

**Hunter, Donielle**

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Connor Herman  
<sierra@sierraclub.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, September 11, 2015 4:28 PM  
**To:** Puco Docketing  
**Subject:** No bailouts for coal

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV  
2015 SEP 11 PM 4:56

PUCO

Sep 11, 2015

PUCO Commissioners

Dear Commissioners,

I do not support Ohio's electric utilities' attempt to bail out their old coal plants on my dime. These plants are not competitive with today's market prices for electricity, and they spew toxic pollution into our air and water.

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 coal plants that are no longer economically feasible is bad public policy that, in addition to costing Ohio electric customers more, will prevent Ohio from reducing dangerous emissions of carbon, soot, smog and mercury pollution.

Sincerely,

Connor Herman  
301 E 17th Ave  
Columbus, OH 43201-1711  
[herman.277@osu.edu](mailto:herman.277@osu.edu)

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 Am Date Processed 9/11/15

## Hunter, Donielle

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Desiree Whitney  
<sierra@sierraclub.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, September 11, 2015 2:06 PM  
**To:** Puco Docketing  
**Subject:** No bailouts for coal

Sep 11, 2015

PUCO Commissioners

Dear Commissioners,

I agree with the Cleveland Plain Dealer's editorial on July 18 "PUCO should reject FirstEnergy rate request" and do not support FirstEnergy's attempt to bail out its old plants on the backs of consumers. These plants are not competitive with today's market prices for electricity, and they spew toxic pollution into our air and water.

As the Plain Dealer stated, FirstEnergy's plan sounds more like "Protecting FirstEnergy Management" than anything that would be in the public interest.

Furthermore, 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.

FirstEnergy's request to bail out plants that are no longer economically feasible is bad public policy that, in addition to costing Ohio electric customers more, will prevent Ohio from reducing dangerous emissions of carbon, soot, smog and mercury pollution.

I reject FirstEnergy's request to bailout their plants and I hope you will as well.

Sincerely,

Desiree Whitney  
1605 Beaver Ridge Dr Apt B  
Dayton, OH 45429-4043  
[burberry444@icloud.com](mailto:burberry444@icloud.com)

From: Ernest Montoro  
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO  
Subject: First Energy raising rates  
Received: 9/10/2015 1:58:20 PM  
Message:  
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

This rate is not needed and will created problems for their customers as they don't have the money for it.

Sincerely,

Ernest Montoro

From: Jeanne Schlatter  
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO  
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO  
Received: 9/10/2015 7:31:17 PM  
Message:  
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

â€œ 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 canâ€™t afford a monopoly power plant bailout.

â€œ 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.

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

â€œ If this bailout goes through, consumers will be on the hook for FirstEnergyâ€™s bad business decisions â€œ at a projected cost of over \$3 billion over fifteen years.

â€œ 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).

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

â€œ 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.

â€œ 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.

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

â€œ Because with this rider, FirstEnergy recovers its full â€œcostâ€ 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,

Jeanne Schlatter

From: Kare Humphries  
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO  
Subject: This is testimony to go on the docket of Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO  
Received: 9/10/2015 9:31:13 PM  
Message:  
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

This testimony is to gon on the docket of Case No. 14-1297-EL-SSO.  
This is another case of allowing FirstEnergy to enforce a monopoly by eliminating the competition, by undercutting more efficient producers in the wholesale electricity market. Customers should not be forced to pay a surcharge if they choose a different supplier. Our utility costs already consume one-third of our income per month. We cannot afford this increase.

Sincerely,

Kare Humphries

From: Thomas Licht  
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO  
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO  
Received: 9/10/2015 1:05:17 PM  
Message:  
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

FirstEnergy is seeking to continue a business model that is unprofitable by forcing consumers to pay higher rates. Rather than shut the plants down, the company is asking Ohio regulators to force customers to buy power from these outdated plants for the next 15 years. If they want to be a monopoly, they should be regulated as one.

Sincerely,

Thomas Licht