

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 2:03 PM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009
Attachments: I just signed "STOP THE DUKE ENERGY RIP OFF! "; I just signed "STOP THE DUKE ENERGY RIP OFF! "; I just signed "STOP THE DUKE ENERGY RIP OFF! "

Customer correspondence

From: Diane Hood
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 11:50 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

These have been added as Docket 130009, PR-69, more of the "Stop the Duke Energy Rip Off". DH

Shawna Senko

From: Phillip Sheppard <mail@changemail.org>
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 11:28 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: I just signed "STOP THE DUKE ENERGY RIP OFF! "

Dear Public Service Commissioners,

I just signed STOP DUKE ENERGY RIP OFF's petition "STOP THE DUKE ENERGY RIP OFF!" on Change.org.

Please vote against any Advance Cost Recovery rate increases, return all advance cost fees taken from customers, and schedule public hearings in affected service areas.

Sincerely,
Phillip Sheppard Cherry Hill, New Jersey

There are now 8 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to STOP DUKE ENERGY RIP OFF by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/stop-the-duke-energy-rip-off/responses/new?response=8f90d4739bf2>



Shawna Senko

From: Frank Lupo <mail@changemail.org>
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 12:32 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: I just signed "STOP THE DUKE ENERGY RIP OFF! "

Dear Public Service Commissioners,

I just signed STOP DUKE ENERGY RIP OFF's petition "STOP THE DUKE ENERGY RIP OFF!" on Change.org.

Please vote against any Advance Cost Recovery rate increases, return all advance cost fees taken from customers, and schedule public hearings in affected service areas.

Sincerely,
Frank Lupo St. Petersburg, Florida

There are now 9 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to STOP DUKE ENERGY RIP OFF by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/stop-the-duke-energy-rip-off/responses/new?response=8f90d4739bf2>



Shawna Senko

From: Francesca Carlsen <mail@changemail.org>
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 8:46 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: I just signed "STOP THE DUKE ENERGY RIP OFF! "

Dear Public Service Commissioners,

I just signed STOP DUKE ENERGY RIP OFF's petition "STOP THE DUKE ENERGY RIP OFF!" on Change.org.

Please vote against any Advance Cost Recovery rate increases, return all advance cost fees taken from customers, and schedule public hearings in affected service areas.

Sincerely,
Francesca Carlsen Palm harbor, Florida

There are now 10 signatures on this petition. Read reasons why people are signing, and respond to STOP DUKE ENERGY RIP OFF by clicking here:

<http://www.change.org/petitions/stop-the-duke-energy-rip-off/responses/new?response=8f90d4739bf2>



Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 11:02 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Customer correspondence

From: Diane Hood
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 9:28 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

These have been filed as Docket 130009, PR-69.

Shawna Senko

From: Ray Bellamy, MD <ray.bellamy@med.fsu.edu>
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2013 12:28 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Ray Bellamy, MD
509 Vinnedge Ride
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Shawna Senko

From: Susannah Troner <srtroner@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 9:55 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

To: PSC Chairperson and Commissioners:

I am a Florida taxpayer and FPL ratepayer. I am requesting that you reject FPL's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I believe that PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. Duke Energy Florida has cancelled nuclear gen projects in Levy County and Crystal River. Customers have already paid for part of those projects and will not get refunds though the projects are now cancelled. But millions of FPL customer like me are still at risk for the same happening to us, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. Please do not allow these bad decisions to perpetuate. Please give the "public service" portion of your Commission's name some meaning and do not approve passing these costs on to us, the Florida residents.

Thank you,

Susannah Troner

Susannah Troner
12701 SW 81 Avenue
Miami, FL 33156

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Brown
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 8:22 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests - Docket No. 130009-EI

Please place the correspondence below in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,
Terry

Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Brown Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)

-----Original Message-----

From: Susannah Troner [<mailto:srtroner@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 9:55 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

To: PSC Chairperson and Commissioners:

I am a Florida taxpayer and FPL ratepayer. I am requesting that you reject FPL's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I believe that PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. Duke Energy Florida has cancelled nuclear gen projects in Levy County and Crystal River. Customers have already paid for part of those projects and will not get refunds though the projects are now cancelled. But millions of FPL customer like me are still at risk for the same happening to us, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. Please do not allow these bad decisions to perpetuate. Please give the "public service" portion of your Commission's name some meaning and do not approve passing these costs on to us, the Florida residents.

Thank you,

Susannah Troner

Susannah Troner
12701 SW 81 Avenue
Miami, FL 33156

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 10:16 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the email below in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,
Cristina

-----Original Message-----

From: Ray Bellamy, MD [<mailto:ray.bellamy@med.fsu.edu>]
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2013 12:28 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Ray Bellamy, MD
509 Vinnedge Ride
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 9:48 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009

Customer correspondence

-----Original Message-----

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 8:37 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

Copy on file, see 1125018C. DHood

-----Original Message-----

From: Abigail Gage [<mailto:agage@madison.main.nc.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 6:40 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please don't fund nuclear power. Let's consider future generations. Please work towards developing an energy descent plan. We need to start looking at a long range time plan.

We should not have to pay for plants that will cause waste that we can't dispose of.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Abigail Gage
600 Alhambra Road
Venice, FL 34285

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Brown
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 8:44 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests - Docket No. 130009-EI

Please place the correspondence below in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,
Terry

Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Brown Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)

-----Original Message-----

From: Ray Bellamy, MD [<mailto:ray.bellamy@med.fsu.edu>]
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2013 12:28 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Ray Bellamy, MD
509 Vinnedge Ride
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Shawna Senko

From: Pamela Paultre on behalf of Office of Commissioner Brisé
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 8:29 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Good morning,

Please place the forwarded or enclosed correspondence in Docket Correspondence of Consumers and their representatives for docket no. 130009-EI .

Thank you,

Pamela Paultre
Assistant to Chairman Ronald Brisé
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6036

-----Original Message-----

From: Ray Bellamy, MD [<mailto:ray.bellamy@med.fsu.edu>]
Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2013 12:28 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Ray Bellamy, MD
509 Vinnedge Ride
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 9:48 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009

Customer correspondence

-----Original Message-----

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2013 8:37 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

Copy on file, see 1125018C. DHood

-----Original Message-----

From: Abigail Gage [<mailto:agage@madison.main.nc.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 6:40 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please don't fund nuclear power. Let's consider future generations. Please work towards developing an energy descent plan. We need to start looking at a long range time plan.

We should not have to pay for plants that will cause waste that we can't dispose of.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Abigail Gage
600 Alhambra Road
Venice, FL 34285

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Brown
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 11:20 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests - Docket No. 130009-EI

Please place the correspondence below in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,
Terry

Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Brown Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)

-----Original Message-----

From: Abigail Gage [<mailto:agage@madison.main.nc.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 6:40 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please don't fund nuclear power. Let's consider future generations. Please work towards developing an energy descent plan. We need to start looking at a long range time plan.

We should not have to pay for plants that will cause waste that we can't dispose of.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Abigail Gage
600 Alhambra Road
Venice, FL 34285

Shawna Senko

From: Pamela Paultre on behalf of Office of Commissioner Brisé
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 8:24 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Good morning,

Please place the forwarded or enclosed correspondence in Docket Correspondence of Consumers and their representatives for docket no. 130009-EI.

Thank you,

Pamela Paultre
Assistant to Chairman Ronald Brisé
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6036

-----Original Message-----

From: Abigail Gage [<mailto:agage@madison.main.nc.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 6:40 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please don't fund nuclear power. Let's consider future generations. Please work towards developing an energy descent plan. We need to start looking at a long range time plan.

We should not have to pay for plants that will cause waste that we can't dispose of.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Abigail Gage
600 Alhambra Road
Venice, FL 34285

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 8:25 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the email below in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,

Cristina

-----Original Message-----

From: Abigail Gage [<mailto:agage@madison.main.nc.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 6:40 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please don't fund nuclear power. Let's consider future generations. Please work towards developing an energy descent plan. We need to start looking at a long range time plan.

We should not have to pay for plants that will cause waste that we can't dispose of.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Abigail Gage
600 Alhambra Road
Venice, FL 34285

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 12:50 PM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: Docket 130009
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Customer correspondence

From: Diane Hood
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 3:50 PM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

These have been added as info request to docket 130009, PR-69. DH

Shawna Senko

From: Brenda Kuntz <bkuntz01@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 12:14 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Brenda Kuntz
3734 River Oaks Court
New Port Richey, FL 34655

Shawna Senko

From: Grant Campbell <conservation@southfloridaaudubon.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 12:56 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Grant Campbell
2321 SW 44 ST
Dania Beach, FL 33312

Shawna Senko

From: carla cowgill <breyerfan11@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 1:08 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

carla cowgill
powell rd
winter haven, FL 33880

Shawna Senko

From: Bryan Cummins <abcu19@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 1:46 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Bryan Cummins
650 70th Ave.
St.Pete Beach, FL 33706

Shawna Senko

From: Virginia Ferriero <gindomf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 1:49 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Virginia Ferriero
15346 Floral Club Road
Delray Beach, FL 33484

Shawna Senko

From: ken gunther <ecocosm@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 2:43 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

ken gunther
11024 161st St. N
Jupiter, FL 33478

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 12:50 PM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: Docket 130009
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Customer correspondence

From: Diane Hood
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 3:50 PM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

These have been added as info request to docket 130009, PR-69. DH

Shawna Senko

From: Brenda Kuntz <bkuntz01@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 12:14 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Brenda Kuntz
3734 River Oaks Court
New Port Richey, FL 34655

Shawna Senko

From: Grant Campbell <conservation@southfloridaaudubon.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 12:56 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Grant Campbell
2321 SW 44 ST
Dania Beach, FL 33312

Shawna Senko

From: carla cowgill <breyerfan11@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 1:08 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

carla cowgill
powell rd
winter haven, FL 33880

Shawna Senko

From: Bryan Cummins <abcu19@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 1:46 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Bryan Cummins
650 70th Ave.
St.Pete Beach, FL 33706

Shawna Senko

From: Virginia Ferriero <gindomf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 1:49 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Virginia Ferriero
15346 Floral Club Road
Delray Beach, FL 33484

Shawna Senko

From: ken gunther <ecocosm@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 2:43 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

ken gunther
11024 161st St. N
Jupiter, FL 33478

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 8:46 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Turkey Point Reactors 6 & 7

Please place the email below in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EL.

Thank you,

Cristina

From: Diane Lawrence [<mailto:dianelee33176@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 3:55 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Turkey Point Reactors 6 & 7

Please support the cancellation of the Levy reactor project and stop approving nuclear cost recovery for the increasingly speculative FPL Turkey Point reactor project. Nuclear power is too expensive and we need to find other sources of power that are not potentially dangerous. Think Fukushima! All we need is a Hurricane Andrew or Katrina to create danger for all of us who live in the Miami area.

Diane Lawrence
10626 S.W. 102nd St.
Miami, FL 33176

Shawna Senko

From: Pamela Paultre
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 8:20 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket no. 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Good morning,

Please place the forwarded or enclosed correspondence in Docket Correspondence of Consumers and their representatives for the aforementioned docket.

Thank you,

Pamela Paultre
Assistant to Chairman Ronald Brisé
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6036

Shawna Senko

From: Mary Detrick <mary13ld@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:53 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Mary Detrick
2065 North Highland Ave.
L178
Clearwater, FL 33755

Shawna Senko

From: Jan Novotny <jnovotny@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:23 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Jan Novotny
401 15th Ave. North
Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

Shawna Senko

From: Drew Martin <dmandch@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 8:23 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Drew Martin
500 Lake Ave # 102
Lake Worth, FL 33460

Shawna Senko

From: Valerie Robbin <flower8349@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 7:55 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Valerie Robbin
730 Palermo Ave
Coral Gables, FL 33134

Shawna Senko

From: PATTI CONSTANTINO-MARTIN <PPATTIPLCSAM@AOL.COM>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 6:22 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

PATTI CONSTANTINO-MARTIN
17249 Helen K Dr
SPRING HILL, FL 34610

Shawna Senko

From: David Keith <focalplane@cfl.rr.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 5:56 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

David Keith
3140 SW 86th Place
Ocala, FL 34476

Shawna Senko

From: ROBERT S MAHONEY <rmahoney@jwu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 5:11 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

ROBERT S MAHONEY
444 NE 102 st
Miami Shores, FL 33138

Shawna Senko

From: Pamela Paultre
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 5:09 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket no. 130009-EI.
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Good afternoon,

Please place the forwarded or enclosed correspondence in Docket Correspondence of Consumers and their representatives for docket no. 130009EI.

Thank you,

Pamela Paultre
Assistant to Chairman Ronald Brisé
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6036

Shawna Senko

From: Veronic Aghayan <vaghay@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 10:01 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Veronic Aghayan
2801 Florida Ave
Miami, FL 33133

Shawna Senko

From: Barbara Laxon <otrbarbinpeace@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:41 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Barbara Laxon
1778 sw 85 ave
Miramar, FL 33025

Shawna Senko

From: Jim May <uwannaiguana@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:15 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Jim May
1415 Dean St
Apt 306
Fort Myers, FL 33901

Shawna Senko

From: Tom Conroy <Tom@conroyroofing.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:11 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

WE HAVE SEEN THIS SCAM BY ENERGY GIANTS BEFORE !!!

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Tom Conroy
P.O. Box 913
Naples, FL 34106

Shawna Senko

From: Jim May <uwannaiguana@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:15 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Jim May
1415 Dean St
Apt 306
Fort Myers, FL 33901

Shawna Senko

From: Tom Conroy <Tom@conroyroofing.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:11 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

WE HAVE SEEN THIS SCAM BY ENERGY GIANTS BEFORE !!!

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Tom Conroy
P.O. Box 913
Naples, FL 34106

Shawna Senko

From: Linda Paleias <swordbrush@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:07 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Linda Paleias
3300 ne 36 street
ft. lauderdale, FL 33308

Shawna Senko

From: Linda Paleias <swordbrush@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:07 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Linda Paleias
3300 ne 36 street
ft. lauderdale, FL 33308

Shawna Senko

From: Linda Paleias <swordbrush@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:06 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Linda Paleias
3300 ne 36 street
ft. lauderdale, FL 33308

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Brown
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 8:19 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket No. 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached correspondence in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,
Terry

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Shawna Senko

From: Mary Detrick <mary13ld@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:53 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Mary Detrick
2065 North Highland Ave.
L178
Clearwater, FL 33755

Shawna Senko

From: Jan Novotny <jnovotny@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:23 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Jan Novotny
401 15th Ave. North
Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

Shawna Senko

From: Drew Martin <dmandch@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 8:23 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Drew Martin
500 Lake Ave # 102
Lake Worth, FL 33460

Shawna Senko

From: Valerie Robbin <flower8349@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 7:55 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Valerie Robbin
730 Palermo Ave
Coral Gables, FL 33134

Shawna Senko

From: PATTI CONSTANTINO-MARTIN <PPATTIPLCSAM@AOL.COM>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 6:22 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

PATTI CONSTANTINO-MARTIN
17249 Helen K Dr
SPRING HILL, FL 34610

Shawna Senko

From: David Keith <focalplane@cfl.rr.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 5:56 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

David Keith
3140 SW 86th Place
Ocala, FL 34476

Shawna Senko

From: ROBERT S MAHONEY <rmahoney@jwu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 5:11 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

ROBERT S MAHONEY
444 NE 102 st
Miami Shores, FL 33138

Shawna Senko

From: Cristina Slaton
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 8:32 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket Correspondence 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached emails in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,

Cristina Slaton
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Balbis
PH: (850) 413-6004
TX: (850) 413-6005
cslaton@psc.state.fl.us

Shawna Senko

From: Arlene Epperson <arlene.epperson@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 2:20 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Arlene Epperson
7628 NW 258th Ave
Alachua, FL 32615

Shawna Senko

From: Mary Detrick <mary13ld@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:53 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Mary Detrick
2065 North Highland Ave.
L178
Clearwater, FL 33755

Shawna Senko

From: Jan Novotny <jnovotny@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:23 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Jan Novotny
401 15th Ave. North
Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

Shawna Senko

From: Drew Martin <dmandch@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 8:23 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Drew Martin
500 Lake Ave # 102
Lake Worth, FL 33460

Shawna Senko

From: Valerie Robbin <flower8349@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 7:55 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Valerie Robbin
730 Palermo Ave
Coral Gables, FL 33134

Shawna Senko

From: PATTI CONSTANTINO-MARTIN <PPATTIPLCSAM@AOL.COM>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 6:22 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

PATTI CONSTANTINO-MARTIN
17249 Helen K Dr
SPRING HILL, FL 34610

Shawna Senko

From: David Keith <focalplane@cfl.rr.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 5:56 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

David Keith
3140 SW 86th Place
Ocala, FL 34476

Shawna Senko

From: ROBERT S MAHONEY <rmahoney@jwu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 5:11 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

ROBERT S MAHONEY
444 NE 102 st
Miami Shores, FL 33138

Shawna Senko

From: ken gunther <ecocosm@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 2:43 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

ken gunther
11024 161st St. N
Jupiter, FL 33478

Shawna Senko

From: Arlene Epperson <arlene.epperson@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 2:20 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Arlene Epperson
7628 NW 258th Ave
Alachua, FL 32615

Shawna Senko

[illegible]

Good afternoon,

Please place the forwarded or enclosed correspondence in Docket Correspondence of Consumers and their representatives for docket no. 130009.

Thank you,

Pamela Paultre
Assistant to Chairman Ronald Brisé
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6036

Shawna Senko

From: Diane Lawrence <dianelee33176@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 3:50 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: FPL Turkey Point Reactors 6 & 7

Please support the cancellation of the Levy reactor project and stop approving nuclear cost recovery for the increasingly speculative FPL Turkey Point reactor project. Nuclear power is too expensive and we need to find other sources of power that are not potentially dangerous. Think Fukushima! All we need is a Hurricane Andrew or Katrina to create danger for all of us who live in the Miami area.

Diane Lawrence
10626 S.W. 102nd St.
Miami, FL 33176

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Brown
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 2:55 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket No. 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached correspondence in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,
Terry

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

Shawna Senko

From: ken gunther <ecocosm@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 2:43 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

ken gunther
11024 161st St. N
Jupiter, FL 33478

Shawna Senko

From: Arlene Epperson <arlene.epperson@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 2:20 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Arlene Epperson
7628 NW 258th Ave
Alachua, FL 32615

Shawna Senko

From: Virginia Ferriero <gindomf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 1:49 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Virginia Ferriero
15346 Floral Club Road
Delray Beach, FL 33484

Shawna Senko

From: Bryan Cummins <abcu19@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 1:46 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Bryan Cummins
650 70th Ave.
St.Pete Beach, FL 33706

Shawna Senko

From: carla cowgill <breyerfan11@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 1:08 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

carla cowgill
powell rd
winter haven, FL 33880

Shawna Senko

From: Grant Campbell <conservation@southfloridaaudubon.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 12:56 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Grant Campbell
2321 SW 44 ST
Dania Beach, FL 33312

Shawna Senko

From: Brenda Kuntz <bkuntz01@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 12:14 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Brenda Kuntz
3734 River Oaks Court
New Port Richey, FL 34655

Shawna Senko

From: David Chestney <chestneyd@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 12:09 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

David Chestney
8870 brittany lakes drive
boynton beach, FL 33472

Shawna Senko

From: david hollister <ddhollister@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 11:50 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

david hollister
357 41st ave
st pete beach, FL 33706

Shawna Senko

From: ken gunther <ecocosm@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 2:43 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

ken gunther
11024 161st St. N
Jupiter, FL 33478

Shawna Senko

From: Arlene Epperson <arlene.epperson@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 2:20 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Arlene Epperson
7628 NW 258th Ave
Alachua, FL 32615

Shawna Senko

From: Virginia Ferriero <gindomf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 1:49 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Virginia Ferriero
15346 Floral Club Road
Delray Beach, FL 33484

Shawna Senko

From: Bryan Cummins <abcu19@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 1:46 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Bryan Cummins
650 70th Ave.
St.Pete Beach, FL 33706

Shawna Senko

From: carla cowgill <breyerfan11@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 1:08 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

carla cowgill
powell rd
winter haven, FL 33880

Shawna Senko

From: Grant Campbell <conservation@southfloridaaudubon.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 12:56 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Grant Campbell
2321 SW 44 ST
Dania Beach, FL 33312

Shawna Senko

From: David Chestney <chestneyd@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 12:09 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

David Chestney
8870 brittany lakes drive
boynton beach, FL 33472

Shawna Senko

From: Brenda Kuntz <bkuntz01@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 12:14 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Brenda Kuntz
3734 River Oaks Court
New Port Richey, FL 34655

Shawna Senko

From: david hollister <ddhollister@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 11:50 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

david hollister
357 41st ave
st pete beach, FL 33706

Shawna Senko

From: Caroline Miller <cmiller1049@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 11:38 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Caroline Miller
6834 4th Ave No
St Petersburg, FL 33710

Shawna Senko

From: kathleen dempsey <kbdempsey@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 11:23 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

kathleen dempsey
289 se 4 ave
Pompano Beach, FL 33060

Shawna Senko

From: Jennifer Scott <jjscott9@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 10:55 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Jennifer Scott
15930 Bayside Pointe West #703
Fort Myers, FL 33908

Shawna Senko

From: Preston Whetstone <pj3whetstone@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 10:53 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Preston Whetstone
2303 Ray Rd
Valrico, FL 33594

Shawna Senko

From: Mary Ann Holtz <maryannwalt@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 10:45 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Mary Ann Holtz
4569 8th Avenue, N
St. Petersburg, FL 33713

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Brown
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 4:20 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Turkey Point Reactors 6&7 - Docket No. 130009-EI

Please place the correspondence below in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,
Terry

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

From: Diane Lawrence [<mailto:dianelee33176@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 4:01 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Turkey Point Reactors 6&7

Please support the cancellation of the Levy reactor project and stop approving nuclear cost recovery for the increasingly speculative FPL Turkey Point reactor project. Nuclear power is too expensive and we need to find other sources of power that are not potentially dangerous. Think Fukushima! All we need is a Hurricane Andrew or Katrina to create danger for all of us who live in the Miami area.

Diane Lawrence
10626 S.W. 102nd St.
Miami, FL 33176

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Brown
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 2:55 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket No. 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached correspondence in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,
Terry

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

Shawna Senko

From: ken gunther <ecocosm@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 2:43 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

ken gunther
11024 161st St. N
Jupiter, FL 33478

Shawna Senko

From: Arlene Epperson <arlene.epperson@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 2:20 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Arlene Epperson
7628 NW 258th Ave
Alachua, FL 32615

Shawna Senko

From: Virginia Ferriero <gindomf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 1:49 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Virginia Ferriero
15346 Floral Club Road
Delray Beach, FL 33484

Shawna Senko

From: Bryan Cummins <abcu19@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 1:46 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Bryan Cummins
650 70th Ave.
St.Pete Beach, FL 33706

Shawna Senko

From: carla cowgill <breyerfan11@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 1:08 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

carla cowgill
powell rd
winter haven, FL 33880

Shawna Senko

From: Grant Campbell <conservation@southfloridaaudubon.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 12:56 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Grant Campbell
2321 SW 44 ST
Dania Beach, FL 33312

Shawna Senko

From: Brenda Kuntz <bkuntz01@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 12:14 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Brenda Kuntz
3734 River Oaks Court
New Port Richey, FL 34655

Shawna Senko

From: David Chestney <chestneyd@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 12:09 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

David Chestney
8870 brittany lakes drive
boynton beach, FL 33472

Shawna Senko

From: david hollister <ddhollister@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 11:50 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

david hollister
357 41st ave
st pete beach, FL 33706

Cristina Slaton
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Balbis
PH: (850) 413-6004
FX: (850) 413-6005
cslaton@psc.state.fl.us

Shawna Senko

From: Virginia Ferriero <gindomf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 1:49 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Virginia Ferriero
15346 Floral Club Road
Delray Beach, FL 33484

Shawna Senko

From: Bryan Cummins <abcu19@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 1:46 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Bryan Cummins
650 70th Ave.
St. Pete Beach, FL 33706

Shawna Senko

From: carla cowgill <breyerfan11@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 1:08 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

carla cowgill
powell rd
winter haven, FL 33880

Shawna Senko

From: Grant Campbell <conservation@southfloridaaudubon.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 12:56 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Grant Campbell
2321 SW 44 ST
Dania Beach, FL 33312

Shawna Senko

From: Brenda Kuntz <bkuntz01@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 12:14 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Brenda Kuntz
3734 River Oaks Court
New Port Richey, FL 34655

Shawna Senko

From: David Chestney <chestneyd@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 12:09 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

David Chestney
8870 brittany lakes drive
boynton beach, FL 33472

Shawna Senko

From: david hollister <ddhollister@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 11:50 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

david hollister
357 41st ave
st pete beach, FL 33706

Shawna Senko

From: Caroline Miller <cmiller1049@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 11:38 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Caroline Miller
6834 4th Ave No
St Petersburg, FL 33710

Shawna Senko

From: kathleen dempsey <kbdempsey@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 11:23 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

kathleen dempsey
289 se 4 ave
Pompano Beach, FL 33060

Shawna Senko

From: Jennifer Scott <jjscott9@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 10:55 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Jennifer Scott
15930 Bayside Pointe West #703
Fort Myers, FL 33908

Shawna Senko

From: Jennifer Scott <jjscott9@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 10:55 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Jennifer Scott
15930 Bayside Pointe West #703
Fort Myers, FL 33908

Shawna Senko

From: Preston Whetstone <pj3whetstone@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 10:53 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Preston Whetstone
2303 Ray Rd
Valrico, FL 33594

Shawna Senko

From: Mary Ann Holtz <maryannwalt@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 10:45 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Mary Ann Holtz
4569 8th Avenue, N
St. Petersburg, FL 33713

Shawna Senko

From: Veronic Aghayan <vaghay@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 10:01 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Veronic Aghayan
2801 Florida Ave
Miami, FL 33133

Shawna Senko

From: Barbara Laxon <otrbarbinpeace@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:41 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Barbara Laxon
1778 sw 85 ave
Miramar, FL 33025

Shawna Senko

From: Jim May <uwannaiguana@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:15 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Jim May
1415 Dean St
Apt 306
Fort Myers, FL 33901

Shawna Senko

From: Tom Conroy <Tom@conroyroofing.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:11 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

WE HAVE SEEN THIS SCAM BY ENERGY GIANTS BEFORE !!!

