

FILE

41

Genesky, Donielle

From: Jane McCullam <cattermole@windstream.net>
Sent: Friday, January 09, 2015 4:40 PM
To: Puco Docketing
Subject: Comment on Case # 14-1297-EL-SSO.

I do not support Ohio's electric utilities' attempt to bail out the aging, dangerous Davis-Besse nuclear reactor, nor dirty coal plants, at ratepayers' expense. These plants are not competitive with today's market prices for electricity, and they spew radioactive and toxic pollution into our air and water. We should not have to pay more for dirty energy.

It's time to pull the plug on Davis-Besse; for decades it has experienced safety problem after safety problem--how much longer can it buck the odds before it causes a catastrophic accident?

Coal, which generates nearly 70 percent of electricity in Ohio, is known to cause major air pollution and negatively impact public health while contributing to climate disruption. Due to Ohio's heavy reliance on coal, we have some of the worst air in the nation.

Ohio's utilities' request to bail out these obsolete plants that are no longer economically viable is bad public policy. Ohio should be focused on policies that will encourage safer, cleaner and affordable clean energy technologies, not expensive and dirty nuclear and coal.

Jane McCullam
9880 Fairmount Road
Newbury, OH 44065

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
2015 JAN -9 PM 4:57
PUCO

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a ~~copy~~ file document delivered in the regular course of business.
Technician SM Date Processed JAN 12 2015

Genesky, Donielle

From: Kenneth Adler <khadler@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, January 09, 2015 4:33 PM
To: Puco Docketing
Subject: Comment on Case # 14-1297-EL-SSO.

I do not support Ohio's electric utilities' attempt to bail out the aging, dangerous Davis-Besse nuclear reactor, nor dirty coal plants, at ratepayers' expense. These plants are not competitive with today's market prices for electricity, and they spew radioactive and toxic pollution into our air and water. We should not have to pay more for dirty energy.

It's time to pull the plug on Davis-Besse; for decades it has experienced safety problem after safety problem--how much longer can it buck the odds before it causes a catastrophic accident?

Coal, which generates nearly 70 percent of electricity in Ohio, is known to cause major air pollution and negatively impact public health while contributing to climate disruption. Due to Ohio's heavy reliance on coal, we have some of the worst air in the nation.

Ohio's utilities' request to bail out these obsolete plants that are no longer economically viable is bad public policy. Ohio should be focused on policies that will encourage safer, cleaner and affordable clean energy technologies, not expensive and dirty nuclear and coal.

Kenneth Adler
4913 Harroun Rd
4913 Harroun Rd
Sylvania, OH 43560

Genesky, Donielle

From: Robert Stein <voter@growthchoices.com>
Sent: Friday, January 09, 2015 4:33 PM
To: Puco Docketing
Subject: Comment on Case # 14-1297-EL-SSO.

It is bad public policy to force ratepayers to bail out utilities for the costs of decommissioning the aging and unsafe Davis-Besse nuclear plant nor the outdated coal plants.

As corporate assets, all expenses related to the life cycles of these plants are the responsibility of the shareholders.

The utility and holding companies have been depreciating the plants for tax purposes and have been paying dividends to their shareholders for decades while they should have been required to contribute to a decommissioning fund or otherwise prepare for decommissioning each of their plants.

The fact that the nuclear plants were built without sufficient due diligence and proved to be bad investments is the responsibility of corporate leaders, not rate payers.

From a regulatory standpoint, Davis-Besse's age and poor safety record does warrant closing it. The coal plants are outliving their economic usefulness as well. However, forcing the public to protect private corporations from their own bad business decisions and failure to prepare for the life cycles of their assets is bad public policy.

Robert Stein

Robert Stein
3067 E. Erie Ave.
Lorain, OH 44052

Genesky, Donielle

From: William Cline <cline@wilmina.ac.jp>
Sent: Friday, January 09, 2015 4:30 PM
To: Puco Docketing
Subject: Comment on Case # 14-1297-EL-SSO.

I do not support Ohio's electric utilities' attempt to bail out the aging, dangerous Davis-Besse nuclear reactor, nor dirty coal plants, at ratepayers' expense. These plants are not competitive with today's market prices for electricity, and they spew radioactive and toxic pollution into our air and water. We should not have to pay more for dirty energy.

