

Tristan Davis

From: Betty Leland
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 2:30 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket #20250011
Attachments: PSC docket #20250011 A much deserved NO vote; Please vote no to solar please hear us

Good Afternoon:

Please place this email in Docket #20250011.

Thanks.

Betty A. Leland, Executive Assistant to
Commissioner Art Graham
Florida Public Service Commission
bleland@psc.state.fl.us
(850) 413-6024

Tristan Davis

From: Ben Nottingham <wewe777bn@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 11:44 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Graham
Subject: PSC docket #20250011 A much deserved NO vote

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

Dear Commissioner Graham:

I have previously written you about the unneeded consequences of passing FPL's proposed rate increase in Docket #20250011. As a 30-yr. resident & 25-yr homeowner, I strongly urge you to vote NO this week for this proposal.

-
This proposal is not acceptable because of FPL's overextension in solar power & FLP isn't increasing low-cost energy alternatives (natural gas), nor are they supporting FL's existing long-term economies and wise land use, and they are **not promoting a diversity of energy types**. The large space needed for this proposal continues to infringe on Florida's cattle production, citrus farming, wildlife habitat, & crop production in the FL landscape. Solar power generation in FL is maximally efficient FOR ONLY 5.1 hrs of the day (DOE Berkeley Natl Lab). And to the detriment of our State & National economy, solar power components are largely made in China & this invariably drives up my overall electric bill. In the last 5 yrs., Europe and Australia have faced rolling "blackouts" due to an overreliance on solar power.

Duke Energy, TECO, and FP&L must be given a clear signal to redevelop a proposal that promotes nuclear & low-carbon emission, fuel sources for power development. This action would fulfill the PSC's own recommendations identified in the April 2025 Feasibility Report to advance Nuclear Power in FL. The 2024 Workshop on Nuclear Feasibility engaged numerous state & federal officials including those with technical expertise in nuclear power and it aligns well with Florida's energy policy (F.S. 377.602 efficient and American made).

Thus, I urge your support to **REJECT this Docket proposal (20250011) outright with no compromise and to urge these public utilities to redesign their proposal to develop more reliable and abundant, low-cost power diversity alternatives which will benefit FL businesses and current & future ratepayers.**

Sincerely,
Ben Nottingham, Jr.
1897 W. Crown Pointe Blvd.
Naples, FL 34112

Tristan Davis

From: polly7702@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, October 8, 2025 10:59 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Graham
Subject: Please vote no to solar please hear us

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

Dear Commissioner Graham,

Thank you for your service.

These are the reasons why we are against it. Also, there is too much building going on in our area. I am afraid we do not have enough water to support all of this building either. The solar energy will be insufficient for the demand that Florida will require.

Thank you for your time.

From: Floridians for abundant, reliable 24/7, low cost & low footprint electricity who request to reject PSC Docket 20250011, FP&L's proposed \$9.0B rate hike.

Whereas:

- 1. The state has seen a completely non-diversified supply of new electric generating capacity added from 2019-2025 by its Florida regulated utilities, being utility scale solar and battery storage only.*
- 2. Filed ten year site plans of the regulated utilities within SERC Florida project some 91% of 2025-2034 of new capacity additions being solar and battery storage (BESS).*
- 3. The related equipment deployed and planned (thin film PV and processed lithium battery components) emanates from Chinese supply sources, and Chinese sub-vendor countries. Fox News, Reuters, and other news agencies; along with a 2017 DOE Sandia lab evaluation have reported the presence of controlling sensors embedded within solar panels, power transformers, and inverters, of Chinese origin.*
- 4. On an energy supply basis, this form of electrification supports Florida power generation only some 5.2 hrs. average hours per day per the*

NREL. Per The DOE Berkeley National Labs., the net accredited capacity factor of Florida Solar power is only 23%.

5. Based on the above, the Energy basis Kwh installed cost of Florida solar power is 8.5X that of the advanced gas fired combined cycle power technology installed across Florida during the 2010-2019 period, and 4.25X as costly as that which would be applied, if based on present new combined cycle build cost estimates.
6. The battery storage proposed within the ten year site plans, required to back up just a portion of the intermittent solar power only 2-3 hrs. per day, costs 3.9X advanced combined cycle power.
7. Based upon the part time and non-reliable nature of the power sources described above, winter and summer peak reserve margins will suffer in Florida, adding to present reliability challenges. Winter reserve margins shall decline by some 10% according to FP&L alone. As well, Florida regulated utilities have begun soliciting customers to reduce power demand during summer and winter peak (ex. four thirty PM seven thirty PM summer peak periods) and shift this demand to midnight to five AM).
8. The Docket assumes as well that existing Florida serving constant duty, base load power plants across Florida shall be shuttered, adding great cost and a net reliability loss to ratepayers via the part time and intermittent, non-dispatchable solar replacement power.
9. FP&L 74.5MW solar farms consume on average, 680 acres each; across FP&L's filed ten year site plan, aggregating some 192,000 acres. This same annual Kwh electrical capacity, if combined cycle, on an energy delivered basis, would consume only some 66 acres.
10. As large quantities of utility scale solar farms are added within a given region, their incremental capacity factor declines markedly, by up to some 40%, according to MISO and WECC studies.
11. Building this kind of solar and BESS capacity has caused rates to rise dramatically in all markets where applied heavily (Western Europe, CA, Australia), along with interim supply shortages to the detriment of consumer ratepayers and industry alike.
12. Alternate, cost effective, proven technology appears available to deploy here, given recent large awards to GE Vernova provided by Duke Energy (11 units), along with Nextera, targeting their hyperscaler and data center clients.

We urge you to reject this extremely costly FP&L plan to continue to install a non-diversified supply of dominantly solar and BESS technology across Florida; as very clearly to the economic, reliability, energy quantity, and land availability detriment of present & potential future Florida Power & Light

David and Michelle Pyle

829 Palm St Unit A, B and C

Marco Island, Fl 34145

Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS