

**Nixon, Anna**

---

**From:** Robert Comer [comer.bob@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 01, 2015 2:13 AM  
**To:** Puc0 Docketing  
**Subject:** FirstEnergy trying to do more customer rip-off: "Electric Security Plan"

Dear Chair Public Utilities Commission 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-SS0.

Sincerely,

Robert Comer

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV  
2015 SEP -1 PM 3:16  
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 ENW Date Processed SEP 01 2015

**Nixon, Anna**

---

**From:** Kathleen Markus-Walczak [jtwalczak@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 01, 2015 1:19 PM  
**To:** PucO Docketing  
**Subject:** Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO - No to aging power plants

Dear Chair Public Utilities Commission 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

**Nixon, Anna**

---

**From:** Zanoaj Battles [Zanoahbattles@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 31, 2015 11:16 PM  
**To:** Puco Docketing  
**Subject:** No bailout

Dear Chair Public Utilities Commission Ohio Andre Porter,

Why are we rewarding bad behavior? If you have a bad business model and your business is failing the mom and pops shops don't get bailed out they get shut down no one cares about their families. Hopefully they try again and do better next time. The decision to bail out these companies is totally unfair. I mean a bad business model is a fancy way of saying bad budget or no budget. If I have a bad budget in my household spending can I get a bailout on my bill. No I get cut off and they should to. Profiting of my tax dollars but what's in it for me. Can you bail me out reset my credit score.

Sincerely,

Zanoaj Battles

**Nixon, Anna**

---

**From:** Joseph MacBenn [1harp3horns@att.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 31, 2015 5:58 PM  
**To:** Puco Docketing  
**Subject:** Ohio Edison rate hike Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO

Dear Chair Public Utilities Commission 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

**Nixon, Anna**

---

**From:** Donald Rowinsky [danny275@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 01, 2015 8:25 AM  
**To:** Puco Docketing  
**Subject:** Testimony for Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO

Dear Chair Public Utilities Commission Ohio Andre Porter,

Please do not raise my utility rate for a company which still pays huge salaries and profits. Please wait on Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO until they are loosing money and paying themselves minimum wage and need to raise the rates.

Sincerely,

Donald Rowinsky

**Nixon, Anna**

---

**From:** richard kunkel [sgtrichusmfc@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 01, 2015 10:31 AM  
**To:** Puco Docketing  
**Subject:** Case No: 14-1297-EL-SSO

Dear Chair Public Utilities Commission 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

**Nixon, Anna**

---

**From:** Barbara Brothers [bbrothers@neo.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 01, 2015 10:38 AM  
**To:** Puco Docketing  
**Subject:** case no. 14-1297-EL-SSO

Dear Chair Public Utilities Commission 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

**Nixon, Anna**

---

**From:** Anthony Camino [acamino@oh.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 01, 2015 1:29 PM  
**To:** Puco Docketing  
**Subject:** Case #: 14-1297-EL-SSO

Dear Chair Public Utilities Commission 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



**Nixon, Anna**

---

**From:** S Lovelace [srlovela@cc.ysu.edu]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 01, 2015 3:13 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 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

**Nixon, Anna**

---

**From:** Nancy Roffey [nroffey@bex.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 01, 2015 1:43 PM  
**To:** Puco Docketing  
**Subject:** Rate Increase

Dear Chair Public Utilities Commission 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