## <u>OHIO STAR FORGE CO.</u>

4000 Mahoning Avenue PO 80x 430 Warren, OH 44482-0430 Telephone: 330-847-6368 Fax: 330-847-6368

FILE

May 3, 2010

Dr. Alan Schriber, Ph.D. Chairman Public Utilities Commission of Ohio 180 East Broad Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215

RE: PUCO Case No. 10-0388-EL-SSO

Dear Chairman Schriber:

I am the Electrical Engineer of a manufacturing facility located in Warren, Ohio. We corrent employ 75 people at our plant. Its been a tough year with employment dipping to 51 people, but we are on our way back and are soon looking forward to full employment of 79 people. It is also anticipated that by September of this year new hires will be necessary, thus creating more well paying jobs for the State of Ohio. We have been following the FirstEnergy electric security plan ("ESP") case closely, and even closer than normal due to the current economic conditions which have hit us (and a lot of other Ohioans) particularly hard.

I am writing to express my concerns about your announcement on April 29, 2010 regarding the ESP application and settlement filed with the Commission on March 23, 2010 by FirstEnergy. As you know, the settlement is supported by numerous parties having diverse interests including the Industrial Energy Users-Ohio ("IEU-Ohio"). My company is a member of IEU-Ohio and we have been following the ESP process which is connected to the Market Rate Offer ("MRO") process initiated last October and based on the current ESP which the PUCO approved about one year ago.

My concern about your April 29th announcement is that it may be perceived as supporting claims that the parties who are not supporting the settlement are correct in alleging that they have not had adequate time to evaluate the proposal. At a time when it is critically important to do things to give citizens confidence that government can act timely and do so in the public interest, it would be unfortunate if the PUCO pays more attention to process concerns than the substantive issues that Ohio must identify and resolve. In this particular case, the ESP filing is the outgrowth of a PUCO Staff recommendation in the MRO proceeding which has been fully litigated and currently awaits a PUCO decision (a decision that will be late as I understand the requirements of Ohio law). Parties interested in this subject matter have had since October of 2009 to conduct discovery and prepare to advocate on behalf of their particular interest. It is misleading to suggest that the ESP process began on March 23, 2010.

The same interests that protested the PUCO's efforts to promote the use of rate stabilization plans prior to the passage of Amended Substitute Senate Bill 221 are now opposing the use of ESPs. As we understand it, the ESP settlement, if approved by the Commission, includes both opportunities to take advantage of generation prices that are at historic lows and economic development and economic retention opportunities that would not otherwise be available.

I urge the Commission to promptly act to take advantage of the historically low generation prices and the other economic development and retention opportunities not otherwise available by timely approving the comprehensive ESP settlement.

 2

Please feel free to contact me at 330-772-3021 if I can provide you with additional information. I thank you, in advance, for your attention and consideration.

Respectfully yours,

Roy H. Setterberg

cc: Commissioner Valerie A. Lemmie

Commissioner Paul A. Centolella Commissioner Cheryl Roberto Commissioner Steven D. Lesser

Beth Trombold, PUCO Legislative Liaison

Governor Ted Strickland

Senator Bill Harris, Senate President

Senator Capri S. Cafaro

Representative Armond Budish, Speaker of the Ohio House of Representatives

Representative Tom Letson