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Tom Conroy
P.O. Box 913
Naples, FL 34106

Shawna Senko

From: Linda Paleias <swordbrush@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:07 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Linda Paleias
3300 ne 36 street
ft. lauderdale, FL 33308

Shawna Senko

From: Linda Paleias <swordbrush@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:07 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Linda Paleias
3300 ne 36 street
ft. lauderdale, FL 33308

Shawna Senko

From: Linda Paleias <swordbrush@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:07 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Linda Paleias
3300 ne 36 street
ft. lauderdale, FL 33308

Shawna Senko

From: Linda Paleias <swordbrush@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:06 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Linda Paleias
3300 ne 36 street
ft. lauderdale, FL 33308

Commission Clerk

Subject: FPSC E-service of Document NO. 05656-13 in Docket 130089-GU (Email ID = 892584)

The document described below has been issued by the Florida Public Service Commission and filed with the Office of Commission Clerk. As a party of record at the time of issuance or, if applicable, an interested person, you are being provided this information electronically.

Notice: E-mail replies from this address are not monitored or read. Should you have any problems accessing this document, please forward this e-mail to Clerk@psc.state.fl.us explaining the problem and a Commission Clerk will assist you. Do not alter the subject line, as it is used for processing.

DOCUMENT NO.	DESCRIPTION	
<u>05656-13 (2 pgs.)</u>	Consummating Order PSC-13-0436-CO-GU making Order PSC-13-0402-PAA-GU effective and final; closes docket.	Yes

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Brown
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 11:45 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket No. 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached correspondence in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,
Terry

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

Shawna Senko

From: Caroline Miller <cmiller1049@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 11:38 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Caroline Miller
6834 4th Ave No
St Petersburg, FL 33710

Shawna Senko

From: kathleen dempsey <kbdempsey@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 11:23 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

kathleen dempsey
289 se 4 ave
Pompano Beach, FL 33060

Shawna Senko

From: Jennifer Scott <jjscott9@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 10:55 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Jennifer Scott
15930 Bayside Pointe West #703
Fort Myers, FL 33908

Shawna Senko

From: Preston Whetstone <pj3whetstone@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 10:53 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Preston Whetstone
2303 Ray Rd
Valrico, FL 33594

Shawna Senko

From: Mary Ann Holtz <maryannwalt@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 10:45 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Mary Ann Holtz
4569 8th Avenue, N
St. Petersburg, FL 33713

Shawna Senko

From: Veronic Aghayan <vaghayanyahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 10:01 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Veronic Aghayan
2801 Florida Ave
Miami, FL 33133

Shawna Senko

From: Barbara Laxon <otrbarbinpeace@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:41 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Barbara Laxon
1778 sw 85 ave
Miramar, FL 33025

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Brown
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:32 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket No. 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached correspondence in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,
Terry

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

Shawna Senko

From: Jim May <uwannaiguana@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:15 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need Commissioners that stand up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public and agrees with whatever bad recommendations the PSC staff offers up. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Jim May
1415 Dean St
Apt 306
Fort Myers, FL 33901

Shawna Senko

From: Tom Conroy <Tom@conroyroofing.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:11 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

WE HAVE SEEN THIS SCAM BY ENERGY GIANTS BEFORE !!!

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Tom Conroy
P.O. Box 913
Naples, FL 34106

Shawna Senko

From: Linda Paleias <swordbrush@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:07 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. The PSC staff made a mistake by recommending approval. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Linda Paleias
3300 ne 36 street
ft. lauderdale, FL 33308

Shawna Senko

From: Linda Paleias <swordbrush@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:07 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Linda Paleias
3300 ne 36 street
ft. lauderdale, FL 33308

Shawna Senko

From: Linda Paleias <swordbrush@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:07 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Linda Paleias
3300 ne 36 street
ft. lauderdale, FL 33308

Shawna Senko

From: Linda Paleias <swordbrush@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:06 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as is being considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Linda Paleias
3300 ne 36 street
ft. lauderdale, FL 33308

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2013 9:34 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009
Attachments: Scan0001.pdf

Customer correspondence

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2013 7:59 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

Copy on file, see 1123832C. DH

From: Michael R Rehfeld [<mailto:rehfeld.mike@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2013 1:55 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Duke Energy Letter

Please review and add to the Duke Energy complaint file.

Michael R Rehfeld
Mobile: 443-790-3777
rehfeld.mike@gmail.com

Michael Rehfeld
5298 N. Peppermint Dr.
Beverly Hills, Florida 34465
352-249-7308
rehfeld.mike@gmail.com

September 17, 2013

Ms. Bonnie Bischoff
Manager, Products & Services Sales
Duke Energy
P.O. Box 1090
Charlotte, NC 28201-1090

Dear Ms. Bonnie Bischoff:

This letter is to **cancel** my HomeWIRE® and Surge Protection services received from a Duke Energy. This cancellation in service is a result of the letters I received on September 16th, 2013 informing me of significant rate increases. I find it unfortunate that Duke Energy choses to increase the cost of these services, even though they have not been used by this customer.

Furthermore, I find it offensive that Duke Energy, raises these rates and is attempting to raise other rates in Citrus County, Florida at the same time your company refuses to pay the assessed property tax to the county I reside. Additionally, Duke Energy has and continues to obtain "cost" recovery money from rate payers for projects that your company has refused to implement. This unethical behavior by Duke Energy calls into question your motives in additional cost assessments.

Sincerely,



Michael Rehfeld

Cc; Florida Public Service Commission

Shawna Senko

From: Pamela Paultre on behalf of Office of Commissioner Brisé
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2013 11:07 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Good morning,

Please place the forwarded or enclosed correspondence in Docket Correspondence of Consumers and their representatives for docket no. 130009-EI.

Thank you,

Pamela Paultre
Assistant to Chairman Ronald Brisé
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6036

-----Original Message-----

From: Allen Gerhardt [<mailto:algerhardt@windstream.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2013 10:35 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Allen Gerhardt
15012 NW CR 231
Gainesville, FL 32609

Crystal Card

From: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2013 8:31 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the email below correspondence in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thanks,

-----Original Message-----

From: Allen Gerhardt [<mailto:algerhardt@windstream.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2013 10:35 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Allen Gerhardt
15012 NW CR 231
Gainesville, FL 32609

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Brown
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2013 4:50 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests - Docket No. 130009-EI

Please place the correspondence below in Docket Correspondence, Consumers, and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,
Terry

Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

-----Original Message-----

From: Allen Gerhardt [<mailto:algerhardt@windstream.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2013 10:35 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Allen Gerhardt
15012 NW CR 231
Gainesville, FL 32609

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2013 11:46 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009

Customer correspondence

-----Original Message-----

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2013 10:43 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

Copy on file, see 1123021C. DH

-----Original Message-----

From: Allen Gerhardt [<mailto:algerhardt@windstream.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2013 10:35 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Allen Gerhardt
15012 NW CR 231
Gainesville, FL 32609

Crystal Card

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Friday, August 30, 2013 9:22 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Customer correspondence

From: Diane Hood
Sent: Friday, August 30, 2013 8:42 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

These have been added as info request to docket 130009, PR-69 DH

Crystal Card

From: ROBERT S MAHONEY <rmahoney@jwu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 6:04 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

ROBERT S MAHONEY
444 NE 102 st
Miami Shores, FL 33138

Crystal Card

From: Nina Powers <npfloridagarden@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 6:17 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Nina Powers
2446 Alameda Ave
Sarasota, FL 34234

Crystal Card

From: Ken Johnson <designer@cfl.rr.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 7:14 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Ken Johnson
2441 Anastasia Drive
South Daytona, FL 32119

Crystal Card

From: Karen Fraley <Karen@aroundbend.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 9:13 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!
Not to mention the hazardous waste they produce.

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Karen Fraley
1815 Palma Sola Blvd
Bradenton, FL 34209

Crystal Card

From: Annie Schiller <annieschiller@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 10:24 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Annie Schiller
10th ST
Sarasota, FL 34236

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Brown
Sent: Friday, September 06, 2013 1:48 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests - Docket No. 130009-EI

Please place the correspondence below in Docket Correspondence, Consumers, and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,
Terry

Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

-----Original Message-----

From: mark Isenberg [<mailto:mark120953@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, September 05, 2013 6:20 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

mark Isenberg
3887 timber ridge ct.
Palm Harbor, FL 34685

Shawna Senko

From: Pamela Paultre on behalf of Office of Commissioner Brisé
Sent: Friday, September 06, 2013 10:05 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Good morning,

Please place the forwarded or enclosed correspondence in Docket Correspondence of Consumers and their representatives for docket no. 130009-EI.

Thank you,

Pamela Paultre
Assistant to Chairman Ronald Brisé
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6036

-----Original Message-----

From: mark Isenberg [<mailto:mark120953@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, September 05, 2013 6:20 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

mark Isenberg
3887 timber ridge ct.
Palm Harbor, FL 34685

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Friday, September 06, 2013 2:50 PM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009

Customer correspondence

-----Original Message-----

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Friday, September 06, 2013 9:50 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

Copy on file, see 1122411C. DH

-----Original Message-----

From: mark Isenberg [<mailto:mark120953@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, September 05, 2013 6:20 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

mark Isenberg
3887 timber ridge ct.
Palm Harbor, FL 34685

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Sent: Friday, September 06, 2013 10:08 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the email below in Docket Correspondence of Consumers and their representatives for docket no. 130009-El.

Thank you,

Cristina

-----Original Message-----

From: mark Isenberg [<mailto:mark120953@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, September 05, 2013 6:20 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

mark Isenberg
3887 timber ridge ct.
Palm Harbor, FL 34685

Shawna Senko

From: Pamela Paultre on behalf of Office of Commissioner Brisé
Sent: Tuesday, September 03, 2013 10:34 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Good morning,

Please place the forwarded or enclosed correspondence in Docket Correspondence of Consumers and their representatives for docket no. 130009-EI.

Thank you,

Pamela Paultre
Assistant to Chairman Ronald Brisé
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6036

-----Original Message-----

From: Drew Martin [<mailto:dmandch@aol.com>]
Sent: Monday, September 02, 2013 10:45 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Drew Martin
500 Lake Ave # 102
Lake Worth, FL 33460

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2013 11:43 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: docket 130009

Customer correspondence

-----Original Message-----

From: Webmaster
Sent: Tuesday, September 03, 2013 2:38 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: FW: My contact

-----Original Message-----

From: contact@psc.state.fl.us [mailto:contact@psc.state.fl.us]
Sent: Tuesday, September 03, 2013 2:28 PM
To: Webmaster
Cc: THVATH2@YAHOO.COM
Subject: My contact

Contact from a Web user

Contact Information:
Name: THOMAS VATH
Company: RETIRED
Primary Phone: 727-345-2714
Secondary Phone: NONE
Email: THVATH2@YAHOO.COM

Response requested? No
CC Sent? Yes

Comments:

PLEASE DO NOT LET DUKE ENERGY RAISE THEIR RETAIL CUSTOMERS RATES TO COVER NUCLEAR COSTS. WHY DO YOU TREAT THIS UTILITY DIFFERENT THAN ALL OTHER RETAIL BUSINESSES? LET THEM DO WHAT OTHER COMPANIES WOULD DO (1) CUTS COSTS. (2_) CUT DIVIDENDS (3) REDUCE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES. I WORKED FOR A UTILITY FOR 22 YEARS AND UTILITIES ARE RUN SO MUCH DIFFERENT THAN PVT COMPANIES. MORE EMPLOYEES, NO CONCERN FOR COSTS BECAUSE THEY CAN APPLY TO THE PSC AND GET AN INCREASE IN RATES. LET THEM DO JUST LIKE EVERY PVT COMPANY WOULD DO - REDUCE COSTS.

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2013 11:14 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009

Customer correspondence

-----Original Message-----

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Tuesday, September 03, 2013 9:01 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

Copy on file, see 1121767C. DH

-----Original Message-----

From: Drew Martin [<mailto:dmandch@aol.com>]
Sent: Monday, September 02, 2013 10:45 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Drew Martin
500 Lake Ave # 102
Lake Worth, FL 33460

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Friday, August 30, 2013 9:19 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Customer correspondence

From: Diane Hood
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 3:50 PM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

These have been added as info request to docket 130009, PR-69 DH

Shawna Senko

From: Larry Trecartin <jmcalvi01832@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 6:59 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Larry Trecartin
2529 Sandy Hill Court
Holiday, FL 34691

Shawna Senko

From: ken gunther <ecocosm@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 7:45 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

ken gunther
11024 161st St. N
Jupiter, FL 33478

Shawna Senko

From: Karen Bonnell <kbsingr@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 4:45 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Karen Bonnell
3511 Santiago Way
Naples, FL 34105

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Brown
Sent: Tuesday, September 03, 2013 11:19 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket No. 130009-EI
Attachments: Power companies request rate hikes; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached correspondence in Docket Correspondence, Consumers, and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,
Terry

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

Shawna Senko

From: Sean Kuchle <sean@djktch.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 03, 2013 8:16 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis; Office Of Commissioner Edgar; Office of Commissioner Brisé; Office Of Commissioner Graham; Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Power companies request rate hikes

Dear Chairman and commissioners, it has come to my attention that Duke Energy (along with Tampa Electric) are requesting of you a rate hike. I happen to live in Clearwater, FL where this rate hike would apply. I humbly request you deny there rate request and until such time make them apply a rate credit to all customers until the funds which were paid by people like me to build and repair nuclear power plants which were never to be built is completely paid back. I understand the credit is a little much but please do not allow them to continue to gouge us customers whose only voice is you. You have the power to say no, and I implore you to please do so, let them know Florida is not a push over state.

Article in Tampa Bay Business Journal Where I learned of this Hike

http://www.bizjournals.com/tampabay/blog/morning-edition/2013/09/power-companies-request-rate-hikes.html?ana=e_tbay_rdup&s=newsletter&ed=2013-09-03

A must read article on the fail nuclear power plants that I am sure your already aware of

<http://www.tampabay.com/news/business/energy/thank-you-tallahassee-for-making-us-pay-so-much-for-nothing/2134390>

Thank you humbly
Sean Kuchle
14330 58th Street North
Apt 5304
Clearwater, FL 33760

Shawna Senko

From: Drew Martin <dmandch@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, September 02, 2013 10:45 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Drew Martin
500 Lake Ave # 102
Lake Worth, FL 33460

Shawna Senko

From: Pamela Paultre on behalf of Office of Commissioner Brisé
Sent: Tuesday, September 03, 2013 10:38 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Good morning,

Please place the forwarded or enclosed correspondence in Docket Correspondence of Consumers and their representatives for docket no. 130009-El.

Thank you,

Pamela Paultre
Assistant to Chairman Ronald Brisé
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6036

-----Original Message-----

From: Robert Keeley [<mailto:robertskeeley@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Friday, August 30, 2013 10:11 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Robert Keeley
126 Star Lane
Key West, FL 33040

Shawna Senko

From: Cristina Slaton
Sent: Tuesday, September 03, 2013 9:22 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket Correspondence 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached correspondence in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thanks,

Cristina Slaton
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Balbis
PH: (850) 413-6004
FAX: (850) 413-6005
cslaton@psc.state.fl.us

Shawna Senko

From: Drew Martin <dmandch@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, September 02, 2013 10:45 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Drew Martin
500 Lake Ave # 102
Lake Worth, FL 33460

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Brown
Sent: Friday, August 30, 2013 4:25 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests - Docket No. 130009-EI

Please place the correspondence below in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,
Terry

Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

-----Original Message-----

From: Robert Keeley [<mailto:robertskeeley@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Friday, August 30, 2013 10:11 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Shawna Senko

Robert Keeley
126 Star Lane
Key West, FL 33040

Shawna Senko

From: Cristina Slaton
Sent: Friday, August 30, 2013 2:21 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket Correspondence 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached correspondence in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thanks,

Cristina Slaton
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Balbis
PH: (850) 413-6004
FX: (850) 413-6005
cslaton@psc.state.fl.us

Shawna Senko

From: Robert Keeley <robertskeeley@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, August 30, 2013 10:11 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Robert Keeley
126 Star Lane
Key West, FL 33040

Shawna Senko

From: Annie Schiller <annieschiller@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 10:24 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Annie Schiller
10th ST
Sarasota, FL 34236

Shawna Senko

From: Karen Fraley <Karen@aroundbend.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 9:13 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!
Not to mention the hazardous waste they produce.

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Karen Fraley
1815 Palma Sola Blvd
Bradenton, FL 34209

Shawna Senko

From: Ken Johnson <designer@cfl.rr.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 7:14 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Ken Johnson
2441 Anastasia Drive
South Daytona, FL 32119

Shawna Senko

From: Nina Powers <npfloridagarden@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 6:17 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Nina Powers
2446 Alameda Ave
Sarasota, FL 34234

Shawna Senko

From: ROBERT S MAHONEY <rmahoney@jwu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 6:04 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

ROBERT S MAHONEY
444 NE 102 st
Miami Shores, FL 33138

Shawna Senko

From: Pamela Paultre
Sent: Friday, August 30, 2013 9:47 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket no. 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Good morning,

Please place the forwarded or enclosed correspondence in Docket Correspondence of Consumers and their representatives for the aforementioned docket.

Thank you,

Pamela Paultre
Assistant to Chairman Ronald Brisé
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6036

Shawna Senko

From: Annie Schiller <annieschiller@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 10:24 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Annie Schiller
10th ST
Sarasota, FL 34236

Shawna Senko

From: Karen Fraley <Karen@aroundbend.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 9:13 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!
Not to mention the hazardous waste they produce.

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Karen Fraley
1815 Palma Sola Blvd
Bradenton, FL 34209

Shawna Senko

From: Ken Johnson <designer@cfl.rr.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 7:14 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Ken Johnson
2441 Anastasia Drive
South Daytona, FL 32119

Shawna Senko

From: Nina Powers <npfloridagarden@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 6:17 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Nina Powers
2446 Alameda Ave
Sarasota, FL 34234

Shawna Senko

From: ROBERT S MAHONEY <rmahoney@jwu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 6:04 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

ROBERT S MAHONEY
444 NE 102 st
Miami Shores, FL 33138

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Friday, August 30, 2013 9:19 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Customer correspondence

From: Diane Hood
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 3:50 PM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

These have been added as info request to docket 130009, PR-69 DH

Shawna Senko

From: Larry Trecartin <jmcalvi01832@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 6:59 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Larry Trecartin
2529 Sandy Hill Court
Holiday, FL 34691

Shawna Senko

From: ken gunther <ecocosm@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 7:45 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

ken gunther
11024 161st St. N
Jupiter, FL 33478

Shawna Senko

From: Karen Bonnell <kbsingr@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 4:45 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Karen Bonnell
3511 Santiago Way
Naples, FL 34105

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Brown
Sent: Friday, August 30, 2013 8:29 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket No. 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached correspondence in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,
Terry

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

Shawna Senko

From: Annie Schiller <annieschiller@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 10:24 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Annie Schiller
10th ST
Sarasota, FL 34236

Shawna Senko

From: Karen Fraley <Karen@aroundbend.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 9:13 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!
Not to mention the hazardous waste they produce.

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Karen Fraley
1815 Palma Sola Blvd
Bradenton, FL 34209

Shawna Senko

From: Ken Johnson <designer@cfl.rr.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 7:14 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Ken Johnson
2441 Anastasia Drive
South Daytona, FL 32119

Shawna Senko

From: Nina Powers <npfloridagarden@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 6:17 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Nina Powers
2446 Alameda Ave
Sarasota, FL 34234

Shawna Senko

From: ROBERT S MAHONEY <rmahoney@jwu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 6:04 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

ROBERT S MAHONEY
444 NE 102 st
Miami Shores, FL 33138

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Brown
Sent: Friday, August 30, 2013 8:29 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket No. 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached correspondence in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,
Terry

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

Shawna Senko

From: Annie Schiller <annieschiller@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 10:24 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Annie Schiller
10th ST
Sarasota, FL 34236

Shawna Senko

From: Karen Fraley <Karen@aroundbend.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 9:13 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!
Not to mention the hazardous waste they produce.

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Karen Fraley
1815 Palma Sola Blvd
Bradenton, FL 34209

Shawna Senko

From: Ken Johnson <designer@cfl.rr.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 7:14 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Ken Johnson
2441 Anastasia Drive
South Daytona, FL 32119

Shawna Senko

From: Nina Powers <npfloridagarden@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 6:17 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Nina Powers
2446 Alameda Ave
Sarasota, FL 34234

Shawna Senko

From: ROBERT S MAHONEY <rmahoney@jwu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 6:04 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

ROBERT S MAHONEY
444 NE 102 st
Miami Shores, FL 33138

Shawna Senko

From: Cristina Slaton
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 1:10 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket Correspondence 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached correspondence in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thanks,

Cristina Slaton
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Balbis
PH: (850) 413-6004
JX: (850) 413-6005
cslaton@psc.state.fl.us

Shawna Senko

From: ken gunther <ecocosm@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 7:45 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

ken gunther
11024 161st St. N
Jupiter, FL 33478

Shawna Senko

From: Larry Trecartin <jmcalvi01832@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 6:59 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Larry Trecartin
2529 Sandy Hill Court
Holiday, FL 34691

Shawna Senko

From: Preston Whetstone <pj3whetstone@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 2:32 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Preston Whetstone
2303 Ray Rd
Valrico, FL 33594

Shawna Senko

From: Mary Detrick <mary13ld@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 1:25 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Mary Detrick
2065 North Highland Ave.
L178
Clearwater, FL 33755

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:55 PM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; nuclear power; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Customer correspondence

From: Diane Hood
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:49 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

These have been added as info request to docket 130009, PR-69 DH

Shawna Senko

From: Edward Berbaum <edwardberbaum@mac.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:28 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Edward Berbaum
1144 Agate Ave
Spring Hill, FL 34609

Shawna Senko

From: Deborah L Born <debborn@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:40 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Deborah L Born
520 SE 30th Ave
Ocala, FL 34471

Shawna Senko

From: nThomas Eck <tweck321@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:41 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

nThomas Eck
14300 66th St N Lot 113
Clearwater, FL 33764

Shawna Senko

From: Susan Linden <suelinden@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:42 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Susan Linden
1061 hunt st nw
Palm Bay, FL 32907

Shawna Senko

From: OTRBarb <otrbarbinpeace@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:53 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: nuclear power

Nuclear power is the most expensive to begin, takes the longest to set up, has the potential to cause the most harm (see Fukushima), and the most lingering problem ("spent" fuel).

We need to end all use of nuclear products-from weapons to power to medical. It all creates more problems than it helps.

We can use the nuclear power plant that is millions of miles away- it takes care of its own waste and it will be millions of years before that will be a problem to us.

Renewable energy in all its forms can go from concept to use in months or weeks or even days rather than decades.

Shawna Senko

From: Jan Novotny <jnovotny@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:12 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Jan Novotny
401 15th Ave. North
Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

Shawna Senko

From: Grant Campbell <conservation@southfloridaaudubon.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:21 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Grant Campbell
2321 SW 44 ST
Dania Beach, FL 33312

Shawna Senko

From: Dana Fortson <Harleychikadee@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:31 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Dana Fortson
1211 East Idlewild Ave.
Tampa, FL 33604

Shawna Senko

From: Alan Kardoff <mgmtdr@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:36 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Alan Kardoff
778 antilles rd ne
palm bay, FL 32907

Shawna Senko

From: Vaughn Anderson <vna@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:44 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

To me, the cost is secondary to the serious dangers of using the nuclear approach for power. Close down all nuclear plants and assure that NO more such plans get the light of day.

Thank you,

Vaughn Anderson
6205 Shoreline Dr
Apt 1101
St. Petersburg, FL 33708

8/29/2013 9:04 AM

Shawna Senko

From: Karen Bonnell <kbsingr@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 4:45 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Karen Bonnell
3511 Santiago Way
Naples, FL 34105

Shawna Senko

From: ken gunther <ecocosm@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 7:45 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

ken gunther
11024 161st St. N
Jupiter, FL 33478

Shawna Senko

From: Larry Trecartin <jmcalvi01832@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 6:59 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Larry Trecartin
2529 Sandy Hill Court
Holiday, FL 34691

Shawna Senko

From: Preston Whetstone <pj3whetstone@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 2:32 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Preston Whetstone
2303 Ray Rd
Valrico, FL 33594

Shawna Senko

From: Mary Detrick <mary13ld@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 1:25 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Mary Detrick
2065 North Highland Ave.
L178
Clearwater, FL 33755

Shawna Senko

From: david hollister <ddhollister@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 1:24 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

david hollister
357 41st ave
st pete beach, FL 33706

Shawna Senko

From: Jorge Garriga <jlg622@drexel.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:54 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Jorge Garriga
9581 Fontainebleau Blvd Apt #110
Miami, FL 33172

Shawna Senko

From: Linda Paleias <swordbrush@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:51 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Linda Paleias
3300 ne 36 street
ft. lauderdale, FL 33308

Shawna Senko

From: Carla Cowgill <breyerfan11@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:48 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Carla Cowgill
703 ave g ne
winter haven, FL 33881

Shawna Senko

From: david hollister <ddhollister@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 1:24 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

david hollister
357 41st ave
st pete beach, FL 33706

Shawna Senko

From: Jan Novotny <jnovotny@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:12 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Jan Novotny
401 15th Ave. North
Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

Shawna Senko

From: PATTI CONSTANTINO-MARTIN <PPATTIPLCSAM@AOL.COM>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:29 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

PATTI CONSTANTINO-MARTIN
17249 Helen K Dr
SPRING HILL, FL 34610

Shawna Senko

From: Mara Shlackman <marashl@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:23 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Mara Shlackman
2100 S. Ocean Dr. #8E
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316

Shawna Senko

From: J Smith <bureau165@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:45 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

J Smith
P.O Box 330851
Miami, FL 33233

Shawna Senko

From: Vaughn Anderson <vna@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:44 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

To me, the cost is secondary to the serious dangers of using the nuclear approach for power. Close down all nuclear plants and assure that NO more such plans get the light of day.