It's time to pull the plug on Davis-Besse; for decades it has experienced safety problem after safety problem--how much longer can it buck the odds before it causes a catastrophic accident?

Coal, which generates nearly 70 percent of electricity in Ohio, is known to cause major air pollution and negatively impact public health while contributing to climate disruption. Due to Ohio's heavy reliance on coal, we have some of the worst air in the nation.

Ohio's utilities' request to bail out these obsolete plants that are no longer economically viable is bad public policy. Ohio should be focused on policies that will encourage safer, cleaner and affordable clean energy technologies, not expensive and dirty nuclear and coal.

The utility commission should encourage more energy efficiency and more renewable energy.

William Cline
13375 Atlantic Rd.
Strongsville, OH 44149

Genesky, Donielle

From: Kathy Guest <kathyguest@ymail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 09, 2015 4:26 PM
To: Puco Docketing
Subject: Comment on Case # 14-1297-EL-SSO.

I do not support Ohio's electric utilities' attempt to bail out the aging, dangerous Davis-Besse nuclear reactor, nor dirty coal plants, at ratepayers' expense. These plants are not competitive with today's market prices for electricity, and they spew radioactive and toxic pollution into our air and water. We should not have to pay more for dirty energy.

It's time to pull the plug on Davis-Besse; for decades it has experienced safety problem after safety problem--how much longer can it buck the odds before it causes a catastrophic accident?

Coal, which generates nearly 70 percent of electricity in Ohio, is known to cause major air pollution and negatively impact public health while contributing to climate disruption. Due to Ohio's heavy reliance on coal, we have some of the worst air in the nation.

Ohio's utilities' request to bail out these obsolete plants that are no longer economically viable is bad public policy. Ohio should be focused on policies that will encourage safer, cleaner and affordable clean energy technologies, not expensive and dirty nuclear and coal.

Kathy Guest

South Bloomingville, OH 43152

Genesky, Donielle

From: Roland Duerksen <duerksra@miamioh.edu>
Sent: Friday, January 09, 2015 4:17 PM
To: Puco Docketing
Subject: Comment on Case # 14-1297-EL-SSO.

I do not support Ohio's electric utilities' attempt to bail out the aging, dangerous Davis-Besse nuclear reactor, nor dirty coal plants, at ratepayers' expense. These plants are not competitive with today's market prices for electricity, and they spew radioactive and toxic pollution into our air and water. We should not have to pay more for dirty energy.

Ohio's utilities' request to bail out these obsolete plants that are no longer economically viable is bad public policy. Ohio should be focused on policies that will encourage safer, cleaner and affordable clean energy technologies, not expensive and dirty nuclear and coal.

Roland Duerksen
5370 McCoy Rd.
Oxford, OH 45056

Genesky, Donielle

From: James Nelson <janls@zoominternet.net>
Sent: Friday, January 09, 2015 4:50 PM
To: Puco Docketing
Subject: Comment on Case # 14-1297-EL-SSO.

I do not support Ohio's electric utilities' attempt to bail out the aging, dangerous Davis-Besse nuclear reactor, nor dirty coal plants, at ratepayers' expense. These plants are not competitive with today's market prices for electricity, and they spew radioactive and toxic pollution into our air and water. We should not have to pay more for dirty energy.

It's time to pull the plug on Davis-Besse; for decades it has experienced safety problem after safety problem--how much longer can it buck the odds before it causes a catastrophic accident?

Coal, which generates nearly 70 percent of electricity in Ohio, is known to cause major air pollution and negatively impact public health while contributing to climate disruption. Due to Ohio's heavy reliance on coal, we have some of the worst air in the nation.

Ohio's utilities' request to bail out these obsolete plants that are no longer economically viable is bad public policy. Ohio should be focused on policies that will encourage safer, cleaner and affordable clean energy technologies, not expensive and dirty nuclear and coal.

James Nelson
2190 N. Kansas Rd.
Orrville, OH 44667

Genesky, Donielle

From: Suzanne Miller <suzer@ohio.net>
Sent: Friday, January 09, 2015 4:47 PM
To: Puco Docketing
Subject: Comment on Case # 14-1297-EL-SSO.

