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1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: We are going to come back

3 from lunch break and get started.

4 Okay. Would you like to go to the -- we had

5 some excellent presentations this morning, and I know we

6 will have more discussion this afternoon, but we'll go

7 ahead and move into our next speaker on the agenda, and

8 that is Ms. Katrina Pielli with the U.S. Environmental

9 Protection Agency. Ms. Pielli has traveled to

10 Tallahassee to be with us here today. She has presented

11 before us before and has been working with our staff,

12 and our staff with some of her staff.

13 And, Katrina, it's so nice to see you again.

14 Thank you, and we're ready to get started.

15 MS. PIELLI: Great. Thank you all for having

16 me. Is this on? No? Okay. Am I good now?

17 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: You're good now.

18 MS. PIELLI: Great. To give the same

19 introduction just for folks who might not have been here

20 the last time I was here, the office I come from at EPA

21 is the side of the voluntary programs, so we're not the

22 side that does enforcement. We're the Climate

23 Protection Partnerships Division. We do house the

24 ENERGY STAR program for EPA, and we also support the

25 National Action Plan for Energy Efficiency, which you
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1 heard a little bit about this morning. So what we do,

2 our role is really to provide assistance to state

3 policymakers across the country, looking at best

4 practices and lessons learned, looking at clean energy,

5 so renewable energy, energy efficiency, and combined

6 heat and power.

7 So we'll jump right in. This is what I would

8 like to focus on today, the bulk of which being the

9 issues garnering increased interest. And I would just

10 like to set the stage really with just a quick overview

11 of a lot of the things that we've been hearing, why

12 people are more interested in efficiency now than they

13 were, say, five years ago, and then briefly move into

14 some resources that are available from our end. So

15 we'll just get started.

16 Quickly, this is probably no surprise to

17 anyone here or any of you, but there's -- many of the

18 energy challenges facing us today really can be served

19 from increased efficiency, from reliability issues,

20 carbon risk, to the energy demand growing, the

21 volatility of natural gas prices. Efficiency really is

22 a quick, cheap, and clean resource. And here is just a

23 sampling of the benefits, really, of energy efficiency.

24 And these are all things that we've heard cited from

25 policymakers and other stakeholders across the country.
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1 What this slide shows you are just a handful

2 of the studies that have come out in the past few years

3 really heralding the large potential for increased

4 investment in efficiency. The McKinsey Global Institute

5 found that from existing technologies, we could cut

6 global energy demand by half or more over the next 15

7 years. ACEEE did a study released in May '06 showing

8 that doubling efficiency could cut load growth by

9 two-thirds by 2024. And the Western Governors

10 Association found that by adopting their best practice

11 scenario in their 18 states, they could cut load growth

12 by 75 percent or more over the next 15 years.

13 But despite all this potential, utility

14 spending has declined. And the caveat I'll give with

15 this slide really is that the trend as of late has been

16 to focus on savings, not on spending. We saw in

17 Minnesota, for example, a shift in their focus from

18 savings to spending -- excuse me, from spending to

19 savings. But I think this is still useful for an

20 illustration of the trend that we've seen over the past

21 15 or so years.

22 There are a number of programs. I know you

23 all got a presentation this morning about the programs

24 that are happening here, and this is just a quick

25 snapshot from some of the ENERGY STAR programs. But
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1 really, I think it's important to note that there are

2 still utility barriers that remain despite the potential

3 and despite the successful programs that are being run

4 across the country.

5 So really now I would like to jump into the

6 bulk of the presentation, which is looking at trends.

7 The first one that I would like to talk about -- and I

8 will be brief. I know it's not quite the focus, really

9 are these quick start programs, since you all have been

10 running programs here for a while. But this is

11 something that has become more important as states look

12 for near-term, quick results. They want something that

13 can provide them with the results that they're expecting

14 in the short term, and then they can build on those for

15 the future going forward.

16 So really, what we did is, working with the

17 Arkansas Commission, they ran a successful collaborative

18 that resulted in efficiency rulemaking, and we drafted

19 up a Quick Start Program Guide. And the idea really was

20 to provide a listing or some suggestions of the

21 residential and commercial programs that are proven that

22 provide quick results. And the result of the Arkansas

23 docket was, the utilities did file, and they did approve

24 a suite of programs, and the cost recovery is allowed

25 through a rate rider.
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1 So the quick start residential programs are

2 here. I won't go through them verbatim. Essentially,

3 suffice it to say that it's promoting different ENERGY

4 STAR qualified products teamed up with targeted

5 incentives and consumer outreach and education. These

6 are -- really, the first three are tried and true, and

7 the last two are suggesting perhaps taking a look at

8 some -- on a pilot basis, some of the more elaborate

9 programs that you really do see successful when you roll

10 out a comprehensive suite of programs. So it's looking

11 at home performance with ENERGY STAR for existing homes

12 and ENERGY STAR qualified new homes, both for built and

13 manufactured.

14 And for commercial programs, it really is a

15 similar combination, in the sense that you're looking at

16 providing incentives for qualified products, to build

17 good lighting and HVAC, and again with the education,

18 and for the commercial programs, some of the technical

19 assistance that can be provided by the utilities or by

20 the ESCOs.

21 The other component when you talk about

22 commericial really is to look at the ENERGY STAR

23 building performance rating system, which is getting a

24 lot of attention in California right now. They passed

25 legislation that really will require the utilities to
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1 incorporate a rating, an ENERGY STAR rating onto the

2 bill so that the customer can see where their building

3 falls in relation to the suite of other buildings

4 nationwide in their similar class to help them

5 understand the opportunities that are available for

6 efficiency.

7 So now I would like to move on to aligning

8 utility incentives with efficiency. And really, this is

9 a broad topic that we've been hearing a lot of increased

10 interest from. We heard from Paul earlier today, and I

11 unfortunately only caught half of his remarks. I had a

12 flight that came in this morning. But I think really

13 what we've been hearing, the bulk of interest from

14 utility regulators, from legislators, and from other

15 stakeholders, like nonprofit groups. And really, when

16 we talk about aligning utility incentives, we talk about

17 it from a three-legged stool. It's providing cost

18 recovery, it's addressing the throughput incentive, and

19 it's considering providing an incentive, a performance

20 incentive.

21 What I would like to focus on here is really

22 the last two. It's not so much looking at cost recovery

23 in the traditional sense for your programs. It's more

24 about addressing the throughput incentive and the

25 performance incentive. So what I've listed here are
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1 just a quick handful of recent activities.

2 The Idaho Commission recently approved a

3 decoupling pilot for Idaho Power, which is an electric

4 IOU in the state, which I'll talk a little bit more

5 about in a moment.

6 In Connecticut, there was legislation passed

7 that requires the Commission to institute decoupling

8 when the utilities come in for their next rate case.

9 And this was in response to a docket that the Commission

10 had out previously, where they decided that they weren't

11 interested in doing decoupling, and the Legislature

12 responded to that.

13 In New York, there's legislation that

14 specifically is requiring the utilities to file

15 decoupling when they come in for their next rate case.

16 And specifically, in Minnesota, there is

17 legislation, recently passed legislation that authorizes

18 decoupling. It doesn't require the Commission to do

19 anything.

20 The other thing I'll just note, in our

21 discussions with folks around, lost revenue adjustment

22 mechanisms really don't seem to be getting a lot of

23 attention lately. They did have a lot of attention in

24 the past, and just for a variety of reasons, we're not

25 hearing a lot of folks ask questions about that or want
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1 assistance on that.

2 When you move into talking about performance

3 incentives, there are any number of ways to slice that,

4 and I just put here a handful of approaches.

