

Response To
SB 32, 2016 OPUC Draft Report to Legislative Assembly

Ken Kestner, Lake County Commissioner

26 July 2016

1. I'll reiterate the points made by Senator Doug Whitsett.
2. I'll emphasize the strategy of collaborative/coordinated & bundling multi-funding scenario, as local, multiple state agencies/depts., LDCs, etc.
On the State's behalf, as others have emphasized, I encourage the 'transparency', which should apply to all other state-funded endeavors.
3. Likewise, I emphasize in the 'construction allowance' that multi-benefits AND long-term benefits be considered.
I recognize that PERPETUITY means 'forever' and the objection by some providers, so therein I stress emphasis on a reasonable LONG-TERM approach, which might encompass several decades. *(I understand that "Reasonable" is interpreted differently by different people; that's where Legislative Assembly can embody an interpretation.)*
4. LDCs' recommendation of OPUC adopting the legislative policy statement in SB 32 is noteworthy.
Having such policy embodied in OPUC gives a tone of emphasis to further facilitate LDCs efforts to expand Nat Gas, as facilitate changes in tariff, etc.
5. On surcharges, as reasonable new customers' surcharges, such would contribute to the local funding contribution.
I'm a little reserved, though not fully opposed, on the Geographical Surcharges concept. A small percentage with possible long-term return to existing customers would be palatable for me.
6. On subject of 'customers' assistance', if considered, I agree such should be applicable & fair to all energy providers.
7. I do like the notion of "banked" amounts of any unused portions of line extension allowances.