

Antonia Hover

From: Office of Chairman Clark
Sent: Friday, October 29, 2021 3:38 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: FPL Rate Increase

Importance: High

Good afternoon,

Please place the attached email in Docket No. 20210015.

Hannah E. Barker

Executive Assistant to Chairman Clark
Florida Public Service Commission
[2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.](#)
[Tallahassee, FL 32399](#)
(850) 413-6004

From: lindsay@wirespring.com <lindsay@wirespring.com>
Sent: Friday, October 29, 2021 2:50 PM
To: Office of Commissioner La Rosa <Commissioner.LaRosa@psc.state.fl.us>; Office of Commissioner Graham <Commissioner.Graham@PSC.STATE.FL.US>; Office of Chairman Clark <Commissioner.Clark@psc.state.fl.us>; Office of Commissioner Fay <Commissioner.Fay@psc.state.fl.us>; Office of Commissioner Passidomo <Commissioner.Passidomo@psc.state.fl.us>
Subject: FPL Rate Increase
Importance: High

All of you should be aware:

Much to my surprise I received a call from Richard Gentry just now, who I guess is Director of the Office of Public Counsel representing utility consumers here in Florida. There are a number of issues which were raised in our conversation that make me even more unsettled with the PSC rate decision earlier this week. I'd like to bring them to your attention because I am appalled literally.

- 1) He questioned the proposed rate increases of \$12 per month that were published in various articles stating that the increase would be more around \$6 per month. He'll deny he stated that but I assure you that is what he told me. He then claimed that the cost increases would be solely attributed to natural gas prices while the long term plan of solar power would eventually reduce all rates. Yet I mentioned my mother on a fixed income who uses less than 1000 kw per month would end up paying \$144 more per year for the same usage ON A FIXED INCOME.
- 2) He also said the increases would fund the proposed solar "farms" that FPL is planning on building. I asked him whether or not those farms would be located in Florida or used by NextEra. He stated that the 6 farms would all be in Florida. So I asked him where those proposed sites are and he said he didn't know. About the viability? ***I don't know how the Office of Public Counsel can allow those increases when they're not even of aware of where those farms are going to be located or if they're even viable.***

3) He then stated that transmissions lines are cheap. I told him not according to FPL submissions to the FCC in their lawsuit with AT&T over pole fees. He stated the difference was intrastate versus interstate with interstate being governed by the Federal Govt. I had to point out to him that the dispute between FPL & AT&T was strictly intrastate.

I informed him that he is supposed to be advocating for all of the Florida residents and that he basically allowed everyone south of Orlando to be hit for the benefit of North Florida residents and for the benefit of the Industrial Power Users Group. He of course denied any type of favoritism.

I also told him that in my opinion he needed to be removed from his position as he is definitely NOT advocating for all residents of Florida.

Those articles were cohesive in the impact of the rate increases. And oh, Richard expects an outcry come next January. But? he considers it a done deal. Has been approved by the PSC he told me.

WHAT THE PSC SHOULD DO IS RAISE THE BASE RATE PER MONTH FROM 1000 KW TO 1500 KW. That is the ONLY way to rectify what you have done in allowing FPL to burden their captive clients with such a huge increase. FIX WHAT YOU HAVE BROKEN.

Best,
Linda Drake

One important feature of the settlement requires residential customers to subsidize a \$1 billion decrease in costs for the state's largest commercial and industrial businesses and also subsidize customers who sign up for FPL's solar expansion.

[FPL witnesses admitted before regulators](#) that the agreement will cost residential customers disproportionately more than the rate increase imposed on the state's largest businesses. Those businesses will pay 20% less than what FPL originally proposed when it filed its rate case in March, while residential customers see a decrease of only 2%.

That wasn't discussed by the commission.

Witnesses for the group of consumer advocates demonstrated that residential customers would have been better off if the commission had approved FPL's original proposal instead of the settlement that was offered.

To ALL Commissioners:

WHAT IS WRONG WITH YOU?

Why would you burden all Florida residents with FPL RATE INCREASES when they are NOT justified?

Why did you ALLOW FPL to basically put their rate increases on RESIDENTIAL residents? How can

you sanction the behavior exhibited by FPL?

Your actions are just OUTRIGHT WRONG.

What are you going to do to rectify the situation?

Linda Drake
4081 SW Alice Street
Port St Lucie, FL 34953
305-829-4833