

FILE

Weight, Mariruth

From: ContactThePUCO@puc.state.oh.us
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2010 11:06 AM
To: Docketing
Subject: FirstEnergy Rate Case
Attachments: Bly.pdf

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Investigation and Audit Division

Memorandum

Date: 6/23/2010

Re: David Bly
21668 Meadows Edge Ln
Strongsville, OH 44149

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
2010 JUN 24 AM 11:39
PUCO

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

Notes: see attachment

To: docketing@puc.state.oh.us
CC:
BCC:
Subject: FirstEnergy Rate Case

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Investigation and Audit Division

Memorandum

Date: 3/25/2010

Re: David Bly
21668 Meadows Edge Ln
Strongsville, OH 44149

Docketing Case No.: 09-906-EL-SSO

Notes: With regard to Case #09-906-EL-SSO, I wish to express my strong opposition to the elimination of the Residential Distribution Credit currently being considered. This entire issue is having devastating impact on owners of all-electric homes who now find they are no longer a part of the housing market.

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 JUN 24 2010

RECEIVED

JUN 23 2010

**INVESTIGATION AND ADJUDICATION
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

Attn: IAD
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
180 E. Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215-3793

June 18, 2010

Ref: PUCO Docket Case #10-176

My wife and I own a home located within a large subdivision of completely all-electric homes. There are no gas mains within the entire subdivision and even if there were, the type of air ducts built into these homes does not allow for conversion to force air gas heat. We are totally reliant upon First Energy and always will be and they know it.

If First Energy, at this late date, is allowed to totally ignore the binding promises and incentives that were made to the builders and owners to forgo installing natural gas service, it will be a travesty resulting in huge monthly electric bills that will adversely affect not just the property value of thousands of homes, it will render these homes virtually unmarketable if the all-electric discount is not permanently restored and assigned to the home, not just the current owner. Our all-electric homes will, in affect, have the same status as homes in the immediate vicinity of a nuclear power plant disaster – you won't be able to give them away! We are already experiencing negative results over these issues. We have had our home on the market for over six months and prospective buyers have stated they are very interested in buying our home, but cannot commit to such a purchase until the entire issue of restoration of the all-electric discount is resolved. What buyer would walk into a situation such as we now face after all these years?

None of the people adversely affected by First Energy's "bait-and-switch" business model believe for one minute that the company did not realize the extreme impact the rate design changes submitted to the PUCO would have upon thousands of Ohio residents. Their data bases had to reflected the elevated kilowatt hours (5000 kWh) used by all-electric homes during the late fall through early spring as opposed to gas users (750 kWh), yet there was never any thought given to industry standards such as quantity discounting. First Energy didn't care and the company hoped the PUCO wouldn't notice – and initially they didn't. To me, such tactics emphasize the need for ongoing regulatory oversight with regard to rate requests by a monopoly such as First Energy where the focus is placed on net profit for officers and stockholders, not the best interests of the general public they are supposed to be serving.

When will the PUCA issue a permanent solution recommendation that the public can review and comment on? Chairman Schriber has already publicly stated that "the problem is simple to solve" as a rate design issue. The PUCO must consider adjusting the guaranteed profit First Energy relies upon when considering their recommendation. All-electric homes were never subsidized by natural gas home owners. The all-electric discount we received was a First Energy decision made to create a market for their excessive generation and it greatly benefited First Energy. It was their business plan that they now want to abandon because it doesn't suit them any longer. If long term business plans begin to reflect diminishing revenue company officers and the stockholders should bear the brunt of that decision, not the general public.

Our only hope rests with the agency that is charged with safeguarding the interests of the residents of this state to be sure we are being treated fairly when dealing with the large utility companies, and in this case that agency is the PUCO. I ask that this correspondence become part of the official record of this case.

Thank you,


David & Jean Bly

David L. Bly
21668 Meadows Edge Lane
Strongsville, OH 44149