

Office of Commission Clerk Official Filing

Ruth Nettles

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Monday, March 03, 2008 1:36 PM
To: Ruth Nettles; Kimberley Pena
Subject: FW: My contact

CONSUMER

Please add to docket 070677.
Thanks,
Ruth

-----Original Message-----
From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Monday, March 03, 2008 10:24 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: FW: My contact

Regarding Net Metering. Please forward.
-----Original Message-----
From: Webmaster
Sent: Monday, March 03, 2008 8:58 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: FW: My contact

-----Original Message-----
From: contact@psc.state.fl.us [mailto:contact@psc.state.fl.us]
Sent: Sunday, March 02, 2008 7:30 AM
To: Webmaster
Subject: My contact

Contact from a Web user

Contact Information:
Name: Wayne Biszick
Company:
Primary Phone: 407-482-0950
Secondary Phone:
Email: wbiszick@cfl.rr.com

Response requested? Yes
CC Sent? No

Comments:
I am delighted that Tallahassee is in the process of once more making the utilites purchase energy generated from alternate energy sources. I am, however, totally opposed to letting the utilities buy this energy without actually paying for it. Let me explain:

Presently when a utility buys power from any of its current suppliers, it must pay for it. Now the Public Utilities Commission is proposing to permit the state's energy utility companies to pay for those individuals who produce their own surplus energy with alternative source with credit slips. Well, I don't choose to accept a credit slip. If I consistantly produce enough surplus energy for my needs, what earthly good would a credit slip do me? If I sell surplus energy to the utility company, which they then take and use, I want to be paid in American greenbacks. Of course, if I used more than I produced, then at the end of a month I want and expect a bill.

If we are environmentally conscious enough to produce excess energy, we should be properly paid for it; the cash would enagle us to put in enough energy generating equipment to live off of the earnings. This could enable us to pay our escalating

DOCUMENT NUMBER - DATE
01628 MAR -4 08
FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

3/3/2008 1:46 PM

Office of Commission Clerk Official Filing

mortgages and elevate our level of spending, which expands our economy. The benefits to going green are already pretty well known and I won't bore you by repeating them all.

I must confess that I am totally amazed that it has not dawned on the utility companies that they have a giant opportunity for new revenue streams here. They could sell the alternative energy equipment to the homeowners and profit from the sale like they did in the distant past when electric appliances were sold and financed by the utility companies. Utilities also benefit from a decentralized supply system when disaster strikes because they encounter no massive power outages and they profit by revenues charged to the customer to maintain the equipment. Our area benefits, too, because it is much more difficult for a terrorist to knock out a decentralized power supply. They would have to knock out tens of thousands of small generating facilities in order to make an impact.

There is no way that this state can claim it wants to go green if the present proposal passes without a murmur of objection. The utilities must be made to pay for the energy they buy. This proposal would essentially assure that no one "goes green" by making it unprofitable for a person to switch over from conventional power sources.

As one of the authors of the New York State Residential Energy Conservation Service Program, I have seen first hand the way privately-owned utilities manage to finagle matters so that they are the only ones who profit from a situation. Their way of doing things is partly responsible for the present environmental mess. We need to decide whether or not we like the current situation. If so, we should keep doing what we have been doing, because if we want something different we're going to have to do something different.

When a person sells something, the method of acceptable payment should be determined by the seller, not the buyer. The National Energy Conservation Policy Act of 1978 required utilities to purchase energy, yes, but it also required the utilities to pay for it.

3/4/2008 12:44 PM

Office of Commission Clerk Official Filing

Ruth Nettles

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Tuesday, March 04, 2008 12:24 PM
To: Ruth Nettles; Kimberley Pena
Subject: FW: My contact

CONSUMER

Please add to docket #070677

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

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Tuesday, March 04, 2008 11:33 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: FW: My contact

To CLK

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

From: Webmaster
Sent: Tuesday, March 04, 2008 11:31 AM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: FW: My contact

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

From: contact@psc.state.fl.us [mailto:contact@psc.state.fl.us]
Sent: Tuesday, March 04, 2008 11:32 AM
To: Webmaster
Subject: My contact

Contact from a Web user

Contact Information:

Name: Enrique Sanchez
Company:
Primary Phone: 305 582-8194
Secondary Phone:
Email: quiquesan@aol.com

Response requested? No
CC Sent? No

Comments:

This may be a bit late but I just heard about your meeting today to approve net metering laws in Florida and as a citizen and voter I would like to express my support for this policy. Net metering is far overdue in Florida because it allows us to meet rising energy demands without having to build additional power plants. I have heard talks about adding a new reactor to the Turkey Point plant in Homestead at a cost of \$2.6 billion that is a lot of expense that will be passed on to tax payers and consumers which can be invested in clean renewable energy. Privately owned Solar panels can also provide emergency power during a blackout similar to the one we had last week and after hurricanes without making any noise and the need for gasoline as with the more popular generators.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

01628 MAR-4 g

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK