FILE

3

Hunter, Donielle

From: Jeanne Schlatter <sionyx@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2015 7:31 PM
To: Puco Docketing
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
2015 SEP 11 AM 9:15
PUCO

Dear Chair Public Utilities Commission Ohio Andre Porter,

• 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?

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 AN Date Processed 9/14/15

• 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,

Jeanne Schlatter

From: Ohio Environmental CouncilOn Behalf OfScott Seppi
Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2015 5:53:46 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)
To: Porter, Andre
Subject: Reject FirstEnergy's proposal to keep old coal plants running

Sep 10, 2015

Chairman Andre Porter

Dear Chairman Porter,

I urge you to reject First Energy's proposal to keep several old, dirty and uncompetitive power plants open. Their plan will not only burden customers with increased electric bills, but the plan is anti-competitive and will harm human health. Ratepayers should not have to pay for these old power plants just because these plants cannot compete with newer technologies like wind or solar power.

These coal power plants are pumping out thousands of tons of soot, carbon and mercury pollution every day, harming me and many other Ohioans in the process. Newer technologies like wind and solar do not cause the kind of damage these old power plants will.

Please do not approve FirstEnergy's plan to bail out First Energy's old, dirty power plants. Supporting FirstEnergy's plan will hurt Ohio in its path to build an energy future powered by clean energy.

Sincerely,

Mr. Scott Seppi
3281 Darbyshire Dr
Hilliard, OH 43026-2532
scoseppi@mail.com