Sandra Soto

From: Sandra Soto on behalf of Records Clerk
Sent: Wednesday, July 26, 2017 2:02 PM

To: 'Ken and Deanna'
Cc: Consumer Contact

Subject: RE: Questions regarding ORDER NO. PSC-17-0178-S-EI

Good afternoon, Mr. Lewis,

We will be placing your comments below in consumer correspondence in Docket No. 20160186 and forwarding your comments to the Office of Consumer Assistance and Outreach.

Sincerely,

Sandra Soto

Commission Deputy Clerk I Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399 ssoto@psc.state.fl.us (850) 413-6010

From: Ken and Deanna [mailto:kanddlewis@cox.net]

Sent: Wednesday, July 26, 2017 1:53 PM To: Records Clerk; Consumer Contact

Subject: Questions regarding ORDER NO. PSC-17-0178-S-EI

Hello Mrs. Stauffer!

Please help address and clarify some of the decisions made within the subject referenced agreement / order number.

What recourse of action is available to the average every day consumer / customer to raise objection to / oppose the rate increase for energy that you all approved and implemented on 16 May, 2017? It would make sense to me if the Judicial Review, or other review process would be open for a period after the date of implementation so that the average person would have the opportunity to see the changes and how they have affected them, particularly within their monthly budgets. As you all have it written and approved, those "adversely affected" by the commission's final action have 30 days to appeal from the date you approved the order (approximately 16 June) which makes it unappealable by a couple of weeks once implemented (1 July) when average customers will see it for the first time.

Please also address the aspect of justification for this energy charge based increase to the tune of netting GP \$54.3M. The cost of oil per barrel has been trending down for over a year, which translates to lower energy costs. What period of time were any potential justifying statements of higher energy / fuel costs presented to the commission based on? Were any figures potentially presented so significantly high that the commission believed it warranted to pass these costs on to the customers / citizens that they are there to represent, protect, and ensure services at fair prices?

I have reviewed the five follow up questions the commission presented to GP, and it appears that none seriously challenged any aspect of increasing residential services to the average consumers by 5%. Please provide some metric that the commission considered in this process, as it does translate to approximately \$10 per customer on a \$200 bill for

just the energy charge alone. Please then also take into account how this also spreads to the franchise fees, and other taxes – easily adding another \$25 to \$30 per bill, or a net additional increase in these areas of approximately 3%.

I look forward to your response and certainly appreciate your time,

Kenneth Lewis