

Collin Roehner

From: Ruth McHargue
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2016 10:34 AM
To: Consumer Correspondence
Cc: Diane Hood
Subject: FW: To CLK Docket 160021

Customer correspondence

From: Consumer Contact
Sent: Friday, November 04, 2016 8:09 AM
To: Ruth McHargue
Subject: To CLK Docket 160021

Copy on file, see 1227057C. DHood

From: home4road [<mailto:home4road@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, November 03, 2016 4:22 PM
To: Consumer Contact
Subject: FPL Docket 160021

TO: PSC Commissioners
RE: FPL Rate hike Docket 160021
DATE: Nov. 3, 2016
FROM: Marvin Clegg

During my research into the deceptive Amendment One on our ballots, I discovered that FPL was apparently the largest financial contributor to this anti-solar effort, donating at least \$7.4 Million to push the effort over on voters.¹ And I also learned that FPL is telling you they need a huge rate hike while funding tricks² like this.

I want to be on record as opposing any rate increase for a corporation that seems more interested in funding politics like this, than in moving towards a brighter tomorrow for our children. As you've no doubt read, one power consultant called this amendment ploy "an incredibly savvy maneuver" that "would completely negate anything they [pro-solar interests] would try to do either legislatively or constitutionally down the road."³ All of this played out as our area of Florida slowly had electricity restored from Hurricane Matthew and residents complained of non-rural areas going for days and days without power being restored despite past storm recovery fees being granted.

Incredibly, Florida lags behind northern states like New Jersey, Massachusetts and New York in solar production, at a ranking of 16th in the nation by one popular publication!⁴ Investor-owned utilities wield excessive power in Tallahassee while the average Florida household spends nearly \$2000 per year on power -- 40 percent more than the national average.

Instead of trying to keep solar at 1% (one) of Florida's energy mix, the utilities should have used their \$19 million in lobbying dollars toward further decentralization of our power sources so we can better withstand natural disasters, hackers, or terrorism against the natural gas lines or coal supplies--after all, in 2015, Florida was still using coal-fired generation for nearly one fifth of our power, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration.⁵ And while FPL has increasingly shifted to natural gas for energy, Florida residents, at least,

pay the fourth highest price for natural gas in the U.S. because it is not cheap moving this fuel around the country.⁶ Building hybrid solar/ gas thermal plants in South Florida on a relatively small scale (kW wise) is not a decentralization of power where North Florida is concerned, and in 2015 renewable energy only accounted for 2.3% of Florida's total net electricity generation--and 90% of THAT was from biomass, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration.

Meanwhile, FPL is asking you for an increase of base rates by 22 % over the next three years, over the objections of the AARP and many consumers who will have to foot the bill to continue the status quo.⁷ A vote for this FPL hike is a vote against Florida's future. FPL brags that natural gas consumption will save consumers money, but compared to *what?* Oil ? Coal? FPL acknowledged in a 2013 press release "it has minimal production, no storage capabilities and only two major pipeline systems," at that time. Meanwhile, it is spending more than \$7 million to deter decentralized solar power in our state while asking these same residents to hike its rates !

It is embarrassing for the Sunshine State to be preparing to spend big dollars to pipe in gas from Alabama for future needs and to brag about using more gas for electricity than any other state other than oil-rich Texas. If FPL already has the millions to trick Floridians at the polls, please don't reward it with a rate hike.

Marvin Clegg
Flagler Beach

1. Financing:

[https://ballotpedia.org/Florida_Solar_Energy_Subsidies_and_Personal_Solar_Use,_Amendment_1_\(2016\)](https://ballotpedia.org/Florida_Solar_Energy_Subsidies_and_Personal_Solar_Use,_Amendment_1_(2016)) and <http://www.orlandosentinel.com/opinion/os-ed-paula-dockery-solar-amendment-no-092216-20160922-story.html>

2. The Florida Supreme Court narrowly approved the deceptive amendment wording, with Justice Pariente saying "let the pro-solar energy consumers beware..." and calling the amendment a masquerade. <http://www.orlandosentinel.com/opinion/os-ed-paula-dockery-solar-amendment-no-092216-20160922-story.html>

3. (Miami Herald Oct. 19,2016 at <http://miamiherald.typepad.com/nakedpolitics/2016/10/jmi-director-backs-off-political-jiu-jitsu-claim-about-utility-industrys-secret-solar-strategy-.html> . Audio recording leak: <http://www.miamiherald.com/news/politics-government/election/article109017387.html#storylink=cpy> and [https://ballotpedia.org/Florida_Solar_Energy_Subsidies_and_Personal_Solar_Use,_Amendment_1_\(2016\)](https://ballotpedia.org/Florida_Solar_Energy_Subsidies_and_Personal_Solar_Use,_Amendment_1_(2016))

4. Solar ranking: <http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/the-koch-brothers-dirty-war-on-solar-power-20160211>. Average residential electricity costs in 2015 per www.eia.gov shows Florida as the 8th highest. Another ranking in 2016 put Florida as the 5th highest, and the poorest residents frequently pay the highest of the percentages of after-tax income that energy costs constitute. <https://wallethub.com/edu/energy-costs-by-state/4833/> Higher residential electricity expenditures in Florida by 40%: <http://www.eia.gov/state/?sid=fl>

5. Coal sources: <https://www.eia.gov/state/analysis.cfm?sid=FL>

6. <https://wallethub.com/edu/energy-costs-by-state/4833/#methodology>

7. Rate hike: <http://www.floridatoday.com/story/news/local/2016/06/16/fpl-customers-express-concerns-rate-hearing/85950818/> and <http://www.law360.com/articles/853047/fpl-looks-to-keep-rate-hike-deal-on-track> and <http://www.sayfiereview.com/page/The%20Week%20Ahead%20in%20Florida%20Politics%20October%2024%202016>