Please do not support Ohio's electric utilities' attempt to bail out the aging, dangerous Davis-Besse nuclear reactor, nor the dirty coal plants, at ratepayers' expense. Not only are these plants not competitive with today's market prices for electricity, they spew radioactive and toxic pollution into our air and water. We should not have to pay more for dirty energy.

Davis-Besse is over the hill; let it roll down and away. For decades it has experienced safety problem after safety problem--how much longer can it buck the odds before it causes a catastrophic accident?

Coal, which generates nearly 70 percent of electricity in Ohio, is responsible for major air pollution, resulting in very serious public health problems as well as being a primary aggravator of climate disruption.

For Ohio to bail out these obsolete plants in order to protect company profits would be an injustice to the public. The State of Ohio should be focused on policies to encourage safer, affordable clean energy technologies, not expensive and dirty nuclear and coal.

Suzanne Miller
3142 Yorkshire Road
n/a
Cleveland Heights, OH 44118

From: Dawn Kosec
 To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
 Subject: docket of Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
 Received: 1/8/2015 10:34:00 PM
 Message:
 Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

Roughly one in three Ohio households, 1.4 million in all, are considered cost burdened by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development standards, paying more than 30 percent of their annual income on housing and utilities combined. Ohio families can't afford a monopoly power plant bailout.

According to the 2013 Home Energy Affordability Gap Report, more than 300,000 Ohio households pay over 30 percent of their annual income just on their home energy bills alone.

FirstEnergy is asking the PUCO to permit its subsidiaries, Ohio Edison, Toledo Edison, and Cleveland Illuminating Company, to buy from FirstEnergy's own power plants, at a premium, instead of from the regional wholesale market where they are required to buy "as part of the deregulation FirstEnergy itself petitioned for.

If this bailout goes through, consumers will be on the hook for FirstEnergy's bad business decisions "at a projected cost of over \$3 billion over fifteen years.

FirstEnergy is fudging the numbers. To get an Electric Security Plan (ESP) instead of a Market Rate Offer, FirstEnergy has to show a cost savings for customers. But even though they're asking for a three year ESP, they're claiming customer savings not over three years, but over the life of the 15 year power purchase agreement bailout they want. And even those numbers are wild speculation. (According to the PUCO website, an ESP is a rate plan for the supply and pricing of electric generation service).

If the ESP is approved, FirstEnergy would realize a revenue surplus of around \$2 billion over operating costs for the fifteen year arrangement.

When FirstEnergy's own projections are limited to the 3 year span of the actual ESP, instead of the 15 year extended rider they're seeking, FirstEnergy's own projections indicate a \$400 million net ratepayer loss.

FirstEnergy's proposal is anticompetitive. Getting this bail out would mean that FirstEnergy can undercut more efficient producers in the wholesale electricity market. Driving out those producers will limit energy choice.

FirstEnergy says efficiency upgrades are costly, but they want these subsidies because they are losing out in the wholesale market "to wind and natural gas.

Because with this rider, FirstEnergy recovers its full "cost" of generation, the rider would create an incentive for FirstEnergy to inflate its costs, which are not totally transparent to the PUCO.

FirstEnergy is saying this plan will save customers money in the long run "but if that's true,

why don't they want to take the risk and realize those cost savings for themselves? They're asking PUCO to force customers to take a risk they're not willing to take themselves.

FirstEnergy has successfully petitioned the PUCO not to release cost and revenue figures so the public can learn the full story. If this plan really will benefit consumers, then what do they have to hide?

FirstEnergy is asking the government to enforce a monopoly. Even though customers may want to choose a different supplier, those served by FirstEnergy power lines would still have to pay the surcharge " even though this surcharge is for subsidizing unprofitable plants, not for grid maintenance.

Sincerely,

Dawn Kosec

From: Deborah Cain
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: First Energy
Received: 1/8/2015 7:04:11 PM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

I want to unequivocally state that I am appalled and embarrassed by their actions! They have to be one of the most backward public utilities in existence. I purchase my power from someone else and will continue to until they change their ways, but unfortunately like everyone else I'm stuck with them to deliver it as I so far do not have my own power generating ability. I've been to other states where the electric utility has placed solar panels on most electric poles all over the state to increase their clean generation capacity! Why couldn't First Energy do that instead!

