Marguerite McLean

From: Phillip Ellis
Sent: Wednesday, April 08, 2015 8:35 AM
To: Marguerite McLean
Cc: Moni Mtenga; Paul Vickery
Subject: RE: Duke Energy - 150083-EG 150000-OT

To my understanding, these concerns are relating to a news article quoting Duke's Ten-Year Site Plan (TYSP) and discussing Utility-scale solar versus distributed/rooftop generation. I believe the TYSP falls under the "undocketed" docket.

From: Marguerite McLean
Sent: Wednesday, April 08, 2015 8:32 AM
To: Phillip Ellis
Subject: Duke Energy - 150083-EG

Phillip,
Should the attached letter be placed in parties and interested persons correspondence in Docket 150083-EG ?

Marguerite H. McLean
Records Technician
Florida Public Service Commission
Office of Commission Clerk
Capital Circle Office Center
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee FL 32399-0850
(850) 413-6824

Angelena McCorvey

From: Rich Blaser <RBlaser@INFINITEENERGY.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 07, 2015 2:48 PM
To: Ryan West
Subject: Solar

Just saw the article about Dukes plan to add 500MW of solar capacity in Florida. I don't agree with utilities using solar to supply power to their customers for two main reasons below:

1. I don't believe solar can be marked as "primary power" because the utility can guarantee it will be available during a peek need (i.e. a cloudy/rainy day). If it can't be relied on won't the PSC require a traditional power plant to back it up? If this true then the rate payers will be paying for generation twice and that doesn't seem right.
2. Solar electricity produced by utility that is then sold to consumers will then also include the transmission and overheard costs (not to mention line loss) which wouldn't be if the customer (residential, commercial, or industrial) customer installed solar on their property and used net metering. This additional cost is expensive.

Richard Blaser | *Chief Executive Officer*

Infinite Energy

7001 SW 24th Ave, Gainesville, FL 32607
Phone: 352.240.4120
Email: Rich@InfiniteEnergy.com
Website: www.InfiniteEnergy.com