

FILE

From: webmaster@puc.state.oh.us
To: ContactThePUCO
Subject: 71838
Received: 1/9/2013 1:56:09 PM
Message:
WEB ID: 71838 AT:01-09-2013 at 01:55 PM

Related Case Number:

TYPE: comment

NAME: Mr. Bill Werman

CONTACT SENDER ? No

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 6829 Fallen Timbers Dr.
- Dublin , Ohio 43017
- USA

PHONE INFORMATION:

- Home: 614-792-7937
- Alternative: *(no alternative phone provided?)*
- Fax: *(no fax number provided?)*

E-MAIL: *(no e-mail address provided)*

INDUSTRY:Gas

ACCOUNT INFORMATION:

- *(no utility company name provided?)*
- *(no account name provided?)*
- *(no service address provided?)*
- *(no service phone number provided?)*
- *(no account number provided?)*

COMMENT DESCRIPTION:

My comment concerns Case # 12-2637 for complete deregulation of natural gas plans. I dislike this plan because I believe it will end up costing Ohio consumers more money.

As of now, Columbia Gas prices are already adjusted on a quarterly if not a monthly basis. I don't believe that the PUCO authorizes each of those changes, so to me that is deregulated. All the PUCO approved was the formula and way that Columbia Gas calculates what the change will be, as determined by the market price for Natural Gas.

12-2637-GA-EXM

RECEIVED-SOCKETING DIV
 2013 JAN 11 AM 11:52
 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. 2013 JAN 11 AM 11:52 Date Processed
 Technician

The Columbus Dispatch recently published an article showing how much more people have paid when selecting an unregulated supplier instead of Columbia Gas. I determined this on my own by reviewing of your Apples to Apples charts before this article was published. For the past several years I have chosen Columbia Gas as my supplier. When deregulation started and Natural Gas prices were rising the unregulated suppliers were a good deal if locking in a yearly price. But for the past several years with flat or falling prices they have cost Ohio consumers a lot of money.

I consider the idea of performing this transition once 70 percent of customers select an unregulated supplier to be ridiculous. First of all you would be denying 30 percent of the customers the choice that they want. Secondly, there has never been close to 70 percent of customers selecting an unregulated supplier. Why would that happen in the future? My guess is that as soon as this could be implemented the unregulated plans would greatly reduce cost (even if they lost money) so this plan would be enacted and get Columbia Gas out of the market. Just like Monopolies of old, they would undercut competition so they could later raise prices. At the very least, require the unregulated supplier to maintain their market share for three to four years.