Thank you,

Vaughn Anderson
6205 Shoreline Dr
Apt 1101
St. Petersburg, FL 33708

Shawna Senko

From: Alan Kardoff <mgmtdr@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:36 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Alan Kardoff
778 antilles rd ne
palm bay, FL 32907

Shawna Senko

From: Dana Fortson <Harleychikadee@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:31 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Dana Fortson
1211 East Idlewild Ave
Tampa, FL 33604

Shawna Senko

From: Grant Campbell <conservation@southfloridaaudubon.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:21 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Grant Campbell
2321 SW 44 ST
Dania Beach, FL 33312

Shawna Senko

From: Susan Linden <suelinden@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:42 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Susan Linden
1061 hunt st nw
Palm Bay, FL 32907

Shawna Senko

From: nThomas Eck <tweck321@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:41 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

nThomas Eck
14300 66th St N Lot 113
Clearwater, FL 33764

Shawna Senko

From: Deborah L Born <debborn@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:40 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Deborah L Born
520 SE 30th Ave
Ocala, FL 34471

Shawna Senko

From: Edward Berbaum <edwardberbaum@mac.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:28 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Edward Berbaum
1144 Agate Ave
Spring Hill, FL 34609

Shawna Senko

From: Brian Paradise <bgparadise@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:26 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Brian Paradise
13 Arbor Club Drt. # 315
Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082

Shawna Senko

From: Caroline Miller <cmiller1049@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:18 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Caroline Miller
6834 4th Ave No
St Petersburg, FL 33710

Shawna Senko

From: Priscilla Hudson <planehudson@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:08 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Priscilla Hudson
3775 Evanwood CT
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Shawna Senko

From: Nina Tatlock <tatlock@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:08 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. The promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Nina Tatlock
1413 Beach Club Ln
Apollo Beach, FL 33572

Shawna Senko

From: Ray Bellamy, MD <ray.bellamy@med.fsu.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 9:58 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

In the past, PSC commissioners acted as if they had a role in protecting consumers from predatory utilities. Now the perception is that PSC Commissioners and lawmakers are captured by utilities and their lobbyists flush with cash. Please act like old fashioned Commissioners did...in our best interest.

Thank you,

Ray Bellamy, MD
509 Vinnedge Ride
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Shawna Senko

From: Jim May <uwannaiguana@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 9:49 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Jim May
1415 Dean St
Apt 306
Fort Myers, FL 33901

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Brown
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 8:36 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket No. 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached correspondence in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thanks,
Terry

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

Shawna Senko

From: Karen Bonnell <kbsingr@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2013 4:45 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Karen Bonnell
3511 Santiago Way
Naples, FL 34105

Shawna Senko

From: ken gunther <ecocosm@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 7:45 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

ken gunther
11024 161st St. N
Jupiter, FL 33478

Shawna Senko

From: Larry Trecartin <jmcalvi01832@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 6:59 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Larry Trecartin
2529 Sandy Hill Court
Holiday, FL 34691

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 5:11 PM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Customer correspondence

From: Diane Hood
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 2:27 PM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

These have been added as info request to docket 130009, PR-69 DH

Shawna Senko

From: J Smith <bureau165@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:45 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

J Smith
P.O Box 330851
Miami, FL 33233

Shawna Senko

From: Mara Shlackman <marashl@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:23 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Mara Shlackman
2100 S. Ocean Dr. #8E
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316

Shawna Senko

From: PATTI CONSTANTINO-MARTIN <PPATTIPLCSAM@AOL.COM>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:29 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

PATTI CONSTANTINO-MARTIN
17249 Helen K Dr
SPRING HILL, FL 34610

Shawna Senko

From: Carla Cowgill <breyerfan11@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:48 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Carla Cowgill
703 ave g ne
winter haven, FL 33881

Shawna Senko

From: Linda Paleias <swordbrush@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:51 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Linda Paleias
3300 ne 36 street
ft. lauderdale, FL 33308

Shawna Senko

From: Jorge Garriga <jlg622@drexel.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:54 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Jorge Garriga
9581 Fontainebleau Blvd Apt #110
Miami, FL 33172

Shawna Senko

From: david hollister <ddhollister@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 1:24 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

david hollister
357 41st ave
st pete beach, FL 33706

Shawna Senko

From: Mary Detrick <mary13ld@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 1:25 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Mary Detrick
2065 North Highland Ave.
L178
Clearwater, FL 33755

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 5:11 PM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009

Customer correspondence

-----Original Message-----

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 3:43 PM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

Copy on file, see 1121487C. DHood

-----Original Message-----

From: Preston Whetstone [<mailto:pj3whetstone@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 2:32 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Preston Whetstone
2303 Ray Rd
Valrico, FL 33594

8/28/2013 2:41 PM

Shawna Senko

From: Preston Whetstone <pj3whetstone@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 2:32 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Preston Whetstone
2303 Ray Rd
Valrico, FL 33594

Shawna Senko

From: Mary Detrick <mary13ld@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 1:25 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Mary Detrick
2065 North Highland Ave.
L178
Clearwater, FL 33755

Shawna Senko

From: david hollister <ddhollister@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 1:24 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

david hollister
357 41st ave
st pete beach, FL 33706

Shawna Senko

From: Jorge Garriga <jlg622@drexel.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:54 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Jorge Garriga
9581 Fontainebleau Blvd Apt #110
Miami, FL 33172

Shawna Senko

From: Linda Paleias <swordbrush@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:51 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Linda Paleias
3300 ne 36 street
ft. lauderdale, FL 33308

Shawna Senko

From: Carla Cowgill <breyerfan11@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:48 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Carla Cowgill
703 ave g ne
winter haven, FL 33881

Shawna Senko

From: PATTI CONSTANTINO-MARTIN <PPATTIPLCSAM@AOL.COM>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:29 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

PATTI CONSTANTINO-MARTIN
17249 Helen K Dr
SPRING HILL, FL 34610

Shawna Senko

From: Mara Shlackman <marashl@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:23 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Mara Shlackman
2100 S. Ocean Dr. #8E
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316

Shawna Senko

From: J Smith <bureau165@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:45 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

J Smith
P.O Box 330851
Miami, FL 33233

Shawna Senko

From: Vaughn Anderson <vna@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:44 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

To me, the cost is secondary to the serious dangers of using the nuclear approach for power. Close down all nuclear plants and assure that NO more such plans get the light of day.

Thank you,

Vaughn Anderson
6205 Shoreline Dr
Apt 1101
St. Petersburg, FL 33708

Shawna Senko

From: Alan Kardoff <mgmtdr@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:36 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Alan Kardoff
778 antilles rd ne
palm bay, FL 32907

Shawna Senko

From: Dana Fortson <Harleychikadee@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:31 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Dana Fortson
1211 East Idlewild Ave
Tampa, FL 33604

Shawna Senko

From: Grant Campbell <conservation@southfloridaaudubon.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:21 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Grant Campbell
2321 SW 44 ST
Dania Beach, FL 33312

Shawna Senko

From: Jan Novotny <jnovotny@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:12 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Jan Novotny
401 15th Ave. North
Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

8/28/2013 2:20 PM

Shawna Senko

From: Mary Detrick <mary13ld@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 1:25 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Mary Detrick
2065 North Highland Ave.
L178
Clearwater, FL 33755

Shawna Senko

From: david hollister <ddhollister@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 1:24 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

david hollister
357 41st ave
st pete beach, FL 33706

Shawna Senko

From: Jorge Garriga <jlg622@drexel.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:54 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Jorge Garriga
9581 Fontainebleau Blvd Apt #110
Miami, FL 33172

Shawna Senko

From: Linda Paleias <swordbrush@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:51 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Linda Paleias
3300 ne 36 street
ft. lauderdale, FL 33308

Shawna Senko

From: Carla Cowgill <breyerfan11@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:48 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Carla Cowgill
703 ave g ne
winter haven, FL 33881

Shawna Senko

From: PATTI CONSTANTINO-MARTIN <PPATTIPLCSAM@AOL.COM>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:29 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

PATTI CONSTANTINO-MARTIN
17249 Helen K Dr
SPRING HILL, FL 34610

Shawna Senko

From: Mara Shlackman <marashl@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:23 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Mara Shlackman
2100 S. Ocean Dr. #8E
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316

Shawna Senko

From: J Smith <bureau165@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:45 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

J Smith
P.O Box 330851
Miami, FL 33233

Shawna Senko

From: Vaughn Anderson <vna@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:44 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

To me, the cost is secondary to the serious dangers of using the nuclear approach for power. Close down all nuclear plants and assure that NO more such plans get the light of day.

Thank you,

Vaughn Anderson
6205 Shoreline Dr
Apt 1101
St. Petersburg, FL 33708

Shawna Senko

From: Alan Kardoff <mgmtdr@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:36 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Alan Kardoff
778 antilles rd ne
palm bay, FL 32907

Shawna Senko

From: Dana Fortson <Harleychikadee@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:31 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Dana Fortson
1211 East Idlewild Ave
Tampa, FL 33604

Shawna Senko

From: Grant Campbell <conservation@southfloridaaudubon.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:21 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Grant Campbell
2321 SW 44 ST
Dania Beach, FL 33312

Shawna Senko

From: Jan Novotny <jnovotny@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:12 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Jan Novotny
401 15th Ave. North
Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

8/28/2013 11:47 AM

Shawna Senko

From: Susan Linden <suelinden@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:42 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Susan Linden
1061 hunt st nw
Palm Bay, FL 32907

Shawna Senko

From: nThomas Eck <tweck321@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:41 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

nThomas Eck
14300 66th St N Lot 113
Clearwater, FL 33764

Shawna Senko

From: Deborah L Born <debborn@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:40 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Deborah L Born
520 SE 30th Ave
Ocala, FL 34471

Shawna Senko

From: Edward Berbaum <edwardberbaum@mac.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:28 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Edward Berbaum
1144 Agate Ave
Spring Hill, FL 34609

Shawna Senko

From: Brian Paradise <bgparadise@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:26 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Brian Paradise
13 Arbor Club Drt. # 315
Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082

Shawna Senko

From: Caroline Miller <cmiller1049@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:18 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Caroline Miller
6834 4th Ave No
St Petersburg, FL 33710

Shawna Senko

From: Priscilla Hudson <planehudson@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:08 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Priscilla Hudson
3775 Evanwood CT
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Shawna Senko

From: Nina Tatlock <tatlock@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:08 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. The promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Nina Tatlock
1413 Beach Club Ln
Apollo Beach, FL 33572

Shawna Senko

From: Ray Bellamy, MD <ray.bellamy@med.fsu.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 9:58 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

In the past, PSC commissioners acted as if they had a role in protecting consumers from predatory utilities. Now the perception is that PSC Commissioners and lawmakers are captured by utilities and their lobbyists flush with cash. Please act like old fashioned Commissioners did...in our best interest.

Thank you,

Ray Bellamy, MD
509 Vinnedge Ride
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Shawna Senko

From: Jim May <uwannaiguana@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 9:49 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Jim May
1415 Dean St
Apt 306
Fort Myers, FL 33901

Shawna Senko

From: Laura Bayona <Bayonalaura@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 9:36 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Laura Bayona
790 111th Ave N
Naples, FL 34108

Shawna Senko

From: Jennifer Scott <jjscott9@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 9:35 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Jennifer Scott
15930 Bayside Pointe West #703
Fort Myers, FL 33908

8/28/2013 11:42 AM

Shawna Senko

From: Susan Linden <suelinden@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:42 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Susan Linden
1061 hunt st nw
Palm Bay, FL 32907

Shawna Senko

From: nThomas Eck <tweck321@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:41 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

nThomas Eck
14300 66th St N Lot 113
Clearwater, FL 33764

Shawna Senko

From: Deborah L Born <debborn@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:40 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Deborah L Born
520 SE 30th Ave
Ocala, FL 34471

Shawna Senko

From: Edward Berbaum <edwardberbaum@mac.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:28 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Edward Berbaum
1144 Agate Ave
Spring Hill, FL 34609

Shawna Senko

From: Brian Paradise <bgparadise@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:26 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Brian Paradise
13 Arbor Club Drt. # 315
Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082

Shawna Senko

From: Caroline Miller <cmiller1049@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:18 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Caroline Miller
6834 4th Ave No
St Petersburg, FL 33710

Shawna Senko

From: Priscilla Hudson <planehudson@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:08 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Priscilla Hudson
3775 Evanwood CT
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Shawna Senko

From: Nina Tatlock <tatlock@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:08 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. The promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Nina Tatlock
1413 Beach Club Ln
Apollo Beach, FL 33572

Shawna Senko

From: Ray Bellamy, MD <ray.bellamy@med.fsu.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 9:58 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

In the past, PSC commissioners acted as if they had a role in protecting consumers from predatory utilities. Now the perception is that PSC Commissioners and lawmakers are captured by utilities and their lobbyists flush with cash. Please act like old fashioned Commissioners did...in our best interest.

Thank you,

Ray Bellamy, MD
509 Vinnedge Ride
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Shawna Senko

From: Jim May <uwannaiguana@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 9:49 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Jim May
1415 Dean St
Apt 306
Fort Myers, FL 33901

Shawna Senko

From: Laura Bayona <Bayonalaura@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 9:36 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Laura Bayona
790 111th Ave N
Naples, FL 34108

Shawna Senko

From: Jennifer Scott <jjscott9@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 9:35 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Jennifer Scott
15930 Bayside Pointe West #703
Fort Myers, FL 33908

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 12:54 PM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Customer correspondence

From: Diane Hood
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 11:10 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

These have been added as info request to docket 130009, PR-69 DH

Shawna Senko

From: Jennifer Scott <jjscott9@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 9:35 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Jennifer Scott
15930 Bayside Pointe West #703
Fort Myers, FL 33908

Shawna Senko

From: Laura Bayona <Bayonalaura@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 9:36 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Laura Bayona
790 111th Ave N
Naples, FL 34108

Shawna Senko

From: Jim May <uwannaiguana@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 9:49 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Jim May
1415 Dean St
Apt 306
Fort Myers, FL 33901

Shawna Senko

From: Ray Bellamy, MD <ray.bellamy@med.fsu.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 9:58 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

In the past, PSC commissioners acted as if they had a role in protecting consumers from predatory utilities. Now the perception is that PSC Commissioners and lawmakers are captured by utilities and their lobbyists flush with cash. Please act like old fashioned Commissioners did...in our best interest.

Thank you,

Ray Bellamy, MD
509 Vinnedge Ride
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Shawna Senko

From: Nina Tatlock <tatlock@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:08 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. The promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Nina Tatlock
1413 Beach Club Ln
Apollo Beach, FL 33572

Shawna Senko

From: Priscilla Hudson <planehudson@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:08 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays. And now that Duke has cancelled both Crystal River and the two new reactors in Levy County, a decision I support, customers are having to pay for the utility's bad pursuit that began years ago. That is not fair.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Priscilla Hudson
3775 Evanwood CT
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Shawna Senko

From: Caroline Miller <cmiller1049@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:18 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Caroline Miller
6834 4th Ave No
St Petersburg, FL 33710

Shawna Senko

From: Brian Paradise <bgparadise@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 10:26 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future. And now the speculative nature of these plans has unfolded as Duke has cancelled both the Crystal River and Levy County reactor projects. Though I think it's best for those projects to be cancelled sooner than later, what's in store now for FPL customers given the proposed Turkey Point reactor project?

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased, often misleading information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency and more consumer protections in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Brian Paradise
13 Arbor Club Drt. # 315
Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082

Shawna Senko

From: Pamela Paultre
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 9:49 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket no. 130009
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Good morning,

Please place the forwarded or enclosed correspondence in Docket Correspondence of Consumers and their representatives in the aforementioned docket.

Thank you,

Pamela Paultre
Assistant to Chairman Ronald Brisé
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6036

Shawna Senko

From: Laura Bayona <Bayonalaura@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 9:36 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Laura Bayona
790 111th Ave N
Naples, FL 34108

Shawna Senko

From: Jennifer Scott <jjscott9@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 9:35 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. In the past, I heard utilities state that they have not even committed to building these reactors. Now Duke has cancelled the Levy reactors and Crystal River and customers have to foot that bill – with no refund. I'm glad that happened before even more of our hard-earned money was wasted. But FPL customers are still at great risk as well, given the continued pursuit of the costly Turkey Point reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue – please protect us in Florida from these bad utility plans.

Thank you,

Jennifer Scott
15930 Bayside Pointe West #703
Fort Myers, FL 33908

Shawna Senko

From: Pamela Paultre on behalf of Office of Commissioner Brisé
Sent: Monday, August 26, 2013 12:14 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Good afternoon,

Please place the forwarded or enclosed correspondence in Docket Correspondence of Consumers and their representatives for docket no. 130009 .

Thank you,

Pamela Paultre
Assistant to Chairman Ronald Brisé
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6036

-----Original Message-----

From: sarah carter [<mailto:carters@mail.usf.edu>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 3:51 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

sarah carter
alafaya
orlando, FL 32828

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2013 8:20 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the email below in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thanks,
Cristina

-----Original Message-----

From: sarah carter [<mailto:carters@mail.usf.edu>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 3:51 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

sarah carter
alafaya
orlando, FL 32828

Crystal Card

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 4:04 PM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009

Customer correspondence

-----Original Message-----

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 3:58 PM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

Copy on file, see 1120423C. DH

-----Original Message-----

From: sarah carter [<mailto:carters@mail.usf.edu>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 3:51 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

sarah carter
alafaya
orlando, FL 32828

Crystal Card

From: Terry Holdnak
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2013 8:22 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket No. 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thanks,
Terry

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

Crystal Card

From: sarah carter <carters@mail.usf.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 3:51 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

sarah carter
alafaya
orlando, FL 32828

Crystal Card

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 4:04 PM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009

Customer correspondence

-----Original Message-----

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 3:58 PM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

Copy on file, see 1120423C. DH

-----Original Message-----

From: sarah carter [<mailto:carters@mail.usf.edu>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2013 3:51 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

sarah carter
alafaya
orlando, FL 32828

Shawna Senko

From: Kathy Lewis
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 7:57 AM
To: Records Clerk
Cc: Marshall Willis; Rhonda Hicks; Jim Dean; Debra Betton; Mark Futrell; Cayce Hinton
Subject: FW: Concerns

Please place the correspondence below from Ms. Beatrice Balboa in Docket File 130009-EI.

Thank you – Kathy Lewis

From: Kathy Lewis
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 7:52 AM
To: 'Beatrice Balboa'
Cc: Marshall Willis; Rhonda Hicks; Jim Dean; Debra Betton; Mark Futrell
Subject: RE: Concerns

Dear Ms. Balboa:

Thank you for your August 11, 2013, email regarding nuclear cost recovery for Florida Power & Light and Duke Energy Florida. Your correspondence has been placed in Docket file 130009-EI where it will be available to all interested parties for review.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Dyal Lewis
Regulatory Analyst
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
(850)413-6594

From: Beatrice Balboa [<mailto:beatricebalboa@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 9:56 PM
To: Kathy Lewis
Cc: Marshall Willis; Rhonda Hicks; Jim Dean; Debra Betton; Mark Futrell
Subject: Concerns

I was reading the latest news media article(s) regarding the latest Florida Power & Light Co. (FPL) and Duke Energy electrical bill rate increase(s) and extremely poor electrical infrastructural activities in the City of Pompano Beach, Broward County and/or the State of Florida with great interest. Please review and implement an action plan to thoroughly address this extremely troubling issue. Media reports continue to underscore the extremely exorbitant and spiraling out-of-control rate increase(s) in a overwhelming recessionary/depression economic climate adversely impacting taxpayer citizens. It is way past time to immediately commence a forensic audit throughout the entirety of Florida Power & Light Co. (FPL) and Duke Energy administrative and upper management salar(ies) to eliminate, consolidate and reduce all non-essential functions by initiating cost cutting budget measures of 5, 10, 25, 50, 75 and/or 90%, starting at the highest levels of management and working downward to the local level, trying to keep the day-to-day operational and logistical electrical services delivery as much as fiscally prudent to relieve the ongoing unsustainable and unconscionable typical electrical

bill inflicted on its senior citizenry. Please coordinate, collaborate and cooperate on Federal, State and/or local jurisdictional levels in addressing these concerns potentially impacting adversely the public's finances, policies, trust, confidence, and quality of life issues. Thank you for your time in this matter and hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

Beatrice Balboa

1010 South Ocean Boulevard, Apt. 1008

Pompano Beach, FL 33062-6666

====

Florida Power & Light asks to continue to collect for Turkey Point expansion

By Mary Ellen Klas Tue, Aug. 06, 2013

Five years and more than \$650 million into refurbishing and building nuclear reactors, Florida Power & Light officials told regulators Monday that it can't guarantee what new reactors will cost consumers, when the reactors will deliver energy, or even if it will get a license to finish the job.

Despite the uncertainty, the state's largest electric company asked regulators to allow it to continue to charge customers to pay for the prospective expansion of the Turkey Point plant on Biscayne Bay in south Miami-Dade County.

The monthly cost on every customer bill in 2014: 48 cents per 1,000 kilowatt hour on every customer bill, down from the \$1.65 a month charged this year to pay for upgrades on the existing reactors.

The earliest conceivable date the project could generate power: 2022.

"I can't commit to a date certain, or a cost certain," said Steve Scroggs, senior project manager for FPL. "I can tell you that it is every bit the company's intention to complete this project," he added, acknowledging that getting a license for the project to begin may still be years away.

Scroggs and other FPL officials argued, however, that the project is a good bet for customers because they intend to build the plant and, if they succeed, the payoff — fuel savings of more than \$78 billion over the life of the plant — will be worth it.

The Public Service Commission will decide this fall whether it agrees. But shrouding FPL's request is the rocky history of speculative nuclear power in Florida.

Last week, Duke Energy of Florida, the state's second largest electric utility, announced it was indefinitely scrapping plans to build a nuclear reactor in Levy County after collecting more than \$1 billion from customers in pre-construction costs and equipment before it obtained a license.

Like FPL, Duke Energy was allowed to charge customers in advance to build nuclear plants under a 2006 law intended to encourage low-emission energy production for the capital intensive nuclear plants.

For years, critics warned that the law failed consumers and provided few safeguards that the money would lead to construction of plants, instead of profits for shareholders. When legislators proposed tightening the law, FPL and Duke Energy's predecessor, Progress Energy, vigorously fought the efforts and the bills never got a hearing.

This year, the law was changed to require the companies to prove that their nuclear projects are reasonable and financially feasible. The companies must now also start building a plant within 10 years of receiving a license, or they have to forfeit the ability to charge the nuclear fees.

Joe McGlothlin, attorney with the Office of Public Counsel which represents the public in utility cases, told regulators that the annual cost of the proposed Turkey Point reactors has more than doubled from \$750 million to \$2.2 billion in the last year, evidence that it is no longer a reasonable cost.

"We submit that the legislature did not intend to promote nuclear capacity at any cost," he said, urging the commission to reject the rate request and refuse to let the company collect on \$200 million in other "unreasonable costs."

George Cavros, an attorney for the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, also urged the PSC to reject FPL's request and avoid another "financial fiasco."

"FPL consumers don't want to suffer the same fate as Duke Energy customers," he said. "The company is five years into the project and still can't commit to a price for the project, a date for the project and it can't commit to the 2022 time frame — or commit that the project will be built at all. We feel that is inconsistent with commission rules."

But FPL's Scroggs testified that the company is managing its costs carefully and the small investment now will reduce financial costs into the future.

Also overshadowing the decision is politics: two commissioners — Art Graham and Ronald Brise — are up for reappointment by the PSC nominating commission that is controlled by the Republican-led legislature. Gov. Rick Scott will make the appointment and FPL remains among the top contributors to both the GOP and Scott's political committees.

In other commission action, the PSC on Monday agreed to allow Duke Energy of Florida collect another \$108 million a year through 2017 for the now shuttered Crystal River reactor and the canceled Levy County project.

The decision will add 89 cents a month for 1,000 kilowatts of energy to current bills for the company's 1.6 million customers. The PSC also agreed to Duke Energy's request to defer approval of a proposed settlement agreement it entered into with the state Public Counsel's Office. The company agreed to end plans to build the Levy Plant and will work out how to pay the \$3.2 billion bill for ending that project and shuttering the Crystal River plant at a hearing next fall.

===

FPL and Duke Energy Customers Still Saddled With Costs of Failed or Future Nuke Plants
August 6, 2013

Florida customers of Duke Energy should expect to pay more next year for nuclear projects, even as the company reduces its planned nuclear footprint.

