

RECEIVED

MAY 12 2022

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

May 10, 2021

Ms. Linda Bridwell

Executive Director

Kentucky Public Service Commission

211 Sower Boulevard

Frankfort, Kentucky 4060-0615

Re: CASE No. 2021-00324

In the Matter of Joseph J. Oka v. Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc.

Dear Ms. Bridwell:

I am writing to address two issues related to my complaint filed against Duke Energy.

First, I want to give a response to Duke's assertion made back on August 30, 2021 that I am not trying to resolve the matter before the PSC in good faith and to show you it is Duke, not I, that is demonstrating bad faith.

Back in August 2021, Duke wrote in their initial response to the PSC in paragraph 31 of their letter dated August 30 2021:

"31. According to Exhibit 8 of the Complaint, Mr. Oka was advised by Commission Staff to file a formal complaint against Duke Energy Kentucky in correspondence dated July 6, 2021. When Mr. Oka contacted the Company's customer service staff on August 5, 2021, he requested the contact information for the Company's renewables energy department, which was provided to him in the course of his call. However, it appears that, in light of the prior direction from Staff given on July 6, 2021, Mr. Oka's August 5, 2021 call was pretextual in nature and his complaint was sent on August 9, 2021 – two business days later. It appears Mr. Oka was attempting to gather support for his Complaint rather than in good faith resolve what he perceived to be a billing dispute."

I called Duke to get an address from them directly because there are several addresses listed on Duke web-pages. I wanted to make sure my complaint was sent to the correct location, because I was told by a competent authority that large companies will play games and ignore complaints if they are not addressed properly. Yes, I sent my package

out “- two business days later” than my phone call. It took me almost a month to put the package together and several days to find someone to proofread my work; I had to get copies made from a quality copier and get the package collated and mailed. From that delay of “two business days” Duke attorneys conclude I had “pretextual ” intent and bad faith. I see no reason to impugn me or my intentions because I lack the resource of unlimited free-time. I feel paragraph 31 was included to sully me before the PSC and I hope the Commission sees through that.

It is Duke that shows bad faith when answering the PSC data requests in a cavalier manner. When the PSC writes a data request in plain language to “Provide a step-by-step explanation of how the -\$80.49 Net Metering Adjustment was calculated” and, Duke’s response to “how” a bill is calculated is “..net metering bills are calculated manually...., ” it is Duke that is being “pretextual.” Duke’s lack of specificity caused the Commission to require another data request to show all the calculations on a spread sheet to which Duke responded with obstructionism.

Secondly, Duke was ordered by the Commission on April 8, 2022 to show its billing calculations. My assumption is that the Commission received this information electronically. Duke, however, via mail, sent to me color copies of spread sheets in font so small that it is unreadable with even the strongest magnifying glass. Enclosed are three pages of calculations as a sample of Duke’s response to me. It is impossible for me, as a customer, to determine the accuracy of Duke’s calculations. There is still no transparency of how net metering adjustment in dollars and resulting tariffs are calculated.

Please see that the facts and evidence show that it is Duke acting in bad faith and that Duke’s modus operandi is to blame the customer for problems that are of Duke’s creation and obstruct with lack of transparency.

Please add this letter to the case file and public record.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Joseph Oka". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Joseph Oka

