

Antonia Hover

From: Angie Calhoun
Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2020 11:30 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diana Vizcarrondo
Subject: FW: To CLK docket 20200000

Consumer contact for docket 20200000.

Angela Calhoun

From: JL Mutolo <jlmutolo@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2020 10:42 AM
To: Consumer Contact <Contact@PSC.STATE.FL.US>
Subject: Comment for NET METERING WORKSHOP

Dear PSC Commissioners:

How ironic that the single most effective means of reducing the amount of electricity that utilities need burn fossil fuels to generate is now cast in terms of class warfare. Every kilowatt that PV systems generate is a kilowatt that a utility doesn't need to generate.

I have a PV system that typically provides on the average 60% of my energy needs and keeps my average monthly consumption to less than 1,000 kilowatts. I had presumed that TECO's rate structure that escalates kW costs at the 1,000 kW point was meant to encourage consumers to take energy saving steps. I have done so, but may be penalized for it.

Not everyone can—or should—have a PV system. Therefore utility infrastructure will continue to be necessary regardless of PV use. Upgrades and maintenance of infrastructure are ongoing costs that should be factored into rate structures, and not unduly borne by those whose efforts reduce utilities' carbon footprints and electricity generation demands. It is obvious that the utilities recognize the value of PV systems by their own significant and increasing investments in the PV "farms" we see.

Finally, whether I have a net use of TECO's generated energy or not, I still pay a \$15 monthly service charge and an additional \$8 each month for "Home Surge" service. This Home Surge service is totally passive, requiring no actions on TECO's part beyond initial installation and an annual request that report to them whether a light is on or not.

Thank you for your consideration and attention to these matters.

JL Mutolo

Lutz, Florida