Meanwhile, Florida Power & Light, which has recently completed upgrades of two nuclear facilities, will lower the amount it collects for nuclear projects. For a homeowner who uses 1,000 kilowatt hours of power a month, that will save \$1.17.

The Florida Public Service Commission on Monday approved an agreement with Juno Beach-based FPL that lowers residential customers' monthly nuclear fees to 48 cents per 1,000 kilowatt hours of power. The PSC backed an increase of 89 cents for the same amount of power that will be added to monthly bills of Duke Energy customers starting in January 2014.

The increase, expected to be on utility bills for seven years, is to cover a past increase for a project at Duke's Crystal River nuclear facility.

The rate hike comes three years earlier than planned, as part of a settlement North Carolina-based Duke reached last week that will halt efforts to build a nuclear plant in Levy County.

Commissioners approved the additional charge despite expressing concerns that they had not been able to thoroughly review the settlement proposal that includes the fee increase.

"It seems to me we're in an awkward procedural position," said Commissioner Eduardo Balbis. "In this case we're raising rates without a bit of evidence in the record."

The commission deferred the overall approval of the settlement until this fall. While the 89-cent increase is expected to be included in that review, the monthly increase isn't expected to face much opposition.

The hike comes as customers of Duke (formerly Progress Energy Florida) have already advanced nearly \$1 billion for the Levy County project under a controversial 2006 state law.

Susan Glickman, a consultant for the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, which has opposed the Levy County nuclear plant, said she had seen estimates that placed construction of the nuclear plant in Levy County at \$25 billion if it had been built.

"Even if we spend \$1.5 billion, it's far better than if we spend \$25 billion," Glickman said. "That could be as much as \$50 to \$100 (a month) on top on the electric bill."

A \$3.45 charge is expected to remain in place for about three years as Duke covers the approximately \$200 million remaining in costs from the federal licensing process for the Levy plant.

The 89-cent hike comes in addition to a \$1.28 per 1,000 kilowatt-hour charge already in place at Crystal River, which includes the damaged Crystal River 3 Nuclear Power Plant that has already been closed.

Customers could expect to see some additional charges within a few years as Duke ensures the deconstruction of the 36-year-old Crystal River 3 is safe and the facility remains stable.

The decision to halt plans for the Levy County plant came less than three months after Gov. Rick Scott signed a law (SB 1472) that established new benchmarks for electric utilities that want to collect controversial advanced fees while planning nuclear-power plants.

The measure altered the 2006 law intended to encourage more nuclear power. Florida Power & Light and Duke have used the law to collect hundreds of millions of dollars in pre-construction nuclear fees.

Duke spokesman Sterling Ivey said the company pulled its plans for Levy County because of delays in licensing by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission along with the drop in natural gas costs.

"We still think the Levy site is a very good site for nuclear," Ivey said. "If things change in the next 15 to 20 years, and nuclear becomes an option again, we want to have that ability to move forward."

Meanwhile, FPL continues to move forward with plans to build Turkey Point 6 and 7 reactors in Miami. Hearings began Monday on the plans that include pre-construction costs.

The 48 cents a month rate is expected to generate \$45 million in advanced costs for the reactors and to cover costs related to recent upgrades at existing reactors in St. Lucie and Miami-Dade counties. The new generators,

which must still go through the nuclear regulatory licensing process, may be a decade, at the earliest, from going online.

—Jim Turner, News Service of Florida

Shawna Senko

From: Pamela Paultre
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 9:53 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket no. 130009
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Docket #130009

Good morning,

Please place the forwarded or enclosed correspondence in Docket Correspondence of Consumers and their representatives for docket no. 130009.

Thank you,

Pamela Paultre
Assistant to Chairman Ronald Brisé
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6036

Shawna Senko

From: Gladys Nobriga <ganobriga@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 11:01 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Gladys Nobriga
2302 A High Road
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Shawna Senko

From: Steve Malagodi <smalagodi@live.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 3:43 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Cc: Office of Commissioner Brisé; Office of Commissioner Balbis; Office Of Commissioner Edgar; Office Of Commissioner Graham; Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Docket #130009

Commissioners:

The ongoing cost-recovery fee being charged by FPL and even more unfairly by Duke Energy is absurd and unwarranted.

Everybody knows that no new reactors will be built at Turkey Point; it is the stupidest place on the planet to build nuclear reactors. The whole place will be under water by the time any construction ~should there ever be any~ would be completed.

This fee is a complete scam. Do not approve it.

Stephen Malagodi
Boca Raton.

Shawna Senko

From: Betty Leland
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 7:47 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Nuclear Cost Recovery vote

Please place the attached e-mail in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009.

Thanks,

Betty Leland

From: Jim Varian
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 5:59 PM
To: 'clint.s.miller@gmail.com'
Cc: Betty Leland
Subject: Nuclear Cost Recovery vote

Dear Mr. Miller –

Thank you for your inquiry about Commissioner Graham's vote. State law restricts a Commissioner's personal involvement in communication about an active case, but I can give you the information you requested.

The Public Service Commission voted Monday to defer hearing Duke Energy Florida's 2013 Nuclear Cost Recovery request, to allow consideration in October of a proposed settlement that would resolve those issues. The vote allowed Duke Energy Florida to collect, on a tentative basis, 89 cents per thousand kilowatt hours, which is intended to recover costs related to the closed Crystal River 3 nuclear plant. Commissioner Graham and the other four Commissioners voted for the deferral and tentative collection after the Office of Public Counsel, which represents consumers, advised in the hearing that the company is entitled by law to collect that amount.

If the proposed settlement between Duke Energy Florida and the Office of Public Counsel is not accepted by the Commission, the correct amount the utility was entitled to recover will be determined in the 2014 Nuclear Cost Recovery proceedings and retroactively applied. This "true-up" adjustment is a normal part of each year's Nuclear Cost Recovery proceedings to assure after a final review that the utility only retains the amount to which it was legitimately entitled.

I hope this responds fully to your inquiry. If you find you need more information, I'll be happy to help.

Jim Varian
Chief Advisor to Commissioner Art Graham
Florida Public Service Commission
jvarian@psc.state.fl.us
850-413-6022

From: Clint Miller [<mailto:clint.s.miller@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 7:12 AM
Shawna Senko

To: Office Of Commissioner Graham
Subject: Your vote

I'd like to know if you voted for or against raising rates to support Duke energy's shuttered nuclear power plant.

--

Respectfully,

Clint

Voice: 407.588.7402

Shawna Senko

From: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 4:49 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the email below in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thanks,

-----Original Message-----

From: Gladys Nobriga [<mailto:ganobriga@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 11:01 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Gladys Nobriga
2302 A High Road
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Shawna Senko

From: Terry Holdnak
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 4:20 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket No. 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thanks,
Terry

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

Shawna Senko

From: Gladys Nobriga <ganobriga@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 11:01 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Gladys Nobriga
2302 A High Road
Tallahassee, FL 32303

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 9:17 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009

Customer correspondence

-----Original Message-----

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 4:23 PM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

Copy on file, see 1118571C. DH

-----Original Message-----

From: Webmaster
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 3:19 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: FW: My contact

-----Original Message-----

From: contact@psc.state.fl.us [<mailto:contact@psc.state.fl.us>]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 2:59 PM
To: Webmaster
Cc: fcann20@tampabay.rr.com
Subject: My contact

Contact from a Web user

Contact Information:

Name: Frank Cannamela
Company:
Primary Phone: 9990000000
Secondary Phone: 9990000000
Email: fcann20@tampabay.rr.com

Response requested? No

CC Sent? Yes

Comments:

Have you people lost your mind? Or is the PSC on duke energy payroll. How can you possibly in good conceince give duke energy a rate hike. They refuse to pay their property taxes to Citrus county shut down the existing plant in Crystal River, then balk on building the new one in Levy county. So the people that are strapped to duke energy now for the next seven years have to pay for something they will never receive. And what about all the money they have collected

for "the repair" of crystal river plant. The people deserve better than what you are provideing. You are a disgrace to Florida

Shawna Senko

From: Randy Roland
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 8:52 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Subject: FW: Docket 130009
Attachments: Duke Energy - Nuclear Cost Recovery Charge; FW: Duke Energy

Please add the attached customer correspondence to Docket 130009EI. Thanks.

Shawna Senko

From: Randy Roland
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 8:47 AM
To: 'jschramm12@tampabay.rr.com'
Subject: Duke Energy - Nuclear Cost Recovery Charge

Mr. Joe Schramm
jschramm12@tampabay.rr.com

Dear Mr. Schramm,

The Governor's office forwarded a copy of your E-mail regarding Duke Energy Florida (DEF) to the Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC). The FPSC regulates investor-owned electric, and natural gas utilities throughout the state, and investor-owned water and wastewater utilities in those counties which have opted to transfer jurisdiction to the FPSC. The FPSC has authority in the telephone industry which is limited to the Lifeline Assistance Program, Florida Relay Service, and pay telephone service. We appreciate the opportunity to assist you.

You expressed concerns regarding the Nuclear Cost Recovery Charge. We will add your correspondence to Docket 130009.

Florida Statute 366.93 governs Commission decisions concerning nuclear cost recovery. You may review the statute by using the following link:

<http://www.flsenate.gov/laws/statutes/2011/366.93>

If you have any questions or concerns you may call me at 1-800-342-3552 or by fax at 1-800-511-0809.

Randy Roland
Regulatory Program Administrator
Florida Public Service Commission

Shawna Senko

From: Governor Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@eog.myflorida.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 1:44 PM
To: Randy Roland
Cc: Sunburst
Subject: FW: Duke Energy

---Original Message-----

From: Joe [mailto:jschramm12@tampabay.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 8:41 PM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Subject: Duke Energy

From: Joe <jschramm12@tampabay.rr.com>

County: Pinellas

Zip Code: 33756

Phone Number: 727-441-2159

Message Body: Dear Governor,

How can the state allow Duke Energy to raise their rates another .89 cents a month. I do not understand this. Business in Clearwater are only hiring part time. All I hear is the job market is getting better I do not see. I have a job but I have not had a raise in two years. The state wants to raise my property tax, my homeowners, and car insurance has went up and food cost. The way the state keeps regulating everything I been think of selling my house and moving out of this great state. Since the government is making it harder to live here.
Thank you for your time.

Shawna Senko

From: Angie Calhoun
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 10:37 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: Docket 130009
Attachments: Duke Energy and the PSC; E-Form Other Complaint TRACKING NUMBER: 34074

Please enter the attached correspondence to the customer correspondence side of docket 130208.

Thank you,

Angela Calhoun

Shawna Senko

From: Brian Koester <fridayxiii@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 9:04 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Duke Energy and the PSC

Dear Men and Women of the Florida PSC:

I'm writing to you regarding the fees charges by Duke Power (nee Progress Energy) to Florida customers for the never-to-be-completed repairs to the Crystal River power plant, and the never-to-be-built Levy County plant.

According to the Tampa Bay Times, customers have been charged IN EXCESS OF \$1.5 BILLION IN FEES. This is money we will NEVER SEE AGAIN. And, what have we gained for it? I also understand from recent news that the PSC is allowing Duke Power to charge another \$0.89 per month for the next seven years. I must ask: to what gain, to what end?

I'm left nearly speechless that the State of Florida has let its customers be raped like this. Yes, rape is a strong word, but that's how we feel. We the People have been violated by the power companies, and you have let them run roughshod over us.

Per the PSC website, your goal is: To facilitate the efficient provision of safe and reliable utility services at fair prices. Question: how can you say that customers are being charged fair prices when we've had rate increases for services that will never be provided?

One of the Goals for Economic Regulation: Provide a regulatory process that results in fair and reasonable rates while offering rate base regulated utilities an opportunity to earn a fair return on their investments. Question: how does \$1,500,000,000 amount to "fair and reasonable"? I'm sure you're aware that Duke Energy will keep at least \$150,000,000 for themselves and their investors, when providing exactly NOTHING in return to its customers. Fair? Really?

One of the Goals of Regulatory Oversight: Provide appropriate regulatory oversight to protect consumers. Question: How exactly have the customers been protected in this case?!?!? As it goes, I'd REALLY love an answer to this one.

As far as I call tell, you the PSC are failing quite short of your stated goals and Mission Statement. in fact, I'd say you're failing miserably. Rest assured that I will be spreading this word to all my friends who are residents of the state of Florida. I've written my elected officials in Tallahassee, and I'll be writing to Gov. Scott as well.

I'd love to hear something back from the PSC other than a form letter. if you have a leg to stand on and can offer up even the flimsiest of defenses for these reprehensible policies and decisions, I'd love to hear it.

Very disappointed,
Brian Koester
Largo, FL

Chaos, Panic, & Disorder. My work here is done.

Shawna Senko

From: consumerComplaint@psc.state.fl.us
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 9:15 AM
Cc: Consumer Contact
Subject: E-Form Other Complaint TRACKING NUMBER: 34074

CUSTOMER INFORMATION

Name: Brian Koester
Telephone:
Email:
Address: 2552 12th Ave. SW Largo FL 33770

BUSINESS INFORMATION

Business Account Name: Brian Koester
Account Number:
Address: 2552 12th Ave. SW Largo Florida 33770

COMPLAINT INFORMATION

Complaint: Other Complaint against Duke Energy Florida, Inc. d/b/a Duke Energy

Details:

Dear Men and Women of the Florida PSC:

Im writing to you regarding the fees charges by Duke Power (nee Progress Energy) to Florida customers for the never-to-be-completed repairs to the Crystal River power plant, and the never-to-be-built Levy County plant.

According to the Tampa Bay Times, customers have been charged IN EXCESS OF \$1.5 BILLION IN FEES. This is money we will NEVER SEE AGAIN. And, what have we gained for it? I also understand from recent news that the PSC is allowing Duke Power to charge another \$0.89 per month for the next seven years. I must ask: to what gain, to what end?

Im left nearly speechless that the State of Florida has let its customers be raped like this. Yes, rape is a strong word, but thats how we feel. We the People have been violated by the power companies, and you have let them run roughshod over us.

Per the PSC website, your goal is: To facilitate the efficient provision of safe and reliable utility services at fair prices. Question: how can you say that customers are being charged fair prices when weve had rate increases for services that will never be provided?

One of the Goals for Economic Regulation: Provide a regulatory process that results in fair and reasonable rates while offering rate base regulated utilities an opportunity to earn a fair return on their investments. Question: how does \$1,500,000,000 amount to "fair and reasonable"? Im sure youre aware that Duke Energy will keep at least \$150,000,000 for themselves and their investors, when providing exactly NOTHING in return to its customers. Fair? Really?

One of the Goals of Regulatory Oversight: Provide appropriate regulatory oversight to protect consumers. Question: How exactly have the customers been protected in this case?!? As it goes, Id REALLY love an answer to this one.

As far as I call tell, you the PSC are failing quite short of your stated goals and Mission Statement. In fact, I'd say you're failing miserably. Rest assured that I will be spreading this word to all my friends who are residents of the state of Florida. I've written my elected officials in Tallahassee, and I'll be writing to Gov. Scott as well.

I'd love to hear something back from the PSC other than a form letter. If you have a leg to stand on and can offer up even the flimsiest of defenses for these reprehensible policies and decisions, I'd love to hear it.

Very disappointed,
Brian Koester
Largo, FL

Shawna Senko

From: Terry Holdnak
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 4:56 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket No. 130009-EI
Attachments: Docket #130009

Please place the attached in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thanks,
Terry

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

Shawna Senko

From: Steve Malagodi <smalagodi@live.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 3:43 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Cc: Office of Commissioner Brisé; Office of Commissioner Balbis; Office Of Commissioner Edgar; Office Of Commissioner Graham; Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Docket #130009

Commissioners:

The ongoing cost-recovery fee being charged by FPL and even more unfairly by Duke Energy is absurd and unwarranted.

Everybody knows that no new reactors will be built at Turkey Point; it is the stupidest place on the planet to build nuclear reactors. The whole place will be under water by the time any construction ~should there ever be any~ would be completed.

This fee is a complete scam. Do not approve it.

Stephen Malagodi
Boca Raton.

Shawna Senko

From: Randy Roland
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 10:04 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Subject: Docket 130009 - Duke Energy
Attachments: Docket 130009 - Nuclear Cost Recovery - Duke Energy Florida; To CLK Docket 130009

Please add the attached correspondence to Docket 130009.

Shawna Senko

From: Randy Roland
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 9:34 AM
To: 'LauraSue@SilverNightingale.com'
Subject: Docket 130009 - Nuclear Cost Recovery - Duke Energy Florida

Ms. Laura Sue Wilansky
LauraSue@SilverNightingale.com

Dear Ms. Wilansky,

This is in response to your E-mail to the Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) regarding your concerns with Duke Energy Florida (DEF) and the Nuclear Cost Recovery Charge.

The FPSC is currently reviewing the Revised and Restated Settlement Agreement filed by DEF and will schedule a Special Agenda in the coming weeks to discuss and consider the Agreement. You can access the Commission Calendar on our website homepage and watch the proceeding by clicking on the blue camera icon on the left side menu by using the following link:

<http://www.floridapsc.com>

Florida Statute 366.93 governs Commission decisions concerning nuclear cost recovery. You may review the statute by using the following link:

<http://www.flsenate.gov/laws/statutes/2011/366.93>

Your correspondence will be added to Docket 130009. If you have any questions or concerns you may call me at 1-800-342-3552 or by fax at 1-800-511-0809.

Sincerely,

Randy Roland
Regulatory Program Administrator
Florida Public Service Commission

Shawna Senko

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 4:28 PM
To: Randy Roland
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

Copy on file, see 1118340C. DHood

-----Original Message-----

From: Laura Sue Wilansky [<mailto:LauraSue@SilverNightingale.com>]
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 4:20 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a Florida Power and Light ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

More and more now, we are seeing utilities collect huge amounts of money for nuclear plants that will never be built, and then ask for even more money. Just this week, Duke Energy decided not to build the nuclear complex in Levy County, for which they have already collected a great deal of money. Now they want even more money because they're not building it!

We need to stop all nuclear cost recovery - early and other. If these companies cannot find their own investors, we, their customers (who have no choice but to purchase our electricity from them) should no longer be forced to invest in their risky, dirty and dangerous nuclear projects.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Laura Sue Wilansky
PO Box 24245
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33307

Shawna Senko

From: Randy Roland
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 9:17 AM
To: 'funkyp@bellsouth.net'
Subject: Docket 130009 - Nuclear Cost Recovery Charge-Duke Energy Florida

Mr. Michael Parker
funkyp@bellsouth.net

Dear Mr. Parker,

This is in response to your E-mail to the Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) regarding your concerns with Duke Energy Florida (DEF) and the Nuclear Cost Recovery Charge.

The FPSC is currently reviewing the Revised and Restated Settlement Agreement filed by DEF and will schedule a Special Agenda in the coming weeks to discuss and consider the Agreement. You can access the Commission Calendar on our website homepage and watch the proceeding by clicking on the blue camera icon on the left side menu by using the following link:

<http://www.floridapsc.com>

Florida Statute 366.93 governs Commission decisions concerning nuclear cost recovery. You may review the statute by using the following link:

<http://www.flsenate.gov/laws/statutes/2011/366.93>

If you have any questions or concerns please call Ellen Plendl at 1-800-342-3552 or by fax at 1-800-511-0809.

Sincerely,

Randy Roland
Regulatory Program Administrator
Florida Public Service Commission

Shawna Senko

From: Randy Roland
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 9:56 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Subject: Docket 130009 - Duke Energy
Attachments: To CLK Docket 130009- Response requested; Docket 130009 - Nuclear Cost Recovery Charge-Duke Energy Florida

Please add the attached customer correspondence to Docket 130009.

Shawna Senko

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 4:05 PM
To: Randy Roland
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009- Response requested

Copy on file, see 1118331C. DH

-----Original Message-----

From: Webmaster
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 3:44 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: FW: My contact

-----Original Message-----

From: contact@psc.state.fl.us [mailto:contact@psc.state.fl.us]
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 3:33 PM
To: Webmaster
Cc: funkyp@bellsouth.net
Subject: My contact

Contact from a Web user

Contact Information:
Name: Michael Parker
Company:
Primary Phone:
Secondary Phone:
Email: funkyp@bellsouth.net

Response requested? Yes
CC Sent? Yes

Comments:

When the PSC first approved the Levy county nuclear project I wrote to each and every member of the PSC at that time. I received 0 responses.

This travesty of a project was always a bad idea, the people should never have been forced to pay for the upfront costs, nor should we still be getting billed higher rates for a project that has now (thankfully) been cancelled.

So we pay Duke energy to not provide energy?

We were ripped off, with your approval, and now we can only get back whatever Duke can recoup from unused equipment?

How can you possibly approve of and justify such pilfering of our money?

Shame on the PSC, the State Legislature, and Governors Scott and Bush for pushing this wasteful project and stealing the money of ratepayers.

Where are our refunds for this fraud of a project?

Shawna Senko

From: Randy Roland
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 9:17 AM
To: 'funkyp@bellsouth.net'
Subject: Docket 130009 - Nuclear Cost Recovery Charge-Duke Energy Florida

Mr. Michael Parker
funkyp@bellsouth.net

Dear Mr. Parker,

This is in response to your E-mail to the Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) regarding your concerns with Duke Energy Florida (DEF) and the Nuclear Cost Recovery Charge.

The FPSC is currently reviewing the Revised and Restated Settlement Agreement filed by DEF and will schedule a Special Agenda in the coming weeks to discuss and consider the Agreement. You can access the Commission Calendar on our website homepage and watch the proceeding by clicking on the blue camera icon on the left side menu by using the following link:

<http://www.floridapsc.com>

Florida Statute 366.93 governs Commission decisions concerning nuclear cost recovery. You may review the statute by using the following link:

<http://www.flsenate.gov/laws/statutes/2011/366.93>

If you have any questions or concerns please call Ellen Plendl at 1-800-342-3552 or by fax at 1-800-511-0809.

Sincerely,

Randy Roland
Regulatory Program Administrator
Florida Public Service Commission

Shawna Senko

From: Cristina Slaton
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 9:54 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket Correspondence 130009-EI
Attachments: your vote; Good Move

Please place the attached in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thanks,

Cristina Slaton
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Bulbis
PH: (850) 413-6004
TX: (850) 413-6005
cslaton@psc.state.fl.us

Shawna Senko

From: Clint Miller <clint.s.miller@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 7:13 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: your vote

I'd like to know if you voted for or against raising rates to continue to pay for Duke Energy's now shuttered nuclear power plant.

--

Respectfully,

Clint

Voice: 407.588.7402

Shawna Senko

From: James Oram <jimoram@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 10:26 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Good Move

It is wonderful that the PSC has given a green light for Duke to raise rates while the common person is still feeling the effects of a poor economy. This is just another indicator of how out-of-touch public servants, such as yourself, are with the common person. Good luck on judgment day.

Sincerely,

James Oram
20535 SW Audubon Ave
Dunnellon, FL 34431

Do not go where the path may lead, go instead where there is no path and leave a trail.
-Ralph Waldo Emerson

Shawna Senko

From: Pamela Paultre
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 9:43 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket Correspondence
Attachments: Untitled

Eric,

Please place the forwarded or enclosed correspondence in Docket Correspondence of Consumers and their representatives for docket no. 130009.

Thank you,

Pamela Paultre
Assistant to Chairman Ronald Brisé
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6036

Shawna Senko

From: James Oram <jimoram@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 10:26 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé

It is wonderful that the PSC has given a green light for Duke to raise rates while the common person is still feeling the effects of a poor economy. This is just another indicator of how out-of-touch public servants, such as yourself, are with the common person. Good luck on judgment day.

Sincerely,

James Oram
20535 SW Audubon Ave
Dunnellon, FL 34431

Do not go where the path may lead, go instead where there is no path and leave a trail.
-Ralph Waldo Emerson

Shawna Senko

From: Terry Holdnak
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 4:56 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket No. 130009-EI
Attachments: Docket #130009

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Please place the attached in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thanks,
Terry

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

Shawna Senko

From: Steve Malagodi <smalagodi@live.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 3:43 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Cc: Office of Commissioner Brisé; Office of Commissioner Balbis; Office Of Commissioner Edgar; Office Of Commissioner Graham; Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Docket #130009

Commissioners:

The ongoing cost-recovery fee being charged by FPL and even more unfairly by Duke Energy is absurd and unwarranted.

Everybody knows that no new reactors will be built at Turkey Point; it is the stupidest place on the planet to build nuclear reactors. The whole place will be under water by the time any construction ~should there ever be any~ would be completed.

This fee is a complete scam. Do not approve it.

Stephen Malagodi
Boca Raton.

Hong Wang

From: Angie Calhoun
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 4:53 PM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: Docket 130208
Attachments: To CLK Docket #130009 ; To CLK Docket 130208

Please enter the attached correspondence to the customer correspondence side of docket 130208.

Thank you,

Angela Calhoun

Shawna Senko

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 3:51 PM
To: Randy Roland
Subject: To CLK Docket #130009

Copy on file, see 1118744C. DHood

From: Steve Malagodi [<mailto:smalagodi@live.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 3:43 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Cc: Office of Commissioner Brisé; Office of Commissioner Balbis; Office Of Commissioner Edgar; Office Of Commissioner Graham; Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Docket #130009

Commissioners:

The ongoing cost-recovery fee being charged by FPL and even more unfairly by Duke Energy is absurd and unwarranted.

Everybody knows that no new reactors will be built at Turkey Point; it is the stupidest place on the planet to build nuclear reactors. The whole place will be under water by the time any construction ~should there ever be any~ would be completed.

This fee is a complete scam. Do not approve it.