Sincerely,

Deborah Cain

From: Michael Klein
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: testimony to go on the docket of Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 1/8/2015 6:31:58 PM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

We were told that in this time and in this state, Ohio, it was no longer necessary to regulate the monopoly utilities anymore: the phone company, the electric company, the gas company. They will be regulated by the market and by competition. Yet, after all these years I have yet to see the competition nor the fruits of it. We broke up Ma Bell. Instead of having 5 Ma Bells competing against one another, we have two regional companies and the small ones are gone or worthless. And I still have to pay a maintenance fee to the other part of my phone company for long distance connection. What a joke and a colossal failure! For electric and gas, if you add in the transport charges (wires or pipes) to the cost of content, it somehow is always cheaper to remain with the same old local utility. Somehow no one comes in with a lower cost of any significance.

I used to listen to my Russian friends who were allowed to leave the old Soviet Union make jokes about Soviet elections. I adapted their joke to electric choice in Ohio: You can choose First Energy, First Energy or First Energy.

Additionally, no matter who we might choose for electric, we still have to pay additionally for that Nuclear Boondoggle of First Energy as well.

Now we are presented with a necessity that we must bail out First Energy. I thought in private enterprise the shareholders bore that burden. We all understand too big too fail of course. I have seen this occur in my life here in the US multiple times. One thing that I thought was a wonderful exception to the way this was always handled was when Obama bailed out GM for one, where, as the cost of the bailout, he named new leaders of the company. Further, when they did not pursue a new and different path/strategy for the company, he removed them until he got someone who would. Perhaps that is what we need now. Either oppose all this and let the company go to the free market, dump that nuclear plant that sucks up money - sell it or decommission it, or re-regulate this monopoly, as all monopolies should be that provide essential services. We need to admit we made an error and now it is time to repair it!

Oppose all First Energy's requests and proposals. If they insist, re-regulate them. This is a problem for the shareholders of First Energy stock, not the customers! Last resort: require the leadership of First Energy to resign and replace them with reformers who might take the company in a more cost-conserving and profitable, sustainable direction. The old ways are no longer working!

Sincerely,

Michael Klein

From: Lois Whealey
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Case 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 1/8/2015 6:27:03 PM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

Please do not bailout First Energy by raising costs to consumers of electricity.

Ohio needs to follow through on cleaning up electricity generation.

I have personally experienced the bad choices, in pursuit of profits, of electric generating in Ohio, from high wall-spoil bank-acidic ponds, through changing eastern Ohio wooded ridges to grass covered rolling hills; from concerns about 1500 stream miles of acid mine drainage creeks to Gavin built without scrubbers, to acid rain protests upwind, mercury fallout into lakes and streams, longwall mining subsidence, shrinking human jobs due to mechanization, etc., to fracking brine depleting fresh water sources.

Don't encourage cut back on alternative energy renewables like solar, wind, efficiency, insulation, etc.!

Sincerely,

Lois Whealey

From: Kenneth Boyles
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: First Energy
Received: 1/8/2015 5:36:22 PM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

I don't feel us tax payers should bail out companies because of unprofitable plants.
When they built the nuclear plants. We the local users of electric had to pay for them with our bills, but
never received any benefits when it was found to be excess for our area and the power was sold
elsewhere.
Let the stock holders suck it up like other companies.
Do your job for us retirees and taxpayer.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Boyles

From: Sara Pandolfi
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 1/8/2015 4:53:57 PM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

The Electric Security Plan proposed by First Energy should be rejected. FirstEnergy's proposal is anticompetitive. Getting this bail out would mean that FirstEnergy can undercut more efficient producers in the wholesale electricity market. Driving out those producers will limit energy choice. Because with this rider, FirstEnergy recovers its full "cost" of generation, the rider would create an incentive for FirstEnergy to inflate its costs, which are not totally transparent to the PUCO. This plan is not in the interest of the public. It simply benefits FirstEnergy at the public's expense.

Sincerely,

Sara Pandolfi

From: Wayne Whited
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: First Energy's Electric Security Plan
Received: 1/9/2015 8:23:17 AM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

I'm asking the PUCO reject First Energy's plan to bilk Ohioans out of more money. First Energy once more has failed to do it's job and wants me to pay for their bad business decisions. I say NO!

