Jan. 29, 2016

Re: Case numbers 14-1297-EL-SSO and 14-1693-EL-SSO

To Whom It May Concern,

I care about reducing toxic pollution and it is my understanding that a bailout of old polluting technology only benefits utility shareholders and delays investment in efficiency and renewable energy. That is why I'm asking you to oppose an "indefinite freeze" of our clean energy standards so that future generations can be ensured of having healthy air to breath and clean water to drink. Thank you.

Cordially,

Lauren Felder

4867 Farnhurst Rd.

Lyndhurst, OH 44124

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DES 2016 FEB -9 AM 8: 58 PUCO

To Whom It May Concern,

My family and I care about reducing toxic pollution and saving money on our electric bills. Also, reducing our dependence on coal for electricity reduces mercury and other contamination that comes from polluted drinking water from Lake Erie and the Ohio River. Please deny the rate increase to lock consumers into buying power from Ohio's oldest, dirtiest coal plants. A bailout of old, polluting technology only benefits utility shareholders and delays investments in efficient and renewable energy. Thank you for your time.

Case number 14-1297-ES-SSO Case number 14-1693-ES-SSO

Sincerely, The Jedlicka's Brunswick, OH





February 3, 2016

Public Utility Commission of Ohio 180 East Broad Street Columbus, OH 43215

RE:

Opposed to Purchase Power Agreement Riders Cases 14-1297-EL-SSO and 14-1693-EL-RDR

Dear PUCO:

OSCO operates three energy-intensive manufacturing plants in Ohio that produce cast metal parts for heating, air conditioning, transportation and power transmission industries. Low cost and reliably-supplied electricity is a critical resource for our Company.

We are both shocked and distressed that the Ohio PUCO is giving serious consideration to the Purchase Power Agreement (PPA) proposed by the electric utilities. The PPA is a complete reversal of about 15 years of migration toward deregulating electric generation in our state and provides an unjustified wind-fall. Clearly, such a large subsidization of the FirstEnergy and AEP is going to cost OSCO and every consumer in their service territory dearly.

We estimate the direct annual increase to our Company from approval of the PPA will be approximately \$345,000. Why are we and other consumers potentially going to be made to pay this large premium for generation assets that cannot provide electricity economically and guarantee a rate of return on those generation assets that we have already paid for via "stranded costs" several times already?

It is sad that the Ohio's regulatory process works in the manner it does. I will never forget my attendance at an AEP-sponsored event back at the time of the first ESP plan; when asked about justifying an irrational 15%/15%/15% year-over-year rate increase AEP's Chairman gave no justification what-so-ever but simply said, "I hope our lawyers (i.e., AEP) are better than your lawyers (i.e., in front of the PUCO)." I can only admire the creativity, legal prowess and political savvy displayed by the electric utilities in getting everything they can from the customer base. Obviously, they have the money and the know-how to work the system and are very effective at doing so.

Please understand that a decision to approve the PPA proposal will significantly impair OSCO's ability to compete in today's marketplace. I ask that you reject their proposal.

1. 2. 3. 3. 3. 4. 4.

achta siatiscae i e zmr.

rick transferred to the teach of

Di marawan iki daga dan baharapa di mengalah baharangan bahasan pinda bisasan pindagan k

en en antigen som en de anderen en gregorier en generale en generale en generale en generale en generale en g En generale en

in a limit of expression in the Water state of the

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely.

John Burke

CEO

In regards to case numbers 14-1297-EL-SSO and 14-1693-EL-SSO

I vehemently oppose an "indefinite freeze" of our state's clean energy standards. I find the use of the word "indefinite" in regards to any legislation to be suspect and insulting. I also very emphatically oppose the use of my tax dollars to fund the bailout style retro-fitting of existing coal or nuclear plants. Again, this is suspect and insulting. I do not want a rate increase. I do not want to contribute to a continued dependence on coal, or to any continued efforts into nuclear power. Both of these mediums have more than proven to be not only inefficient, but extremely toxic. Our water is becoming increasingly laden with heavy metals and other deadly carcinogenic and neuro-toxins that cannot be removed. Time is of the essence, and in situations like we find ourselves in here and now, words such as "indefinite" are inexcusable. We must put our money towards reducing and limiting the pollution we already create, and to finding clean and renewable sources of energy for the future. There is no more time for political theatrics and empty rhetoric.

Lauren Schloeus 2/3/16

In regards to case numbers 14-1297-EL-SSO and 14-1693-EL-SSO

I vehemently oppose an "indefinite freeze" of our state's clean energy standards. I find the use of the word "indefinite" in regards to any legislation to be suspect and insulting. I also very emphatically oppose the use of my tax dollars to fund the bailout style retro-fitting of existing coal or nuclear plants. Again, this is suspect and insulting. I do not want a rate increase. I do not want to contribute to a continued dependence on coal, or to any continued efforts into nuclear power. Both of these mediums have more than proven to be not only inefficient, but extremely toxic. Our water is becoming increasingly laden with heavy metals and other deadly carcinogenic and neuro-toxins that cannot be removed. Time is of the essence, and in situations like we find ourselves in here and now, words such as "indefinite" are inexcusable. We must put our money towards reducing and limiting the pollution we already create, and to finding clean and renewable sources of energy for the future. There is no more time for political theatrics and empty rhetoric.