*Stephen Malagodi
Boca Raton.*

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 11:47 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009

Customer correspondence

-----Original Message-----

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 11:45 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

Copy on file, see 1118361C. DH

-----Original Message-----

From: Barbara Laxon [<mailto:otrbarbinpeace@comcast.net>]
Sent: Sunday, August 04, 2013 11:36 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Barbara Laxon
1778 sw 85 ave
Miramar, FL 33025

Shawna Senko

From: Terry Holdnak
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 9:09 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket No. 130009-EI
Attachments: Your vote; Untitled; Power company = Power over government

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Please place the attached in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thanks,
Terry

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Shawna Senko

From: Clint Miller <clint.s.miller@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2013 7:13 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Your vote

I'd like to know if you voted for or against raising rates to support the now shuttered Duke nuclear power plant.

--

Respectfully,

Clint

Voice: 407.588.7402

Shawna Senko

From: James Oram <jimoram@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 10:29 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown

It is wonderful that the PSC has given a green light for Duke to raise rates while the common person is still feeling the effects of a poor economy. This is just another indicator of how out-of-touch public servants, such as yourself, are with the common person. Good luck on judgment day.

Sincerely,

James Oram
20535 SW Audubon Ave
Dunnellon, FL 34431

Do not go where the path may lead, go instead where there is no path and leave a trail.
-Ralph Waldo Emerson

Shawna Senko

From: Mark Winder <mwinder2@centurylink.net>
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 6:38 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown; Office of Commissioner Balbis; Office Of Commissioner Edgar; Office of Commissioner Brisé; Office Of Commissioner Graham; Consumer Contact
Subject: Power company = Power over government
Importance: High

To all, it appears that you work for the power companies and not the people! Do any of you own a buisness? Are any of you still charging costumers for services no longer provided? Are any of you collecting payment for services that will never be provided?

Apparently you are!!! And feel comfortable allowing others to do so also.

Or maybe you are recieving payment from them as well! Who Knows!!!

How can you justify these actions, law or no law! Make the laws make sense, not make the power companies money!

Our Government at work for us... I mean the power companies!!!!

Get Real people!!!

Mark Winder

Shawna Senko

From: Terry Holdnak
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 1:00 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket No. 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thanks,
Terry

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

Shawna Senko

From: Barbara Laxon <otrbarbinpeace@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, August 04, 2013 11:36 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Barbara Laxon
1778 sw 85 ave
Miramar, FL 33025

Shawna Senko

From: Laura Sue Wilansky <LauraSue@SilverNightingale.com>
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 4:20 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a Florida Power and Light ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

More and more now, we are seeing utilities collect huge amounts of money for nuclear plants that will never be built, and then ask for even more money. Just this week, Duke Energy decided not to build the nuclear complex in Levy County, for which they have already collected a great deal of money. Now they want even more money because they're not building it!

We need to stop all nuclear cost recovery - early and other. If these companies cannot find their own investors, we, their customers (who have no choice but to purchase our electricity from them) should no longer be forced to invest in their risky, dirty and dangerous nuclear projects.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Laura Sue Wilansky
PO Box 24245
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33307

8/5/2013 9:28 AM

Shawna Senko

From: Barbara Laxon <otrbarbinpeace@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, August 04, 2013 11:36 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Barbara Laxon
1778 sw 85 ave
Miramar, FL 33025

Shawna Senko

From: Laura Sue Wilansky <LauraSue@SilverNightingale.com>
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 4:20 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a Florida Power and Light ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

More and more now, we are seeing utilities collect huge amounts of money for nuclear plants that will never be built, and then ask for even more money. Just this week, Duke Energy decided not to build the nuclear complex in Levy County, for which they have already collected a great deal of money. Now they want even more money because they're not building it!

We need to stop all nuclear cost recovery - early and other. If these companies cannot find their own investors, we, their customers (who have no choice but to purchase our electricity from them) should no longer be forced to invest in their risky, dirty and dangerous nuclear projects.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Laura Sue Wilansky
PO Box 24245
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33307

Shawna Senko

From: winnie foster <wfoster26@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 10:34 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

winnie foster
311 57th ave so
st petersburg, FL 33705

Shawna Senko

From: nThomas Eck <tweck321@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 9:49 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

nThomas Eck
14300 66th St N Lot 113
Clearwater, FL 33764

Shawna Senko

From: Argelys Pena <argelys@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 8:18 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Argelys Pena
19620 Pines Blvd Suite 217
Pembroke Pines, FL 33029

Shawna Senko

From: david hollister <ddhollister@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 6:00 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

david hollister
357 41st ave
st pete beach, FL 33706

Shawna Senko

From: Bonnie Netherton <bonniechickpea@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 4:33 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Bonnie Netherton
19656 Canal Drive
Sugarloaf Key, FL 33042

Shawna Senko

From: Preston Whetstone <pj3whetstone@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 5:41 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Preston Whetstone
2303 Ray Rd
Valrico, FL 33594

Shawna Senko

From: Carol Vanek <cvanek@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 7:40 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Carol Vanek
1211 Lake Como Drive
Lutz, FL 33558

Shawna Senko

From: Mary Detrick <mary13ld@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 7:10 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Mary Detrick
2065 North Highland Ave.
L178
Clearwater, FL 33755

Shawna Senko

From: Vaughn Anderson <vna@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 6:36 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Florida does not need nor want nuclear energy.

Thank you,

Vaughn Anderson
6205 Shoreline Dr
Apt 1101
St. Petersburg, FL 33708

Shawna Senko

From: Linda Paleias <swordbrush@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 6:17 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Linda Paleias
3300 ne 36 street
ft. lauderdale, FL 33308

Shawna Senko

From: Drew Martin <dmandch@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 5:07 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Drew Martin
500 Lake Ave # 102
Lake Worth, FL 33460

Shawna Senko

From: Rose Eckert <rosemme@att.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 4:38 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Rose Eckert
784 Providence Island Court
Jacksonville, FL 32225

Shawna Senko

From: Bob Fay <RFay808700@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 3:14 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Bob Fay
4000 24th St. N.
St. Petersburg, FL 33714

Shawna Senko

From: Bob Fay <RFay808700@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 3:14 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Bob Fay
4000 24th St. N.
St. Petersburg, FL 33714

Shawna Senko

From: Mary Ann Holtz <maryannwalt@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:39 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Mary Ann Holtz
4569 8th Avenue, N
St. Petersburg, FL 33713

Shawna Senko

From: Brian Paradise <bgparadise@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:32 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Brian Paradise
13 Arbor Club Drt. # 315
Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082

Shawna Senko

From: Monica Mayer <scribbler1990@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:26 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Monica Mayer
2826 Oakville Place
Oviedo, FL 32765

Shawna Senko

From: J Smith <bureau165@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:18 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

J Smith
P.O Box 330851
Miami, FL 33233

Shawna Senko

From: Nina Tatlock <tatlock@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 1:52 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Nina Tatlock
1413 Beach Club Ln
Apollo Beach, FL 33572

Shawna Senko

From: Thomas Washburn <ameliaislanders119@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 12:45 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Thomas Washburn
1609 Lake Park Dr.
Fernandina Beach, FL 32034

Shawna Senko

From: Jim May <uwannaiguana@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 12:37 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Jim May
1415 Dean St
Apt 306
Fort Myers, FL 33901

Shawna Senko

From: Jennifer Scott <jjscott9@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 12:20 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Jennifer Scott
15930 Bayside Pointe West #703
Fort Myers, FL 33908

Shawna Senko

From: Caroline Miller <cmiller1049@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 11:54 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Caroline Miller
6834 4th Ave No
St Petersburg, FL 33710

Shawna Senko

From: Susan Linden <suelinden@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 11:15 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Susan Linden
1061 hunt st nw
Palm Bay, FL 32907

Shawna Senko

From: Alan Kardoff <mgmtdr@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:50 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I oppose. We have had reactors proposed that are not built yet but the tax is already on.

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Alan Kardoff
778 antilles rd ne
palm bay, FL 32907

Shawna Senko

From: Larry Trecartin <jmcalvi01832@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:15 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Larry Trecartin
2529 Sandy Hill Court
Holiday, FL 34691

Shawna Senko

From: Rebecca Muzychka <b.muzyk@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:14 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Rebecca Muzychka
2105 S. Miami Road
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316

Shawna Senko

From: judi trecartin <jmcalvi01832@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:14 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

judi trecartin
2529 sandy hill court
Holiday, FL 34691

Shawna Senko

From: Ray Bellamy <ray.bellamy@med.fsu.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 9:40 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Ray Bellamy
509 vinnedge ride
tallahassee, FL 32303

Shawna Senko

From: Cristina Slaton
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 10:42 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket Correspondence 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Duke Energy

Please place the attached emails in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,

Cristina Slaton
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Balbis
PH: (850) 413-6004
JX: (850) 413-6005
cslaton@psc.state.fl.us

Shawna Senko

From: Barbara Laxon <otrbarbinpeace@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, August 04, 2013 11:36 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Barbara Laxon
1778 sw 85 ave
Miramar, FL 33025

Shawna Senko

From: Laura Sue Wilansky <LauraSue@SilverNightingale.com>
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 4:20 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a Florida Power and Light ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

More and more now, we are seeing utilities collect huge amounts of money for nuclear plants that will never be built, and then ask for even more money. Just this week, Duke Energy decided not to build the nuclear complex in Levy County, for which they have already collected a great deal of money. Now they want even more money because they're not building it!

We need to stop all nuclear cost recovery - early and other. If these companies cannot find their own investors, we, their customers (who have no choice but to purchase our electricity from them) should no longer be forced to invest in their risky, dirty and dangerous nuclear projects.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Laura Sue Wilansky
PO Box 24245
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33307

Shawna Senko

From: Ed West AND Leigh Westcott <fwest22@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 3:52 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Duke Energy

Dear Sir;

It is important that you & your fellow members not allow Duke Energy to continue the pillaging of their customers here in Florida. In good faith we have paid our bills with the expectation of the increased charges we incurred for the nuclear plant to be built, to actually be built. Now that Duke Energy has decided not to build that plant, it is the belief of most consumers that those monies be returned to us as either cash refunds or credit on future electric bills. This is not, in any way, an unreasonable expectation. I would hope that you & your fellow commission members will make this your first priority. This is no small task as more than a billion dollars is in question. Please do not act with Duke Energy's interest at heart, as it seems you & your fellow members have acted in the past. Act instead, as if you had a decent heart & mind. You are a Floridian and I would hope that you would take pride in doing the right thing for fellow Floridians, native & transplant alike.

Thank you,
F. Ed West

Shawna Senko

From: Terry Holdnak
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 5:02 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket No. 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached email in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

Shawna Senko

From: Laura Sue Wilansky <LauraSue@SilverNightingale.com>
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 4:20 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a Florida Power and Light ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

More and more now, we are seeing utilities collect huge amounts of money for nuclear plants that will never be built, and then ask for even more money. Just this week, Duke Energy decided not to build the nuclear complex in Levy County, for which they have already collected a great deal of money. Now they want even more money because they're not building it!

We need to stop all nuclear cost recovery - early and other. If these companies cannot find their own investors, we, their customers (who have no choice but to purchase our electricity from them) should no longer be forced to invest in their risky, dirty and dangerous nuclear projects.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Laura Sue Wilansky
PO Box 24245
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33307

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 3:49 PM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Customer correspondence

From: Diane Hood
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 8:47 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

These have been added as info request to docket 130009, PR-69 DH

Shawna Senko

From: Bonnie Netherton <bonniechickpea@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 4:33 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Bonnie Netherton
19656 Canal Drive
Sugarloaf Key, FL 33042

Shawna Senko

From: david hollister <ddhollister@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 6:00 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

david hollister
357 41st ave
st pete beach, FL 33706

Shawna Senko

From: Argelys Pena <argelys@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 8:18 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Argelys Pena
19620 Pines Blvd Suite 217
Pembroke Pines, FL 33029

Shawna Senko

From: nThomas Eck <tweck321@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 9:49 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

nThomas Eck
14300 66th St N Lot 113
Clearwater, FL 33764

Shawna Senko

From: winnie foster <wfoster26@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 10:34 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

winnie foster
311 57th ave so
st petersburg, FL 33705

Shawna Senko

From: Cristina Slaton
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 9:39 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket Correspondence 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Duke Energy

Please place the attached emails in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,

Cristina Slaton
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Balbis
PH: (850) 413-6004
FX: (850) 413-6005
cslaton@psc.state.fl.us

Shawna Senko

From: winnie foster <wfoster26@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 10:34 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

winnie foster
311 57th ave so
st petersburg, FL 33705

Shawna Senko

From: nThomas Eck <tweck321@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 9:49 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

nThomas Eck
14300 66th St N Lot 113
Clearwater, FL 33764

Shawna Senko

From: Argelys Pena <argelys@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 8:18 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Argelys Pena
19620 Pines Blvd Suite 217
Pembroke Pines, FL 33029

Shawna Senko

From: david hollister <ddhollister@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 6:00 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

david hollister
357 41st ave
st pete beach, FL 33706

Shawna Senko

From: Bonnie Netherton <bonniechickpea@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 4:33 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Bonnie Netherton
19656 Canal Drive
Sugarloaf Key, FL 33042

Shawna Senko

From: Kevin King <kking1@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 6:36 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Cc: Office Of Commissioner Edgar; Office of Commissioner Brisé; Office Of Commissioner Graham; Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Duke Energy

TO: Florida Public Service Commissioners:

Today I saw an article on Bay News 9 in the Tampa, FL area that Duke Energy has decided not to build the \$24.7 Billion Levy County Nuclear Power Plant. This plant was proposed and a Nuclear cost recovery fee was approved by the Public Service Commission. This means that Florida Residents who are forced to use Duke Energy as their power provider (because there is no other provider available to us) have paid \$1.5 billion to Duke Energy for this proposed plant. Considering the fact that Duke Energy has decided not to build this power plant, I am respectfully requesting that the Public Service Commission work with Duke Energy and require that every penny of the \$1.5 billion collected so far is returned to its customers. Additionally I would respectfully request that any future power plants that are proposed by Duke Energy or any other power company in Florida be denied a Nuclear cost recovery fee until after the plant has been built or at least construction has begun. You should Require the Power companies to obtain funding for these power plants from investors, or other sources, then be permitted to recover these costs only after the plant is built or construction has comenced. This will ensure that they are not stealing from their customers, as would appear to be the case here if they do not return the money!!!

Regards

Kevin King

Shawna Senko

From: Terry Holdnak
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 8:25 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket No. 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Duke Energy; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached emails in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

Shawna Senko

From: winnie foster <wfoster26@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 10:34 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

winnie foster
311 57th ave so
st petersburg, FL 33705

Shawna Senko

From: nThomas Eck <tweck321@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 9:49 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

nThomas Eck
14300 66th St N Lot 113
Clearwater, FL 33764

Shawna Senko

From: Argelys Pena <argelys@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 8:18 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Argelys Pena
19620 Pines Blvd Suite 217
Pembroke Pines, FL 33029

Shawna Senko

From: Kevin King <kking1@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 6:36 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Cc: Office Of Commissioner Edgar; Office of Commissioner Brisé; Office Of Commissioner Graham; Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Duke Energy

TO: Florida Public Service Commissioners:

Today I saw an article on Bay News 9 in the Tampa, FL area that Duke Energy has decided not to build the \$24.7 Billion Levy County Nuclear Power Plant. This plant was proposed and a Nuclear cost recovery fee was approved by the Public Service Commission. This means that Florida Residents who are forced to use Duke Energy as their power provider (because there is no other provider available to us) have paid \$1.5 billion to Duke Energy for this proposed plant. Considering the fact that Duke Energy has decided not to build this power plant, I am respectfully requesting that the Public Service Commission work with Duke Energy and require that every penny of the \$1.5 billion collected so far is returned to its customers. Additionally I would respectfully request that any future power plants that are proposed by Duke Energy or any other power company in Florida be denied a Nuclear cost recovery fee until after the plant has been built or at least construction has begun. You should Require the Power companies to obtain funding for these power plants from investors, or other sources, then be permitted to recover these costs only after the plant is built or construction has commenced. This will ensure that they are not stealing from their customers, as would appear to be the case here if they do not return the money!!!

Regards

Kevin King

Shawna Senko

From: david hollister <ddhollister@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 6:00 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

david hollister
357 41st ave
st pete beach, FL 33706

Shawna Senko

From: Bonnie Netherton <bonniechickpea@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 4:33 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Bonnie Netherton
19656 Canal Drive
Sugarloaf Key, FL 33042

Shawna Senko

From: Cristina Slaton
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 3:54 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket Correspondence 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached emails in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,

Cristina Slaton
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Balbis
PH: (850) 413-6004
FX: (850) 413-6005
cslaton@psc.state.fl.us

Shawna Senko

From: J.C. Exposito <exposito.jc@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 8:27 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

J.C. Exposito
3470 East Coast Ave.
Miami, FL 33137

Shawna Senko

From: Preston Whetstone <pj3whetstone@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 5:41 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Preston Whetstone
2303 Ray Rd
Valrico, FL 33594

Shawna Senko

From: Carol Vanek <cvanek@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 7:40 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Carol Vanek
1211 Lake Como Drive
Lutz, FL 33558

Shawna Senko

From: Mary Detrick <mary13ld@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 7:10 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Mary Detrick
2065 North Highland Ave.
L178
Clearwater, FL 33755

Shawna Senko

From: Vaughn Anderson <vna@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 6:36 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Florida does not need nor want nuclear energy.

Thank you,

Vaughn Anderson
6205 Shoreline Dr
Apt 1101
St. Petersburg, FL 33708

Shawna Senko

From: Linda Paleias <swordbrush@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 6:17 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Linda Paleias
3300 ne 36 street
ft. lauderdale, FL 33308

Shawna Senko

From: Drew Martin <dmandch@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 5:07 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Drew Martin
500 Lake Ave # 102
Lake Worth, FL 33460

Shawna Senko

From: Rose Eckert <roseemme@att.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 4:38 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Rose Eckert
784 Providence Island Court
Jacksonville, FL 32225

Shawna Senko

From: Bob Fay <RFay808700@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 3:14 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Bob Fay
4000 24th St. N.
St. Petersburg, FL 33714

Shawna Senko

From: Terry Holdnak
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 2:03 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket No. 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached emails in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

Shawna Senko

From: J.C. Exposito <exposito.jc@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 8:27 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

J.C. Exposito
3470 East Coast Ave.
Miami, FL 33137

Shawna Senko

From: Preston Whetstone <pj3whetstone@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 5:41 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Preston Whetstone
2303 Ray Rd
Valrico, FL 33594

Shawna Senko

From: Carol Vanek <cvanek@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 7:40 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Carol Vanek
1211 Lake Como Drive
Lutz, FL 33558

Shawna Senko

From: Mary Detrick <mary13ld@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 7:10 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Mary Detrick
2065 North Highland Ave.
L178
Clearwater, FL 33755

Shawna Senko

From: Vaughn Anderson <vna@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 6:36 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Florida does not need nor want nuclear energy.

Thank you,

Vaughn Anderson
6205 Shoreline Dr
Apt 1101
St. Petersburg, FL 33708

Shawna Senko

From: Linda Paleias <swordbrush@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 6:17 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Linda Paleias
3300 ne 36 street
ft. lauderdale, FL 33308

Shawna Senko

From: Drew Martin <dmandch@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 5:07 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Drew Martin
500 Lake Ave # 102
Lake Worth, FL 33460

Eric Fryson

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 9:09 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Customer correspondence

From: Diane Hood
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 8:37 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

These have been added as info request to docket 130009, PR-69 DH

Eric Fryson

From: Rose Eckert <roseemme@att.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 4:38 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Rose Eckert
784 Providence Island Court
Jacksonville, FL 32225

Eric Fryson

From: Drew Martin <dmandch@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 5:07 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Drew Martin
500 Lake Ave # 102
Lake Worth, FL 33460

Eric Fryson

From: Linda Paleias <swordbrush@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 6:17 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Linda Paleias
3300 ne 36 street
ft. lauderdale, FL 33308

Eric Fryson

From: Vaughn Anderson <vna@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 6:36 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Florida does not need nor want nuclear energy.

Thank you,

Vaughn Anderson
6205 Shoreline Dr
Apt 1101
St. Petersburg, FL 33708

Eric Fryson

From: Mary Detrick <mary13ld@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 7:10 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Mary Detrick
2065 North Highland Ave.
L178
Clearwater, FL 33755

Eric Fryson

From: Carol Vanek <cvanek@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 7:40 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Carol Vanek
1211 Lake Como Drive
Lutz, FL 33558

Eric Fryson

From: Preston Whetstone <pj3whetstone@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 5:41 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Preston Whetstone
2303 Ray Rd
Valrico, FL 33594

Eric Fryson

From: J.C. Exposito <exposito.jc@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 8:27 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

J.C. Exposito
3470 East Coast Ave.
Miami, FL 33137

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 5:19 PM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Customer correspondence

From: Diane Hood
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 3:52 PM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

These have been added as info request to docket 130009, PR-69 DH

Shawna Senko

From: J Smith <bureau165@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:18 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

J Smith
P.O Box 330851
Miami, FL 33233

Shawna Senko

From: Brian Paradise <bgparadise@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:32 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Brian Paradise
13 Arbor Club Drt. # 315
Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082

Shawna Senko

From: Bob Fay <RFay808700@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 3:14 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Bob Fay
4000 24th St. N.
St. Petersburg, FL 33714

Shawna Senko

From: Monica Mayer <scribbler1990@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:26 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Monica Mayer
2826 Oakville Place
Oviedo, FL 32765

Shawna Senko

From: Mary Ann Holtz <maryannwalt@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:39 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Mary Ann Holtz
4569 8th Avenue, N
St. Petersburg, FL 33713

Shawna Senko

From: Terry Holdnak
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 5:03 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket No. 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please place the attached emails in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,

*Ms. Terry Holdnak
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Julie I. Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
tholdnak@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6030 (Office)
(850) 413-6031 (Fax)*

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

Shawna Senko

From: Rose Eckert <roseemme@att.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 4:38 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Rose Eckert
784 Providence Island Court
Jacksonville, FL 32225

Shawna Senko

From: Mary Ann Holtz <maryannwalt@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:39 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Mary Ann Holtz
4569 8th Avenue, N
St. Petersburg, FL 33713

Shawna Senko

From: Monica Mayer <scribbler1990@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:26 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Monica Mayer
2826 Oakville Place
Oviedo, FL 32765

Shawna Senko

From: Bob Fay <RFay808700@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 3:14 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Bob Fay
4000 24th St. N.
St. Petersburg, FL 33714

Shawna Senko

From: Brian Paradise <bgparadise@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:32 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Brian Paradise
13 Arbor Club Drt. # 315
Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082

Shawna Senko

From: J Smith <bureau165@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:18 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

J Smith
P.O Box 330851
Miami, FL 33233

Eric Fryson

From: Cristina Slaton
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:44 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket Correspondence 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; letter about electric service shut off for person with medical needs.; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Please place the attached emails in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,

Cristina Slaton
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Balbis
PH: (850) 413-6004
FX: (850) 413-6005
cslaton@psc.state.fl.us

Eric Fryson

From: Mary Ann Holtz <maryannwalt@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:39 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Mary Ann Holtz
4569 8th Avenue, N
St. Petersburg, FL 33713

Eric Fryson

From: Brian Paradise <bgparadise@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:32 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Brian Paradise
13 Arbor Club Drt. # 315
Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082

Eric Fryson

From: Monica Mayer <scribbler1990@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:26 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Monica Mayer
2826 Oakville Place
Oviedo, FL 32765

Eric Fryson

From: J Smith <bureau165@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:18 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

J Smith
P.O Box 330851
Miami, FL 33233

Eric Fryson

From: Lori Stromberg <Lorijs1@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:18 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: letter about electric service shut off for person with medical needs.
Attachments: img006.jpg

Eric Fryson

From: Nina Tatlock <tatlock@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 1:52 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Nina Tatlock
1413 Beach Club Ln
Apollo Beach, FL 33572

Eric Fryson

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:41 PM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Customer correspondence

From: Diane Hood
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 2:03 PM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

These have been added as info request to docket 130009, PR-69 DH

Eric Fryson

From: Caroline Miller <cmiller1049@tampabay.rr.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 11:54 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Caroline Miller
6834 4th Ave No
St Petersburg, FL 33710

Eric Fryson

From: PATTI CONSTANTINO-MARTIN <PPATTIPLCSAM@AOL.COM>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 12:01 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

The prices are outrageous now. I am paying \$350 a month. My weekly paycheck does not amount to that. How do you expect people to pay this?

Thank you,

PATTI CONSTANTINO-MARTIN
17249 Helen K Dr
SPRING HILL, FL 34610

Eric Fryson

From: Jennifer Scott <jjscott9@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 12:20 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Jennifer Scott
15930 Bayside Pointe West #703
Fort Myers, FL 33908

Eric Fryson

From: Jim May <uwannaiguana@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 12:37 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Jim May
1415 Dean St
Apt 306
Fort Myers, FL 33901

Eric Fryson

From: Thomas Washburn <ameliaislanders119@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 12:45 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Thomas Washburn
1609 Lake Park Dr.
Fernandina Beach, FL 32034

Eric Fryson

From: Nina Tatlock <tatlock@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 1:52 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Nina Tatlock
1413 Beach Club Ln
Apollo Beach, FL 33572

7/31/2013 2:20 PM

Shawna Senko

From: Rebecca Muzychka <b.muzyk@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:14 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Rebecca Muzychka
2105 S. Miami Road
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316

Shawna Senko

From: Ray Bellamy <ray.bellamy@med.fsu.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 9:40 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Ray Bellamy
509 vinnedge ride
tallahassee, FL 32303

Shawna Senko

From: Larry Trecartin <jmcalvi01832@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:15 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Larry Trecartin
2529 Sandy Hill Court
Holiday, FL 34691

Shawna Senko

From: judi trecartin <jmcalvi01832@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:14 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

judi trecartin
2529 sandy hill court
Holiday, FL 34691

Shawna Senko

From: Thomas Washburn <ameliaislanders119@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 12:45 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy Florida) ratepayer, writing to ask that you please reject the utility's request for nuclear cost recovery in Docket 130009. I have watched powerlessly as my bill has risen year after year. I heard the utilities testify last year that they have not even committed to building these reactors. This cannot be allowed to continue.

