

FILE

2

Hunter, Donielle

**From:** ContactThePUCO  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 12, 2013 5:29 PM  
**To:** Docketing  
**Subject:** Docketing

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio  
Investigation and Audit Division

Memorandum

Date: 2/12/2013

Re: Richard Mcvay  
8198 Daleview Rd  
Cincinnati, OH 45247

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV  
2013 FEB 13 AM 8:04  
PUCO

Docketing Case No.:

12-1682-EL-AIR

Notes:

Please docket the following in the case number above. Thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### COMPLAINT DESCRIPTION:

1. Facilities Relocation - Mass Transportation Rider (Rider FRT) OBJECTION 27: OCC (Ohio Consumers' Counsel) agrees with the Staff's recommendation that Duke's proposed Rider FRT should not be authorized for Duke to collect dollar amounts from customers. However, OCC objects that the Staff did not include (but should have included) in its rationale for not supporting Rider FRT the following public policy implications: 1) Rider FRT unfairly discriminates among customer classes by giving members of one class - governmental entities - preferential treatment in paying the costs associated with their requests for relocation of facilities; 2) utility company riders should not be used as a means for governmental entities to fund public works projects, as governmental bodies have other means for paying the costs of relocating facilities; and 3) to the extent that the citizens of the governmental entity would not pay their electric bill, the Rider FRT portion of that bill would be collected from all other Duke customers through the uncollectible rider. Talking points summary: 1.) Why should costs for utilities construction work associated with an infrastructure project be buried in a utility rate increase? Transparency would suggest the project burden the costs. 2.) Why should these costs be passed on to other Duke customers outside of the geographic boundaries of the governmental entity involved? 3.) Sets a dangerous precedence of a private company charging rate payers for costs incurred on a public project, thus reducing the "published" costs of the project. 4.) Lastly, if costs will be increased based on projects in other geographic areas, rate payers are being "taxed" without representation. At a minimum, related costs of unpaid bills should be redistributed within the geography of the governmental entity - not to all Duke rate payers within Ohio.

\*\*\*\*\*

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 2 Date Processed FEB 13 2013

From: webmaster@puc.state.oh.us  
To: ContactThePUCO  
Subject: 72667  
Received: 2/12/2013 11:04:19 AM  
Message:  
WEB ID: 72667 AT:02-12-2013 at 11:04 AM

Related Case Number: 12-1682-EL-AIR

TYPE: comment

NAME: Mrs. Karen May

CONTACT SENDER ? Yes

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 9363 Montoro Drive
- (NO CITY?) , Ohio 45231
- USA

PHONE INFORMATION:

- Home: 513-522-5804
- Alternative: *(no alternative phone provided?)*
- Fax: *(no fax number provided?)*

E-MAIL: kmay@fuse.net

INDUSTRY:Gas

ACCOUNT INFORMATION:

- Company: Duke Energy
- Name on account: Donald W. May
- Service address: 9363 Montoro Drive
- Service phone: 513-522-5804
- Account Number: 0980-0236-20-4

COMMENT DESCRIPTION:

Duke Energy MUST NOT pass along their cost of man hours and machinery for construction of the streetcar project. This project is being pushed on the people so that Mayor Mallory will have a legacy to leave. Why would he expect Duke to do the relocation, etc and be able to pass their costs onto their customers. We citizens have not had the opportunity to vote on this project, not being in the city limits. Therefore, WHY MUST we be made to fund any monies toward the project? We already have to pay Duke for those customers who don't pay their bills. This is taxation without representation!! I'm sure Clermont and Butler county residents feel the same. Times are tough and this project is not necessary.

Hamilton County residents are still paying for the baseball and football stadiums which supposedly it was to bring income to Cincinnati unlike the streetcar project would ever do.

Sincerely, Karen May