RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

2014 DEC -4 AM 8: 41

PUCO

November 30, 2014

PUCO Docket for Case #14-1297-EL-SSO

Dear Sirs,

I would like to inform you that I am opposed to First Energy's proposed Purchase Power Agreement to bail out their failing power plants.

First Energy has had no concern about what they have done to us All Electric Homeowners in the past. They refuse to admit that they promised us lower rates in order to get us to build these all electric homes. No one would have gone to the expense of building these all electric homes if they were not promised these discounts.

Now it appears that the little savings we were allowed to keep after the last give away to First Energy are now in more jeopardy.

Please stop this from happening to the over 200,000 all electric home owners, who did nothing but listen to First Energy's false promises.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours.

Richard Jordan 11430 Twin Mills Lane Chardon, Ohio 44024 440-479-4847 RFJIND@WINDSREAM.NET

This is to certify that the images appearing one an accurate and complete reproduction of a case fill document delivered in the regular course of backbass.

Technician A Date Processed 12/4/14

From:

marthatakacs@sbcglobal.net

Sent:

Thursday, December 04, 2014 8:11 AM

To:

Puco Docketing

Subject:

Comments

<u>I am opposed to FirstEnergy's proposed Purchased Power Agreement to bailout their failing power plants. Please file my comments into the docket for Case # 14-1297-EL-SSO. Thank you.</u>

From: Dave Battles <dbattles52@windstream.net>

Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2014 5:42 PM

To: Puco Docketing Cc: Sue Steigerwald

Subject: file your comments into the docket for case # 14-1297-EL-SSO.

I am an all electric homeowner. First Energy has previously granted discounts to provide some relief to using electric for all home uses. Now First Energy

is trying to have their distribution companies obligated to pay whatever First Energy says the electricity costs which includes costs to update their plants.

When the electricity is sold into the wholesale market, the gain or loss is automatically going to be charges to us, the end users.

First Energy has admitted that for 3 years this arrangement will operate at a loss with charges to the customer.

I am opposed to First Energy's proposed purchased power agreement to bailout their failing power plants.

From: Richard Matey < richardmatey@wowway.com>

Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2014 8:23 PM

To: Puco Docketing
Cc: Richard Matey

Subject: docket for Case #14-1297-EL-SSO.

We are against the unjustly First Energy raise on are electric rates. We have an all electric house and our rates keep going up. In 1999 First Energy fought for and won the right to separate its distribution and generation facilities. First Energy Distribution (delivery of electricity to homes) remained with the Illuminating Company, Ohio Edison, Toledo Edison as our local utility companies. First Energy Generation became the company known as First Energy Solution (fes) who owns all the power plants. This separation was supposed to be good for consumers because it was hypothetically the first step to allowing a competitive retail electric market to develop which would allow all of us to shop for lower generation prices. We strongly oppose to First Energy's proposed purchase power agreement to bailout their failing power plants. Thank you for your consideration

From:

tim@adamjava.com

Sent:

Wednesday, December 03, 2014 9:44 PM

To:

Puco Docketing

Subject:

Case # 14-1297-EL-SSO

Please file these comments into the docket for Case # 14-1297-EL-SSO.

Dear Sir or Madam:

I stand against FirstEnergy's proposed Purchased Power Agreement, as I understand it, for three reasons:

- (1) FirstEnergy distribution customers should not be forced to bailout FES for any losses in its power generation;
- (2) Those customers should not have to pay for any sort of power generation on the distribution side of the bill; and
- (3) Electric heating customers (as I am), after losing the heating rate discount, should not have to pay even more, especially with a new usage-based charge.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Timothy S. Adam 5743 S.R. 303 Wakeman, OH 44889

tim@adamjava.com