

Linda A. Hammond

1121 Snyder Drive
Leesport, PA 19533

Email: lahammond24@gmail.com
Cell 484.709.5604

Opposition to the Proposed Met-Ed Rate Increases

I am appalled, offended, and livid at the inequity against the public regarding the proposed electric rate increases by Met-Ed. Met-Ed, parented by FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company, proposes the following rate increases by category:

- Residential, 9.2 percent;
- Commercial, 3.9 percent; and,
- Industrial, 0.5 percent.

Now, how does this look to you? Is this equitable? The proposed residential rate of 9.2% is 2.4 x greater than the commercial rate. It is 18.4 x greater than the industrial rate. Fair? How is this equitable? I repeat: John Q. Public's rate is nearly 2.5 times higher than commercial's and 19 times higher than industrial's rate. Residential consumers are getting screwed!

Met-Ed requests of the Public Utility Commission (PUC) an increase of \$146 million per year. Are we consumers to assume that total of \$146 million will come from this increase? If so, we do not know—perhaps someone else has determined the amount of monies each category would contribute to the \$146 million request.

Incidentally, the current CEO of FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric company is John W. Somerhalder II. His annual salary is \$4,497,007. That is 122x the median employee salary of \$37,000 per year.

I suggest Met-Ed cut costs by discontinuing mass mailings of insurance programs for underground wiring maintenance, which in the past Met-Ed has disclaimed although mailings have Met-Ed's logo on the return label of the envelope. In addition, what are the costs of mailings "comparing energy usage" like neighbor to like neighbor. (Many variables are not considered in these erroneous reports.)

What, as an overseeing commission, are you doing to monitor Met-Ed's costs? Where can and should they be cutting expenses? Are you looking at that? Or are they just passing them along to PA consumers and assuming you will overlook them?

Many residential customers pay their Met-Ed statements online automatically. They do not see notices of “....Rate Changes.” Ironically, I have met many people unaware of these proposed increases. Could this equate to a dearth in opposing responses to this exorbitant residential rate increase?

Met-Ed asks for public residents to pay nearly 20 times more for their electricity than for industrial customers and 4 times more than commercial customers. This is totally and blatantly unfair, placing again the burden on residential customers – John and Mary Q. Public--to shoulder this unjustifiable request.

I implore the commission to:

- **Reject the proposed rate increases;**
- **Review the categorical rates; and,**
- **Approve a residential rate increase of no more than 1.5 percent.**

Yes, that is no more than 1.5 percent.

Thank you for your consideration.

Linda Hammond, RN, BSN, CTHP