

Hiep Nguyen

From: Office of Commissioner Passidomo
Sent: Friday, June 3, 2022 12:34 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Duke Energy
Attachments: PSC.docx

Please place the attached in Docket No. 20210016.

Thank you!

From: Stephen Hendershott <steveh fla@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 1, 2022 12:34 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Passidomo <Commissioner.Passidomo@psc.state.fl.us>
Subject: Duke Energy

Please see the attached letter. It has been emailed individually to each PSC Commissioner.

Thank you.

Stephen W. Hendershott

448 Klosterman Road West
Palm Harbor, FL 34683-1112
585.857.2577
steveh fla@outlook.com

Stephen W. Hendershott

448 Klosterman Rd. W. • Palm Harbor FL 34683
C: (585) 857-2577 • steveh.fla@outlook.com

June 1, 2022

Andrew Giles Fay, Chairman
Art Graham, Mike La Rosa, Gabriella Passidomo, Gary F. Clark, Commissioners
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Dear Chairman and Commissioners:

I am writing to you to seek your assistance with a problem with Duke Energy Florida.

Recently I had solar panels installed on my home. As Florida is the "Sunshine State" I thought it would be helpful to the environment, efficient to the grid, and effective to me financially if I went with solar panels. I am retired and live on Social Security and a small pension. That being the case, I financed the solar panels and their installation. This was supposed to be a wash on my net billing between my monthly finance payment and Duke bill, including the \$12 monthly fee for administration purposes by Duke. All well and good. However, they are now adding on an additional fee of almost \$18. They have told me that this is to cover their costs of maintaining the grid. That is their responsibility, not mine.

Understandably, this is a small amount in perspective. But instead of solar being affordable, it is now costing me more to generate solar power than it was without solar panels. And, it is extremely unfair and burdensome to a person of my limited means.

To put this into the proper perspective, I did some research on Duke Energy. Duke Energy for 2021 had a gross profit of \$18.137 **billion** which was a 4.49% increase from 2020. Their net annual income for 2021 was \$3.802 **billion** and a 199.37% increase from 2020.

Now I'm all in favor of capitalism and I want Duke to be profitable. But with those kinds of profits, why are they allowed to make an unwarranted charge against little people like me? Duke has 1.8 million customers. If they reduced the bill to every customer by \$18 that would only amount to \$32.4 million. That would still leave Duke's net annual income at more than \$3.7 billion. I don't know how many of the 1.8 million customers have solar panels but surely it is a very small percentage which would have an even less impact. So to put that also into the proper perspective, the elimination of this charge to solar panel homeowners for Duke to maintain their grid would have an inconsequential effect on Duke's bottom line. To me, it seems to be a punitive charge Duke is making to punish people who choose to go with solar.

Duke has informed me that this \$18 charge for grid maintenance was approved by you, the Public Service Commission. That being the case, and with all due respect, **I would ask you to reconsider the approval of this charge and then vote to rescind it, effective immediately.** I think the PSC does an excellent job overall in regulating Duke and protecting the consumers, large and small. This small item seems to have slipped through the cracks as far as protecting the consumer and has a large impact on people such as myself.

Thank you for your consideration. If I can provide any additional input, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Stephen W. Hendershott