I also would like to express my continued dismay that the Public Service Commission is not allowing the public to comment during the hearings on these proceedings. Aren't rate cases usually more open to public scrutiny?

Thank you,

Thomas Washburn
1609 Lake Park Dr.
Fernandina Beach, FL 32034

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 1:38 PM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Customer correspondence

From: Diane Hood
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 11:37 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

These have been added as info request to docket 130009, PR-69 DH

Shawna Senko

From: Rebecca Muzychka <b.muzyk@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:14 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Rebecca Muzychka
2105 S. Miami Road
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316

Shawna Senko

From: Larry Trecartin <jmcalvi01832@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:15 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Larry Trecartin
2529 Sandy Hill Court
Holiday, FL 34691

Shawna Senko

From: Susan Linden <suelinden@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 11:15 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Susan Linden
1061 hunt st nw
Palm Bay, FL 32907

Shawna Senko

From: judi trecartin <jmcalvi01832@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:14 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

judi trecartin
2529 sandy hill court
Holiday, FL 34691

Shawna Senko

From: Alan Kardoff <mgmtdr@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:50 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I oppose. We have had reactors proposed that are not built yet but the tax is already on.

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Alan Kardoff
778 antilles rd ne
palm bay, FL 32907

Shawna Senko

From: Alan Kardoff <mgmtdr@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:50 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I oppose. We have had reactors proposed that are not built yet but the tax is already on.

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Alan Kardoff
778 antilles rd ne
palm bay, FL 32907

Shawna Senko

From: Jorge Garriga <jlg622@drexel.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 11:21 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Jorge Garriga
9581 Fontainebleau Blvd Apt #110
Miami, FL 33172

Shawna Senko

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:12 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009

Customer correspondence

-----Original Message-----

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 9:44 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

Copy on file, see 1117919C. DHood

-----Original Message-----

From: Ray Bellamy [<mailto:ray.bellamy@med.fsu.edu>]
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 9:40 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

Ray Bellamy
509 vinnedge ride
tallahassee, FL 32303

Shawna Senko

From: Katherine Fleming
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 11:23 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket NO. 130009-EI
Attachments: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests; Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please place the attached emails in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,

Katherine E. Fleming
Chief Advisor to Commissioner Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6028 (Office)
(850) 413-6029 (Facsimile)

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

Shawna Senko

From: Jorge Garriga <jlg622@drexel.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 11:21 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Jorge Garriga
9581 Fontainebleau Blvd Apt #110
Miami, FL 33172

Shawna Senko

From: Alan Kardoff <mgmtdr@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:50 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

I oppose. We have had reactors proposed that are not built yet but the tax is already on.

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Alan Kardoff
778 antilles rd ne
palm bay, FL 32907

Shawna Senko

From: Rebecca Muzychka <b.muzyk@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:14 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Rebecca Muzychka
2105 S. Miami Road
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316

Shawna Senko

From: Susan Linden <suelinden@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 11:15 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Susan Linden
1061 hunt st nw
Palm Bay, FL 32907

Shawna Senko

From: Larry Trecartin <jmcalvi01832@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:15 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please consider the impact that nuclear cost recovery rate increases are having on Florida's consumers. My bill, for instance, continues to go up, yet the promises of new nuclear generation is getting ever more expensive with continual delays.

I believe that Florida needs to focus on tangible, affordable energy solutions such as energy efficiency, not expensive new nuclear reactors that may never even be built!

Please deny approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009.

Thank you,

Larry Trecartin
2529 Sandy Hill Court
Holiday, FL 34691

Shawna Senko

From: judi trecartin <jmcalvi01832@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2013 10:14 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Please oppose nuclear cost recovery requests

Re: Docket 130009

Please suspend further approval of nuclear cost recovery, as will be considered under Docket 130009. I am a (Florida Power and Light / Duke Energy) ratepayer that has watched my bill creep further upwards, just as the cost of these new nuclear projects has been pushed ever higher and the completion dates pushed ever further into the future.

Florida's ratepayers need a Public Service Commission that stands up for the public's interests in addition to the needs of the utilities, not just one that "decides what's best" for the public, based on biased information provided by the utilities. We need more transparency in these proceedings.

Thank you,

judi trecartin
2529 sandy hill court
Holiday, FL 34691

Shawna Senko

PRE-APPENDED
JUL 31, 2013 - 10:41 A.M.
DOCUMENT NO. 00302-13

From: John McMurphy
Sent: Tuesday, July 30, 2013 4:42 PM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: RE: To CLK Docket 130009

Customer correspondence

-----Original Message-----

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Tuesday, July 30, 2013 1:44 PM
To: Martha McClendon
Subject: RE: To CLK Docket 130009

Copy on file, see 13178471 PD

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, July 30, 2013 2:41 PM
Cc: Consumer Contact
Subject: E-Form Other Complaint TRACKING NUMBER: 34027

CUSTOMER INFORMATION

Name: Martha McClendon
Telephone: 850 980 6009
Email: [REDACTED]
Address: 295 W Palmer Rd #4444 Tallahassee, FL 32310

BUSINESS INFORMATION

~~Business Name: [REDACTED]~~

Account Number:
Address: 295 W Palmer Rd #4444 Tallahassee, FL 32310

COMPLAINT INFORMATION

Complaint: Other Complaint against Duke Energy Florida, Inc. d/b/a Duke Energy
Details:

It is my understanding that 3-5 years ago, the PSC allowed energy companies operating in Florida to increase their rates to pay for the construction of nuclear power plants. This was a bad idea from the beginning. If they wish to construct, they should obtain loans, like any other entity. The PSC should roll back any rate increase for such reason and refund this portion of the bills paid to the rate payers.

Eric Fryson

From: Ellen Plendl
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2013 12:46 PM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Subject: Docket Correspondence
Attachments: FW: P.S.C.; Consumer Inquiry - Electric charge; Re: Consumer Inquiry - Electric charge;
Consumer Inquiry - Duke Energy Florida; Re: Consumer Inquiry - Electric charge;
Consumer Inquiry - Duke Energy Florida

Please see attached correspondence and PSC response for Docket 130009-EI.

Eric Fryson

From: Governor Rick Scott <Rick.Scott@eog.myflorida.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 9:54 AM
To: Ellen Plendl
Cc: Sunburst
Subject: FW: P.S.C.

Original Message-----

From: Nelly Short [<mailto:nshort5@cfl.rr.com>]
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 9:48 AM
To: Governor Rick Scott
Subject: P.S.C.

From: Nelly Short <nshort5@cfl.rr.com>

County: Seminole

Zip Code: 32746

Message Body: My electric co. is charging us a fee for the privilege of using their service. The P.S.C. admits it was approved. Why did you remove commissioners that were willing to protect our rights against excessive charges? do you intend to change the P.S.C. back to a commission FOR the people or are you going to keep keep it as a Utility Service Commission? you have caused a burden for the low income seniors of Fla.

Eric Fryson

From: Ellen Plendl
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 9:58 AM
To: 'nshort5@cfl.rr.com'
Subject: Consumer Inquiry - Electric charge

Ms. Nelly Short
nshort5@cfl.rr.com

Dear Ms. Short:

The Governor's office forwarded a copy of your email regarding a disputed charge on your electric billing statement to the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC). The PSC regulates investor-owned electric, and natural gas utilities throughout the state, and investor-owned water and wastewater utilities in those counties which have opted to transfer jurisdiction to the PSC. The PSC has authority in the telephone industry which is limited to the Lifeline Assistance Program, Florida Relay Service, and pay telephone service. We appreciate the opportunity to assist you.

To assist you, please provide us with the following:

- * Your service address
- * Your mailing address
- * Your service telephone number
- * Your daytime contact telephone number
- * The name of your utility company
- * The name in which your electric bill is addressed
- * Your account number
- * The specific charge you are disputing as identified on your billing statement

You may respond by return e-mail or by calling me at 1-800-342-3552. I will look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Ellen Plendl
Regulatory Specialist
Florida Public Service Commission
Office of Consumer Assistance & Outreach
1-800-342-3552 (phone)
1-800-511-0809 (fax)

Eric Fryson

From: Nelly Short <nshort5@cfl.rr.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 10:40 AM
To: Ellen Plendl
Subject: Re: Consumer Inquiry - Electric charge

Service address and mailing address are the same. 168 W. Wilbur Av. Lake Mary Fl.. telephone number for service and daytime contact are the same, 407-321-5668. utility co... Progress Energy/Duke-----Billed to Arthur Short, acct. number 36637-20646----- customer charge of \$8.76

From: Ellen Plendl
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 9:58 AM
To: nshort5@cfl.rr.com
Subject: Consumer Inquiry - Electric charge

Ms. Nelly Short
nshort5@cfl.rr.com

Dear Ms. Short:

The Governor's office forwarded a copy of your email regarding a disputed charge on your electric billing statement to the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC). The PSC regulates investor-owned electric, and natural gas utilities throughout the state, and investor-owned water and wastewater utilities in those counties which have opted to transfer jurisdiction to the PSC. The PSC has authority in the telephone industry which is limited to the Lifeline Assistance Program, Florida Relay Service, and pay telephone service. We appreciate the opportunity to assist you.

To assist you, please provide us with the following:

- * Your service address
- * Your mailing address
- * Your service telephone number
- * Your daytime contact telephone number
- * The name of your utility company
- * The name in which your electric bill is addressed
- * Your account number
- * The specific charge you are disputing as identified on your billing statement

You may respond by return e-mail or by calling me at 1-800-342-3552. I will look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Ellen Plendl
Regulatory Specialist
Florida Public Service Commission
Office of Consumer Assistance & Outreach
1-800-342-3552 (phone)
1-800-511-0809 (fax)

Eric Fryson

From: Randy Roland
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 10:58 AM
To: 'nshort5@cfl.rr.com'
Subject: Consumer Inquiry - Duke Energy Florida

Ms. Nelly Short
nshort5@cfl.rr.com

Dear Ms. Short:

This is in response to your inquiry with the Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) regarding Duke Energy Florida, Incorporated (DEF), formerly Progress Energy Florida, Incorporated. You expressed a concern about DEF billing a customer charge to your electric account.

The costs associated with the customer charge can be classified as either customer accounting costs or fixed operating expenses incurred in providing certain transmission and distribution facilities. For instance, meter reading and customer billing are done monthly regardless of the customer's kilowatt-hour consumption level. As a result, DEF bills the usage separately, as this amount may fluctuate each month. Other expenses included are depreciation on certain utility installed equipment such as meters, distribution lines from the pole to the customer's premises, line transformers, and other expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of these items.

Progress Energy's tariff, 6.120, allows the company to bill a monthly customer charge of \$8.76 to your residential account. I have attached the company's tariff for your review.

Rule 25-6.100, Florida Administrative Code, requires electric utilities to bill the customer charge separately from the energy charge. I have also attached a copy of the rule for your review.

You may be interested in Emergency Home Energy Assistance for the Elderly (EHEAP), which provides assistance for home-energy emergencies to qualified, low-income households with at least one person 60 years of age or older. To find out about qualifications, you may contact your county's local EHEAP agency, or by calling 1-800-963-5337.

Complaints are a valuable source of information, and we will keep your complaint on file. We closely monitor complaints and track any trends indicating where further action might be needed.

If you have any questions or concerns please contact Ms. Ellen Plendl 1-800-342-3552 or by fax at 1-800-511-0809.

Sincerely,

Randy Roland
Regulatory Program Administrator
Florida Public Service Commission

<<

25-6.100.doc (30.0KB)

de-rates-RS-1.pdf (78.8KB)

(108.8KB)

>>

Eric Fryson

From: Nelly Short <nshort5@cfl.rr.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 07, 2013 2:52 PM
To: Ellen Plendl
Subject: Re: Consumer Inquiry - Electric charge

Service address and mailing address are the same..168 W Wilbur Ave. Lake Mary fl. 32746..Telephone..407-321-5668..daytime contact number is the same..Utility co is Duke Energy, until just recently it was progress energy..Bill is in the name of..Arthur Short..acct number 36637 20646..The disputed charge of "customer charge" of \$8.76 has been explained two ways by two different people..One is the cost of doing business,,or it is a charge to pay for a future energy plant that may or may not be built..Maybe some customers don't pay any attention to their bills but the ones of us straining under social security have to ..Our PSC is no longer a public service commission it is now A UTILITY service commission..I hope this answers all your questions..
Nelly Short

nshort5@cfl.rr.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Ellen Plendl
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 9:58 AM
To: nshort5@cfl.rr.com
Subject: Consumer Inquiry - Electric charge

Ms. Nelly Short
nshort5@cfl.rr.com

Dear Ms. Short:

The Governor's office forwarded a copy of your email regarding a disputed charge on your electric billing statement to the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC). The PSC regulates investor-owned electric, and natural gas utilities throughout the state, and investor-owned water and wastewater utilities in those counties which have opted to transfer jurisdiction to the PSC. The PSC has authority in the telephone industry which is limited to the Lifeline Assistance Program, Florida Relay Service, and pay telephone service. We appreciate the opportunity to assist you.

To assist you, please provide us with the following:

- * Your service address
- * Your mailing address
- * Your service telephone number
- * Your daytime contact telephone number
- * The name of your utility company
- * The name in which your electric bill is addressed
- * Your account number
- * The specific charge you are disputing as identified on your billing statement

You may respond by return e-mail or by calling me at 1-800-342-3552. I will look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Ellen Plendl
Regulatory Specialist
Florida Public Service Commission
Office of Consumer Assistance & Outreach
1-800-342-3552 (phone)
1-800-511-0809 (fax)

Eric Fryson

From: Ellen Plendl
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2013 12:44 PM
To: 'Nelly Short'
Subject: Consumer Inquiry - Duke Energy Florida
Attachments: 25-6.100.doc; de-rates-RS-1.pdf

Ms. Nelly Short
nshort5@cfl.rr.com

Dear Ms. Short:

This is in response to your inquiry with the Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) regarding Duke Energy Florida, Incorporated (DEF), formerly Progress Energy Florida, Incorporated. You expressed a concern about DEF billing a customer charge to your electric account.

The costs associated with the customer charge can be classified as either customer accounting costs or fixed operating expenses incurred in providing certain transmission and distribution facilities. For instance, meter reading and customer billing are done monthly regardless of the customer's kilowatt-hour consumption level. As a result, DEF bills the usage separately, as this amount may fluctuate each month. Other expenses included are depreciation on certain utility installed equipment such as meters, distribution lines from the pole to the customer's premises, line transformers, and other expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of these items.

Progress Energy's tariff, 6.120, allows the company to bill a monthly customer charge of \$8.76 to your residential account. I have attached the company's tariff for your review.

Rule 25-6.100, Florida Administrative Code, requires electric utilities to bill the customer charge separately from the energy charge. I have also attached a copy of the rule for your review.

You also expressed a concern about Duke Energy's nuclear cost recovery. The FPSC has scheduled the hearings for Florida's five investor-owned utilities with respect to nuclear cost recovery from August 5, 2013, to August 9, 2013. Commissioners will decide on recovery amounts after reviewing all the testimony and evidence presented at the hearing. The new rate will take effect on customer bills beginning in January 2014. Electric rates will also be affected by other cost recovery clause hearings, including fuel, environmental, and capacity cost, and are scheduled for November 4, 2013, through November 6, 2013.

In particular, you may review Duke Energy Florida's nuclear cost recovery request by using the following link:

<http://www.floridapsc.com/library/FILINGS/13/01087-13/01087-13.pdf>

You may follow the hearing process on our website by using the following link:

<http://www.floridapsc.com/agendas/schedule/hearings.aspx>

You may view/listen to the hearings by using the following link from August 5, 2013, to August 9, 2013:

<http://www.floridapsc.com/agendas/audiovideo/index.aspx>

After each hearing, the events will be archived and available for three months following the conclusion of the hearings. You may review the archived events by using the following link:

<http://www.floridapsc.com/agendas/audiovideo/archives/>

I will add your comments to the correspondence side of Docket No. 130009-EI regarding your position on the nuclear cost recovery.

You may be interested in Emergency Home Energy Assistance for the Elderly (EHEAP), which provides assistance for home-energy emergencies to qualified, low-income households with at least one person 60 years of age or older. To find out about qualifications, you may contact your county's local EHEAP agency, or by calling 1-800-963-5337.

Complaints are a valuable source of information, and we will keep your complaint on file. We closely monitor complaints and track any trends indicating where further action might be needed.

If you have any questions or concerns please contact Ms. Ellen Plendl 1-800-342-3552 or by fax at 1-800-511-0809.

Sincerely,

Ellen Plendl
Regulatory Specialist
Florida Public Service Commission
Office of Consumer Assistance & Outreach
1-800-342-3552 (phone)
1-800-511-0809 (fax)

Eric Fryson

From: Commission Clerk
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2013 10:55 AM
To: Dorothy Menasco; Eric Fryson
Subject: FW: 130009-EI Consumer Correspondence

Please see Correspondence for Docket 130009-EI below.

From: Kathy Lewis
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2013 10:06 AM
To: Commission Clerk
Cc: Marshall Willis; Rhonda Hicks; Jim Dean; Debra Betton; Mark Futrell; Cayce Hinton
Subject: Consumer Correspondence

Please place the correspondence below from Ms. Beatrice Balboa in Docket File 130009-EI.

Thank you – Kathy Lewis

From: Kathy Lewis
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2013 9:57 AM
To: 'Beatrice Balboa'
Cc: Marshall Willis; Rhonda Hicks; Jim Dean; Debra Betton; Mark Futrell; Cayce Hinton
Subject: RE: Concerns

Dear Ms. Balboa:

Thank you for your July 8, 2013, email forwarding the editorial entitled "FPL Smokestacks Coming Down, But Rates May Go Up" by Sun Sentinel columnist Michael Mayo. The Florida Public Service Commission is conducting its annual examination of the costs Florida Power & Light has submitted for recovery through the nuclear cost recovery clause in Docket 130009-EI. Your correspondence has been placed in the docket file where it will be available to all interested parties for review.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Dyal Lewis
Regulatory Analyst
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
(850)413-6594
klewis@psc.state.fl.us

From: Beatrice Balboa [<mailto:beatricebalboa@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2013 8:49 AM
To: Kathy Lewis
Cc: Marshall Willis; Rhonda Hicks; Jim Dean; Debra Betton; Mark Futrell
Subject: Concerns

I was reading the latest news media article(s) regarding the latest Florida Power & Light Co. (FPL) more electrical bill rate increase and extremely poor electrical infrastructural activities in the City of Pompano Beach, Broward County and/or the State of Florida with great interest. Please review and implement an action plan to

thoroughly address this extremely troubling issue. Media reports continue to underscore the proposed spiralling out-of-control rate increase in a overwhelming recessionary/depression economic climate adversely impacting taxpayer citizens. It is way past time to immediately commence a forensic audit throughout the entirety of Florida Power & Light Co. (FPL) administrative and upper management salary(ies) to eliminate, consolidate and reduce all non-essential functions by initiating cost cutting budget measures of 5, 10, 25, 50, 75 and/or 90%, starting at the highest levels of management and working downward to the local level, trying to keep the day-to-day operational and logistical electrical services delivery as much as fiscally prudent to relieve the ongoing unsustainable and unconscionable typical electrical bill inflicted on its senior citizenry. Please coordinate, collaborate and cooperate on Federal, State and/or local jurisdictional levels in addressing these concerns potentially impacting adversely the public's finances, policies, trust, confidence, and quality of life issues. Thank you for your time in this matter and hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

Beatrice Balboa

1010 South Ocean Boulevard, Apt. 1008

Pompano Beach, FL 33062-6666

====

FPL smokestacks coming down, but rates may go up

The good, the bad and the ugly from my favorite electric monopoly

Michael Mayo, July 6, 2013

I'm recharged after a nice vacation, and my clocks weren't blinking when I got home — no outages during thunderstorm season, hooray! So it seems like a fine time to catch up with the good, the bad and the ugly from my favorite electric monopoly, Florida Power & Light.

The good: Forget July 4th fireworks, the best show in town this month will come at 6:45 a.m. on July 16, when the four candy-cane striped smokestacks at FPL's Port Everglades power plant will come tumbling down in dramatic fashion. FPL is demolishing the outdated oil-and-gas plant, replacing it with an all natural-gas facility scheduled to open in 2016. That will mean cleaner energy and hopefully lower fuel costs on our bills.

FPL says the 350-foot smokestacks will topple in about 60 seconds, after a series of controlled explosions. For those who can't view it in person, FPL will have a live video feed of the demolition on its website, fpl.com.

The bad: FPL is seeking another round of rate hikes, \$822 million over three years, to upgrade mini-plants that are used during peak usage, called "peaking units." State law allows FPL to pass along costs for the federally mandated environmental upgrades to its 4.6 million customers. That's in addition to earlier rate hikes approved for other construction projects, like at Port Everglades. So much for the savings on our bills from lower fuel costs.

The ugly: In my mail pile when I got home was an offer from FPL Energy Services, an FPL affiliate, for its SurgeShield program to protect A/C units and major appliances from lightning and surge damage. The grounding device is installed over your meter and blocks lightning surges that flow from FPL transformers and main wires. The problem: You have to pay in perpetuity (\$9.95 a month added to your electric bill), it doesn't prevent outages or brownouts, and a customer service representative I called said, "There is a possibility that surges can still enter your home."

Under state law, FPL isn't responsible for surge damage to homes or appliances. But the SurgeShield program offers some repayment if major appliances get damaged. The problem: It doesn't give replacement coverage, but only pays "fair-market value." So if your 10-year-old fridge or 12-year-old dryer gets sizzled, you're still going to have to shell out.

Some deal. Especially when you consider there are surge protectors that can be installed over circuit-breaker panels by electrical contractors for a one-time fee (\$400-\$500). An FPL Energy Services spokesman said the pay-forever approach was developed as a "convenient way" for customers to avoid hefty upfront costs. He noted the service was "voluntary" and could be cancelled any time. He wouldn't say how many customers have enrolled, calling it "proprietary information." I say instead of paying \$1,200 every 10 years for something that probably costs \$100, it sure would be nice if FPL offered a fair upfront rate to buy and install the device. Or better yet, since this technology exists, it would be nice if state regulators and legislators mandated it as part of basic electric service, which we already pay handsomely for. But FPL says that would be "prohibitive."

So FPL's parent company, NextEra Energy, gets to profit even more by preying on lightning/surge fears. That really fries my...fusebox.

From: [Pamela Paultre](#) on behalf of [Office of Commissioner Brisé](#)
To: [Commissioner Correspondence](#)
Subject: FW: Fla Nuclear Power Law
Date: Wednesday, June 26, 2013 2:11:05 PM

Cathi,

Please place the forwarded or enclosed correspondence in Docket Correspondence of Consumers and their representatives for docket no. 130009.

Thank you,

Pamela Paultre
Assistant to Chairman Ronald Brisé
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6036

From: Jim Leary [mailto:jpleary2010@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2013 9:56 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Fla Nuclear Power Law

Florida Nuclear Project Law: SB1472
6/24/2013

Dear Commissioner:

Under SB 1472, the PSC determines whether nuclear project costs are “reasonable”.

Let’s face the facts with new nuclear project costs: They’re unreasonable and too expensive!

In fact, Warren Buffet’s MidAmerican Iowa utility just concluded that nuclear projects are too costly and are REFUNDING the costs collected from a nuclear surcharge back to utility customers. An idea Florida could sorely use!

Cost: 12,000 \$/KW x 1000 MW/reactor = \$12 billion. Each utility (FPL and Duke) wants to build two reactors = \$24 billion. These costs are over 50% of these two companies net worth/market capitalization. Such a concentration of capital in one plant in one location by itself is not financially prudent.

Development and Construction time: 10 years plus. Commercial Operation Dates: 2024 plus.

The simplified ratemaking cost of power if you assume a fixed charge rate of 10% = $(12,000 \text{ \$/KW} \times .1) / (8000 \text{ hrs}) = 15 \text{ cent/kwh}$ plus add .4 cent/kwh for fuel. Uranium prices have gone from 15 \\$/lb to 55\\$/lb in the last few years, and is largely imported. Current, average WHOLESale power rates are 3-5 cent/kwh.

Nuclear power is 3-5 times as expensive!

These projects will not be producing power for over ten years, and yet add to ratepayers rates each and every year NOW! Give us a refund!

These cost estimates are projections. Nobody knows how much the final bill will be or what the rate of interest on construction funds will be. The reactors under construction in Georgia are already over \$1 billion more than the original cost estimate. The last nuclear project constructed was in 1974 and it took over 10 years to construct.

Nuclear power is not “clean”. CO2 may not be emitted, but reactors produce dangerous radioactive wastes which will never leave Florida’s soil. No other state or country wants it. People in Nevada do not want our radioactive waste at Yucca Mtn. (ask Senator Reid) Would you, if you were a citizen of Nevada? And other states don’t want it transported through their states for fear of an accident. Nuclear fuel reprocessing is a technology that has been proven uneconomic and infeasible.