Sincerely,

Wayne Whited

From: Steve Meade
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: First Energy Bail Out
Received: 1/9/2015 6:53:26 AM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

I think this bail out is wrong and there needs to be a thorough investigation. How is it the customer has to save the company?

Sincerely,

Steve Meade

From: Ann C. McGill

To: PUCO ContactThePUCO

Subject: First Energy trying to collect from us for their maintenance

Received: 1/9/2015 12:22:58 AM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

First Energy knowingly refused to invest in the technology needed to make clean energy. They now claim they will charge the consumers, people like myself, for their refusal to do this in a timely manner which would have been much less expensive than it is today! If I miss I sale, I have to pay full price, and they have no right to make me responsible for their errors and desire for outlanding profits.

Sincerely,

Ann C. McGill

From: Ann C. McGill

To: PUCO ContactThePUCO

Subject: First Energy trying to collect from us for their maintenance

Received: 1/9/2015 12:22:58 AM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

First Energy knowingly refused to invest in the technology needed to make clean energy. They now claim they will charge the consumers, people like myself, for their refusal to do this in a timely manner which would have been much less expensive than it is today! If I miss I sale, I have to pay full price, and they have no right to make me responsible for their errors and desire for outlanding profits.

Sincerely,

Ann C. McGill

From: Georgia Ellis
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: First Energy, Ohio
Received: 1/8/2015 11:59:59 PM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

As a resident of the State of Ohio for over 60 years, I request that First Energy is not allowed to rip off the citizens. In regard to the docket of Case No. 14-1297-EL-SSO, we cannot afford a monopoly power plant bailout. Ohio Residents cannot be on the hook for First Energy's bad business decision. At a cost of 3 BILLION Dollars over 15 years to residents sounds to me like a bailout. Please DENY this request. First Energy should be investigated!!!

Thank You, Georgia Ellis

Sincerely,

Georgia Ellis

From: Georgia Ellis
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: First Energy, Ohio
Received: 1/8/2015 11:59:59 PM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

As a resident of the State of Ohio for over 60 years, I request that First Energy is not allowed to rip off the citizens. In regard to the docket of Case No. 14-1297-EL-SSO, we cannot afford a monopoly power plant bailout. Ohio Residents cannot be on the hook for First Energy's bad business decision. At a cost of 3 BILLION Dollars over 15 years to residents sounds to me like a bailout. Please DENY this request. First Energy should be investigated!!!

Thank You, Georgia Ellis

Sincerely,

Georgia Ellis

From: Fred Powell
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Electric Security Plan
Received: 1/8/2015 11:42:13 PM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

Why would the PUCO even consider a case such as 14-1297-EL-SSO. We worry about the guy on welfare buying steaks with his food stamps, while we give corporations billions in corporate welfare. What is wrong with that picture?

Sincerely,

Fred Powell

From: William Phinisee
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: injustice
Received: 1/9/2015 6:22:59 AM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

Monopolies are illegal in the USA so why is and exception for energy company.

Sincerely,

William Phinisee

From: Ann Vetter
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 1/8/2015 2:43:13 PM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

Dear PUCO,

I am opposed to First Energy's proposed "Electric Security Plan". This bailout is not necessary. If, as you say, we'll save money in the long run by refurbishing old outdated methods, why not make the necessary upgrades now and allow us to save NOW? We both should benefit by these cost savings while First Energy gets itself into 21st century technology. We are producing more energy efficient automobiles by using up-to-date technology, not producing automobiles exactly as we did 20-30-or 50 years ago.

Sincerely,

Ann Vetter

From: Robert Erzen
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Voodoo Numbers from First Energy
Received: 1/8/2015 2:25:01 PM
Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

FirstEnergy is fudging the numbers. To get an Electric Security Plan (ESP) instead of a Market Rate Offer, FirstEnergy has to show a cost savings for customers. But even though theyâ€™re asking for a three year ESP, theyâ€™re claiming customer savings not over three years, but over the life of the 15 year power purchase agreement bailout they want. And even those numbers are wild speculation. (According to the PUCO website, an ESP is a rate plan for the supply and pricing of electric generation service).