Wahelus Blasky

2/4/16 Kathy Scheck 3846 Troon Dr Uniontown OH 44685 Re: Case numbers 14-1297- EL-SSO 14-1693- EL-550 Dear Governor Kasichet PUCO: This letter is in regard to the bailants and the great of our clean energy Reducing to fine is not only essential today, but it the future! a builtent berieto starcholdra but not the enverment In Jutur generations As what is right! Not what your political oppliations would have you do. The Canad expect our young people to do better the we have hore. Show Hen the way! DO WHAT IS RIGHT. July- you,

Lathy School

Please reference the literature from O.C.A. and work to keep Lake Erie clean and Safe.

Flat Carbon



February 4, 2016

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (PUCO) 180 East Broad Street Columbus, OH 43215

RE: Opposition Comment to PPA Cases 14-1693-EL-RDR; 14-1297-EL-SSO

Dear Public Utilities Commission of Ohio:

I am writing to urge you to act to reject the negotiated settlements of FirstEnergy and AEP (and a small group of others who have negotiated certain benefits) to enable the utilities to implement unwarranted and costly Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) riders and other cost-driving provisions.

Should the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (PUCO) approve the deals, both utilities can use riders to collect costs from all of their customers to subsidize their generation assets they have determined are otherwise uneconomical. In an unprecedented request in an unregulated market, they propose to protect the utility shareholders from cost risk and to guarantee profits and cost recovery for eight years at the expense of their customers and to the detriment of the Ohio economy.

The State of Ohio has chosen to deregulate its electricity markets, a process that has worked well for both the consumer and the utilities. During the ups in the market, the Ohio utilities made exceptional profits. Now that there is a downturn in the markets, these same utilities are looking to take advantage of the system by not having their shareholders bear any of the financial risk associated with their prior business decisions.

Ohio's Consumers' Counsel estimated the FirstEnergy proposal could cost consumers \$3.9 billion over eight years, while the AEP proposal could cost consumers \$2 billion. ArcelorMittal would face cost increases of more than \$20 million in that eight year span, with no concomitant benefits.

The timing could not be worse. As a company, we've been transparent about the challenges facing our USA business and our industry. Global steel overcapacity has resulted in a flood of record-level imports that have eroded the increase in demand we would normally experience from an improving U.S. economy. The influx of imports has drastically reduced domestic steel pricing, with hot-rolled coil spot pricing down by more than 40 percent since Q1 2014. In the United States alone, the steel industry has announced a temporary or permanent loss of more than 12,000 jobs in 2015.

We have been forced to implement a number of cost savings initiatives including a reduction in purchasing, supplier and operating costs and a revised health care plan for our salaried employees. We are also working hard to improve our business performance through strategies that include asset optimization planning, stronger trade enforcement to battle the flood of unfairly traded imports, and labor negotiations with the United Steelworkers.

(continued)

The loss of tens of millions of dollars over the next several years could have a significant impact on the 3,000 jobs we provide in Ohio, take away from innovation and reduce scarce capital investments, hurting the long-term viability of our Ohio facilities and our USA business.

If PUCO approves these proposals, it will not only increase costs to customers, but open the door to other proposals that undermine the very basis of deregulation. Such a decision may result in the following: discourage good management practices; constrain competition; and dampen technological innovation in Ohio.

The markets for electricity in Ohio are currently working to the benefit of consumers. The proposals on the table will harm the consumer-friendly efficiency of Ohio's markets and important energy-intensive manufacturers like ArcelorMittal.

Sincerely

Eric Hauge

Vice President & General Manager

ArcelorMittal Cleveland

cc: Honorable John Kasich, Ohio Governor

Wayne Struble, Chief of Staff to the Governor

Jai Chabria, Senior Advisor to the Governor

Honorable Tom Patton, Ohio Senate

Honorable Michael J. Skindell, Ohio Senate

Honorable Sandra R. Williams, Ohio Senate

Honorable Kenny Yuko, Ohio Senate

Honorable John Barnes, Jr., Ohio House of Representatives

Honorable Janine R. Boyd, Ohio House of Representatives

Honorable Nicholas J. Celebrezze, Ohio House of Representatives

Honorable Mike Dovilla, Ohio House of Representatives

Honorable Stephanie D. Howse, Ohio House of Representatives

Honorable Bill Patmon, Ohio House of Representatives

Honorable Martin J. Sweeney, Ohio House of Representatives