



The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
2009 FEB 17 PM 1:53

KSCH11190800
Case Number

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Attn: Docketing
180 E. Broad St.
Columbus, OH 43215

PUCO

Formal Complaint Form

KYLE D. SCHEIDLER
Customer Name

969 PHILLIPS RD
Customer Address

CINCINNATI OH 45230
City State Zip

Against

6720-0861-28-8
Account Number

Customer Service Address (if different from above)

DUKE ENERGY
Utility Company Name

City State Zip

Please describe your complaint. (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

I disagree with a charge that Duke has levied. I believe it is unreasonable based on the data provided by Duke. A detailed explanation is attached.

[Signature]
Signature

(513) 2376-8495
Customer Telephone Number

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 Tm Date Processed 2/17/2009

I was provided information from Duke Energy on a revenue recovery calculation for a period when my gas meter was not operational. I understand and agree that I am liable for estimated gas usage during the period when I occupied the house and when the meter was broken. I disagree with Duke's calculations as I believe the estimated usage that they calculate is significantly above what appears to be reasonable when compared to recent actual usage data.

My house has only two gas appliances: A water heater and a furnace. I did not occupy the house between summer of 2004 and summer of 2007 when I was living abroad. The PUCO case number is KSCH111908UO.

My primary comparison focuses on recent CCF usage data vs. Duke's estimate for CCF usage. I understand that weather has an impact on the estimated usage, which I assume impacts only furnace usage, so I'll focus my comparison on the months where I would expect only the hot water heater was used. The following shows the estimated amounts are significantly higher than 2008 actual usage:

Bill	Actual CCF, 2008	2007 CCF Estimated by Duke	Estimated as a percent of Actual
Mid Oct	6	15	250%
Mid Sep	6	11	183%
Mid Aug	5	10	200%
Mid July	6	9	150%

Duke Energy also shows usage statistics for the same months from 2003:

Bill	Actual CCF, 2008	Actual CCF, 2003	Average CCF, Actuals	2007 CCF Estimated by Duke	Estimated as a percent of Average
Mid Oct	6	17	11.5	15	130%
Mid Sep	6	13	9.5	11	116%
Mid Aug	5	10	7.5	10	133%
Mid July	6	10	8	9	113%

It appears that Duke deemed that the information from 2003 was more relevant than 2008's information as the assessed CCF track much more closely to this data vs. the more recent data. (i.e., estimated usage is equal to or just below the actual 2003 data.) While not occupying the house in 2004-2007, I replaced both the water heater and furnace. I can provide receipts if you would like. I would expect my new appliances to be more efficient than those used in the 2003/2004 period, thus making the data points in 2008 much more relevant. The old appliances were installed when the house was built in 1991.

I fully appreciate that there is no way to know the exact usage, but I feel the estimated amounts from Duke are exceptionally high. I would be willing to accept a 30% reduction in the estimated usage. My basis for this is that the adjusted estimates would be in the range of the average between the 2008 and 2003 data. I believe this is still somewhat generous since the 2003 data, in my opinion, is much less relevant than the 2008 data. Also, as stated previously, I don't have the ability to account for weather impacts, so unfortunately I'll have to defer to your oversight on this.