



PENNSYLVANIA CITIZENS
CONSUMER COUNCIL

P.O. BOX 736
EDINBORO, PA 16412-0736

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
PA Public Utility Commission
PO Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Dear Mr. McNulty:

I am receiving several copies of notices from the Commission relative to various dockets concerning electric restructuring. In order to eliminate confusion and save the PUC money, I would appreciate your office eliminating all organizations and addresses for me and use only the following:

Dr. Louis S. Meyer
PA Citizens Consumer Council
PO Box 736
Edinboro, PA 16412-0736

I am presently receiving mail from your office which comes to my home in Cambridge Springs but addressed to PO Box 736 which is in Edinboro, not Cambridge Springs. The latest item, notice of the Order for consumer education, is addressed to Louise S. Meyer, PhD, close but inaccurate. I will appreciate your taking care of this matter. Certified mail is expensive and there is no reason to receive three mailings when one will suffice. Many thanks!!

KJR

May 4, 1998

R- 974149
R- 973953
R- 973954
R- 973975
R- 973981
R- 974008
R- 974009
R- 974104
M-00981036
P-981325

RECEIVED

MAY 07 1998

Sincerely,

Louis S. Meyer

Louis S. Meyer
President

DOCUMENT
FOLDER

LOUISE S MEYER
PRESIDENT
PA CITIZENS CONSUMER CNSL
P O BOX 736
EDINBORO PA 16412-0736

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
PROTHONOTARY'S OFFICE
DOCKETED

MAY 13 1998

LOU MEYER
PA INST FOR COMM SERVS
BOX 723 RD 2
CAMBRIDGE SPRINGS PA 16403

No

m-00981036



BRYN MAWR MEDICAL SPECIALISTS ASSOCIATION

933 HAVERFORD ROAD

BRYN MAWR, PENNSYLVANIA 19010

RECEIVED

ORIGINAL

MAY 18 1998

May 7, 1998
REP

CARDIOLOGY

Frank S. Harrison, Jr., M.D.
Wayne W. Keller, M.D.
Henry S. Mayer, M.D.
Francis P. Day, M.D.
John P. Fisher, M.D.

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
Joint Office
P.O. Box 3265

Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

GASTROENTEROLOGY

Philip R. Nast, M.D.
Rodman B. Finkbinder, M.D.
Robert E. Levitt, M.D.
Robert R. Atkins, M.D.
Gerald C. Dragonetti, M.D.

Dear Sirs:

R-00973953

HEMATOLOGY-ONCOLOGY

Patrick M. Growney, M.D.
James P. Bond, M.D.
Steven C. Cohen, M.D.

INFECTIOUS DISEASE

Peter G. Spitzer, M.D.
Ted Martynowicz, D.O.

NEUROLOGY

Erich J. Freimuth, M.D.
Linda Stallings Sykes, M.D.
Richard A. Eisner, M.D.
Christopher J. Reid, M.D.

RHEUMATOLOGY

F. Douglas Raymond, Jr., M.D.
Emeritus
Patricia A. Fenn, M.D.
Martina M. Martin, M.D.
John H. Martin, M.D.
Donald S. Miller, M.D.

PULMONARY/CRITICAL CARE

Edward A. Theurkauf, Jr., M.D.
N. Blair LeRoy, M.D.
John F. Ledlie, M.D.
Andrew P. Pitman, M.D.
David S. Prince, M.D.

ADMINISTRATOR

Lawrence M. Werner
(610) 527-3800

I read with interest the proposed settlement with PECO energy. I would like to offer my strong opposition to this. The leaders of PECO, particularly Corbin O'Neill, the President, have been less than candid with the public. They offered an immediate 10% rate reduction when they were trying to keep the Texas people away from Pennsylvania. I see that that is now decreased to 8%. By some illogical stretching of fairness, I see also that PECO will be allowed to recover \$5.26 billion in what they call "stranded assets and costs". As a former shareholder in PECO Energy, I was particularly concerned about this portion of the settlement. After offering a 10% rate reduction, the Board of PECO Energy slashed the dividend to its shareholders in order to pay for these costs. I now see that the settlement will allow them to bill the customers for those costs. I am sure it is unlikely that PECO will honestly restore the dividend to the shareholders in that they now have another way to recover their costs from the unsuspecting future subscribers of PECO.

In summary, I urge rejection of this settlement. PECO has already set aside the money to pay for the stranded costs out of the hides of their shareholders. They need no help from the future subscribers to PECO Energy. This certainly will delay true competitive electric supply in Pennsylvania for a long period and will go contrary to the thoughts that generated the law of December of 1996 directing competition among the retail electric market. If possible, I certainly intend to be an ex-customer of PECO when my chance to buy electricity from a competitor is available so that I will not be saddled with the costs that PECO calls stranded, but I am sure true competition is a long way off as long as the PUC continues to support the uneven playing field that will result from this proposed settlement.

