

FILE

6

Nixon, Anna

From: Josh Willis [willisfarms@frontier.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 02, 2015 1:28 PM
To: Puco Docketing
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO

Dear Chair Public Utilities Commission Ohio Andre Porter,

this is testimony to go on the docket of Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO I support FirstEnergy's proposed "ESP" because of the need for the stability of long term base load generation.

Sincerely,

Josh Willis

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
2015 SEP -2 PM 3:31
PUCO

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a case file document delivered in the regular course of business.
Technician SM Date Processed SEP 02 2015

Nixon, Anna

From: Susan Whipple [charliesue49@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 02, 2015 3:19 PM
To: Puco Docketing
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO

Dear Chair Public Utilities Commission Ohio Andre Porter,

As a customer of Cleveland Illuminating Company, I strongly oppose FirstEnergy's proposed "Electric Security Plan".

This plan will not provide a savings to consumers but instead will line FirstEnergy's pockets by allowing its subsidiaries to buy from them instead of the regional wholesale market where they are required to buy.

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.

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.

I also believe that the cost and revenue figures of this proposal should be released so the public can learn the full story. If this plan really will benefit consumers, then what does FirstEnergy have to hide?

Thank you for considering my request to refuse FirstEnergy's proposal.

Sincerely,

Susan Whipple

Nixon, Anna

From: Fred Welty [fdwelt@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 02, 2015 10:58 AM
To: Puco Docketing
Subject: Electric Security Plan

Dear Chair Public Utilities Commission Ohio Andre Porter,

Free enterprise is what made our economy strong and fair. Please, do not counter the benefits of our capitalist system by passing the so-called Electric Security Plan. This would give First Energy a bailout to enable them to perpetuate antiquated facilities. Please let 21st Century technology vie for market share without giving preference to old, polluting technology.

I notice that the electric rates will go up in the near-term with the Electric Security Plan. Promises of lower rates in the distance future are dubious. Those promises are contingent upon certain favorable and unlikely conditions being met. Very unlikely. We will have higher rates far into the future with the Electric Security Plan. Please vote against it. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Fred Welty

Nixon, Anna

From: ContactThePUCO@puc.state.oh.us
Sent: Wednesday, September 02, 2015 3:35 PM
To: Puco Docketing
Subject: Docketing

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Investigation and Audit Division

Memorandum

Date: 9/2/2015

Re: Veronica Pavia

,

Docketing Case No.: 14-1297-EL-SSO

Notes:

Please docket the attached in the case number above.

COMMENT DESCRIPTION:

I wanted to voice my objection to FirstEnergy's plan to force customers to bail out the old, dirty and expensive Sammis coalburning power plant, as well as the aging Davis Besse nuclear plant, for 15 years. These plants compete poorly in a free market against cheaper, cleaner sources of energy. FirstEnergy wants the PUCO to gamble on the idea that its nuclear and coal plants -- which already are 37 and 56 years old, respectively -- will, magically, one day become profitable again, while ignoring state and national trends that clearly point to the contrary. Operating a 56-year-old coal plant like Sammis in 2015 is a risky position to be in. Operating a 71-year-old coal plant in 2031, as this plan proposes for First-Energy's customers, is a position nobody will want to be in. FirstEnergy has a history of making bad bets and then losing big. Ohio families and businesses shouldn't be forced to underwrite its gambles, and our communities certainly shouldn't be responsible for bailing out its bad business decisions. The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio should protect Ohio's electricity customers and stay the course in rejecting these misguided attempts at corporate welfare. Excerpted from Daniel Sawmiller's editorial in today's Plain Dealer. I couldn't have said it better myself and I totally agree with everything in his column. It's time to stop coddling FirstEnergy at the expense of Ohio's electricity consumers.

Nixon, Anna

From: Barbara Baird [baird9992@frontier.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 02, 2015 11:34 AM
To: Puco Docketing
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO

Dear Chair Public Utilities Commission Ohio Andre Porter,

To protect the citizens of Ohio, oppose First Energy's Plan for the following reasons.

- 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.
- 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,

Barbara Baird