FILE

From: webmaster@puc.state.oh.us
To: ContactThePUCO
Subject: 58782
Received: 3/25/2011 4:11:15 PM
Message:
WEB ID: 58782 AT:03-25-2011 at 04:10 PM

09-1948-EL-PDR

Related Case Number:

TYPE: complaint

NAME: Ms. Shannon Kerr

CONTACT SENDER ? Yes

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 1235 Jersey St
- Alliance , Ohio 44619
- USA

PHONE INFORMATION:

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

E-MAIL: cpslion@excite.com

INDUSTRY:Other

ACCOUNT INFORMATION:

- Company: PUCO
- *(no account name provided?)*
- *(no service address provided?)*
- *(no service phone number provided?)*
- *(no account number provided?)*

COMPLAINT DESCRIPTION:

I am extremely angry with PUCO's recent determination about the First Energy light bulb program. You have set a very unfair precedent for all consumers! In order for First Energy to get the energy usage down, customers need to use less electric/ more efficiency. So you ok'd First Energy to bill all customers $.30/month for 3 yrs for two fluorescent bulbs. Where is Freedom of choice? It is voluntary but we have to pay for it whether or not we get the bulbs! And what about the households who already replaced their own bulbs? Plus, you also allowed First Energy to charge $1.20 a month to make up the loss of revenue that the company will experience because the consumers will be using less (the ultimate goal). Why should CUSTOMERS have to pay for the more efficient goods AND then also pay the

supplier the difference they would have made if we were using not using less? This only benefits First Energy WITH NO REGARD FOR THE CONSUMERS! This program also sets a bad precedent: Next we are looking at gasoline prices. Federal guidelines have mandated that car manufacturers have to improve mph on every car sold in U.S. Based on YOUR guide....Americans would then have to pay the difference oil companies would "lose" by having better gas mileage on cars to make it up. It sounds dumb, right? That is just what you did with First Energy!!! We rejected this program in 2009, why on earth would you approve it now without ANY consideration for the consumer? BOO to PUCO!