

1110 Whaley Rd New Carlisle, OH 45344-9700 9 May 2010

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Attn: Docketing Department 180 E. Broad St. Columbus, OH 43215

Re: Case Number 10-388-EL-SSO

Sir/Madam:

This letter is to inform the PUCO of my current dissatisfaction with the PUCO approval of past FirstEnergy rates as well as my deep concerns over the current proposed rate increase under the Electric Security Plan for June 2011 to May 2014 (Case Number 10-338-EL-SSO). In particular, I have strong discontent for the following content of the proposal: Delivery Capital Recovery Rider, Payment for Transmission Recovery Costs, Lost Revenues, and Economic Development. As written, the proposal would result in an even larger disparity between FirstEnergy and other electric companies in Ohio and the region, resulting in a significant financial gain with minimal business risk to FirstEnergy through an unfair cost burden to their consumers.

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

2818 MAY 13 PM 12: 14

PUCO

Ohio Edison is the FirstEnergy subsidiary which provides my electric service at the above address. I do not have a choice in my service provider. Ohio Edison currently charges an exorbitant rate for electric delivery, which I have absolutely no recourse in shopping for competitive rates or negotiating. Consider this FACT: for the exact same service and kW-hours, an electric bill with Ohio Edison is 34% higher than with the neighboring electric company Dayton Power & Light. This disparity is directly associated with the delivery service fees charged.

It makes consumers wonder...how can the PUCO justify such a disparity in price for the exact same product/service and even consider yet another rate increase? Why should the consumer pay the costs and accept the burden of an apparently poorly managed company (as compared to DP&L)?

With these facts in mind, I urge the PUCO to soundly REJECT the FirstEnergy plan.

Sincerely,

oel A. Johnson