

Antonia Hover

From: Office of Commissioner Clark
Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2022 10:43 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Minimum Bill Adjustment Failure

Good morning,

Please place the attached email in Docket No. 20210016.

Hannah E. Branum

Executive Assistant to Commissioner Clark
Florida Public Service Commission
[2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.](#)
[Tallahassee, FL 32399](#)
(850) 413-6004

From: Steven Herzfeld <steven.herzfeld@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 4:55 PM
Subject: Minimum Bill Adjustment Failure

Dear Commissioners,

Duke Energy's new "minimum bill" amounts to one of the most severe regulatory failures that I have ever witnessed. The premise is simply insulting to the intelligent and hard working residents of Florida, and it's frankly embarrassing for the commission to have allowed such a poorly planned and, seemingly disingenuous, rate change to be allowed.

Knowing that even some completely energy-sufficient Duke Energy customers often still rely on a safe and reliable electric distribution grid for their energy needs, such as times of day when their solar panels are not fully meeting their electricity demand, I do not see a problem with charging otherwise energy-sufficient customers a base fee to cover the maintenance of this grid. However, if \$30 is what Duke Energy has determined to be the minimum per household cost to maintain the necessary infrastructure, then that cost must be shared equally by every electric customer. As it stands, customers who do not meet the minimum bill each month plainly subsidize the maintenance of the electric grid for the users who actually get a far greater benefit from Duke's services and who also sustain a much greater demand on the grid. The base "customer charge" (currently \$12.45) must be adjusted to sufficiently cover the cost to maintain our electric distribution infrastructure.

It is not at all ambiguous that Duke's new "minimum bill" policy is either the result of ethically-irresponsible lobbying efforts by special interests, or an oversight by the commission so blatant and so obvious that it would seem to me that the body would want to act swiftly to correct their mistake (which many would love to see, and would welcome with open arms during this era of such extreme political ineptitude). There is no other justification whatsoever for the format for this policy, and that is, without any doubt, plain to see by anyone with a middle-school level understanding of mathematics.

I'm interested in learning more about how the Commission came to approve these changes. Can you please provide my answers to the following questions:

- Are your meeting minutes published online?
- What are the steps required to begin reversing this complete travesty as quickly as possible?
- What options do energy-sufficient Florida residents have for closing their accounts with Duke Energy?

I admonish you to act swiftly and in good-conscience, and I look forward to your replies.

Sincerely,

Steven Herzfeld
Real Estate Advisor
KW Commercial - Tampa Bay
C: 727-244-0442 (Call or Text)
[Steven's KW Website](#)

