CORRESPONDENCE 7/11/2022 DOCUMENT NO. 04645-2022

## **Hiep Nguyen**

From: Office of Commissioner Passidomo
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2022 12:04 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence

Subject:Docket No. 20210016Attachments:Duke Energy Florida

Please place the attached in Docket No. 20210016.

Thank you!

## **Hiep Nguyen**

From: Stephen Hendershott <steveh.fla@outlook.com>

**Sent:** Monday, July 11, 2022 10:57 AM

**To:** Ellen Plendl; Office of Commissioner Passidomo

**Subject:** Duke Energy Florida

Ms. Plendl and Ms. McCoy:

Thank you for your quick replies to my complaint to the Florida Public Service Commission against Duke Energy. Forgive me for the delay in responding to your information.

I understand completely the information you supplied. Thank you.

However, the purpose of the PSC as stated on your website is: "The Florida Public Service Commission is committed to making sure that Florida's consumers receive some of their most essential services — electric, natural gas, telephone, water, and wastewater — in a safe, reasonable, and reliable manner."

I believe in capitalism. Nevertheless, when a monopoly such as Duke Energy sustains an annual net income of \$3.08 billion with an increase from the prior year of 199%, any <u>reasonable</u> person would come to the conclusion that those numbers are excessive. The PSC, by your own purpose, exists to protect consumers.

To allow Duke Energy to tack on an additional charge to compensate for their costs of maintaining the grid, charged to consumers that move to solar energy is definitely not reasonable and does not protect Florida's consumers.

Again, with all due respect, I would ask the PSC to reconsider the approval of this charge and then vote to rescind it, effective immediately. That would be in the best interest of the consumers that the PSC is there to protect.

Sincerely,

Stephen W. Hendershott

448 Klosterman Road West Palm Harbor, FL 34683-1112 585.857.2577

steveh.fla@outlook.com