Sincerely,

Robert Erzen

From: Linda Cucitrone
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 1/8/2015 1:45:06 PM
Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

I do not normally get involved in public issues but energy and its cost is important to me. I am retired and living on a fixed income. Over 30% of my pension goes to pay utilities. I believe alternate energy sources such as wind and natural gas should be used in greater quantities.

First Energy is proposing an Electric Security Plan. They have successfully petitioned the PUCO not to release cost and revenue figures so the public can learn the full story. If this plan really will benefit consumers, then what do they have to hide?

They are asking the PUCO to permit its subsidiaries, Ohio Edison, Toledo Edison, and Cleveland Illuminating Company, to buy from FirstEnergy's own power plants, at a premium, instead of from the regional wholesale market where they are required to buy "as part of the deregulation FirstEnergy itself petitioned for. If this bailout goes through, consumers will be on the hook for FirstEnergy's bad business decisions" at a projected cost of over \$3 billion over fifteen years.

FirstEnergy is asking the government to enforce a monopoly. Even though customers may want to choose a different supplier, those served by FirstEnergy power lines would still have to pay the surcharge "even though this surcharge is for subsidizing unprofitable plants, not for grid maintenance.

Please do not allow this Electric Security Plan to be approved.

Sincerely,

Linda Cucitrone

From: Mark Williams
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Re: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 1/8/2015 1:43:01 PM
Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

No bailout! Don't raise our rates until FirstEnergy completely shows their hands and fully justifies their reasoning for not improving their method of power generation and raising our rates. I do not agree with the canned answers the company gives the public is just supposed to digest and not question. No!

This is just another additional thing that will detract from all business and population expansion in our state. I don't support this. Additionally, the industry should be actively moving towards cheaper and more competitive energy markets instead of deferring to the way "we have always done things." Get off the coal "tit" and do things a smarter and cleaner way. Consumers are tired of being held hostage and being screwed by the faceless entities in corporate America. Consumers are all just numbers (money) when all things are measured within the issue.

Utility costs should not be raised if FirstEnergy is not willing to be transparent with all pertinent operational and fiscal information

It is apparent that FirstEnergy is the only game in town--a monopoly. They need some healthy competition. Maybe some other providers should be given a chance to come up with a better solution before the rates are increased

FirstEnergy could do for some corporate balancing of their books and some internal restructuring to better balance their overhead. Now is the time to innovate, not regress with outdated technologies and force consumers to accept that.

This move to raise rates is not popular and should not be allowed without substantial review by the PUCO and a long public comment period.

What is the PUCO for if it allows FirstEnergy to continue with business as usual, without being fully transparent with all the facts and with no plans to change the way they generate power for most consumers? Surely not for the entire interest of consumers.

No one needs their electric bills raised right now without some hard proof the industry is going to improve from where it is now.

Sincerely,

Mark Williams

From: David Bilski
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: first energy
Received: 1/8/2015 1:26:58 PM
Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

Let the people make up their own minds.

Sincerely,

David Bilski

From: Connie Waldeck
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 1/8/2015 1:11:58 PM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

As a consumer from First Energy, we don't want to be on the hook for First Energy's bad energy decisions. We are not willing to pay more inflated costs for our utilities.

Sincerely,

Connie Waldeck

From: Elinore Evans
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 1/8/2015 1:04:13 PM
Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

There are many reasons why the proposed Electric Security Plan should not be approved. First of all, the cost savings projected are not for the three year ESP submitted but rather for a 15 year period. Since no one can successfully project this information over this length of time this is pure speculation. A more realistic three year projection shows a net ratepayer loss of 400 million. Second, the proposal discourages competition by putting First Energy in the position of being able to undercut more efficient producers, thus driving them out of the market. Third, the ESP clearly creates incentive for First Energy to inflate its costs in order to recover more money. Fourth, why should First Energy receive subsidies? If the upgrades make sense they will pay for themselves without a subsidy. Fifth, there is a serious lack of transparency reflected in First Energy's petitioning of the PUCO to not release the cost and revenue figures. Why would this information not be beneficial to them if there is a legitimate argument in favor of the ESP? This reeks of back door politicking. Sixth, customers will have no incentive to choose another supplier since the surcharge will remain in order to subsidize unprofitable plants rather than go toward grid maintenance. (Speaking of grid maintenance, isn't this a serious priority that hasn't been adequately addressed?) Seventh, customers will be footing an additional 3 billion dollar cost over a fifteen year period. This means that at least 300,000 lower income Ohio households who pay over 30% of their annual income to home energy costs will be at greater risk financially when they have to make tough choices about where to cut expenditures. Will children be hungrier? Will people forgo buying important medicines? These are all important considerations.

