

**Charlie Smith**

**From:** John Plescow  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 9, 2025 8:42 AM  
**To:** Consumer Correspondence; Consina Griffin-Greaux  
**Subject:** FW: TECO Proposed storm recovery rate increase

Please, add to docket 20240172.

---

**From:** Consina Griffin-Greaux <CGriffin@psc.state.fl.us> **On Behalf Of** Consumer Contact  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 08, 2025 11:56 AM  
**To:** John Plescow <JPlescow@PSC.STATE.FL.US>  
**Subject:** RE: TECO Proposed storm recovery rate increase

John,

Please forward to clerk's office.

CGriffin

**From:** Andrew <drewsky72@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 27, 2024 6:55 PM  
**To:** Consumer Contact <[Contact@PSC.STATE.FL.US](mailto:Contact@PSC.STATE.FL.US)>  
**Subject:** TECO Proposed storm recovery rate increase

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Good day, I'm writing to the PSC as a TECO customer based in Tampa FL, regarding their latest rate increase request to recover \$464 MILLION dollars in storm damages for the 2024 hurricane season.

To the PSC I ask: When is enough enough?? When will the commision stop rubber-stamping utilities so that they may protect their profit margins?

The public is repeatedly asked to fund rate increases to "harden the grid" or to "modernize power plants to save money" yet, we the customers do not see any of the outcomes of this investment. (otherwise we'd see rate DECREASES eventually).

I endured both of the hurricanes that impacted Tampa FL. I lost power for five days from hurricane Milton. There are anecdotal reports of linemen [from out of state helping with the recovery] that stated that some of the line/pole failures from the storm were so bad that they should have been replaced years ago. YEARS AGO! Have you asked the utility about this?

This begs the question that when the utility comes to you to approve rate increases to do a thing (in this case, harden transmission equipment for storm hardiness). What do you do to ensure that investment is made?

The commission recently approved a graduating rate increase to haden the power grid, and now we have to pay an ENORMOUS amount of money to repair it. We're talking about HALF A BILLION DOLLARS here. This isn't small money. What is this money spent on? Of that, what had to be paid for on a neglected grid that should have been already replaced? How much is just going toward protecting the profit margin of a foreign holding company? Who's asking for these audits?

Now, it isn't unreasonable to seek recovery for a storm. HOWEVER, it is my expectation (and it should, by extension, be yours) that this recovery cost goes down if we are continually investing in grid hardening. What that means is that if a utility says "we need extra rates to make the grid resilient", that comes with the implied agreement that "we the utility won't come to ask for repairs after this" (so we the utility will need to do a good and thorough job).

I want to be clear here: IT IS NOT MY (the customer's) RISK TO ASSUME STORM DAMAGE TO THE GRID: it is owned by TECO, this is their assumption of risk, and if they don't want to lose money, then they sure as heck better make sure they properly invest back into it. It is my contention that is not happening, and therefore the consumer is paying the bill while the utility can continue to slow-walk grid hardening/repair/maintenance investment. That is not right, and that is what the PSC is supposed to protect us from.

If the commision cannot deny this rate change by law (similar to fuel costs recovery law), then I would strongly suggest a commitment from TECO that because they are already bound by a "grid hardening" rate change, that the commision will no longer approve such rate change requests in the future. This has to stop.

Respectfully,  
Andrew Wyman  
110-2 S Bungalow Park Avenue  
Tampa FL 33609