

From: webmaster@puco.ohio.gov  
To: PUCO ContactThePUCO  
Subject: PUCO CONTACT FORM: 115274  
Received: 11/2/2017 1:06:00 PM  
Message:  
WEB ID: 115274 AT:11-02-2017 at 01:05 PM

Related Case Number:

TYPE: Comment

NAME: Mr. Ronald Hischak

CONTACT SENDER ? No

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 1624 Clarewood Ave
- Cincinnati , Ohio 45207
- USA

PHONE INFORMATION:

- Home: *(no home phone provided?)*
- Alternative: *(no alternative phone provided?)*
- Fax: *(no fax number provided?)*

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

INDUSTRY:Electric

ACCOUNT INFORMATION:

- Company: Duke Energy
- *(no account name provided?)*
- *(no service address provided?)*
- *(no service phone number provided?)*
- *(no account number provided?)*

COMMENT DESCRIPTION:

This concerns Duke Energy's request for a distribution rate change 17-32-EL-AIR. The proposed rate change once again punishes low kilowatt costumers and rewards high level consumers. A customer using less than about 800 KWH will be cross subsidizing those who consume more than this amount. A customer using less than 120 KWH a month will see their total electric bill more than double. Low usage customers save everyone costs by reducing the need for building additional generating capacity, the largest single cost component of providing electricity. Apparently since Duke Energy is retreating from the generating side of the business it no longer need show any concern for the fixed costs of generating capacity. To the contrary all fixed charges should be abolished, including thr Riders which are essentially fixed charges. The costs Duke deems as fixed should be covered by a higher distribution charge to ensure that consumption and peak generating capacity are kept to a minimum. If these rate changes reflect the desirability of having charges for particular sevicees match the costs of providing them then one must question how there could be only one distribution rate for all residential customers. How is it that an apartment dweller in a large urban building can be charged the same rate as a customer on a one acre lot in the exurbs. The one distribution charge for all signifies a gross distortion of

charges to costs. The distribution rate charge should be based on the amount of land taken up by the customer's property. Neither I nor any other Duke Energy customer chose to have a smart meter installed in their home. Few if any residential customers would have chosen to pay \$18.00 a month to have a smart meter. A cheap and underhanded example of techno hucksterism, these smart meters must be able to recover their costs through greater efficiencies etc. Otherwise the Duke Energy shareholders must cover the cost of this "investment". A business cannot force its customers to invest in the business. If Duke refuses to remove these meters on request of the customer then it must issue stock shares and pay dividends to these customers.

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio  
Consumer Services Division

Memorandum

Date: 11/6/2017

Re: Brian Englum  
3418 Monteith Ave

Cincinnati, OH 45208

Docketing Case No.:  
17-32 el-air

Notes:

From: [webmaster@puco.ohio.gov](mailto:webmaster@puco.ohio.gov)

To: PUCO

ContactThePUCO

Subject: PUCO CONTACT

FORM: 115257

Received: 11/1/2017 7:15:47 PM

Message:

WEB ID: 115257

AT:11-01-2017 at 07:15 PM

Related Case Number:

TYPE: Comment

NAME: Mrs. Ren Englum

CONTACT SENDER ? Yes

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 3418 Monteith Ave.
- CINCINNATI , Ohio 45208
- USA

PHONE INFORMATION:

- Home: 443-812-8930
- Alternative: *(no alternative phone provided?)*
- Fax: *(no fax number provided?)*

E-MAIL: [renenglum@gmail.com](mailto:renenglum@gmail.com)

INDUSTRY:Electric

ACCOUNT INFORMATION:

- Company: Duke Energy
- Name on account: Brian Englum
- Service address: 3418 Monteith Ave. Cincinnati OH 45208
- *(no service phone number provided?)*
- *(no account number provided?)*

COMMENT DESCRIPTION:

I am writing in reference to case# 17-32-EL-AIR, asking you to deny Duke Energy's request for a 300% increase in the fixed charge of my bill. If this rate hike is approved, it will act as a deterrent toward the energy efficiency and clean energy initiatives that we desperately need right now to stabilize energy costs and combat climate change. We consumers need more control over our bills, not less. Thank you for your kind attention. Ren

Please docket the attached in the case number above.

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio  
Consumer Services Division

Memorandum

Date: 11/6/2017

Re: Ronald Miller  
4120 Allendale Dr  
# 4B  
Cincinnati, OH 45209

Docketing Case No.:  
17-32 el-air

Notes:

From: [webmaster@puco.ohio.gov](mailto:webmaster@puco.ohio.gov)  
To: PUCO  
ContactThePUCO  
Subject: PUCO CONTACT  
FORM: 115170  
Received: 10/28/2017 12:18:40 PM  
Message:  
WEB ID:  
115170 AT:10-28-2017 at 12:18 PM

Related Case Number: 17-0032

TYPE: Comment

NAME: Mr. Ronald Miller

CONTACT SENDER ? No

MAILING ADDRESS:

- 4120 Allendale Drive
- 4B
- Cincinnati , Ohio 45209
- USA

PHONE INFORMATION:

- Home: 5132215560
- Alternative: *(no alternative phone provided?)*
- Fax: *(no fax number provided?)*

E-MAIL: [rpmiller@fuse.net](mailto:rpmiller@fuse.net)

INDUSTRY:Electric

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:

I oppose the 280% increase proposed by Duke Energy -- increasing their \$72 "customer fee" every year for each household regardless of electricity usage to \$273.24 per year, even as they are lowering fees for business customers and making generous profits.

Please docket the attached in the case number



**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities**

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**11/6/2017 5:06:50 PM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 17-0032-EL-AIR**

Summary: Public Comment electronically filed by Docketing Staff on behalf of Docketing