Sincerely,

Elinore Evans

From: Brigitta Hanzely
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 1/8/2015 12:59:03 PM
Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

I am asking you to deny approval of First Energy's Electric Security Plan. The plan is anti competitive, expensive for the consumers, and detrimental to our environment.

I strongly urge you to vote NO!

Sincerely,

Brigitta Hanzely

Sincerely,

Brigitta Hanzely

From: Brett Milks
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 1/8/2015 12:55:31 PM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

We shouldn't have to pay for your bailout!
Accept responsibility!

Sincerely,

Brett Milks

From: Sherry Massaro
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 1/8/2015 12:51:14 PM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

These profitable utility companies need to lower the pay for their top executives and make the necessary changes on their own dimes. Of course, this would lower their profits. But, this should not be on the backs of the middle and lower class citizens of Ohio

Sincerely,

Sherry Massaro

From: leann ramirez
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Please Say NO to First Energy's "Security Plan"
Received: 1/8/2015 10:20:24 PM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

This is testimony to go on the docket of Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO.

FirstEnergy is fudging the numbers. To get an Electric Security Plan (ESP) instead of a Market Rate Offer, FirstEnergy has to show a cost savings for customers. But even though theyâ€™re asking for a three year ESP, theyâ€™re claiming customer savings not over three years, but over the life of the 15 year power purchase agreement bailout they want. And even those numbers are wild speculation. (According to the PUCO website, an ESP is a rate plan for the supply and pricing of electric generation service).

If the ESP is approved, FirstEnergy would realize a revenue surplus of around \$2 billion over operating costs for the fifteen year arrangement. When FirstEnergyâ€™s own projections are limited to the 3 year span of the actual ESP, instead of the 15 year extended rider theyâ€™re seeking, FirstEnergyâ€™s own projections indicate a \$400 million net ratepayer loss.

FirstEnergyâ€™s proposal is anticompetitive. Getting this bail out would mean that FirstEnergy can undercut more efficient producers in the wholesale electricity market. Driving out those producers will limit energy choice.

Because with this rider, FirstEnergy recovers its full "cost" of generation, the rider would create an incentive for FirstEnergy to inflate its costs, which are not totally transparent to the PUCO. FirstEnergy has successfully petitioned the PUCO not to release cost and revenue figures so the public can learn the full story. If this plan really will benefit consumers, then what do they have to hide?

FirstEnergy is asking the government to enforce a monopoly. Even though customers may want to choose a different supplier, those served by FirstEnergy power lines would still have to pay the surcharge " even though this surcharge is for subsidizing unprofitable plants, not for grid maintenance.

This is clearly not in the best interest of Ohioans, and should not be allowed.

Sincerely,

leann ramirez

From: Valerie Sherrill
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: testimony to go on the docket of Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 1/9/2015 10:39:35 AM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

Roughly one in three Ohio households, 1.4 million in all, are considered cost burdened by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development standards, paying more than 30 percent of their annual income on housing and utilities combined. Ohio families can't afford a monopoly power plant bailout.

FirstEnergy is saying this plan will save customers money in the long run " but if that's true, why don't they want to take the risk and realize those cost savings for themselves? They're asking PUCO to force customers to take a risk they're not willing to take themselves.

Sincerely,

Valerie Sherrill

From: Ed George
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: This is testimony to go on the docket of Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 1/8/2015 9:27:16 PM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

FirstEnergy is asking the PUCO to permit its subsidiaries, Ohio Edison, Toledo Edison, and Cleveland Illuminating Company, to buy from FirstEnergy's own power plants, at a premium, instead of from the regional wholesale market where they are required to buy "as part of the deregulation FirstEnergy itself petitioned for.

FirstEnergy is fudging the numbers. To get an Electric Security Plan (ESP) instead of a Market Rate Offer, FirstEnergy has to show a cost savings for customers. But even though they're asking for a three year ESP, they're claiming customer savings not over three years, but over the life of the 15 year power purchase agreement bailout they want. And even those numbers are wild speculation. (According to the PUCO website, an ESP is a rate plan for the supply and pricing of electric generation service).

