FILE

Nancy Dawley 7497 Hosbrook Rd. Cincinnati, OH 45243 November 30, 2017

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio 180 E. Broad Street Columbus, OH 43215

Re: Rate Case H 17-0032-EL-AIR



Over the years I have owned my home I have carefully invested in ways to save energy – both for the environment and to keep my energy bills from getting out of hand. This has included attic insulation, new insulated windows, caulking, energy efficient appliances, and insulated window blinds.

Of course all of these were not possible at one time. I had to plan my expenditures to meet my budget. With these home improvements, I have felt good about keeping my monthly Duke Energy bill lower than without such planning.

Duke Energy has known for some time that people are reducing their use of electricity. They should have been doing what I was doing – planning changes in their way of doing business to address the reduced income as people used less of their product and upgrading their plants to be more efficient. It appears to me that they did not, and that instead they think that their customers should bail them out from their lack of planning. This seems to be a common belief of utilities, that they should be bailed out rather than make a smaller profit when they make bad decisions.

Duke Energy is asking that residential customers pay greater fixed fees per month. This means that the small customer, the ones like me who have been frugal with energy, are being stuck with paying more for less, while businesses that use more energy are not. We already pay more per KWH than their big users. I feel that any necessary increase should be based on actual usage, not on hook-up. I should not be subsidizing Duke when their big users are getting a free ride.

I ask you to reject Duke Energy's proposed rate hike.

Sincerely,		
Namey Dan	rley	
Nancy Dawley	This is to dertify that the images accorded	A 日子長 数
	accurate and complete reproduction	∈
	document delivered in the regular co	୍ୟୁ
	Technician A Date Procession 11/2	117