The Fukushima disaster in Japan showed us how a loss in power to the circulating pumps in the “temporary” cooling tanks for the spent nuclear fuel rods can lead to a dangerous situation. Also that hydrogen buildup can lead to explosions. The devastating accident has left three reactors with fuel rods that have melted through the steel containment vessels and hundreds of tons of spent fuel rods in temporary cooling tanks. 6,000 tons of water per week is required to cool the molten fuel rods, and this water must then be decontaminated. To prevent spills into the Pacific Ocean the utility is installing a steel barrier between the reactors and the ocean to prevent further contamination. Decommissioning of the site will take over 40 years. COSTS ARE ESTIMATED AT OVER \$137 BILLION! The molten fuel cannot be

removed until 2021. Over 100,000 people have been evacuated from around the site's 12 mile nuclear exclusion zone and 8% of the landmass of Japan has been contaminated by radioactive fallout. It will be decades before the land and coastal waters around the site can be worked. Rice paddies and the fisheries around the plant have been abandoned. A large number of people's lives are in a traumatic upheaval.

This could happen if a Category 5 hurricane hits one of Florida's nuclear plants. Radioactive waste must be contained safely for thousands of years---beyond any civilization's duration of existence in human history! Support for nuclear power is a vote for a nuclear waste repository in Florida at the plants site!

The U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C. ruled last year that the NRC's "waste confidence" rule, a generic presumption that storing spent fuel on nuclear sites is safe, was deficient, and that the possibility of never having a repository had to be considered, along with the risks of leaks and fires in spent-fuel pools.

These plants also require tremendous amounts of water for cooling. Water is a precious commodity here in Florida. Uranium mining is also not environmentally benign either with tailings polluting ground water.

And think where these nuclear plants are sited, near our precious coastline. Turkey Pt is near the National Marine Sanctuary in the Florida Keys, the National Biscayne Bay Park, the National Everglades Park, and in a historical hurricane path! This is insanity! Why should the people of Florida bear this risk to **NATIONALLY** designated parks or to nearby cities and towns?

There have been numerous costly incidents at nuclear power plants in the U.S. that have been unanticipated from the Three Mile Island reactor accident which cost \$1 billion to clean up in Pennsylvania in 1979 to the most recent \$700 million leak of radioactive tritium into the groundwater from the aged Vermont Yankee nuclear plant's degraded underground piping system.

Why is the Florida government picking "winners and losers" here for the investor owned utility industry?

The nuclear industry already enjoys federal subsidies on insurance for

catastrophic incidents. That should tell you something right there how POTENTIALLY dangerous this industry is.

One could argue the investor owned utilities control Tallahassee and this is their way of growing the Rate Base which means more profits for their shareholders and management. It also means base fixed rates go up. FPL's president is a professional lawyer/lobbyist and knows how to play the marionette game in Tallahassee! It's hard to find a lobbyist who doesn't work for a utility.

Read FPL's investor information presentations. #1 Goal: Grow the Rate Base because that means more ROE for shareholders. Is NextEra building nuclear power in any other state? No.

As a citizen, when I see legislation like the Florida nuclear law and the actions of the Florida Public Service Commission approving utility increases for rates---not even addressing basic realities like ROE premiums that are inordinately high versus prevailing interest rates and versus unregulated S&P 500 companies, and capital structures that include higher % of Equity versus the norm, there is something unfair and exploitive going on. There are also average salaries in excess of \$100,000/yr, executive managements making millions of dollars, investments of our money in other states without any commensurate benefit to the Florida ratepayer, and increases in their dividend by 10% per year, it is enough to know the PSC is not doing their job protecting the ratepayer from a MONOPOLY, but rather embellishing management's compensation and shareholder returns! They don't even give their employees 10% raises, but they do management, and their shareholders. Look at how high their stock price is! Is the PSC endorsing the three highest paid executives (Hay, Robo and Dewhurst) who made 33, 14 and 14 million dollars in 2012. Think of the excessive private gains made off of the public, and from a REGULATED MONOPOLY. These three men have the rewards equivalent to over a 1,000 average workers. This is ludicrous.

The argument that FPL's rates are lower than the other utilities' rates so these increases are justified doesn't mean much. FPL is the largest monopoly by far in the state and has economies of scale. They're supposed to have the lowest rates, and natural gas prices are low. Nobody can accurately predict natural gas prices!

These companies haven't even recovered the billions of dollars they will need to dismantle and decommission their existing nuclear projects!

Look at what Progress Energy did with their nuclear upgrade project----a complete irresponsible, incompetent disaster! And the ratepayer is left to pay for the radioactive waste cleanup sometime in the distant future.

Let's leave it to our children must be the thinking---a very poor example of stewardship and planning for posterity.

*** Fuel Diversity from Natural Gas: Solar Panels *****

Let's talk solar panels and the amount of money already spent on nuclear power to date: **\$1.5 billion**. That is a tremendous amount of money! Solar panels are one way to achieve fuel diversity away from more natural gas and it's cheaper than nuclear and less harmful.

At \$5,000/KW for an installed residential system for a 3 KW residential load = \$15,000. Divide that into \$1.5 billion and the result is 100,000 systems! 100,000 voting ratepayer households could already be generating power in Florida, cleanly!

So what does solar panel produced power cost:

$(\$5,000/\text{KW} \times .7 \times .6 \times .1)/1500 \text{ hours} = 14 \text{ cent/kwh.}$

The .7 represents the 30% Investment tax credit and the .6 is an estimate for the five yr accelerated tax depreciation benefit available. Solar panels produce partial amounts of their rating during the 4,380 hours of sunlight—think of the arc of the sun across the sky as the power output curve—peak rated power is 10-2PM, so a shorthand way to estimate the power is summing those kwh and dividing by the system rating to get to the 1500 hours which is an equivalent full power number which makes it easier to do the math.

Current Residential power rates in Florida range from 11-14 cent/kwh, depending on the utility.

So if you spread the \$1.5 billion over 200,000 systems which would halve a ratepayers cost to \$2,500/KW, these systems would produce power for

approximately 7 cent/kwh and allow the ratepayer to save nearly half on their electricity bill for those kwh used.

Let's do the rate paying citizen voters a service. Let's repeal the nuclear bill and put in a charge for solar! Let's get our money back spent on the nuclear projects too, with interest! Let's use that money and buy solar panel systems. It will save us on our growing natural gas bill.

Think of all the local contractor jobs that could be created, and if you mandated that the panels must come from Florida, we could attract manufacturing or assembly plants----even more jobs! Solar panel costs are coming down dramatically—50 cent/Watt (= 500\$/KW)!

Special thanks to the Florida House and Senate for exempting the residential solar systems from property taxes this year. A great first step in the right direction! Commercial properties should be next to gain an exemption!

Solar rooftops make sense—it's at the point of load, so there are no transmission and distribution line losses (7%), and it does have capacity on the hottest summer day peaks. It's estimated that 60% of a solar panel systems rating is available in the late afternoon summer peaks. Solar panels also produce when we need it most during the DAY. Nuclear power produces at night-----there is no need for capacity in Florida at night. Reserve margins are at over 50%. If you took the night time hours out of the above equation for nuclear, the costs would double to 30 cent/kwh.

Utility executives argue there is no value for solar during the early morning Winter peaks in January/February. However, the natural gas fired combustion turbines/combined cycle plants increase their output by 10% in the Winter due to the colder ambient inlet temperatures, so solar is the perfect compliment when these projects lose 10% of their capacity in the summer.

While solar panels have over 99% reliability and guarantees for output for 25 years, nuclear plants must be refueled every 18 months for 40 days and also are down for repairs and maintenance which may take even more time, and they cost \$ billions to decommission at the end of their lives, not so with solar panels....just replace them with even more efficient panels in the future. Panel efficiency increases every year. The panels used in space are 3 times as

efficient as current commercial panels, but due to costs are only used in space. Given time and economies of scale and innovation, commercial solar panels are only going to become more efficient and cheaper.

Let's bring the solar industry to Florida and put the "Sun" in the Sunshine State. The only people against this are the utilities who see solar power diminishing their sales and profits. The old electric utility mantra is "Hot Summers, Cold Winters" = profits!

Another big step for the PSC would be to allow solar power purchase agreements—currently deemed illegal in Florida from a "nonutility" third party.

Currently, all solar systems must be bought or leased. Power purchase agreements are just another way for a third party to finance your solar system. The advantage versus a lease is that the contract is structured based on performance—kwh produced. These are widely available in other states, and like a lease require no upfront costs from the ratepayer.

Do we still need a well functioning power grid with centralized generation? Yes we do, but let's give distributed solar power to the People! Who wouldn't support you if you supported solar power? Who would support you if you're found to be against it?

Solar power is as popular as it gets, and makes sense, especially here in Florida, unless of course you're an electric utility executive! The time is NOW!

Let's use the changes to the nuclear power law and stop the new construction of nuclear power. Let's change the law to include a solar panel charge to lessen our dependence on natural gas.

And let's for our children's future receive a realistic plan on the cost of closing down the existing nuclear plants and putting the radioactive waste into dry cask storage versus in the "temporary" spent fuel rod cooling tanks if that is the safest course of action.

Thanks for your attention in this matter.

Sincerely,

Jim Leary
Palm Beach Gardens, Fla

From: [Office of Commissioner Brown](#)
To: [Commissioner Correspondence](#)
Subject: FW: Fla Nuclear Power Law
Date: Wednesday, June 26, 2013 11:23:57 AM

Please place the attached in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,

Katherine

Katherine E. Fleming
Chief Advisor to Commissioner Brown
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6028 (Office)
(850) 413-6029 (Facsimile)

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are considered to be public records and will be made available to the public and the media upon request. Therefore, your e-mail message may be subject to public disclosure.

From: Jim Leary [mailto:jpleary2010@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2013 9:58 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: Fla Nuclear Power Law

Florida Nuclear Project Law: SB1472 6/24/2013

Dear Commissioner:

Under SB 1472, the PSC determines whether nuclear project costs are “reasonable”.

Let’s face the facts with new nuclear project costs: They’re unreasonable and too expensive!

In fact, Warren Buffet’s MidAmerican Iowa utility just concluded that nuclear projects are too costly and are REFUNDING the costs collected from a nuclear surcharge back to utility customers. An idea Florida could sorely use!

Cost: 12,000 \$/KW x 1000 MW/reactor = \$12 billion. Each utility (FPL and

Duke) wants to build two reactors = \$24 billion. These costs are over 50% of these two companies net worth/market capitalization. Such a concentration of capital in one plant in one location by itself is not financially prudent.

Development and Construction time: 10 years plus. Commercial Operation Dates: 2024 plus.

The simplified ratemaking cost of power if you assume a fixed charge rate of 10% = $(12,000 \text{ \$/KW} \times 1)/(8000 \text{ hrs}) = 15 \text{ cent/kwh}$ plus add .4 cent/kwh for fuel. Uranium prices have gone from 15 \\$/lb to 55\\$/lb in the last few years, and is largely imported. Current, average WHOLESALE power rates are 3-5 cent/kwh.

Nuclear power is 3-5 times as expensive!

These projects will not be producing power for over ten years, and yet add to ratepayers rates each and every year NOW! Give us a refund!

These cost estimates are projections. Nobody knows how much the final bill will be or what the rate of interest on construction funds will be. The reactors under construction in Georgia are already over \$1 billion more than the original cost estimate. The last nuclear project constructed was in 1974 and it took over 10 years to construct.

Nuclear power is not “clean”. CO₂ may not be emitted, but reactors produce dangerous radioactive wastes which will never leave Florida’s soil. No other state or country wants it. People in Nevada do not want our radioactive waste at Yucca Mtn. (ask Senator Reid) Would you, if you were a citizen of Nevada? And other states don’t want it transported through their states for fear of an accident. Nuclear fuel reprocessing is a technology that has been proven uneconomic and infeasible.

The Fukushima disaster in Japan showed us how a loss in power to the circulating pumps in the “temporary” cooling tanks for the spent nuclear fuel rods can lead to a dangerous situation. Also that hydrogen buildup can lead to explosions. The devastating accident has left three reactors with fuel rods that have melted through the steel containment vessels and hundreds of tons of spent fuel rods in temporary cooling tanks. 6,000 tons of water per week is required to cool the molten fuel rods, and this water must then be

decontaminated. To prevent spills into the Pacific Ocean the utility is installing a steel barrier between the reactors and the ocean to prevent further contamination. Decommissioning of the site will take over 40 years. COSTS ARE ESTIMATED AT OVER \$137 BILLION! The molten fuel cannot be removed until 2021. Over 100,000 people have been evacuated from around the site's 12 mile nuclear exclusion zone and 8% of the landmass of Japan has been contaminated by radioactive fallout. It will be decades before the land and coastal waters around the site can be worked. Rice paddies and the fisheries around the plant have been abandoned. A large number of people's lives are in a traumatic upheaval.

This could happen if a Category 5 hurricane hits one of Florida's nuclear plants. Radioactive waste must be contained safely for thousands of years---beyond any civilization's duration of existence in human history! Support for nuclear power is a vote for a nuclear waste repository in Florida at the plants site!

The U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C. ruled last year that the NRC's "waste confidence" rule, a generic presumption that storing spent fuel on nuclear sites is safe, was deficient, and that the possibility of never having a repository had to be considered, along with the risks of leaks and fires in spent-fuel pools.

These plants also require tremendous amounts of water for cooling. Water is a precious commodity here in Florida. Uranium mining is also not environmentally benign either with tailings polluting ground water.

And think where these nuclear plants are sited, near our precious coastline. Turkey Pt is near the National Marine Sanctuary in the Florida Keys, the National Biscayne Bay Park, the National Everglades Park, and in a historical hurricane path! This is insanity! Why should the people of Florida bear this risk to **NATIONALLY** designated parks or to nearby cities and towns?

There have been numerous costly incidents at nuclear power plants in the U.S. that have been unanticipated from the Three Mile Island reactor accident which cost \$1 billion to clean up in Pennsylvania in 1979 to the most recent \$700 million leak of radioactive tritium into the groundwater from the aged Vermont Yankee nuclear plant's degraded underground piping system.

Why is the Florida government picking “winners and losers” here for the investor owned utility industry?

The nuclear industry already enjoys federal subsidies on insurance for catastrophic incidents. That should tell you something right there how POTENTIALLY dangerous this industry is.

One could argue the investor owned utilities control Tallahassee and this is their way of growing the Rate Base which means more profits for their shareholders and management. It also means base fixed rates go up. FPL's president is a professional lawyer/lobbyist and knows how to play the marionette game in Tallahassee! It's hard to find a lobbyist who doesn't work for a utility.

Read FPL's investor information presentations. #1 Goal: Grow the Rate Base because that means more ROE for shareholders. Is NextEra building nuclear power in any other state? No.

As a citizen, when I see legislation like the Florida nuclear law and the actions of the Florida Public Service Commission approving utility increases for rates---not even addressing basic realities like ROE premiums that are inordinately high versus prevailing interest rates and versus unregulated S&P 500 companies, and capital structures that include higher % of Equity versus the norm, there is something unfair and exploitive going on. There are also average salaries in excess of \$100,000/yr, executive managements making millions of dollars, investments of our money in other states without any commensurate benefit to the Florida ratepayer, and increases in their dividend by 10% per year, it is enough to know the PSC is not doing their job protecting the ratepayer from a MONOPOLY, but rather embellishing management's compensation and shareholder returns! They don't even give their employees 10% raises, but they do management, and their shareholders. Look at how high their stock price is! Is the PSC endorsing the three highest paid executives (Hay, Robo and Dewhurst) who made 33, 14 and 14 million dollars in 2012. Think of the excessive private gains made off of the public, and from a REGULATED MONOPOLY. These three men have the rewards equivalent to over a 1,000 average workers. This is ludicrous.

The argument that FPL's rates are lower than the other utilities' rates so these increases are justified doesn't mean much. FPL is the largest monopoly by far

in the state and has economies of scale. They're supposed to have the lowest rates, and natural gas prices are low. Nobody can accurately predict natural gas prices!

These companies haven't even recovered the billions of dollars they will need to dismantle and decommission their existing nuclear projects!

Look at what Progress Energy did with their nuclear upgrade project----a complete irresponsible, incompetent disaster! And the ratepayer is left to pay for the radioactive waste cleanup sometime in the distant future.

Let's leave it to our children must be the thinking---a very poor example of stewardship and planning for posterity.

*** Fuel Diversity from Natural Gas: Solar Panels *****

Let's talk solar panels and the amount of money already spent on nuclear power to date: **\$1.5 billion**. That is a tremendous amount of money! Solar panels are one way to achieve fuel diversity away from more natural gas and it's cheaper than nuclear and less harmful.

At \$5,000/KW for an installed residential system for a 3 KW residential load = \$15,000. Divide that into \$1.5 billion and the result is 100,000 systems! 100,000 voting ratepayer households could already be generating power in Florida, cleanly!

So what does solar panel produced power cost:

$(\$5,000/\text{KW} \times .7 \times .6 \times .1)/1500 \text{ hours} = 14 \text{ cent/kwh.}$

The .7 represents the 30% Investment tax credit and the .6 is an estimate for the five yr accelerated tax depreciation benefit available. Solar panels produce partial amounts of their rating during the 4,380 hours of sunlight—think of the arc of the sun across the sky as the power output curve—peak rated power is 10-2PM, so a shorthand way to estimate the power is summing those kwh and dividing by the system rating to get to the 1500 hours which is an equivalent full power number which makes it easier to do the math.

Current Residential power rates in Florida range from 11-14 cent/kwh,

depending on the utility.

So if you spread the \$1.5 billion over 200,000 systems which would halve a ratepayers cost to \$2,500/KW, these systems would produce power for approximately 7 cent/kwh and allow the ratepayer to save nearly half on their electricity bill for those kwh used.

Let's do the rate paying citizen voters a service. Let's repeal the nuclear bill and put in a charge for solar! Let's get our money back spent on the nuclear projects too, with interest! Let's use that money and buy solar panel systems. It will save us on our growing natural gas bill.

Think of all the local contractor jobs that could be created, and if you mandated that the panels must come from Florida, we could attract manufacturing or assembly plants----even more jobs! Solar panel costs are coming down dramatically—50 cent/Watt (= 500\$/KW)!

Special thanks to the Florida House and Senate for exempting the residential solar systems from property taxes this year. A great first step in the right direction! Commercial properties should be next to gain an exemption!

Solar rooftops make sense—it's at the point of load, so there are no transmission and distribution line losses (7%), and it does have capacity on the hottest summer day peaks. It's estimated that 60% of a solar panel systems rating is available in the late afternoon summer peaks. Solar panels also produce when we need it most during the DAY. Nuclear power produces at night-----there is no need for capacity in Florida at night. Reserve margins are at over 50%. If you took the night time hours out of the above equation for nuclear, the costs would double to 30 cent/kwh.

Utility executives argue there is no value for solar during the early morning Winter peaks in January/February. However, the natural gas fired combustion turbines/combined cycle plants increase their output by 10% in the Winter due to the colder ambient inlet temperatures, so solar is the perfect compliment when these projects lose 10% of their capacity in the summer.

While solar panels have over 99% reliability and guarantees for output for 25 years, nuclear plants must be refueled every 18 months for 40 days and also

are down for repairs and maintenance which may take even more time, and they cost \$ billions to decommission at the end of their lives, not so with solar panels....just replace them with even more efficient panels in the future. Panel efficiency increases every year. The panels used in space are 3 times as efficient as current commercial panels, but due to costs are only used in space. Given time and economies of scale and innovation, commercial solar panels are only going to become more efficient and cheaper.

Let's bring the solar industry to Florida and put the "Sun" in the Sunshine State. The only people against this are the utilities who see solar power diminishing their sales and profits. The old electric utility mantra is "Hot Summers, Cold Winters" = profits!

Another big step for the PSC would be to allow solar power purchase agreements—currently deemed illegal in Florida from a "nonutility" third party.

Currently, all solar systems must be bought or leased. Power purchase agreements are just another way for a third party to finance your solar system. The advantage versus a lease is that the contract is structured based on performance—kwh produced. These are widely available in other states, and like a lease require no upfront costs from the ratepayer.

Do we still need a well functioning power grid with centralized generation? Yes we do, but let's give distributed solar power to the People! Who wouldn't support you if you supported solar power? Who would support you if you're found to be against it?

Solar power is as popular as it gets, and makes sense, especially here in Florida, unless of course you're an electric utility executive! The time is NOW!

Let's use the changes to the nuclear power law and stop the new construction of nuclear power. Let's change the law to include a solar panel charge to lessen our dependence on natural gas.

And let's for our children's future receive a realistic plan on the cost of closing down the existing nuclear plants and putting the radioactive waste into dry cask storage versus in the "temporary" spent fuel rod cooling tanks if that

is the safest course of action.

Thanks for your attention in this matter.

Sincerely,

Jim Leary
Palm Beach Gardens, Fla

Eric Fryson

130009-E1

From: Ann Cole
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 8:42 AM
To: Eric Fryson
Cc: Hong Wang; Catherine Potts
Subject: FW: Requesting Partnership - 2013 East Coast & Gulf Coast Bicycle Tour to Protect America's Wetlands
Attachments: 2013 East Coast & Gulf Coast Bicycle Tour to Protect Ameri..pdf; Global Renewable Energy Project - Florida Governor Rick Sc..pdf

FPSC, CLK - CORRESPONDENCE
___Administrative___ Parties ☒ Consumer
DOCUMENT NO. 00302-13
DISTRIBUTION: _____

Please process. Thanks, Ann

From: Pamela Paultre **On Behalf Of** Office of Commissioner Brisé
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 8:40 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Requesting Partnership - 2013 East Coast & Gulf Coast Bicycle Tour to Protect America's Wetlands

Cathl,

Please place the forwarded or enclosed correspondence in Docket Correspondence of Consumers and their representatives for docket no. 130009-E1.

Thank you,

Pamela Paultre
Assistant to Chairman Ronald Brisé
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6036

From: PATRICK POST [<mailto:patrickclaypost@msn.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2013 8:05 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé; Office of Commissioner Balbis; Office of Commissioner Brown; Office Of Commissioner Edgar; Office Of Commissioner Graham
Subject: FW: Requesting Partnership - 2013 East Coast & Gulf Coast Bicycle Tour to Protect America's Wetlands

From: patrickclaypost@msn.com
To: lwvfexecutivedirector@gmail.com
Subject: Requesting Partnership - 2013 East Coast & Gulf Coast Bicycle Tour to Protect America's Wetlands
Date: Wed, 29 May 2013 19:11:24 -0400

Dear League of Women Voters of Florida,

I am writing to you today to request assistance and to potentially create a partnership to help our group oppose all efforts of Florida Power & Light and Duke Energy to build four new nuclear power reactors in Florida. The cost to build the reactors will be \$40 billion and the funding will be attained by raising electric utility rates throughout Florida. We will use our 2013 bicycle tour, which is in development, to help in marketing our revolutionary global renewable energy and job creation proposals which are a cost-effective alternative to nuclear power.

Please see the first PDF attachment above that provides an overview of our 2013 East Coast & Gulf Coast Bicycle Tour to Protect America's Wetlands. It also provides new information relating to our renewable energy proposals. The second PDF attachment is a letter sent to Florida Governor Rick Scott on February 20, 2013 that provides more details about the renewable energy project. Governor Scott kindly forwarded this information to state agencies including the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services as well as the Department of Economic Opportunity and the Division of Strategic Business Development.

Please feel free to share this information with anyone who may be interested in reading about our energy proposals and our upcoming bicycle tour that may start as early as July 1st depending on availability of funding.

Regards,

Patrick Post

President/CEO New Earth Energy Organization

www.newearthenergy.org

patrick@newearthenergy.org

786-327-8525 or 561-568-1650

Patrick Post - President/CEO
New Earth Energy Organization
PO Box 143677, Coral Gables, FL 33114
786-327-8525 patrick@newearthenergy.org
www.newearthenergy.org

February 20, 2013

Office of Governor Rick Scott
State of Florida
400 S. Monroe St.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0001

Dear Governor Scott:

I am developing a revolutionary renewable energy project that will create a minimum of 125,000 high-tech jobs in the United States and it could create over one million U.S. jobs. It is a project which will finally put America on the path to energy independence and it will help the U.S. take a new leadership role in the global development of renewable energy. One of my main goals is to create and promote the installation of small four-part renewable energy systems in homes and buildings throughout America and worldwide. These systems will cost \$2000 to purchase and install and they will provide free, clean, and unlimited renewable energy from solar, wind, solar hot water, and electricity stored in batteries. Each identical system will produce and save an average of \$20 a month in electricity, equaling \$240 a year or 10% of a typical U.S. structure's annual power usage.

If the energy systems are installed in all of America's 150 million homes and buildings, this would equal \$36 billion a year in electric power generation or 10% of America's annual power consumption in structures. The cost to install these systems throughout the United States would be \$300 billion. Ten million energy systems would be installed annually $\times \$2000$ for each system = $\$20 \text{ billion} \times 15 \text{ years} = \300 billion . The \$20 billion a year for 15 years is a small amount to pay when you consider this renewable energy project will generate significantly more revenue and benefits than the cost to fund it.

The project will be promoted as a practical and cost-effective alternative to nuclear power and our planet's continued reliance on coal, oil, and natural gas to generate electricity. It will also reduce pollution and help in controlling global warming, and it will provide at least twice the electricity and job creation benefits of nuclear power and fossil fuels at less than 1/2 the cost. The electricity and the energy saving benefits will be created where people live and work. This will help reduce the enormous global problem of electricity wasted by transmitting it long distances through inefficient and outdated power lines, transformers, and other distribution equipment. Inefficient equipment causes the loss of roughly 60% of the electricity generated in the United States and worldwide every year.

