

Antonia Hover

From: John Plescow
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2022 11:32 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence; Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 20210015
Attachments: Minimum PSC-Approved Electric Bill is Excessive; Re Minimum PSC-Approved Electric Bill is Excessive

Please, add to the FPL docket ending 015. Both attachments are for the same customer.

From: Diane Hood <DHOOD@PSC.STATE.FL.US>
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2022 11:12 AM
To: John Plescow <JPlescow@PSC.STATE.FL.US>
Subject: To CLK Docket 20210015

The 2 included is the same customer.

Antonia Hover

From: Howard Kanner <howiek00@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 11, 2022 5:55 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Minimum PSC-Approved Electric Bill is Excessive

Greetings:

I am very frustrated with the newly approved \$25 minimum bill of \$25 for electricity (with FPL).

A few years ago, I installed approximately 10 KW of solar generation capability on my house. This was to help reduce my personal load on the grid and help join the green energy efforts. Personally, I would have preferred to have installed 20 KW and eliminated my reliance on FPL, which is mediocre for getting power returned after a storm, but the state law makes that very difficult for a homeowner (and costly).

I have been paying about \$10 a month when my solar is more productive than my consumption, which has been acceptable because I do not have energy storage at my house. I am waiting for storage to become better in quality, and I am not comfortable spending \$10K or more for a battery system that might not last long.

Now, you, the PSC have approved the most consumer unfriendly fee! For a "public service" commission, this seems more like you are in service of the industry, which has limited the ability of the public to embrace green energy.

Can you please explain to me how this new minimum \$25 per month is in the benefit of the greater public good?

Perhaps a more fair approach would be to charge the minimum \$25, but also associate that with up to a minimum consumption? In other words, if I overproduce and have a reserve of perhaps 500 KW, and if I use 200 KW in a given month, do not permit the power companies from reducing my reserve, but charge me the minimum fee with a minimum consumption?

This would allow me to stretch my overproduction further throughout the year, and we know summer is enough to burn through most reserves.

Then, fewer people would be receiving the unfair charge for no services rendered, only those who produce more than the minimum consumption over the course of a year, and they will receive a credit at the end of the year, which we know is about \$0.10 on the dollar.

But most households will be paying for what they use in any given month. And if they do not use the minimum consumption for a given month, at least they still get to carry forward more of their reserve.

Sure, this would increase the math for the power companies, but only once, and then they will have updated their systems to correct billing and be more fair to the public!

As the current bill appears to be, I am getting charged \$30 (with taxes and fees) for the privilege of being connected to FPL, and my reserve has been reduced. I would rather have paid for my 176 KW used this past month. Or, perhaps I should have cranked my AC to frosty levels and wore a sweater just so I would have used more power since it would not change my total electric bill!

Please contact me about how your PSC can make this proposal happen, and the public who are embracing green energy, and helping reduce the load on the power grid during, which gets strained every summer, can be more fairly treated.

Or is the intent of this minimum \$25 bill trying to encourage people to get off the electric grid completely if they have the means? If I were to add another 10 KW to my house, and a battery storage system, I will never need to deal with FPL again.

Or is the intent for people who have solar to just consume even more electricity so that they can feel like they are not getting taken advantage of?

Thank you.

-Howard

Howard and Jo Ellen Kanner

930 Bluegrass Ln

Rockledge, FL 32955

Antonia Hover

From: Howard Kanner <howiek00@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 12, 2022 8:14 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: Re: Minimum PSC-Approved Electric Bill is Excessive

Greetings, and a follow-up

I read a little more about the approved rate increase, and now realize that it is a base rate increase for ALL customers, which equates to \$240 per year increase after all taxes and fees.

This is very harsh, considering the profits that the power companies have had this past year or two, and the poor upkeep of infrastructure, as well as pathetic efforts to help stem the reliance on fossil fuels. Still, those costs should have been mostly approved fuel and non-fuel rate increases, which are the actual expenses that are increasing, since it is rather obvious that the infrastructure projects are empty promises!