5 One is the very recently announced California

6 approach which they announced in September. It's a

7 rewards and penalties mechanism. And really, it's

8 geared towards (1) how well the utility did meeting the

9 goals that the Commission established for energy

10 savings, and (2) also the net benefits that were

11 achieved from that portfolio.

12 In Nevada, they've had an enhanced or bonus

13 rate of return for years now. They're one of the only

14 states that is actually implementing it. There were a

15 handful of states that it's still on the books,

16 Washington and Montana, and I think there's another one

17 as well, but they're really not using it. And the

18 reason is that essentially capitalizing efficiency has

19 just kind of fallen out of favor, so it's not really

20 something that they're looking at doing.

21 And Xcel Energy recently filed in both New

22 Mexico and Colorado decoupling mechanisms that are

23 currently under consideration.

24 I'm going to take a moment -- we do support

25 the National Action Plan for Energy Efficiency, and the
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1 report was released, which we were very excited about,

2 last summer. And we did on November 12th release the

3 Aligning Utility Incentives with Energy Efficiency

4 report. And I apologize. I didn't bring some down for

5 folks. If I knew it was going to be such a big focus, I

6 would have brought some down. It is on the website for

7 folks that want to read it.

8 And essentially, if you'll permit me for a

9 moment, I would like to just respond a handful of things

10 that Paul had said in his presentation. One is really

11 in the Aligning Utility Incentives paper. It's very

12 clearly stated that the overarching objective in every

13 jurisdiction that considers an efficiency investment

14 should be to generate and capture substantial net

15 economic benefits. So the savings target is often

16 megawatt or percentage, and once that is established,

17 then you look at the mechanism.

18 The straight fixed-variable rate design does

19 break the link between throughput and revenue, and in

20 that way, it's comparable to decoupling. However, it

21 has a substantial disadvantage if one's objective is to

22 achieve efficiency that is in the long-term economic

23 interest of the ratepayers. Thus, it potentially

24 improves the utility's commitment to efficiency, while

25 reducing the end user's commitment, a balance that has
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1 not been viewed as a net positive approach for increased

2 investment and cost-effective efficiency from the

3 electric utility regulators. That's from the Aligning

4 Utility Incentives paper.

5 From the original report that was released

6 last summer, one more quote, and then I'll move on. The

7 lost margin issue arises because some or all of the

8 utility's current fixed costs are recovered through

9 volumetric charges. The most straightforward resolution

10 to this issue is to design and implement rate structures

11 that allocate a larger share or all of fixed costs to

12 fixed charges. This becomes more problematic when

13 applied to an integrated electric utility than an

14 integrated gas utility.

15 Given the overarching objective of capturing

16 the net economic and environmental benefits of

17 efficiency investment, straight fixed-variable design

18 can significantly reduce a customer's incentive to

19 undertake efficiency because of the associated reduction

20 in variable charges. These alternative rate designs

21 such as straight fixed-variable are more problematic

22 when applied to integrated electric utilities.

23 For example, the need for base load capacity

24 is driven by the level of energy consumption as much or

25 more than by the need for base load capacity. It is
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1 more difficult to allocate all fixed costs to a fixed

2 customer charge simply because such costs can be very

3 high, and allocation to a fixed charge would impose

4 serious ability to pay issues on lower income customers.

5 I hope that made some sense. There's a lot

6 more that I could go into, and in my limited time, I did

7 just want to provide a few quotes, but I think that --

8 I'm not the expert who wrote the paper. We do have

9 access to the expert who did write the paper, and I

10 would happy to put him in touch with folks if they want

11 to hear more about that. So I would like to move on.

12 What this chart shows you is from that

13 Aligning Utility Incentives paper, and it's just a quick

14 snapshot. The data was collected over the summer of

15 where things stand when you look across the country at

16 the issue of the throughput incentive and also

17 performance incentives. And what you see is that

18 currently there are over 10 states that have opened

19 decoupling investigations. There are 16 states that

20 have electric or gas decoupling for at least one

21 utility. And the caveat with that number, some of them

22 are pilots, like Idaho. There are six states currently

23 that have LRAM, lost revenue adjustment mechanism, and

24 18 that have performance incentives.

