

FILE

32

Hunter, Donielle

From: ContactThePUCO@puc.state.oh.us
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2015 9:34 AM
To: Puco Docketing
Subject: Docketing

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Investigation and Audit Division

Memorandum

Date: 9/1/2015

Re: Christopher Dillon

, 00000

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

Notes:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter, I am writing to express my disapproval of the proposed First Energy rate hike which I believe would not be in the best interest of Ohio consumers. We must actively move away from aging, dirty sources of power and the draining expenses they create, not just on Ohians finances, but on our environment as well. Investments in clean, renewable, engergy will create jobs for the future. Thank you. Sincerely, Christopher Dillon

Please docket the attached in the case number above.

RECEIVED - DOCKETING DIV
2015 SEP -3 AM 9:44
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 03 2015

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.

Will we not stop learning about the health dangers in Coal. Over and over again starting at the mine level people die breathing emissions from coal, hot or cold.

Please, no more killing machines

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. John McEvoy
51 Terrace Villa Dr
Dayton, OH 45459-4730
jpmc1937@yahoo.comcom

Aug 20, 2015

Commissioner Beth Trombold

Dear Commissioner Trombold,

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.

Now's the perfect time to use financial resources to build NEW and BETTER energy sources. As a consumer, I'd rather pay more every month towards building wind and solar resources than to save coal plants for the next 12 years. If not now, WHEN?

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,

Miss Catherine Murray
3262 Valley Ln S
Columbus, OH 43231-3117
contact@photokitchen.net

Aug 20, 2015

Commissioner Beth Trombold

Dear Commissioner Trombold,

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,

Dr. Kenneth Adler
4913 Harroun Rd
Sylvania, OH 43560-2197
khadler@aol.com

Aug 24, 2015

Commissioner Beth Trombold

Dear Commissioner Trombold,

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,

Mrs. Theresa Clark
15575 Twp. Rd. 453
Loudonville, OH 44842
tkjuice@gmail.com

Aug 24, 2015

Commissioner Beth Trombold

Dear Commissioner Trombold,

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,

Ms. christine bruce
2019 Grafton Rd
Elyria, OH 44035-8319
christybspinall@yahoo.com

From: Joseph MacBenn
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Ohio Edison rate hike Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 8/31/2015 5:57:35 PM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

Energy costs in Ohio are high enough -senior citizens on fixed income cannot afford another rate hike especially with another cold winter coming on.

Joseph Mac Benn

Sincerely,

Joseph MacBenn

From: Priscilla Lytle
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 8/31/2015 6:14:10 PM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

Ohio residents cannot afford to foot the bill for First Energies failed buissness decisions! They are asking the Government to enforce a monopoly. This bailout for First Energy can undercut more efficant producers in the wholesale electricity market. Driving out those producers will limit Ohio's enrgy choices. Please don't approve Case No:14-1279-EL-SSO.

Sincerely,

Priscilla Lytle

From: Arlene Floyd
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 8/31/2015 6:33:33 PM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

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

I object to the First Energy request for the "Electric Security Plan." FirstEnergy is asking 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. 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. Once again, the customer loses.

Sincerely,

Arlene Floyd

)

From: Brenda Peace
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: docket of Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 9/1/2015 6:35:23 AM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

I am not in agreement of this new Electric Security Plan and do not want to see this plan come into fruition for at the cost it would pass on to us as consumers. Stop making decisions that are not of a benefit to us as consumers and puts a burden on us.

Sincerely,
Brenda Peace

Sincerely,

Brenda Peace

From: elnora/thomas sipp

To: PUCO ContactThePUCO

Subject: chairman

Received: 9/1/2015 8:11:17 AM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

we cannot handle any increases in our light bill or any other bill for that matter, we are on fixed incomes. we can barley eat.take it out the CEO money.we don't make any.

Elnora and Thomas sipp

Sincerely,

elnora/thomas sipp

From: Brenda Peace
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: docket of Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 9/1/2015 6:35:23 AM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

I am not in agreement of this new Electric Security Plan and do not want to see this plan come into fruition for at the cost it would pass on to us as consumers. Stop making decisions that are not of a benefit to us as consumers and puts a burden on us.

Sincerely,
Brenda Peace

Sincerely,
Brenda Peace

From: Scott Penwell
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 8/31/2015 3:14:21 PM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

I believe Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO will enrich the electric companies, and reward poor planning, on the backs of Ohio's most vulnerable citizens.

