

FILE

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

Docketing Division

180 E. Broad St.

Columbus, OH 43215-3793

Case # 17-1842-EL-ORD

Feb 22 2018

PUCO

2018 FEB 26 PM 1:37

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

Dear PUCO :

On Oct 24, 2017 Duke Energy suffered an equipment failure on one of their power poles located across the street and to the south of my house. This failure resulted in structural damage to the outside of my house. It also led to loss of electrical power, but I was NOT damaged by this loss of service. I have asked Duke for copies all pertinent records concerning this failure but they have refused. What I do know from my observations immediately after the failure is that it was not a self-contained event. Sparks flew and a current surge was induced to lowest set of power lines. This power surge caused the street end of the service drop to fall onto the street. The anchorage for the house end had been installed by Duke. The anchorage failed. There is no way to know if it failed because it had not been screwed in all the way or if it was under sized. This caused damage to siding and down spout before the weather head. It pulled the weather head and cable from the wall and damaged the cables outside layer of weather protection.

I am requesting that the PUCO get from Duke a copy of every report, correspondence, records of telephone calls or memoranda on this equipment failure. A detailed description of the equipment that failed, the name of company that made it and the date that it was placed in service. It is further requested that the PUCO find structural damage of this type does not fall within the purview of Section II: Supplying and Taking of Service. In essence this section states Duke is not responsible for damages caused by too much or too little electric current. It does not consider damages caused failing to make a proper anchor. It should be noted that other utilities require the customer to provide the anchor, by electing to do it themselves, Duke also assumed the liability of not doing it correctly.

When I had these damages repaired, Duke required that the meter be moved from inside my garage to the outside. I estimate that this requirement increased the cost by about \$200. My contractor said Duke was taking this action so they could turn off my power without going inside the house. He also said Duke was not doing this in Mariemont, OH because the village did not want meters on the outside. While Duke has the authority to dictate the initial location of the meter, it is an abuse of this authority to require the customer to pay the cost of moving the meter unless justified by electrical code requirements or economic benefits. Neither is present in this instance.

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 AW Date Processed 2/26/18

If Duke can turn off the power from the outside, so can robbers and thieves. Such action by the bad guys would place me in great peril as I would be total darkness, my land phone line and any other protective devices that require power would be inoperative.

A benefit to cost study must include all the costs, mine and Duke's. If the new meter goes in the rate base, this too would be a cost. I have no idea how this action generates any benefits.

It is requested that the PUCO study this issue and if the PUCO finds that dangers and costs exceeds the benefits, that the PUCO take legal action to reimburse all Duke customers that have been impacted.



Frank Guiner

1630 Robinway Dr.
Cincinnati, OH 45230

Phone 513 231 8922

Service Address: same as above

I am a customer of Duke Energy