25 And this table, I know it's a bit hard to read
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1 for folks. It is in the paper, so if folks are

2 interested in seeing that, you can download that online.

3 I did want to spend one moment on the Idaho

4 Power pilot, because it is very new, and it is getting

5 increased attention. Marsha Smith is the Commissioner

6 from Idaho, and she's also the current president of

7 NARUC, and so because of that, I would just like to talk

8 about this for a moment.

9 What it is, it's technically not a decoupling

10 mechanism in the broadest sense. It's really a fixed

11 cost adjustment mechanism. And really, what happened,

12 the Commission had a very long process, stakeholder

13 process that started in 2004 and ended with the company,

14 Idaho Power, filing for a fixed cost adjustment

15 mechanism in 2005, and the Commission did approve that.

16 But what I would like to talk about for one

17 moment is a report that came out of this collaborative

18 process. And really, what they found is that before

19 they advocated the company filing for their fixed cost

20 adjustment mechanism, they did note that the development

21 of a true-up simulation to track what might have

22 occurred if decoupling or a true-up mechanism had been

23 implemented for Idaho Power at the last general rate

24 case would be wise so that they would know what it would

25 have been if they had had this mechanism implemented in
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1 the past before they went forward with it. And then

2 they said, given that, we would be interested in Idaho

3 Power filing a pilot for this type of recovery

4 mechanism.

5 So the parties agreed -- and this was a

6 diverse stakeholder process. The parties agreed to go

7 ahead and conduct the simulation, and the Commission,

8 based on the results of the simulation, they found that

9 the throughput incentive was a problem for Idaho Power

10 when you looked at their incentives to invest in

11 increased efficiency. So the Commission approved a

12 three-year decoupling pilot, decoupling meaning fixed

13 cost adjustment mechanism.

14 And what the next slide shows you is, it

15 originally got filed in January of '06, and it became

16 effective this past January in '07. It's slated to go

17 through the end of 2009, and the first adjustment

18 mechanism is slated to happen June 1st of '08.

19 They do have very preliminary results right

20 now that they are looking at which show that Idaho

21 Power, the use per customer is up, based on the

22 forecast. So as it currently stands, if the trend

23 continues, Idaho Power will have over-recovered the

24 fixed costs, and the customers will get a refund.

25 That's just a preliminary result, and we'll see what
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1 happens in the summer.

2 But I think it's important to note that with

3 the Idaho Power mechanism, they do have a 3 percent cap,

4 so they do have a deadband of sorts. So that's an

5 important component that came out of the stakeholder

6 process and also the filing. But it's a 3 percent cap

7 on annual increase of any unrecovered deferred costs.

8 One other thing to note with the Idaho Power

9 example, it's just for residential and commercial,

10 because those two classes really represent the bulk of

11 the fixed cost exposure for the company, so it in no way

12 influences or affects their industrial customers right

13 now through this pilot program.

14 The other component that I would like to talk

15 about briefly -- one more quick comment on Idaho Power.

16 I apologize. Another component that the Commission made

17 clear when they filed -- excuse me, when they approved

18 the filing was that it should demonstrate an enhanced

19 commitment to efficiency investment because of the fixed

20 cost adjustment mechanism. So they specifically cited

21 that it should include making efficiency and load

22 management programs widely available, supporting

23 building code improvements, actively pursuing appliance

24 standards, and expanding their DSM programs.

25 I know consumer advocates came up this
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1 morning, and really, when you talk to the consumer

2 advocates that we have in the Midwest, it's very

3 important from their perspective, the ones that we've

4 had conversations with, that to look at any type of

5 decoupling or throughput incentive really needs to be

6 tied to increased efficiency, that the overarching goal

7 is to lead to more efficiency to receive those benefits,

8 and so to do any type of moving the throughput incentive

9 without actually looking at tying that to the increased

10 efficiency investment, that has not been something that

11 some of those consumer advocates in the Midwest are

12 interested in.

13 So now moving on to California, the Commission

14 in September issued a very new and innovative and

15 sweeping decision that really was a risk and reward.

16 And this is a simplified summary of it, but essentially

17 what happens is, the Commission sets individual savings

18 goals for each of the investor-owned utilities. And if

19 the utility receives -- excuse me. If the utility

20 achieves 85 percent of the goal, they receive a reward;

21 if they achieve 65 percent or less, they receive a

22 penalty; and if they're in between, there's no reward or

23 penalty, so 65 to 85 is a deadband. The reward really

24 is a shareholder reward, 9 percent, up to 9 percent of

25 the total net benefits from the efficiency portfolio.
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1 And if you get 100 percent or more of the goal, you

2 receive 12 percent.

3 What I would like to show you here briefly,

4 and then we'll go back, this chart shows you on the

5 vertical axis the savings and on the horizontal axis the

6 year, so historical and projected. The top line shows

7 you 85 percent of the Commission's goals and 65 percent.

8 So as you can see, even the limit for a penalty is very

9 aggressive if you look at what they've achieved in the

10 past.

11 The other important thing to note is that the

12 rewards and the penalties are both capped at 450

13 million, and that's a total for the three-year cycle.

14 The penalty component is really tied to again

15 65 percent or less, so in their opinion, a poor

16 performance of the utility, and it can be either the

17 larger of the per unit penalty or the net positive costs

18 of the efficiency portfolio. And this is unique in the

19 sense that it provides a penalty, which no other

20 commission currently does.

21 So I'll move on Hawaii. Hawaii had a very

22 long process. It was two years between when they

23 initiated the docket and when they reached the decision.

24 And they really did come to decisions on nine very key

25 topics, and I'll give you the listing here and then give
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1 you a little bit more information on a handful.

2 The decision was released in February, and

3 they established goals for HECO, which is a collection

4 of three utilities in Hawaii, the large IOU on the

5 islands. So they established the goals, they selected

6 the appropriate market structure, they determined the

7 cost recovery mechanisms, they determined the

8 appropriate costs and cost tests, they established the

9 appropriate incentive mechanism, and they also decided

10 that based on the filing, the modified filing that HECO

11 put forward, they thought they could achieve those goals

12 and savings. So the efficiency goals that were decided

13 on for HECO was based on the megawatt and megawatt-hour

14 savings that they had put forward that were modified. I

15 have listed them here for you for commercial and

16 industrial and residential. And again, in the filing,

17 the Commission determined that this would lead to -- the

18 programs that they put forward would lead to achieving

19 these savings.

20 They did decide that a third-party or a

21 non-utility market structure would be the most favorable

22 for reaching these goals on the islands. And one of

23 their reasons that they cite for doing that is, they

24 decided that facilitating the introduction of innovative

25 programs really do lead, in their mind, to having a
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1 third-party administrator. They also expect the

2 third-party administrator to result in improved

3 penetration in hard to reach and underserved segments,

4 and they also expect it to improve the

5 cost-effectiveness of administering the programs.

6 The Commission did decide to not address

7 decoupling during this proceeding. It was part of the

8 comments that were filed and part of the discussion, and

9 they decided to defer that.

10 They also decided as an incentive mechanism to

11 institute shared savings.

12 And regarding cost-effectiveness tests, they

13 decided to use all five of the California Standard

14 Practice Manual tests, with the most weight given to the

15 Total Resource Cost Test, the caveat being that all of

16 the program portfolios that would be filed had to have

17 benefit-to-cost ratios above 1 for each test except for

18 the RIM test, the Ratepayer Impact Measure.