Sincerely,

Scott Penwell

From: richard kunkel
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 9/1/2015 10:31:15 AM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

Sirs:

I feel it is unwise to subsidize both the Sammis and Davis Besse plants. Utilitioes have been bleding me dry forever, if they need new updates, they need to pay for them by themselves, or shut down the plants as too old. THAT would be my preferance. Tired of being held hostage to absolute needs in life (ie, health, power, water).

richard kunkel

Sincerely,

richard kunkel

From: L Bendict

To: PUCO ContactThePUCO

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

Received: 9/1/2015 11:07:15 AM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

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

â€¢ 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€¢ 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€¢ 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€¢ 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.

â€¢ FirstEnergy is saying this plan will save customers money in the long run â€” but if thatâ€™s true, why donâ€™t they want to take the risk and realize those cost savings for themselves? Theyâ€™re asking PUCO to force customers to take a risk theyâ€™re not willing to take themselves.

â€¢ 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?

â€¢ 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 â€” even though this surcharge is for subsidizing unprofitable plants, not for grid maintenance.

All fields must be completed unless marked "optional."

Sincerely,

L Benedict

From: Jeannie Kochanowski
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: First energy
Received: 8/31/2015 5:37:43 PM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

Please do not allow a monopoly in the Ohio energy market as the cost would go up for consumers.

Sincerely,

Jeannie Kochanowski

From: Barbara Brothers
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: case no. 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 9/1/2015 10:37:33 AM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

For our economic well-being and the future of our planet, we need to support clean energy. It is criminal to ask us to support First Energy's coal plants.

Sincerely,

Barbara Brothers

From: Nancy Roffey

To: PUCO ContactThePUCO

Subject: Rate Increase

Received: 9/1/2015 1:43:15 PM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

I am strongly opposed to any rate increase. That would give you a monopoly, especially disgusting given these past 2 years of alternative energy development. You must be a major financial supporter of Kasich. I strongly support closing down Davis-Besse. You have given no real reason for an increase beyond basic greed.

Sincerely,

Nancy Roffey

From: Robert Comer

To: PUCO ContactThePUCO

Subject: FirstEnergy trying to do more customer rip-off: "Electric Security Plan"

Received: 9/1/2015 2:13:18 AM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

FirstEnergy must be stopped from doing more ridiculous and dangerous lying about their seriously antiquated, inefficient and pollution-causing power plants. The Sammis plant should be converted to natural gas or shut down. I live in Carroll County and an \$890 million natural gas-fired electric generating plant is currently being built on S.R. 9, just north of Carrollton. NE Ohio has a massive amount of natural gas available with a possible 100 years of gas in the Marcellus and Utica formations. Coal is the most dirty fossil fuel and natural gas is the cleanest. So, I am asking the PUCO to stop FirstEnergy's monopoly and not give them taxpayer dollars to continue on their "Dark Ages" technology path. I am requesting my statements in this email be made part of the testimony to go on the docket of Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO.

Sincerely,

Robert Comer

From: Amy Gelfand
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Thumbs Down to First Energy's Electric Security Plan
Received: 8/31/2015 3:33:44 PM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

As an Ohio home owner and parent, I am appalled (but not surprised) by yet another sneaky move to put Ohio at the bottom of the heap in terms of environmental diligence. A greedy First Energy's recent plans show a blatant disregard not only for the financial welfare of Ohio households, but for the environment. Future generations of Ohioans deserve far better than this. Please block these potentially harmful efforts by First Energy! Ohio is already the laughing stock of the nation due to our governor's backward-thinking energy policies!

Sincerely,

Amy Gelfand

From: Anthony Camino
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Case #: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 9/1/2015 1:29:19 PM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

With regard to the proposed Electric Security Plan of First Energy, Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO, I strongly urge the PUCO to reject this attempt to saddle consumers with costs more appropriately handled by First Energy themselves. Many, many Ohio home owners will have a difficult time absorbing the proposed rate hikes while First Energy is positioned to profit from the poor decisions they made not investing in cleaner energy when they had the opportunity.

The whole point of deregulation was to allow competition and, thus, create the best playing field for consumers. This plan does just the opposite; consumers assume the majority of the risk and First Energy is able to reap the benefits by undercutting competition and assessing higher surcharges to suppliers using their power lines.

This ESP is a bad deal for Ohio consumers, and I encourage the PUCO to reject it.

Sincerely,

Anthony Camino

From: Kathleen Markus-Walczak
 To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
 Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO - No to aging power plants
 Received: 9/1/2015 1:19:15 PM
 Message:
 Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

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 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 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.

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.

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.

