2011 MAR 29 AM 8: 50

PUCO

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

copearing

This is to cartify that the images

reproducti he regular

0 12 40

CODO

end čel±

accurato

**P**ZOC4850073

Date

# FILE

From: webmaster@puc.state.oh.us To: ContactThePUCO Subject: 58697 Received: 3/23/2011 5:32:02 PM Message: WEB ID: 58697 AT:03-23-2011 at 05:30 PM

Related Case Number:

TYPE: complaint

NAME: Mr. Dan Pfeiffer

**CONTACT SENDER ? Yes** 

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 1098 w. wallings rd
- broadview heights, Ohio 44147
- USA

## PHONE INFORMATION:

- Home: (no home phone provided?)
- Alternative: (no alternative phone provided?)
- Fax: (no fax number provided?)

E-MAIL: dpfeiffer1098@gmail.com

INDUSTRY:Electric

## ACCOUNT INFORMATION:

- (no utility company name provided?)
- (no account name provided?)
- (no service address provided?)
- (no service phone number provided?)
- (no account number provided?)

## COMPLAINT DESCRIPTION:

## Dear Sirs,

This complaint is in regards to the PUCO unanimously approving a redesigned version of FirstEnergy's disastrous 2009 light bulb campaign

I understand that the reason for the energy saving program that you approved for First Energy is for them to avoid the cost of constructing additional power plants. Since avoiding the cost of constructing new power plants will benefit the share holders of First Energy I do not believe the cost of the energy

09-1947-EL-POR

savings plan should be borne by the customers of First Energy.

So ultimately, the consumer is financing a utility program, mandated by the government to benefit the consumer.

Since I am also under the impression that the PUCO exists to protect the interest of the public please explain your rationale for having First Energy's customers pay for reducing their capital expenditures.

Thank you in advance for your response.