

**Antonia Hover**

---

**From:** Office of Commissioner Passidomo  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 1, 2022 9:17 AM  
**To:** Commissioner Correspondence  
**Subject:** Docket No. 20210015  
**Attachments:** Re FPL - Minimum Billing - A better way to implement

Please place the attached in Docket No. 20210015.

Thank you!

## Antonia Hover

---

**From:** Jim Blankenship <jimblankenship26105@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 1, 2022 9:01 AM  
**To:** Office of Chairman Fay; Office of Commissioner Graham; Office of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner La Rosa; Office of Commissioner Passidomo  
**Subject:** Re: FPL - Minimum Billing - A better way to implement

9/1/2022

Commissioners:

This is a follow-up to an earlier email discussing the new FPL minimum billing.

I have now received several months of bills. After detailed review of the contract and my bills, **I have concluded the approved contract is ILLEGAL per FL and federal law.** There is no problem forcing customers to pay a minimum usage amount. **However, it is ILLEGAL to not give those customers the product (in case kWh's) they are forced to purchase.** If you do not believe this is a serious issue, I challenge you to find any examples of any valid contract that forces customers to purchase a product, which they do not receive. **It is time (NOW) for you to act and correct this illegal situation (that you approved).**

The FPL algorithm is complicated; most likely this was done on purpose to confuse consumers and the commissioners. However, there is a simple means to strip away confusion; you simply need to recognize Solar Customers never receive credit for the minimum-billed kWh they purchase.

- Detailed simple calculation: To see the problem first hand, take any Solar Customer's bill and recalculate the reserve with a proper algorithm; Start out by adding the (minimum) purchased kWh to their reserve; subtract the actual usage to get a new reserve balance. When you compare the new reserve balance to the old reserve balance, the difference is exactly the minimum purchased kWh.

I am paying for the kWh and I should be able to use these stolen kWh as I see fit. For example, there are more than enough stolen kWh to pay for a full year of electric car usage. Wow. Think about it!

I am not here to prevent FPL from making a profit. I am here to get the kWh that I am paying for. Nevermind the known benefits consumer electric panels provide to FPL. These panels reduce kW usage demand at its most demanding time. Nevermind panel usage can/could prevent the need for another Florida nuclear power plant as Florida's population grows at a high rate. I simply want what I am paying for. FIX IT.

Regards

Jeffery Blankenship  
6480 36th Pl  
Vero Beach, FL 32966  
Cell: 304-210-6830

On Tue, Jul 5, 2022 at 9:31 PM Jim Blankenship <[jimblankenship26105@gmail.com](mailto:jimblankenship26105@gmail.com)> wrote:  
Commissioners:

I am sure you have received many complaints about FPL's minimum billing. This email suggests a different implementation method that helps EVERYONE.

A simple and excellent solution to the minimum bill is to implement "Net \$16.01" instead of "Net \$0". That is, FPL gets their minimum \$16.01 billing, home/panel owners have a predictable bill (before buying panels), FPL does not double dip into homeowners' reserves, and solar companies continue to sell solar panels. However, the solar companies will sell enough panels for net annual usage to \$16.01/month instead of net \$0.00/year. Moreover, the environment, Florida and FPL all win because less power plants will be needed to handle Florida's continued population growth. **Note:** I use the term "Net \$16.01" to simplify communication for the current situation. A more generic term might be "Net Minimum Usage Billing", which should stay constant even though the minimum billing amount can change over time.

What is wrong now? I have attached my most recent bill. FPL is double dipping on their billing. Per a FPL representative, the minimum billing of \$16.01 represents 239 kWh of electricity. I only used 56 kWh from 5/23 - 6/22. FLP double dipped by charging me \$16.01 while also removing 56 kWh from my reserve. By the end of 2022, I will use far less than 239 kWh/month and FPL will charge me more than \$16.01/month for every month that I use more than 239 kWh.

To summarize, FPL's current customer billing is not fair because FPL double dips their charges when considering reserves. My suggested "Net \$16.01" method removes all double dipping while providing numerous other benefits, which are listed above. Even further, FPL previous net-0 billing computer programs should work exactly the same as they did under Net-0; FPL would simply need to change the year-end balancing process to balance to \$16.01 instead of \$0.00. Everyone is a winner and it is super simple to implement!

Please consider my suggestion. I think it will be great for everyone and great every entity involved in the discussion.

Thank you,

Jeffery James Blankenship  
6480 36th Pl. Vero Beach, FL 32966  
Cell: 304-210-6830