmatic approach for distribution and that is burying their lines which they have not done for the most part, and then if the neighborhood requested this be done they wanted it to be then back billed off to the neighborhood.

So, I close by saying we would sincerely hope that you will listen and listen with the same intensity as the lobbyists are performing in Columbus. Listen with that same intensity because this state, this community has as stake holders, a big

1 risk with this, imagine from your own 2 personal financial situation a fixed income 3 wherein you're struggling to maintain your 4 ability for taking the drugs, all of a sudden 5 now you are looking at your cash flow per 6 month being decimated as a result of a 7 insurance of a profitability factor for a 8 monopolized utility. Please, when you deliberate and you 10 think about whether or not they are fair or 11 not, think about the stake holders that are 12 in northwestern Ohio, are they being treated 13 fairly by this monopolistic company who 14 realistically only has one goal in mind and 15 it isn't for the consumer, it's for their 16 profitability. 17 Thank you. 18 MS. BOJKO: Mr. John 19 Swartzlander. Move on. Loretta, Miss 20 Loretta Thompson, Thomas, excuse me. 21 22 LORETTA THOMAS 23 Having been first duly sworn, testified 24 as follows: 25 Could you please MS. BOJKO:

state your name and address for the record.

MS. THOMAS: My name is Loretta
Thomas, I live at 1527 Vance Street, Toledo,
Ohio.

I also work with Block Watch 641 G and I did prepare a statement when I came here today, but I want to speak on behalf of seniors, young people that are unemployed and people who are suffering. And you set there and say there have been no rate increase to First Energy since 1996. My understanding, I agree with the gentleman over here, if you look at your bills there is rate increase because on a monthly basis I get my light bill, on there it states for distribution. Just to transmit the charges on my bill is higher than my usage charges. So, every month it's fluctuating, one month it's one, next month it's another.

What I'm wondering at this point why, if it's for distribution charge why don't they have one fixed rate and all of a sudden, I'm going to say this because it's the truth, I have a 108 year old dad. If I wasn't living and retired, we moved him out

25

of his place on account of utility bills. There's a lot of seniors in this state and in Toledo and like I was telling the people over in PUCO, most of the times when these things hit the newspaper, hit the news it's already been decided. You see in a couple months it's already there, it's already on your bill, it's already, the increases have been made already. For people who are retired such as myself and on a fixed income paying part of the medical now-a-days, you can't afford these rates. And there's no way in the world we haven't had an increase since 1996. On a monthly basis it changes, my light is all over \$100. I live in a small space. The people who are unemployed and seniors, we can't afford it. We cannot afford it and we can't afford, saying right now that this is, has to be because these people are making enormous profits already. You cannot allow this to happen because some senior citizens such as my dad, if he didn't have a family he would be outdoors and he's very well same and able to live by himself, he just happen to be 108 years old, I can't

1 afford these rates at 66 years old. 2 So, I'm looking at the seniors and 3 unemployed who these bills are coming to and 4 then we sit around and we say, well, okay, 5 maybe this is like not going to take effect. 6 Guess what? It is going to take effect if 7 somebody don't have some common sense to say 8 we're tired of all these rate increases. 9 can't do nothing about the gas pumps. We can 10 decide in the State of Ohio we need an 11 alternative source. We were better off when 12 we just had Toledo Edison, now we have First 13 Energy. 14 I'm asking you to consider what 15 you're really doing. The economy being the 16 way it is right now we can't afford an 17 increase. Thank you. 18 MS. BOJKO: Councilman Collins, 19 did you give the written E-mails to the court 20 reporter? We're going to mark those as 21 Exhibit 2. We already have an Exhibit 1 22 which was testimony from another individual. 23 MR. COLLINS: Thank you very much. 24 I apologize for the tardiness of bringing it 25 back.

Next we have Patrick 1 MS. BOJKO: 2 Allen, please. Is Patrick Allen not here? 3 Okay. We'll move on to Neal Troy. * * * * * * * * * NEAL TROY Having been first duly sworn, testified 7 as follows: 8 MS. BOJKO: Please state your name and address. 10 MR. TROY: My name is Neal 11 Troy. My residence is 4232 Tejon Road, 12 Toledo, Ohio, 43623. 13 I'm here today on my personal 14 situation, but I believe I may represent a 15 significant number of people who are normally 16 not going out in this. 39 years ago my wife 17 and I built an all electric home, one of the 18 things to consideration at that time was the 19 rate that was available from Toledo Edison with the use of that energy relative to 20 21 natural gas or other purposes. Consequently, 22 we were involved in building a home using the 23 help of Toledo Edison in the construction of 24 the home and insulation with things and so

forth like that.

In those 39 years, well, 38 of those years we had recognized the increase in rates as well as others have already stated. The fall of 2006, as this lady just recently somewhat referred to, I was informed with my electric bill at that point in time that the all electric rate would be available to us as long as we were a resident of that home. However, if we sold the home the purchaser would not have that rate and would revert to the normal residential rate.

I ask that they calculate what my cost would have been for my previous years, years' usage and what it was with the rate that would be applicable if I did not have the all electric rate. That calculation was found to be 27 percent increase. I felt at the time, I filed an objection with First Energy at the time based on that fact, and then another energy source could not be used in my home because there is no piping and no venting for a combustion system and, therefore, what they essentially do would be a de-valuation of my home in a normal marketplace.

rate changes requested, and I understand you are only dealing with the transmission rate but that's part of the rate that they propose to change, that would be that, that rate that I've been under for the last 38, 39 years would be eliminated, I would be placed on residential, normal residential rate which means my, my energy costs would go up 27 percent.

Now the Governors and legislation and other people's interest in conservation and reduction of greenhouse gases, I believe that an all electric home with a geothermal heat pump which I have would make more of an impact on those two concerns than many of the issues that are being considered. I was also informed by First Energy that if you approve the present rate structure I will no longer be grandfathered, my rate will automatically go up.

I went to EPA to find out the data that lists and found residential greenhouse gas emissions for the year 2005 was 21.9 percent of the greenhouse gases emitted

by everything in this nation. A total, and that is of the total emissions, trillions of BTUs.

I went, then went to the Department of Energy data system, it shows that the average household, I'm not trying to throw any aspersions on those that have natural gas, that's what you've been using and I understand that, however, residents on an annual basis emit 11.4 metric tons of carbon dioxide, 80 kilograms of methane, 41 grams of sulphur fluorides. All electric homes' emissions of gases are zero, nothing.

I don't have the data, but I believe that per unit of energy used in a residence for heating and cooking by the emissions from generating equipment, the average emissions from generating equipment based on the same energy situation would be less than that of use of natural gas and other fuels for a home such as I've described.

The use of geothermal units in heating and cooling further reduces the energy consumption rates. The energy from

1 heating comes out of the water in the ground and ability to cool your home comes back into 2 3 the water in the ground. 4 I think First Energy should be 5 encouraged to have construction and/or 6 conversion of residents to all electric 7 situations, not penalizing those that are presently in existence. I believe that I 8 9 speak for a significant number of homes in 10 this area. 11 I request that you do not grant 12 that provision of eliminating the all 13 electric home rate for all electric homes, 14 and that's to remove the restriction placed 15 on me that if I sell my home the purchaser 16 will not have that. 17 I thank you for your time. 18 Thank you. MS. BOJKO: Ken 19 Smith. 20 21 KEN SMITH 22 Having been first duly sworn, testified 23 as follows: Kenneth Smith, 3418 24 MR. SMITH: 25 Plumey Road in Northwood, Ohio 43619.

1 Hello, and thank you for hearing 2 me. 3 My name is Ken Smith and I am a member of the Lake Local School Board of 5 Education and I wanted to address a few 6 issues. 7 Just a couple of years ago we 8 struggled to get a levy passed to maintain 9 the education of our children at Lake Local 10 Schools. With the current funding system 11 limiting any increase in tax revenues to 12 schools, and with the condition of the State 13 budget, all schools will be hurt by 14 additional increases in expenses that we have 15 no control over. 16 In the current two year budget 17 cycle in the State of Ohio lake school as 18 well as many others have had their level of 19 funding frozen for both of these years. 20 MR. PRICE: Can you slow down 21 for the court reporter. 22 I'm sorry, I'm a MR. SMITH: 23 fast talker. With a 13.4% in electric rates, 24 and possibly 40-50% or more increase in the 25 distribution rates this is just making it

even harder for school districts to continue 1 2 with their mission. 3 Schools all over Ohio are having a 4 harder and harder time passing levies as the 5 voters are concerned about their expenses, we just cannot continue to see these huge. 6 7 increases in our expenses. В My school district in one of 249 9 schools who are part of the Ohio Schools 10 Council and it is estimated that it will cost 11 these schools collectively over \$11.7 12 million, plus any other distribution or 13 generation rate increases that may be approved. Where does that money come from, 14 15 but from the pockets of the people that live 16 in our school districts. I want to thank you and we hope 17 18 that the Commission would be sympathetic 19 towards schools and look at us as a distinct 20 group, worthy of the school rates which have 21 been in effect for many years. 22 Thank you. 23 MS. BOJKO: Evan Booth, please. 24 25 EVAN BOOTH

1 Having been first duly sworn, testified 2 as follows: My name is Evan 3 MR. BOOTH: 4 Booth, I live at 2914 Wyndale Road, Toledo, 5 Ohio. 6 Pretty much a lot of things can be 7 covered that's been said here, but I brought an article from the February 26th, Toledo 8 9 Blade Business Section. There's an article 10 on First Energy, stated that their profit for 11 last year was \$1.3 billion. I could read the 12 article if that's necessary. First Energy Corporation parent of 13 Toledo Edison, said yesterday it had a record 14 15 profit last year of \$1.31 billion, or \$4.22 a share, on revenue of \$12.8 billion. That was 16 17 up from \$1.25 billion, or \$3,81 a hare, on 18 revenue of \$11.5 billion. 19 For the fourth quarter, profit fell 20 2 percent, hurt by higher costs to buy power. 21 The company had a profit of \$268 million, or 22 87 cents a share, for the quarter ended. December 31st. That compares with a profit 23 24 of \$274 million, or 84 cents a share, in the

year-ago quarter.

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

1.4

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

Per share results were up because First Energy has bought back stock.

Revenue rose 15 percent in the quarter to \$3.1 billion from \$2.7 billion in the year-ago quarter.

My concern is this, is that this is also going to generate another \$340 million increase, this increase, like the gentleman over here said, the transaction fee going up 3 percent. On my bill, I've called PUCO several times complaining about my bill. of the things they charge you for is \$4.95 a bill to cover their billing department and also have their meter read. I'm paying for their employee which is not \$4.75 charge to have their meter read, which to me is not There's also a delivery charge which right. covers the line going from the pole to my house. This house was built in '56, everything, their equipment has been paid for for several years and how they justify raising the rates and robbing us people is beyond me. I can't believe they are even They should be out of this door and here. never come back and take their increase with

1 them. 2 MS. BOJKO: Victoria Jacobs. 3 VICTORIA JACOBS 5 Having been first duly sworn, testified 6 as follows: MS. JACOBS: I'm Victoria Jacobs, 8 I live at 617 Sylvester, Toledo 43605. G I'm just going to be repeating what 10 everybody else has said. My husband and I 11 are on a fixed income. I expect on my little 12 bitty old pension, \$400 and some dollars, to 13 get maybe \$18 at the end of the year, that's 14 what's estimated. Till then I have to live 15 without it. Where does that come in on our 16 utility bills? I mean give us a break. This 17 gentleman said his house was built in 1956, 18 ours was built in 1929. All our stuff has 19 been paid for, paid for, paid for. 20 The thing about the street lights, 21 we go through our neighborhood, find out 22 street lights are out, report them then about 23 it, well, maybe a day or two later, maybe a 24 week later it will be fixed. 25

I don't understand why everybody

1	has to be rich, rich, rich. Middle income
2	has to get poorer and poorer and
3	forget about the people that are, that don't
4	have anything invested to rely on.
5	That's all I have to say.
6	MS. BOJKO: Barb Lovell.
7	* * * * * * * * * * * *
8	BARB LOVELL
9	Having been first duly sworn, testified
10	as follows:
11	MS. LOVELL: I'm here, I am not a
12	senior citiz e n.
13	MS. BOJKO: Before you begin,
14	name and address, please.
15	MS. LOVELL: I'm sorry. My name
16	is Barb Lovell, 541 Waggoner Boulevard,
17	Toledo, 43612.
18	MS. BOJKO: Thank you.
19	MS. LOVELL: I'm not here as a
20	senior citizen, I am not here because I live
21	on a fixed income. My husband and I are both
22	gainfully employed. We own our home. I have
23	a child in college. I face the same issues
24	that a senior citizen does. They are saying
25	that this is, this distribution thing, that

they need it to improve lines. Well, and that the last distribution improvement request they got was in 19, I believe you

said '96 or '97.

I have lived in my home for ten
years, they have not come through and
repaired any lines in my neighborhood. I
suffer at least twice a year from having a
squirrel, yes, a little furry rodent running
down the lines and at least twice a year I
lose electricity. They have not improved my
neighborhood because my neighborhood was
established in 1927. The homes that are
there have been there.

I have no bang for my dollar, nothing to show for it.

for their buck. There has been testimony
before me that their profit was 1 billion
with a B. I'm struggling to send my child to
college, and they are trying to tell me their
distribution rates need improvement. No. My
service needs improving when a little furry,
probably weighs less than my toy poodle,
which weighs for the record 7.6 pounds, can

take out the electricity for twenty homes on a street.

I'm sorry, again, no bang for my buck.

My husband and I work hard. work very hard. I am not a senior citizen and, yes, for the next ten years my income will go up, it's the way it is, I'm sorry for that, for the seniors whose don't go up. I do apologize because I do truly feel bad they are struggling. We have done everything that Toledo Edison has requested us to do to improve our costs. I went through my house, there's not one light in my home that does not have a fluorescent bulb, there is not one outlet in my home that has not been updated to where it's, you know, we've updated our electric service, we do not, I heat my home at 69 degrees because I can't afford to keep it higher, I have a set back thermostat so that when I am not at home my, I'm not heating an empty home. We sit around at night with blankets on so that my cost of heat is down. Yes, again, I heat with natural gas but I have to have a blower, I

have to run electricity to get my heat from the basement to the second floor.

And they are asking to have, the audacity to ask me to reach further into my pocket and pay for distribution that had, I don't know, maybe it's me, we are pro-active in our home ownership, we are pro-active in our car ownership. I do not wait till my car breaks down to get it fixed. I get the oil changed, I have my tires rotated and my brakes looked at. I am pro-active.

And it should not come down to the consumer to pay because a company with, may I repeat, \$1.3 billion in profit, because they decided not to be pro-active, they didn't keep up with their business lines, they didn't keep up with their residential lines, they are wanting everybody to build all these wonderful new homes and now they say, damn, shucky, darn, we didn't plan on the people needing more electricity. That is not my fault, that poor planning on their part should not mean higher rates on my part.

It is not fair, no way, no way, shape or form. I am not asking you to pay

for my son's college.

The PUCO was designed to help the consumer against just this, unjust raise in electric service. It seems to me, again, no

bang for my buck.

The PUCO, they ask for 44 percent increase, you say, well, you know, we think 44 is a little excessive, how about 24 instead? How about for the consumers you say, you know what? You need to dig deep in your pocket, you need to take your profit and be pro-active. You need to help and say no. You know, the government expected our kids to just say no to drugs, why can't the PUCO tell the Toledo Electric Company and First Energy to just say no? Figure it out.

I have to figure out how I'm going to come up with the money to pay, I have to come up with the money for college, I have to come up with money to get my husband back and forth to Detroit so that he can attend his job because his job in Toledo was eliminated and that increases not only my bottom line in gas but my bottom line on car repairs and the rest of it. I see less of my husband.

1.6

Toledo Edison don't seem to care. They say well, geez, we weren't pro-active, we didn't keep up with our distribution line. Sorry, not my problem. Just like you're saying to yourself, sorry, not my problem your husband has to drive to Detroit, at least he's employed. But I don't see Toledo Edison coming to my help. I doubt if their CEO is going to sit there and say, you know what, Mrs. Lovell, you guys work hard, how about an extra \$1,000 a year in your pocket to help pay for your husband to go to Detroit? It's not fair.

And no, I'm not a senior, I'm not on a fixed income. But no matter how you look at it, obviously they are not on a fixed income either. What budget cuts has Toledo Edison taken? My service is not as good, I'm paying higher rates than ever. I don't see anybody asking Toledo Edison to cut back on them. And you know what's going to happen if they cut back if you tell them no? I can already tell you, service is not going to get better, it's going to decrease. They are going to, their attitude is going to be,

1 well, damn, we didn't get this money so we're 2 going to have to layoff people. 3 They are saying it's distribution, I don't believe it. I don't believe it for a 4 5 minute. This is not going to be 6 distribution. It seems really funny to me 7 that they requested this in June and I 8 believe their Nuclear Regulatory Commission 9 issued them a fine in April of last year, was 10 it April? Does anybody know? I think it was 11 April of last year they got a fine for the 12 Davis Besse fiasco and now all of a sudden 13 now they are saying whoa, wait, wait, wait, wait, we need an increase for 14 distribution. Davis Besse is supposed to be 15 16 distributing, I believe it's still in shut 17 down, ain't it? No bang for our buck and yet they want more. I don't think it's fair. 18 19 Thank you. 20 MS. BOJKO: Barbara Judy or 21 Judge, is it Judy or Judge? 22 It's Judge like in MS. JUDGE: 23 court. MR. PRICE: Thanks. 24 25

1 BARBARA JUDGE 2 Having been first duly sworn, testified 3 as follows: 4 MS. JUDGE: Can you hear me? 5 I'd like to, like the lady before me --6 MS. BOJKO: I'm sorry, state 7 your name and address for the record, please. 8 MS. JUDGE: Barbara Judge, 2114 9 Silverpine Court, Toledo 43615. 10 Like the lady before me I have some 11 concerns, too, and it's not only just the 12 increase, but what the increase will do as 13 far as our young people leaving. There was 14 an article in the paper about all the doctors 15 who are about to graduate are going to 16 graduate on to some other state or some other 17 part of Ohio. People are losing their jobs 18 and the Toledo Edison wants more money. As far as I can see I don't see any 19 20 justification for this area being the highest 21 rate in probably the country, if not the 22 highest close to it. If they want to 23 increase their distribution perhaps instead 24 of people moving out of the state and other 25 places where they can find jobs which have

1 been lost because of the high utility rates, 2 retail, we are no longer a manufacturing 3 place because most of those jobs have been moved someplace else where they don't have to 5 pay so much for their electricity to run their plants. It's getting so that people 6 7 are just disappearing from this part of the 8 country. 9 Instead of raising the rates what 10 they should do is lower them in line with the 11 rest of the state and the country. They are 12 way too high. They have been way too high 13 for a long time and to raise rates again is 14 unconscionable. 15 Like people say, let them use their 16 wonderful profit to take care of a lot of the 17 things they need to do instead of forcing us 18 to do it. The rate should be lower, not 19 raised. 20 Thank you. 21 MS. BOJKO: Beth Kramer. 22 23 BETH KRAMER 24 Having been first duly sworn, testified 25 as follows:

1 MS. KRAMER: My name is Beth 2 Kramer, I live at 2093 US 20 A in Swanton. Ι 3 just want to tell you a little bit of my 4 fiasco with First Energy. 5 I moved into my home in '99. At 6 that time I had a cracked utility pole, took 7 them two years to get a new one. The old one 8 still stands there. It's an eye sore to my front yard, everybody that passes by. I have 10 not received an electric bill since October 11 of last year and it got to the point where I 12 have now had to acquire a PO Box just to get 13 my electric bill. Somebody down there cannot 14 figure out why I have no utility bill come 15 every month. 16 So, in my opinion it's just costing 17 me a lot just to deal with the hassle and 18 then turn around and you guys want to 19 increase the rates. 20 Like everybody else here, you guys 21 really need to consider decreasing the rates, 22 taking your profit, putting it back into your 23 company like a lot of the small business 24 owners do. 25 You know, we're the third highest

1 foreclosure state in, that was to the last 2 record in the United States. You know we 3 have the highest rates of electric in the midwest. And I would just ask just from 5 somebody that's just a middle age, you know, 6 middle income that if you would just really 7 consider decreasing it and putting the profits back into the company. I think that 8 that would help in the long run for a lot of 10 people. 11 That's all I have to say. 12 you. 13 MS. BOJKO: Thank you. Go back 14 one more time to David Drew. 1.5 16 DAVID DREW 17 Having been first duly sworn, testified 18 as follows: 19 MR. DREW: My name is David 20 Drew, I live at 417 Potter Street, Toledo, 21 Ohio, 43605. 22 I was injured on the job eight 23 years ago and I just now recently got 24 disabled, finally got an income coming in 25 which ain't much, just me and my wife.

1	struggling. I got 18 months worth of
2	electric bills in this folder, not one of
3	them are ever the same when ${f i}{f t}$ comes ${f to}{f a}$
4	related component delivery charge,
5	transaction charge. We even get charged to
6	be a customer, which makes no sense to me.
7	I get \$120 electric bill, they
8	charge me \$67 to deliver it to my house, they
9	charge me \$58 for a transaction fee, related
10	component must be my meter I have on my house
11	\$25. They are charging me \$156 on top of the
12	\$120 I already paid them. It's all going
13	I can't afford to keep paying them.
14	So, I don't understand what they
15	are trying to do here. Trying to run us out?
16	It's up to you guys.
17	MS. BOJKO: I will try John
18	Swartzlander one more time. And Patrick
19	Allen. Okay.
20	Is there anybody else that would
21	like to testify that did not sign up?
22	FEMALE: Am I allowed to ask
23	a question?
24	MS. BOJKO: You can ask us a
25	procedural question.

1 FEMALE: I don't know what 2 that is. 3 MS. BOJKO: You can't ask us 4 about the substantive part of the case. 5 really --6 You can tell me yes FEMALE: 7 or no. Did you give specifics as to why you 8 feel the distribution rate needs to be 9 increased? Was there a specific reason for 10 that? 11 MS. BOJKO: I can answer your 12 question as saying that the Commission has 13 not yet made a ruling on the case. 14 application was filed back in June by the 15 company. Last month we had approximately 16 three weeks of hearings on the matter, we 17 heard all the testimony from 60 witnesses 18 approximately, either filed testimony or 19 presented testimony, and the attorneys were 20 there for numerous intervenors, numerous 21 parties to the proceeding and then 22 cross-examined the witnesses. That's what 23 happened. And then the second part of that hearing process is to have public hearings 24

25

which is what we're doing today. We have 12

1 of these public hearings scheduled all over 2 the State of Ohio in First Energy's three 3 service territories and we are listening to testimony, it is being transcribed and then 4 5 the Commission, the five member Commission 6 will make the ultimate decision on the case. 7 MS. THOMAS: There's only five 8 members that are going to make the decision 9 after hearing everyone? There's only five 10 members, right? 11 MS. BOJKO: Yes. 12 MS. THOMAS: I'm going to say 13 this off the record --We're still on the 14 MS. BOJKO: 15 record, ma'am. We can't hear any more 16 testimony. 17 MS. THOMAS: I'm not going to ask 18 any questions. I thank you all for coming 19 today and I thank our council people for 20 taking the people, although our good Mayor 21 wasn't here, taking the time to listen to 22 some of us. When you take into consideration 23 that we do have a Public Utility Commission 24 for the State of Ohio, the consumer should 25 not, we as consumers really shouldn't have to