How about imposing requirements on the power companies to make residential solar more accessible? Residential solar decreases the loads on the crappy infrastructure (my power flashes on and off at least once per week from May through October, and I live in the city of Rockledge) How about imposing requirements on the power companies to reinvest those profits into renewable energy sources? I am not talking about eliminating dependence on fossil fuels, as there is still a need for them until energy storage is more efficient and environmentally friendly, but this would help all consumers with less impacts from fuel price fluctuations. And we all know that when a rate goes up for rising costs, they never go back down, ever!

How about working to update the laws/codes for residential solar? Allow residents to size a system to 125% their projected annual needs, but pay a basic connection fee to use the electrical grid as storage? Heck, paying 10-cents on the dollar for over-production is fair, because residential solar should not be a private business, and that reduced payout rate is another fee for using the grid as storage. And I recognize that grid-tied residential solar is not powering a house during any outages, but that is necessary to protect linemen who need to service the outages.

I am not opposed to rate increases when it is transparent (with more than 30 days notice), and it is clear how those funds will be used. But with FPLs current annual profits, the optics of such an increase is rather suspicious.

Thank you.
-Howard

> On Jun 11, 2022, at 5:54 AM, Howard Kanner <howiek00@yahoo.com> wrote:

>

> Greetings:

> I am very frustrated with the newly approved \$25 minimum bill of \$25 for electricity (with FPL).

>

> A few years ago, I installed approximately 10 KW of solar generation capability on my house. This was to help reduce my personal load on the grid and help join the green energy efforts. Personally, I would have preferred to have installed 20 KW and eliminated my reliance on FPL, which is mediocre for getting power returned after a storm, but the state law makes that very difficult for a homeowner (and costly).

>

> I have been paying about \$10 a month when my solar is more productive than my consumption, which has been acceptable because I do not have energy storage at my house. I am waiting for storage to become better in quality, and I am not comfortable spending \$10K or more for a battery system that might not last long.

>

> Now, you, the PSC have approved the most consumer unfriendly fee! For a “public service” commission, this seems more like your are in service of the industry, which has limited the ability of the public to embrace green energy.

>

> Can you please explain to me how this new minimum \$25 per month is in the benefit of the greater public good?

>

> Perhaps a more fair approach would be to charge the minimum \$25, but also associate that with up to a minimum consumption? In other words, if I overproduce and have a reserve of perhaps 500 KW, and if I use 200 KW in a given month, do not permit the power companies from reducing my reserve, but charge me the minimum fee with a minimum consumption?

> This would allow me to stretch my overproduction further throughout the year, and we know summer is enough to burn through most reserves.

>

> Then, fewer people would be receiving the unfair charge for no services rendered, only those who produce more than the minimum consumption over the course of a yea, and they will receive a credit at the end of the year, which we know is about \$0.10 on the dollar.

> But most households will be paying for what they use in any given month. And if they do not use the minimum consumption for a given month, at least they still get to carry forward more of their reserve.

>

> Sure, this would increase the math for the power companies, but only once, and then they will have updated their systems to correct billing and be more fair to the public!

> As the current bill appears to be, I am getting charged \$30 (with taxes and fees) for the privilege of being connected to FPL, and my reserve has been reduced. I would rather have paid for my 176 KW used this past month. Or, perhaps I should have cranked my AC to frosty levels and wore a sweater just so I would have used more power since it would not change my total electric bill!

>

> Please contact me about how your PSC can make this proposal happen, and the public who are embracing green energy, and helping reduce the load on the power grid during, which gets strained every summer, can be more fairly treated.

>

> Or is the intent of this minimum \$25 bill trying to encourage people to get off the electric grid completely if they have the means? If I were to add another 10 KW to my house, and a battery storage system, I will never need to deal with FPL again.

> Or is the intent for people who have solar to just consume even more electricity so that they can feel like they are not getting taken advantage of?

>

> Thank you.

> -Howard

>

> Howard and Jo Ellen Kanner

> 930 Bluegrass Ln

> Rockledge, FL 32955