When FirstEnergy's own projections are limited to the 3 year span of the actual ESP, instead of the 15 year extended rider they're seeking, FirstEnergy's own projections indicate a \$400 million net ratepayer loss.

Sincerely,

Ed George

From: Julia Radwany
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Electric Security Plan
Received: 1/8/2015 9:16:12 PM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

Regarding case #14-1297-EL-SSO:

I am opposed to First Energy's Electric Security Plan because it would cost ratepayers extra money and commit Ohio to dirty energy in the form of coal instead of clean energy such as wind.

Sincerely,

Julia Radwany

From: Mary Maglicic
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Docket Case #14 1297 EL SSO
Received: 1/8/2015 8:35:37 PM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

As a concered taxpayer who is also a supporter of energy efficiency, I have tried to do my part in conserving energy because I believe it is good for the long term benefits to society. I expect that the reward would be steady rates and now we have this attempt by First Energy to seek reward even though it was their own poor business decisions that caused the problem. Now they want to pass their business losses on to the customers. Please do not reward them at a cosg to us consumers. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mary Maglicic

From: Theresa Pretlow
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Testimony for Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 1/9/2015 3:25:08 PM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

FirstEnergy is asking the PUCO to permit its subsidiaries, Ohio Edison, Toledo Edison, and Cleveland Illuminating Company, to buy from FirstEnergy's own power plants, at a premium, instead of from the regional wholesale market where they are required to buy as part of the deregulation FirstEnergy itself petitioned for. FirstEnergy's proposal is anticompetitive since it would mean that FirstEnergy can undercut more efficient producers in the wholesale electricity market. Driving out those producers will limit energy choice.

FirstEnergy is saying this plan will save customers money in the long run. If that's true, why don't they want to take the risk and realize those cost savings for themselves? They're asking PUCO to force customers to take a risk they're not willing to take themselves. FirstEnergy has successfully petitioned the PUCO not to release cost and revenue figures so the public can learn the full story. If this plan really will benefit consumers, then what do they have to hide?

Please do not stick the consumers with higher rates. According to the 2013 Home Energy Affordability Gap Report, more than 300,000 Ohio households already pay over 30 percent of their annual income just on their home energy bills alone.

Sincerely,

Theresa Pretlow

From: Nicole Maschke
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Thank You....
Received: 1/9/2015 2:22:19 PM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

To begin with, I wish to say thank you to first energy for their heroic work to keep power coming to my home in 2010 when my wife was dying of Cancer. No words are sufficient to express my gratitude for the efforts made by first energy to help me to keep my wife alive.

That being said, I do not believe that I am one to criticize first energy for how they do business. At the same time, with Ohio being listed at the single worst state in the entire United States for toxic dumping. At age 64, I do not believe that this is the kind of legacy that we, the adults, the mothers and fathers of Ohio really want to be giving to our children.

In today's world, the rush for money, and profits, all too often seems to be the governing factor in how companies are doing business. But with the pollution in Cleveland being so bad, that most of the time the pollution levels are in the Yellow range, (from EPA figures). That does not seem something that we, the people of Ohio should either be proud of, or have tolerate, merely on the basis of how companies, seem to be more concerned with profits than they are with the quality of human life. If we, fail to give our children a better world. In that the air is dirtier, and the water is full of toxic poisons. Then we have not only failed our children. But we have failed all future generations at being the custodians of this world and ourselves. I sincerely hope that Ohio will elect to do better at preserving the health of all Ohio citizens, instead of rushing to profits. It's not for me. I'm an old man. It's for our children that I write this. They deserve better. They do not deserve to grow up in a world that they must repair. But a world that they can build on. If we poison the air and the water. There will be nothing left for our children to build on. And that. That, to me, would be one of the most serious crimes that we, our current generation could ever think of doing to ourselves, to our children and to the world that we have been given. Godspeed.

Sincerely,

Nicole Maschke

From: Pete MORABITO
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: First Energy Rate Hike
Received: 1/9/2015 2:09:36 PM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Thomas W. Johnson,

Rather than raise the peoples rates, shut down the power plant and use more efficient energy!

Sincerely,

Pete MORABITO