1 be here today when you see these people are 2 making billions of dollars in profit. You 3 all shouldn't be here today. These people, 4 don't take no five men panel to make a 5 decision. We got a Public Utility Commission б for the State of Ohio. If you look at every 7 legislative thing that will happen with our 8 Public Utility Commission, they never turn 9 down any of these people for these raises. 10 It always passes regardless of what anyone 11 say. It always passes. 12 Just to be clear, MS. BOJKO: 13 the five member is the Public Utilities Commission, they are the five commissioners, 14 15 they are the public --16 Made up of brothers MS. THOMAS: 17 and sisters and in-laws. These are people 18 that need to be chosen by the State of Ohio. 19 We need to, in the sixties I used to go down 20 to the Public Utilities, now in the seventies 21 Public Utility Commission of State of Ohio. 22 These people are not chosen, they are 23 appointed. So, maybe that's part of the 24 problem. 25 You had your MS. BOJKO:

opportunity to testify, as everybody has had the opportunity to testify. I'm mean I'm asking if there was someone that did not have an opportunity to sign up and that would like to be heard. We have heard all of you, it has been transcribed. We will take this back, the Commissioners will review the testimony and they will make the ultimate decision.

Sir, did you want an opportunity to testify?

MR. GILCREST: I have a question.

Have you given any consideration to holding

this type of meeting in the evening because

of the number of people that are working?

MS. BOJKO: We have twelve local public hearings, we have some of those in the afternoon at 1:30 because there are some individuals that would like to come out during the day, and then we have many of those hearings, the majority are in the evening at 6:30. We have one this evening in Maumee at 6:30 tonight that we will all be attending. We have one tomorrow in Cleveland at 1:30 and in a Cleveland suburb at 6:30

1 tomorrow night, Shaker Heights. So, we do 2 have them both at 1:30 and 6:30 to 3 accommodate all people. 4 Could you state your name? The 5 court reporter needs your name for the 6 transcript. 7 MR. GILCREST: 2217 Thornridge 8 Drive, Toledo, Ohio 43614. 9 MS. BOJKO: One more question 10 and we're going to cut off. 11 Procedural question. MR. ALINGER: 12 Would you like my name also? My name is 13 James Alinger, 14704 Howard Road, Defiance, 14 clear out in the west end that nobody thinks 15 about. 16 My procedural question is this, 17 considering this is the Public Utilities 18 Commission, why don't we approach the public 19 before we are approached by the intervenors 20 and the utility companies and all of that 21 when a rate case comes up? I think these 22 public hearings should be held first to get 23 some public input to the Public Utilities 24 Commission before the stipulations, 25 recommendations and side deals go into

1	effect.
2	MS. BOJKO: The record is not
3	finished, it's all a matter of scheduling. A
4	lot of times the public hearings are held
5	before the evidentiary hearings. There's no
6	difference with regard to that. We hear all
7	testimony, we record all testimony, it will
8	all be considered.
9	I want to thank everybody for
10	coming out today and for testifying and we
11	will conclude, adjourn for the day. Thank
12	you.
13	* * * * * * * * * * *
14	Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned at
15	2:56 p.m.
16	* * * * * * * * * * * *
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

STATE OF OHIO 1 2 COUNTY OF LUCAS C-E-R-T-I-F-I-C-A-T-E3 I, LORI L. UDOWSKI, Notary Public in and for the 4 State of Ohio, duly commissioned and qualified, do hereby 5 6 certify that the above and foregoing is a true and accurate 7 transcription of the aforementioned matter. 8 I do further certify that I am not a relative, 9 employee or counsel of any of the parties hereto, and 10 further that I am not a relative or employee of any 11 attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, or 12 financially interested in the action. 13 I do further certify that I am not, nor is the 14 court reporting firm with which I am affiliated, under a 15 contract as defined in Civil Rule 28 (D). 16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand 17 and affixed my seal of office at Toledo, Ohio, on this 17th 18 day of March, 2008. 19 20 21 Notary Public in and for the STATE OF OHIO 22 23 My Commission Expires: February 5, 2012. 24