Two other areas needing major improvement are increasing the energy efficiency of all homes and buildings globally and replacing outdated and inefficient appliances. This will lower the energy consumption in structures by over 30%. It is infinitely faster and more cost-effective to reduce energy consumption through conservation, than it is to build new nuclear and fossil fuel power plants. Innovation is also important. An example of this can be shown in the rising efficiency of solar panels which are improving by 10% each year.

The first goal of this renewable energy project is to install the \$2000 systems in all 8.5 million homes and buildings in Florida over fifteen years, costing a total of \$17 billion or \$1.13 billion annually. This \$17 billion is roughly equal to Florida Power & Light's own high-end estimate to build two proposed nuclear power reactors at their Turkey Point facility which is located only 25 miles south of Miami, Florida. Due to strong opposition, these reactors will likely take fifteen years to build and they will need 90 million gallons of water daily to cool them. This will require drilling twelve 900 foot long wells in this environmental sensitive area near the Everglades. The reactors will collectively produce up to \$2 billion each year in power. The 8.5 million systems will also produce \$2 billion in power annually and they will start producing power as soon as each system is installed.

I propose that ten million identical U.S. manufactured systems should be mass-produced annually using the very efficient Henry Ford production concept and we should install these systems throughout America in a block by block basis similar to Smart Grid meters. This will reduce the cost of manufacturing and installing each system to \$2000. Custom created and randomly installed systems would cost over \$10,000 each. It will require a technician 2-3 days to install each system, creating 6000 high-tech jobs in Florida for fifteen years. Installing the systems across America will create at least 100,000 jobs and maintaining the systems will provide permanent employment for thousands of workers. Manufacturing the systems in the U.S. for our market will create 25,000 additional jobs and producing and installing them for the global market could create two million jobs.

It is important to understand that Florida Power & Light's two proposed nuclear power reactors near Miami will not generate a single watt of electricity until they are completed in about fifteen years. In this same period of time, the 8.5 million small renewable energy systems will produce a total of \$15 billion in electricity. To explain the simple equation in greater detail, the 1st year would begin with 8.5 million Florida homes and buildings divided by 15 years = 566,666 structures x \$240 = \$136 million in electricity generated. In the 15th year, the energy systems will be installed in all 8.5 million structures and they will collectively produce a total of \$2.04 billion in electricity. The generation and saving of electric power during these first fifteen years will average \$1 billion per year.

One of the most negative aspects of these two reactors is that FP&L has been authorized by the State of Florida to charge their 4.5 million utility customers for the \$17 billion cost to design and build the plants. This is equal to \$3778 per customer and all of the money will be attained from increased utility rates. Then FP&L's customers will pay \$2 billion annually for all of the power generated by the reactors or \$445 a year per customer, times the 40 year lifespan of the reactors = \$17,800 x 4.5 million utility customers = \$80 billion paid to FP&L for all of the power produced. There is also no site to permanently store the plant's future toxic nuclear waste and taxpayers will be forced to pay all storage costs.

Another negative issue is that the value of the two plants will be 100% owned by FP&L's stockholders. FP&L's customers will own zero percentage of the reactors even though they will pay all of the \$17 billion costs to build them. In sharp contrast, the value of the \$17 billion 8.5 million systems will be 100% owned by Florida's 8.5 million home and building owners, allowing them to create 10% of their own power on site. There are also many homes and condos in Florida that are only used in the winter. If these structures are vacant for days or months, the surplus power created could be sent to FP&L for a credit.

After we start installing the systems in Florida, we will progressively expand over fifteen years to include all 150 million structures in the United States. The ultimate goal is to expand worldwide over the next thirty years to include a minimum of two billion homes and buildings. When you consider that America consumes 20% of the world's fossil fuels and electricity and the U.S. is only 4% of our planet's seven billion in population, these small \$2000 renewable energy systems will generate enough clean and reliable electricity to supply the basic power needs for more than 60% of the homes and buildings in the world. This would include critical electricity needed for refrigeration, water purification, water pumps, lighting, fans, phones, radios, TVs, and computers, etc.

There are three billion people on our planet who only have power for a few hours each day and one billion have no power at all. This project will help fill this gap and it will increase the health, quality of life, education, and economic development for these people living in poor and developing nations globally. It also could save millions of lives lost every year to disease and malnutrition. Once the project is developed and the benefits are demonstrated, many wealthy individuals (Bill Gates), non-profit groups (Sierra Club), and corporations (GE) will likely contribute to the global expansion of the project.

Our planet's total population will grow to more than eight billion people within the next twenty years. In this time, India with a population now at 1.18 billion people will increase by 300 million (1.25% annual growth) or roughly the current total population of America (.85% annual growth). India, which is only 1.2 million square miles or 40% the size of America or China, will then pass China's population (.25% annual growth) as the world's largest population with 1.48 billion citizens. The global population is expected to grow to ten billion within the next 60 years. When you consider this fact and the fact that we are quickly consuming all known fossil fuel reserves on earth, this project is in the right place at the right time to provide for the future energy needs of our rapidly shrinking planet.

These renewable energy systems will increase the value of each structure and they will last 20-25 years. They will also provide an emergency backup system for every home and building on earth, which will help in strengthening and flattening our planet's electric power grids. This will assist in reducing the cost of electricity. The payback period for installing the systems in America will average 8.3 years. After this time, the systems will generate revenue of \$240 every year at today's electricity prices for home and building owners for an additional 12-17 years. This equals \$2880 to \$4080 in owner profits. If the price of electric power increases, the revenue created by the systems will also increase.

The money to purchase the \$2000 systems could be provided by the U.S. Government and/or state governments at zero interest in ten-year loans to the owners of homes and buildings in the United States. All of the money needed to pay back the renewable energy loans will be created from the \$240+ annual electricity savings that is attained at each structure. This means U.S. home and building owners will pay nothing out of pocket and the U.S. Federal Government and/or state governments will be repaid 100% of the cost of these loans. The loan payments could be made through the electric utility companies to reduce costs and paperwork. Two other major benefits include the creation of additional federal and state tax revenue that is generated from the wages of the U.S. workers who will be paid to manufacture and install the systems, and the reduction of \$150 million paid annually to every 10,000 U.S. citizens who are receiving unemployment benefits.

All of the facts in this letter create a very strong case in demonstrating the overwhelming benefits of this revolutionary renewable energy project to generate clean electric power, lower energy costs, reduce pollution and global warming, and protect the environment, when compared to nuclear power, coal, oil, and natural gas. It is a project that will finally make renewable energy affordable for the vast majority of citizens on our planet.

These small \$2000 energy systems will also provide an infinitely better alternative to the worldwide expansion of nuclear power into Iran and other countries. This would reduce military tensions globally and the United States could then spend more of our money on economic development, education, healthcare, protecting the environment, and rebuilding our infrastructure, and less money on our military. The enormous growth of our military, fighting two wars, and focusing on nation building in other countries are the main reasons for our \$16.6 trillion U.S. national debt that is increasing by \$100 billion every month.

In 2012, our U.S. military budget was \$711 billion and an additional \$322 billion was spent on other military expenditures such as \$110 billion on interest on the debt from previous wars, \$70 billion Veterans Affairs, \$55 billion military pensions, \$47 billion Homeland Security, and \$40 billion on related costs. This equals a total of \$1.033 trillion and it almost equals the total combined military budgets for the rest of the world.

Instead of trying to be the policeman of the world through the continuous expansion of our already immense military, the United States should develop this renewable energy project to demonstrate to every country on earth America's strong desire and capability to create a safer, healthier, and more economically vibrant planet for every citizen on earth. This important renewable energy project will provide a tremendous opportunity for the United States to show the entire world that America can and will lead our planet in a new direction in the 21st Century to reduce every country's dependence on fossil fuels and to improve and safeguard planet earth for our future generations. A critical part of this large global effort will be to increase the energy efficiency of electricity distribution through all of our planet's electric power grids. The potential energy saved (60%) could then be used to power hundreds of millions of electric vehicles annually throughout the world.

I would like to speak with you to discuss the development of this revolutionary project. The total profits from \$4-\$8 trillion in potential global sales would be \$200-\$400 billion and the early pioneers and visionaries who develop these energy concepts will receive the greatest financial rewards. If you view my website at www.newearthenergy.org you will find more information relating to this project including numerous letters of support for my innovative renewable energy proposals from throughout America. This includes the U.S. Department of Energy, governors, state departments of environmental protection, universities, and national environmental groups, etc.

I look forward to speaking with you soon.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Patrick Post". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial "P".

Patrick Post

NEEO

NEW EARTH ENERGY ORGANIZATION

**2013 East Coast & Gulf Coast
Bicycle Tour to Protect
America's Wetlands**

**Renewable Energy &
Job Creation Proposal
Alternative to Nuclear Power**

**Patrick Post – President/CEO
New Earth Energy Organization
PO Box 143677 Coral Gables, FL 33114
www.newearthenergy.org
786-327-8525 or 561-568-1650
patrick@newearthenergy.org**

2013 East Coast & Gulf Coast Bicycle Tour to Protect America's Wetlands
Renewable Energy and Job Creation Proposal - Alternative to Nuclear Power
Written by Patrick Post

We are requesting funding and sponsorship for our 3500 mile bicycle tour starting this summer called the 2013 East Coast & Gulf Coast Bicycle Tour to Protect America's Wetlands. It is a four month promotional tour which could start as early as July 1st depending on availability of funding and it will end roughly on or after October 31st. I have experience in riding long distance bicycle tours and my longest trip was a 5000 mile tour of Europe in 1996 that included the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, Austria, Italy, and France. We need equipment and financial support to help fund our bicycle tour, and to create a quality low budget movie about protecting America's wetlands, ecosystems, and outdoor environment. Any funding that you provide would be greatly appreciated and no amount is too small.

The tour will involve four people riding four identical bicycles along the Atlantic coastline and the Gulf of Mexico from Portland, Maine to Miami, Florida to Corpus Christi, Texas. Two people will drive a new equipment van which we will purchase or attain as a donation. We will wrap the van with our group's name New Earth Energy Organization and sponsors names will be displayed on the van.

While riding on the bike tour we will organize events and rallies every week to encourage protecting America's wetlands, and we will promote riding bicycles as an alternative to driving vehicles. We will also encourage public support for developing my revolutionary renewable energy and job creation proposals which are a cost-effective alternative to building 36 proposed nuclear power reactors in America costing \$360-\$500 billion. All of the costs to build the reactors will be paid by electric utility customers. Then they will pay \$1.5 trillion for power created by the reactors over 40 years. We have an infinitely better plan that will generate more power than the 36 nuclear reactors and it will provide free, clean, and unlimited electricity from the sun and wind. This plan will benefit all Americans, instead of only benefiting big for-profit electric utility companies who will own 100% of the nuclear reactors.

I sent a four-page summary of my renewable energy proposals to Florida Governor Rick Scott on February 20, 2013 and he forwarded this information to the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services as well as the Department of Economic Opportunity and the Division of Strategic Business Development. A copy of the summary can be viewed on our group's website which is www.newearthenergy.org. It is in a link near the bottom of the Home Page and the name of the link is entitled: (Renewable Energy Summary Letter 02/20/2013 to Florida Governor Rick Scott).

We will film the tour with bicycle mounted cameras and other cameras for the purpose of making a documentary about protecting America's wetlands and we will have a daily blog so people can follow our progress. One of our goals will be to invite local bicycle clubs along the tour route to ride with our group in their communities to help in promoting our proposals. We will stop at most of the nuclear and coal power plants located near the coastlines of America's East Coast and Gulf of Mexico and talk with local citizens about their environmental concerns. We will also visit small and large newspapers and suggest that they write articles about our bike tour and we will meet with mayors, governors, and state and national leaders and ask them to support our national renewable energy and job creation project.

We will film comments from a wide range of people and show them on our blog and include them in the main film which will be edited to about two hours. We will begin showing the film in early 2014 at schools and environmental events. This will help create support for protecting America's wetlands, ecosystems, and outdoor environment, and it will encourage the expansion of renewable energy in the United States. The film will promote riding bikes for fun, exercise, and commuting to increase health, reduce traffic congestion, and lower pollution. We will add the film to our blog and our website.

I have received many letters of support for my renewable energy proposals from throughout America. At the bottom of the Home Page on our website you will see six example letters. They include:

1. Sylvie Rokab - Environmental Film Director, 2. Louisiana State Department of Natural Resources, 3. Lewis Hay III - Chairman/CEO Florida Power & Light, 4. Jeremy Susac - Florida Governor Charlie Crist's Energy Office, 5. Dr. Yong X. Tao, PhD – (FIU) Florida International University, 6. Alexander Karsner – U.S. Department of Energy, Assistant Secretary Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy.

One of the purposes of our long term energy project is to put America on the path to achieving energy independence. This goal will be achieved by creating small four-part \$2000 renewable energy systems (from off the shelf equipment) which can be easily installed on all 150 million homes and buildings in America. They will include solar, wind, solar hot water, and electricity stored in batteries. The low cost will be attained by mass producing the systems and installing them in a block by block basis similar to Smart Grid meters. Custom systems randomly installed can cost \$10,000 each. Since the power will be created on site, this eliminates distribution costs and power losses that often average 50%. Our project will be the first step to installing renewable energy equipment in all homes and buildings and it will lead to building Net-Zero structures that will create enough surplus power to recharge electric vehicles.

Our \$2000 systems will last 20-25 years and the payback period will average 8.3 years. They will generate 10% of the power used in a typical U.S. home or building or \$20 a month x 12 months = \$240 annually. If the U.S. Government or states provided ten-year zero-interest loans to install the systems, the cost would be \$16.67 a month. The government and states would then make money from the taxes paid on wages of thousands of workers who will be employed to manufacture and install the systems. The systems will generate 150-200% more power than the cost of the systems or \$4800-\$6000 during their 20-25 year lifespan. This will provide profits of \$240 each year for home and building owners for 12-17 years after the systems are paid off. The profits created will provide enough money to purchase a new energy system when the first system needs replacing. Since the efficiency of solar and renewable energy equipment is increasing by 10% each year, the replacement system will generate 350% more power than the first system or \$840 annually. If the power generated is \$840 a year, the average profits over 22.5 years will be \$18,900 x 8.5 million homes and buildings in Florida = \$160 billion in profits.

The systems will provide an emergency backup to create basic electricity if power is lost and they will help to strengthen and flatten the main electric grid by providing a new reliable power source. The time to build one nuclear plant averages 15 years before they produce one watt of electricity but our systems will start generating power as soon as they are installed. If one of these systems were installed in each of America's 150 million homes and buildings, this would equal \$36 billion annually in electric power generated or \$240 x 150 million systems = \$36 billion. This is 10% of the annual power consumption of all U.S. homes and buildings and it is the same amount of power generated by 36 nuclear reactors.

These systems would work best in poorer nations because they will provide 100% of the daily power needs for 60% of the people on earth. This is because three billion people on earth only have electricity for a few hours each day and one billion have no power. The systems will provide critical power for refrigeration, water purification, lights, fans, radios, TVs, and computers. The U.S. should manufacture the systems for the enormous global market to create U.S. jobs and reduce worldwide CO2 pollution.

In the years 2013-2014, America is at a crossroads and we could either commit to expanding nuclear power or we could switch directions and use the money (our money) for developing renewable energy. Every new nuclear reactor built today in the U.S. will cost electric utility customers roughly \$10 billion in construction costs and \$40 billion in electricity purchased over 40 years. Renewable energy from the sun, wind, and earth is free, clean, and unlimited and it can provide large profits for home and building owners. Renewable energy is the future for our planet and nuclear power is the past. We will promote this important message throughout America and globally, and demonstrate that renewable energy is an infinitely better and more cost-effective choice than nuclear power for generating electricity.

Homes and buildings in the U.S. produce more CO2 pollution which causes global warming than all forms of transportation combined. This is caused because 40% of America's power is produced from burning coal. To reduce this pollution, our group will develop, promote, and implement numerous innovative renewable energy ideas, concepts, and systems that will help in reducing electric power consumption. Once we clearly demonstrate the economic and environmental benefits of our processes, we will expand them in Florida, across the United States, and worldwide. It is much easier and more cost-effective to conserve electricity, than it is to use nuclear, coal, oil, and natural gas to create it.


One of the goals of our bike tour is to attain enough public support for my renewable energy proposals to stop four proposed nuclear power reactors from being built in Florida by Florida Power & Light and Duke Energy. FP&L's two reactors will be built for a cost of \$17 billion at their nuclear facility that is located 25 miles south of Miami near the Everglades. These reactors will use 90 million gallons of water each day for cooling in this environmentally sensitive area. Duke Energy is America's largest electric utility and they recently purchased Florida's Progress Energy. They plan to build two reactors costing \$24 billion near Tampa. The decision to approve the construction of these four reactors could be finalized in one year by June of 2014. There are three hearings scheduled this summer on July 17th, 23rd, and 25th to hear public testimony relating to FP&L's project. The meetings will be a major step in FP&L attaining final approval to build their two reactors. I am organizing a group of knowledgeable and concerned citizens to speak at these meetings against building any new nuclear reactors in Florida.

Since time is short, we must move quickly to present our case that renewable energy is an infinitely better choice than nuclear power to produce electricity. We believe that we can stop these four nuclear power reactors from being built in Florida. This will be possible because we have developed a more cost-effective plan which will benefit the citizens of Florida, instead of giving all of the huge financial benefits to Florida Power & Light and Duke Energy, including owning 100% of the nuclear reactors. If the four nuclear reactors are built in the next 15 years, they will cost Florida's citizens \$40 billion or \$4700 per utility customer. Then our citizens will have to pay FP&L and Duke Energy \$4 billion each year for the power x 40 years operating the plants = \$160 billion. The total cost will be \$40 billion + \$160 billion = \$200 billion or \$23,500 per utility customer. We have a better plan that will provide two \$2000 renewable energy systems to each of Florida's 8.5 million electric utility customers, without costing them any out of pocket money. The 17 million energy systems progressively installed over the next 15 years throughout Florida will produce more power annually than the four nuclear reactors.

Two of these first generation systems will create an average of \$40 a month in electricity x 12 months = \$480 or 20% of the power used each year in a typical U.S. home or building. Two second generation systems will produce \$1680 in electricity annually or \$480 x 350% = \$1680 or 70% of power usage. The profits attained by Florida's citizens over 55 years by switching from nuclear to renewable will be \$320 billion or \$38,000 per utility customer. In the first 15 years, the 17 million systems will produce \$30 billion in free power, compared to zero power by the reactors. This project will also create 20,000 jobs in Florida and it will make Florida number one in the installation of renewable energy equipment.

For every \$1 invested today in solar and wind power, this will produce \$2-\$3 in free electricity, and for every \$1 invested in nuclear, we must pay \$4 more to purchase the power. We want to help America's citizens discover what the true costs are to expand nuclear power. Once they learn about these costs and the huge economic and environmental benefits from developing our energy project, strong public opinion will prevent these four nuclear reactors from being built. Please contact me if you have any questions and I look forward to your response regarding funding and sponsorship of our bicycle tour.

Regards,



Patrick Post

Eric Fryson

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 3:52 PM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009

FPSC, CLK - CORRESPONDENCE
Administrative Parties ☒ Consumer
DOCUMENT NO. 00302-13
DISTRIBUTION: _____

Customer correspondence

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 3:51 PM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

Copy on file, see 1110431C. DH

From: Merle Norman - South Pasadena [<mailto:merlenormansp@tampabay.rr.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 1:05 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Duke Energy Rate Increase

Greetings,

This note is meant to encourage you to repeal any rate increase request submitted by Duke Energy. Recent rate increases granted to Progress Energy have already stifled small business growth in the Tampa Bay area. As a small business owner I have personally postponed a variety of expansions because my electric rates are excessive. And I'm not the only one. Many of my peers are postponing as well to see what the commission will do concerning Duke.

Duke Energy knew what they were assuming when acquiring Progress and we all know what the boondoggle Crystal River turned out to be. Duke customers should NOT be forced to absorb Duke's costs with Crystal River.

Thank you,

Duane Estel, MGMR
Perina Enterprises, LLC

Eric Fryson

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Thursday, May 09, 2013 2:35 PM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: docket 130009

FPSC, CLK - CORRESPONDENCE
Administrative Parties ☒ Consumer
DOCUMENT NO. 00302-13
DISTRIBUTION: _____

Customer correspondence.

-----Original Message-----

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Tuesday, May 07, 2013 3:06 PM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: FW: My contact

Copy on file, see 1109772C. DH

-----Original Message-----

From: Webmaster
Sent: Monday, May 06, 2013 9:14 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: FW: My contact

-----Original Message-----

From: contact@psc.state.fl.us [<mailto:contact@psc.state.fl.us>]
Sent: Sunday, May 05, 2013 10:53 PM
To: Webmaster
Subject: My contact

Contact from a Web user

Contact Information:

Name: Lowell Andrews
Company: None
Primary Phone:
Secondary Phone:
Email: andya1950@gmail.com

Response requested? Yes

CC Sent? No

Comments:

The Florida PSC is as corrupt as it gets! Your stewardship of the Florida rate paying public has obviously been sold out! Why charge me for Duke's services never to be rendered? What a giant and sinful scam! What theft is this you approve? YOU are supposed to be preventing THIS VERY ACT! That's why YOU exist, remember! Right now, I see the PSC as a nest of bribed prostitutes, subservient to a bunch of criminal, filthy rich Duke stockholders who are obviously bribing republican politicians to write laws to STEAL my money on a BIG FAT CRIMINAL LIE!

Your treason is the epitome of sinful, blatant, public theft and corrupt thievery by force, and shows a clear conspiracy to bribe the law and to steal!

I believe, the entire PSC should be arrested and jailed for high treason and conspiracy to defraud the public!

Catherine Potts

From: Office of Commissioner Balbis
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2013 9:13 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: A Question about Duke/Progress Energy and Nuclear Cost Fees

FPSC, CLK - CORRESPONDENCE
_Administrative_Parties/Consumer
DOCUMENT NO. DD302-13
DISTRIBUTION:

Cathi,

Please place the attached letter in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 130009-EI.

Thank you,
Cristian

-----Original Message-----

From: Linus Upson [mailto:Linus@lampabay.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2013 12:42 PM
To: Office Of Commissioner Edgar; Office of Commissioner Balbis; Office of Commissioner Brisé; Office Of Commissioner Graham; Office of Commissioner Brown
Subject: A Question about Duke/Progress Energy and Nuclear Cost Fees

Progress Energy demonstrated poor judgement and flawed management practices when it decided to save millions of dollars by putting at risk billions of dollars of investment in the Crystal River 3 facility.

Under then President Johnson management decided to use its in-house untested approach to opening the containment building. It did so after contacting the major US civil nuclear engineering firms which had opened and closed containment domes numerous times successfully. And rejected their approaches. In fact, publicly, several outside senior engineers then and afterward raised serious questions about the Progress/Duke approach. Very unusual steps.

Johnson et al. went down their own road and history tells us they were wrong.

More importantly, from my perspective, the decision was simply imprudent. Their process was flawed by looking at saving cents instead of safely providing power for decades into the future worth billions.

The requirement in the PSC's founding document is that taxing forward only applies to companies with "prudent management."

My question is, how, after the CR3 fiasco, and the Duke management kerfluffles, could the PSC of the State of Florida decide again to channel millions of Florida tax payer dollars to Duke Energy on a wish and a prayer that this company could now somehow show it is "prudent"?

Eric Fryson

From: Ann Cole
Sent: Monday, February 11, 2013 10:24 AM
To: Eric Fryson
Cc: Hong Wang; Catherine Potts
Subject: FW: Nuclear Cost Recovery Law

FPSC, CLK CORRESPONDENCE		
<input type="checkbox"/> Administrative	<input type="checkbox"/> Parties	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consumer
DOCUMENT NO. <u>00302-13</u>		
DISTRIBUTION: _____		

Please process this request. Thank you, Ann

-----Original Message-----

From: Pamela Paultre On Behalf Of Office of Commissioner Brisé
Sent: Monday, February 11, 2013 10:16 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Nuclear Cost Recovery Law

Cathi,

Please place the forwarded or enclosed correspondence in Docket Correspondence of Consumers and their representatives for docket no. 13009-EI.

Thank you,

Pamela Paultre
Assistant to Chairman Ronald Brisé
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6036

-----Original Message-----

From: Terry Hammonds [mailto:hammonds_terry@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 10, 2013 5:52 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brisé
Subject: Nuclear Cost Recovery Law

Will you work with Florida legislators to repeal the nuclear cost recovery law?

This law allows Duke Energy and other electric providers to take money from customers today to fund nuclear plant construction that will never be built, yet they get to keep the money collected.

Duke Energy shareholders should be responsible for the financial risks, not Florida customers.

Terry Hammonds MSW
Dunedin, Florida
hammonds_terry@yahoo.com
727.465.8623
Sent from my iPad

Eric Fryson

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Tuesday, January 15, 2013 10:58 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 130009
Customer correspondence

CONSUMER

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Tuesday, January 15, 2013 10:26 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 130009

Copy on file. see 1096877C. DH

From: Robert [mailto:RMOODY18@tampabay.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, January 14, 2013 4:15 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Progress Energy

You, the PSC, and us customers of Progress Energy(PE) have just been scammed by PE. You just approved PE's request to lower customer's bills in 2013. In a way that did not happen. Yes PE went down in fuel charge from 4.86 to 3.393 (1st 1000 kwh residential service), but they went up in energy charge from 6.275 to 7.047 (1st 1000 kwh). Just as well say the increase washed out the decrease. So either they pulled the wool over PSC's eyes or you people allowed them to do this while advertising a decrease in rates thinking nobody out here was smart enough to catch this. Who do you represent? Robert D. Moody, Citrus Springs



DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

00302 JAN 15 2

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

1/15/2013