

FILE

Hunter, Donielle

From: ContactThePUCO@puc.state.oh.us
Sent: Monday, March 01, 2010 2:47 PM
To: Docketing
Subject: FirstEnergy Rate Case

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Investigation and Audit Division

Memorandum

Date: 3/1/2010

Re: Jill Peasley
7145 Mildon Dr
Painesville, OH 44077

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
2010 MAR -1 PM 2:43
PUCO

Docketing Case No.: 10-0176-EL-ATA

Notes: Our complaint is against The Illuminating Company AND the PUCO.

Our all-electric discounted rate was offered as an incentive to furnish a house with all electric appliances when it was built and when the house was resold to us three years later the rate was grandfathered by The Illuminating Company as an incentive to maintain electric appliances. We were informed by the staff of The Illuminating Company that this rate went forward for us as long as we owned this home and kept all of the appliances electric. Numerous purchases including an electric water heater and electric heat pump were made with this information in mind.

This decision by The Illuminating Company and the PUCO also impacts the resale value of our home, not to mention the impact to our finances due to the unplanned and budgeted extremely high cost of electric during the winter heating months. The chances of a prospective buyer now being interested in our home when they find out that we have all electric appliances and heat has been severely reduced and the amount of money that we will be able to get from the sale of our home is now also lower.

This grandfathered rate is a legally binding contract between The Illuminating Co and us and there was no clause stating that it could be cancelled at any time or that the discounted rate would expire. Our discount rate should not have been cancelled and the cancellation should be considered a breach of contract. The discounted rate should be re-established retro-active to the unlawful cancelling of the all-electric rate.

The PUCO failed to research the full impact of allowing this change to be made and should be held accountable for "permitting" the cancellation of a legally binding rate. The PUCO has failed in their mission to be a watch dog over the electric company and a protector of the public's rights.

Please docket the attached in the case number above.

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 _____ Date Processed MAR 01 2010