

Antonia Hover

From: Office of Chairman Clark
Sent: Friday, September 25, 2020 10:25 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Solar PSC workshop

Good morning,

Please place the attached email in Docket No. 20200000.

Hannah E. Barker
Executive Assistant to Chairman Clark
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(850) 413-6004

-----Original Message-----

From: scot@solarscot.com [mailto:scot@solarscot.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2020 2:35 PM
To: Office of Commissioner Brown; Office of Commissioner Graham; Office of Chairman Clark; Office of Commissioner Polmann; Office of Commissioner Fay
Subject: Solar PSC workshop

Dear Commissioners:

The workshop on Solar this past week was very informative. As a stakeholder, there is some information that I'd like to share.

First, let's reflect on major technology monopolies over recent history: The shipping and stagecoach lines lost market share when the railroads were built. Folks had another way to travel and ship things. When the airlines expanded routes, the rail companies lost market share. Folks had another way to travel. The companies losing market share, competed harder. There was no subsidy paid for lost market share to those losing the market. It is with this backdrop that the idea of subsidizing the Florida electric IOUs is foreign to me. They are losing fewer customers than they are gaining, and want to get subsidized. According to the presenter from SEIA, Justin Hoysradt, 59 net meters NM are installed and 178 new meters are added to grid, New Era data filings. So. they are gaining 119 accounts per day. the IOUs are reaching for a subsidy that should not be granted.

In addition Mr. Deason stated " NM customers ENJOY fixed rate benefits with out paying for them." Really? I have been an FPL customer for 30 years. I have paid for plenty of FPL's fixed assets. The number of existing NM customers who have paid for plenty of fixed assets is large. It's not as if we have just suddenly become IOU customers. Mr. Deason also stated that no fixe costs are being paid by NM customers. Mr Deason stated that most NM customers buy electricity from the IOUs to meet the difference from their system's solar production and their electricity usage. So, NM customers are being charged fixed costs when they purchase IOU electricity.

Commissioner Art Graham made a statement "people invested (in solar rooftop) and were considering the next ten years or more; Legislative changes to effect the expected economic return (should be) avoided." This is very true. In the

event of PSC granting the subsidy, can a carve-out of existing NM at that time be part of the deal? For example, could then all the current NM customers remain on the existing rate plan from which their solar investment decisions were made? This could be a compromise. This would be fair to the Floridians making solar purchases now.

I do like the push Commissioner Brown had with her questions. She focused mainly upon expanding solar and the IOUs helping the expansion. Leasing presented by Sun Run, Tyson Grinstead, was interesting. What are the pro's and con's as seen by the customer base from which they have just come? A study of the leasing customers is a must. We can avoid pitfalls that may exist and get the best financing for Floridians. I understand they want to move rapidly, but an understanding of their leasing outcomes for consumers is essential.

It was a good meeting to see stakeholders and what it is they are after. I've concerns that Floridians are going to be left with higher rates and questionable solar financing. I've lived long enough to see aviation take market share from trains. When you give the IOUs what they want please take care of customers who bought solar under current rate agreement.

Thank You

Scott Hart
Floridian