

Ashley Quick

From: Joann Parsons
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 9:20 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Correspondence frm J. Brow
Attachments: 2016-06-19, Ltr frm JBrow.pdf


Please place the attached in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and Their Representatives, Docket No. 150171-EI.

Thank you,

Joann

June 19, 2016

Julie I. Brown, Chairman
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850



Dear Chairman Brown:

So, what is with the new charge on the Duke Energy statement? The one that states, "Asset Securitization Charge." When I inquired I was told that rather than increase the energy charge this was used. This is an energy charge that was implemented this July.

First of all, Duke Energy is a monopoly. We should not be paying a customer charge for using this MONOPLOY. Now we are hit with an additional charge for energy when the cost of energy is going down and has been for some time.

The Public Service Commission should be looking out for the interests of the consumers, not the welfare of Duke Energy. Perhaps they are in need of money being the largest electric company in our country and just spending five billion to purchase Piedmont Natural Gas Company.

I would like an explanation as to why this illegal charge was permitted.

Sincerely,

Joseph F. Brow
711 Osceola Ave.
Lake Wales, FL 33853

Cc Governor Scott