I am adamantly opposed to their dirty plan and dirty dealings. They could have been using this time to invest themselves in cleaner energy generation. Instead they want to keep passing the bill to me. They can do better. They must do better. The current proposal is wholly unacceptable.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Markus-Walczak

From: Sue Greaves

To: PUCO ContactThePUCO

Subject: raisinfg rates

Received: 9/1/2015 8:59:25 PM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

Chairman-

this simple--I can't use air in the summer--and I keep my heat at 65 in the winter--with the wage cut I took--it is that simple--rx refill or stay cool/warm---

Sue Greaves

Sincerely,

Sue Greaves

From: Tom Rizzo
 To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
 Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
 Received: 9/1/2015 9:13:20 PM
 Message:
 Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

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

The question I want answered is when will enough be enough for First Energy? It wasn't enough that it stopped its consumer energy-efficiency programs in Ohio, which should have been expanded rather than phased out.

It wasn't enough that it poured its financial and lobbying clout into getting the exceptionally ill-conceived SB 310 enacted, giving Ohio the dubious distinction of becoming the first U.S. state to roll back both its efficiency rules and its renewable energy mandates.

Now it wants Ohioans to guarantee the profitability of two of its dirtiest, most dangerous and inefficient plants -- the largest coal-fired plant in Ohio (Sammis) and the numerous near-miss catastrophe-plagued Davis Besse nuclear plant -- for 15 years! Holy Free Market Capitalism, Batman! Think of how many Buckeye State enterprises would love to sign on to such a market-distorting, corporate-welfare-gone-wildly-astray sort of giveaway program!

I say ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! It is HIGH TIME that First Energy join the 21st century and get serious about facing the stark reality that Americans have tried for decades to hide from: much of the coal that we live on top of needs to stay in the ground, and nuclear energy is a needless, ticking time bomb whose waste is an intolerable albatross around the necks of future generations of Americans.

Fossil-fuel utilities need to adopt an unprecedented sense of urgency in either embracing renewable energy generation or getting out of the way of new enterprises which will embark upon a serious transition to sustainable renewable energy.

I live in Akron, where 15% of my monthly water bill and 83% of my sewer bill consist of EPA-mandated charges to remedy our combined sewer overflow problem. In other words, my bill this month is \$133.61, rather than \$55.88. The absolute last thing I need is to pay one red cent more to First Energy to ensure the profitability of two plants that should be RETIRED AS SOON AS HUMANLY POSSIBLE, not kept online to pollute Ohio further, not for one more week, month, year, sure as hell not for 15 more years.

The 1896 Carbon Economy got us through the 20th century, First Energy. But all things come to an end, and it's time for a 21st century energy policy. You can certainly join us in building that exciting future, or you can get out of our way. It's your choice.

I urge the Public Utilities Commission, in the strongest possible terms, to REJECT First

Energy's brazen subsidy request. Ohio cannot afford it.

Sincerely,

Tom Rizzo

From: Fred Welty
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Electric Security Plan
Received: 9/2/2015 10:57:35 AM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of 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

From: Josh Willis
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 9/2/2015 1:27:40 PM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of 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

Hunter, Donielle

From: jim darby <jdarby@ameritech.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 02, 2015 6:34 PM
To: Puco Docketing
Subject: proposed electric security plan

Dear Chair Public Utilities Commission Ohio Andre Porter,

My remarks are regarding Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO.

This bailout of FirstEnergy makes us Ohio consumers pay for their bad business decisions. Their plan is speculative, misleading anti-competitive and will likely cost us consumers billions over the next 15 years. Their proposal allows them to undercut other more efficient wind and gas producers eventually limiting our energy choices in the wholesale electricity market. They have petitioned the PUCO to conceal their cost and revenue figures which can only mean they are hiding the facts from consumers. We eventually will pay more for their dirty electricity while they avoid the risks and reap the profits. The PUCO's job is to protect the consumers of Ohio. Please don't let this monopoly get away with making us pay their surcharges which they use to subsidize their unprofitable, outdated plants instead of grid maintenance. Do the right thing and protect us from this FirstEnergy scam.

Sincerely,

jim darby

From: Susan Whipple
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 9/2/2015 3:19:15 PM
Message:
Dear Public Utilities Commission of 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

From: S Lovelace
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO
Subject: Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO
Received: 9/1/2015 3:13:13 PM

Message:

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Andre Porter,

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

As a consumer I expect choices and do not want to be locked in to a supplier unless I choose the supplier. I also expect the commission to look out for the tax payers best interest.

Sincerely,

S Lovelace