

Public Comment 18-0298-GA-AIR

Having read through the testimony associated with this case, and as a Vectren customer that has multiple gas appliances, the more costs recouped through the customer charge vs the usage charge would seem to benefit me. However, I believe that folks should pay for what they consume so do NOT support Vectren increasing the customer charge for costs that are not truly shared equally by every Vectren customer. When it comes to utilities, usage based charges are even more important as they encourage folks to be more efficient with their usage. If I'm going to pay a fixed cost of \$35 per month regardless of usage, I'm less inclined to work toward efficiency because I can't do anything to lessen that cost. This is worse if the fixed cost becomes higher than the usage based cost on my bill. Where's my incentive?

As a tax payer, I'm paying Vectren to promote energy efficiency programs. That would seem a waste if folks aren't incentivized on a monthly basis to be more energy efficient.

The reasons for Vectren requesting an increase, whether fixed or usage based, are vague to me. They should be able to state specifically what these dollars will be going to fund, what the cost of each is and what the purpose or expected result is. In my personal budget or when requesting add'l dollars for the upcoming year from the finance dept at the company I work for, I need to answer these questions BEFORE the dollars are approved. Seems reasonable to expect that from Vectren.

I also read Vectren is looking to get out of the gas supply game and no longer negotiate an SCO rate. Having the SCO rate in place is the EASIEST way for folks to get a decent gas supply rate. If you want to do better, you have to compare and switch suppliers somewhat regularly (every few months to a year). If you get an intro rate and don't switch when the intro is up, you usually get put in to a rate that negates the intro savings within a month or so. I love the Energy Choice Ohio program. It's saved me a decent amount of money over the years. But I have to put effort in to it. Not everyone is going to be up for doing that, or able to do that, but they shouldn't be penalized as heavily as they would be by getting in to a crazy high, post-intro rate. And it's ironic that Vectren is saying, on one hand, they need more money to administer the natural gas distribution in this area, and on the other hand saying they want to drop a valuable service (i.e. negotiating a default gas supplier rate). In all the promoting I've seen for the Energy Choice Ohio program, never do I recall seeing the potential savings front and center. If you want to get folks attention and change behaviors, show them how much money could be kept in their wallets.

If it's true that the costs that Vectren incurs when wearing its "supplier" hat are included in its "delivery" charge, that needs to be changed. The supplier costs should be in the SCO rate since that's the supplier side of Vectren. No increase in rates should be approved until this is sorted.

Additionally, any service or access Vectren makes available to one supplier should be extended to all suppliers unless there is a security or hardship issue with doing so. The supplier should be notified of why they were denied and given an opportunity to fix things up and apply again. It's in Vectren's customers' best interest.

Thank you for considering my comments on this matter.

Laura L Davis

(937) 757-1614

couponingindayton@gmail.com

Public Comment 18-0298-GA-AIR

I just heard about the Vectren rate increase, not in time to go to the hearing. This increase will be hard on those of us who are on a fixed income. I've been retired for 5 years and live on my social security.

I understand that there was testimony about Vectren being a good community citizen. Having them spend money sponsoring an air show or a little league is nice, but it doesn't help me put food on the table.

No company that has a monopoly on service should be allowed to double the cost of that service. Do your job, PUCO, and deny this increase.

Mary Sue Gmeiner
1418 Arbor Avenue
Dayton, OH 45420
(937) 813-8436
msgmeiner@yahoo.com

Vectren proposal for \$35 minimum monthly charge > I find this proposal arrogant and completely unwarranted. Too many customers in Dayton area are financially challenged to pay this charge regardless of how much or how little gas they use. I view it as a cost of doing business for Vectren to build out and maintain their infrastructure. They need to manage better, be more efficient and effective in running their business not simply add charges to consumers when they feel they need money. It is a utility making millions, they can pay senior management less and manage their resources better. Totally arrogant and unnecessary.

Brooks Kerrick
Dayton, OH
(937) 395-1601
bkerrick@woh.rr.com

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

11/16/2018 2:40:22 PM

in

Case No(s). 18-0298-GA-AIR

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