Sincerely,

Wayne W. Keller

Wayne W. Keller, M.D.

MARKETED

MAY 19 1998

WWK:asz
cc: PECO Energy Company

DOCUMENT
FOLDER

ORIGINAL

7502

KJR

39 Valley View Drive - Box 300
Fountainville, PA 18923

May 8, 1998

Secretary to the Commission
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105

RECEIVED
PROTHONOTARY'S OFFICE
98 MAY 12 AM 11:22

Re: Proposed Settlement to PECO Energy
Company's Restructing Plan
(Docket No. R-00973953)

Dear Sir:

I wish to file a protest in the event the Joint Petition for Settlement's provision permitting PECO Energy to recover \$5.26 billion in stranded assets can be interpreted to included current PECO Energy's generation equipment and assets which will continue to be used by PECO Energy to generate electricity for sale, and ask for a hearing on the matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Albert J. Paiste, Major
Army of the United States, Retired.

DOCKETED
MAY 14 1998

DOCUMENT
FOLDER

John M. Alvarez

175 Beulah Road, Doylestown PA 18901-2614

47248

Saturday, May 9, 1998

Secretary of the PUC
PO Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

ORIGINAL KJR

RE: **R-00973953**

To whom it may concern:

I do most strenuously object to the PECO proposed settlement for the following reasons:

1. PECO has been one of the most expensive distributors of electricity in the United States for years, so had they run it properly, they would have had the funds necessary to pay for their mistakes (TMI) like every other business does when their own people screw up.
2. Although competition requires more advertising, they admit that the rates will go down.
3. Competition will drive the prices down 10% gross, while half of the cost is represented by generation and distribution. That means that the billing, metering and administration has been 20% over-priced. If their gross billings since the TMI incident reveal that the 10% gross overcharge would have more than compensated the company for their loss due to their error, no repayment of any kind would be fitting.
4. PECO should face the same product of mismanagement that their customers face, namely: Your own company and your own stockholders lose when you do a bad job. Guaranteeing the repayment of those losses is unthinkable.
5. *It is my belief that if the public had the choice, they would indicate their displeasure with PECO's gluttonous pricing policy thus far, by changing suppliers immediately and enmass.*
6. If they are permitted to transfer transmission facilities to other corporate entities, they will certainly do that with raw profits in mind, which can benefit the customers, but usually creates the opportunity to wipe out the equity of long time employees. New facilities have higher capitalization costs and newer employees. Allowing PECO to restructure and dump ("downsize") labor costs without capital investment would, once again, give them an unfair advantage.

While the PUC still has some control over this deal, it would benefit the people of the Philadelphia area who have funded PECO's folly thus far, if the CTC and ITC plans were rejected. PECO deserves the desertion of stockholders and customers because of their mismanagement. Maybe it will force them to improve their operations as others in the country have done.

Sincerely,



John M. Alvarez

BUCKETED
MAY 13 1998

**DOCUMENT
FOLDER**

24

P.O. at P.O. 3265 Harrisburg PA

May 11, 98

Dear Sir: R-00973953

DOCUMENT
FOLDER

I am a senior citizen, slightly
handicapped, on social security income
on a fixed income. I would
like the Peco competition market
issue settlement as soon as possible.

Thank you

Hubert Sgambato

RECEIVED
PROTHONOTARY'S OFFICE

98 MAY 14 AM 8:55

147727



STORB INCORPORATED

Engineering Consultants - Construction Managers

410 NORTH EASTON ROAD

WILLOW GROVE, PA 19090-2511

Telephone: (215) 657-6695 • Facsimile: (215) 657-7695



May 11, 1998

Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105-3265

KJR
R-973953
P-971265

RE: PECO ENERGY REQUEST FOR JOINT PETITION FOR SETTLEMENT

Gentlemen and Ladies:

I have received a copy of your tentative order approving a Joint Petition for Settlement of PECO Energy's Restructuring Plan.

This entire plan appears to me as a method to bail out a Company which is probably the most badly run Electric Company in the United States.

The one item that particularly stands out is the "Permit PECO Energy to recover \$5.26 billion in stranded assets and costs through a Competitive Transition Charge (CTC) and/or an Intangible Transition Charge (ITC) through December 31, 2010". This permit to PECO Energy has to be the biggest "rip-off" ever perpetrated by anyone.

As far as I am concerned, the Philadelphia Electric Company (PECO Energy) ought to be disbanded and taken over by other Companies who have a record of competent management.

Very truly yours,
STORB INCORPORATED

John W. Storb, P.E.
JWS/ams

DOCKETED

MAY 14 1998

47517

CC: files - pucpeco.doc

DOCUMENT
FOLDER

ORIGINAL

98 MAY 13 AM 8:13
RECEIVED
PROTHONOTARY'S OFFICE

9