

**From:** [Kathryn Glaeser](#)  
**To:** [MPSCEDOCKETS;](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Consumers Energy Company - Alternatives Analysis (PTI No. 341-07) & MPSC Case No. U-15996  
**Date:** Monday, July 20, 2009 8:39:21 PM  
**Attachments:**

---

Jul 20, 2009

Ms. Mary Jo Kunkle  
P.O. Box 30221  
Lansing, MI 48909

Dear Ms. Kunkle,

The draft permit for the proposed Consumers Energy Coal Plant must be denied and the Alternatives Analysis must be rejected as inadequate. Based on the analysis submitted by Consumers Energy, the information provided does not establish the need for the plant or the lack of alternatives to the plant.

First, there is no need for this, or any, new coal-fired power plant in the State of Michigan. The filing makes unsubstantiated claims that the state's energy needs will grow and underestimates the ability of more cost-effective clean energy alternatives to meet energy needs in the future. Consumers own recent projections show a decline in current and future energy demand. Projections for electric demand in the state show there is no need for any new plant and that electric demand in the State of Michigan is in fact level or even decreasing.

Second, there are cleaner alternatives. Even when demand starts growing again, increased demand can easily be met with cleaner alternatives. Cleaner alternatives such as clean, renewable energy and energy efficiency can meet the need while creating clean energy jobs for the state.

There is no need for new coal-fired power plants in our foreseeable

future and efficiency measures can meet our energy demands for decades,

save our citizens' precious energy dollars in these very difficult times, and create tens of thousands of new green jobs to stimulate immediate and long-term economic health across Michigan.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Kathryn Glaeser  
6199 Goddard Rd  
Newport, MI 48166-9654

**From:** [C. Corbit](#)  
**To:** [MPSCEDOCKETS;](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Consumers Energy Company - Alternatives Analysis (PTI No. 341-07) & MPSC Case No. U-15996  
**Date:** Monday, July 20, 2009 9:08:56 PM  
**Attachments:**

---

Jul 20, 2009

Ms. Mary Jo Kunkle  
P.O. Box 30221  
Lansing, MI 48909

Dear Ms. Kunkle,

The draft permit for the proposed Consumers Energy Coal Plant must be denied and the Alternatives Analysis must be rejected as inadequate. Based on the analysis submitted by Consumers Energy, the information provided does not establish the need for the plant or the lack of alternatives to the plant.

First, there is no need for this, or any, new coal-fired power plant in the State of Michigan. The filing makes unsubstantiated claims that the state's energy needs will grow and underestimates the ability of more cost-effective clean energy alternatives to meet energy needs in the future. Consumers own recent projections show a decline in current and future energy demand. Projections for electric demand in the state show there is no need for any new plant and that electric demand in the State of Michigan is in fact level or even decreasing.

Second, there are cleaner alternatives. Even when demand starts growing again, increased demand can easily be met with cleaner alternatives. Cleaner alternatives such as clean, renewable energy and energy efficiency can meet the need while creating clean energy jobs for the state.

There is no need for new coal-fired power plants in our foreseeable

future and efficiency measures can meet our energy demands for decades,

save our citizens' precious energy dollars in these very difficult times, and create tens of thousands of new green jobs to stimulate immediate and long-term economic health across Michigan.

Sincerely,

Ms. C. Corbit  
24120 Seneca St  
Oak Park, MI 48237-3726

**From:** [Tom Mugglestone](#)  
**To:** [MPSCEDOCKETS;](#)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Consumers Energy Company - Alternatives Analysis (PTI No. 341-07) & MPSC Case No. U-15996  
**Date:** Monday, July 20, 2009 11:09:33 PM  
**Attachments:**

---

Jul 20, 2009

Ms. Mary Jo Kunkle  
P.O. Box 30221  
Lansing, MI 48909

Dear Ms. Kunkle,

The Draft Permit for the Proposed Coal Plant must be denied and the Alternatives Analysis must be rejected as inadequate. Based on the analysis submitted by Consumers Energy, the information provided does not establish the need for the plant or the lack of alternatives to the plant.

First, there is no need for this, or any, new coal-fired power plant in the State of Michigan. The filing makes unsubstantiated claims that the state's energy needs will grow and underestimates the ability of more cost-effective clean energy alternatives to meet energy needs in the future. Consumers own recent projections show a decline in current and future energy demand. Projections for electric demand in the state show there is no need for any new plant and that electric demand in the State of Michigan is in fact level or even decreasing.

Second, there are cleaner alternatives. Even when demand starts growing again, increased demand can easily be met with cleaner alternatives. Cleaner alternatives such as clean, renewable energy and energy efficiency can meet the need while creating clean energy jobs for the state.

There is no need for new coal-fired power plants in our foreseeable

future and efficiency measures can meet our energy demands for decades, save our citizens' precious energy dollars in these very difficult times, and create tens of thousands of new green jobs to stimulate immediate and long-term economic health across Michigan

Sincerely,

Mr. Tom Mugglestone  
3023 Deakin St  
Berkeley, CA 94705-1948