19 So now I would like to move into talking about

20 incorporating efficiency as a resource in planning.

21 This has been getting a lot of attention really, and

22 California again was one of the first states that did

23 this, in the sense that in their energy master plan,

24 they designated efficiency as the resource of highest

25 priority or resource of first priority.
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1 Washington State actually recently passed a

2 voter ballot initiative. It was tied to a portfolio

3 standard, but it did determine that conservation was the

4 resource of first choice.

5 And the North Carolina Commission recently

6 passed new IRP rules that require comparison of a

7 comprehensive combination of both demand and supply-side

8 resources, and it requires the Commission to determine

9 and the utility to determine an IRP that offers the

10 least-cost, long-term set of resources to meet the

11 system needs. The important thing to note here is that

12 it doesn't require a direct tie between demand-side

13 resources and transmission investment.

14 ISO New England, which is the independent

15 system operator for New England, they really are on the

16 cutting edge as far as the ISOs and the RTOs go across

17 the country in implementing demand resources, as far as

18 capacity resources, level or equal to supply-side

19 resources. So what they did was, again through a

20 stakeholder process, they created a forward capacity

21 market that allows supply and demand resources to bid in

22 to provide that resource. And again, they had over

23 2,000 megawatts of demand resources that expressed

24 interest. And this is very important, because it is the

25 first in the country. But the other thing to note here
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1 is that the first auction will be conducted in February

2 of '08, with the first commitment period being June 1st

3 of 2010. And Commissioner Wellinghoff of FERC has

4 expressed large interest in seeing how the FCM goes and

5 has suggested that if it goes well, he might look to

6 encouraging some of the other ISOs and RTOs to institute

7 something similar, so there's a lot of folks that are

8 watching that.

9 The other thing I'll just mention is TVA.

10 They have their new strategic plan, and their board

11 recently approved a new goal of 1,200 megawatts demand

12 reduction over five years, which they've tied to being a

13 similar capacity to their Watts Bar unit. And they

14 really have expressed through some stakeholder processes

15 that they've been having an interest in doing more

16 efficiency and really trying to take that next step.

17 Wisconsin has also -- recently the Legislature

18 passed a bill requiring the Commission to conduct

19 efficiency planning every four years and to incorporate

20 that into their strategic energy assessment, and this

21 really will help. In addition, the docket that the

22 Commission opened helped develop a regional approach to

23 planning and also incorporating efficiency in planning.

24 So that's something that's new and that's happening the

25 Midwest.
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1 And then finally, that Arkansas decision that

2 I previously talked about, as part of that decision,

3 they talk about resource planning and talk about giving

4 the comparable weight or comparable consideration to

5 demand and supply-side resources, looking at IRPs going

6 forward, and to identify and investigate resources

7 including efficiency, conservation, demand-side

8 management, and price responsive demand.

9 What this slide really shows you is just a

10 quelling of the best practice findings from the National

11 Action Plan document, the Guide to Resource Planning

12 with Efficiency. And what it really does show you is

13 that there are the necessary data and tools available to

14 help utilities and states to incorporate efficiency in

15 planning, that there are energy, capacity and non-energy

16 benefits that can help to justify more robust programs,

17 and also that the sooner you are able to integrate

18 efficiency into the planning process, the better to

19 capture the full value. And there's a report that was

20 done by Lawrence Berkeley National Lab looking at the

21 Western states and their IRPs that specifically provided

22 a lot of information on that that we can provide if

23 folks are interested.

24 And on cost-effectiveness tests, I won't spend

25 a lot of time here. I know Mark talked about this this
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1 morning, but I would like to just give a brief mention

2 of it, largely because we've gotten a lot of questions

3 and discussions with some folks across the country on

4 this very issue, particularly tied to the idea that we

5 want to do more efficiency. I've heard from people

6 that, "Our cost-effectiveness test is a problem. What

7 can we do?" And so a number of the National Action Plan

8 reports touch on cost-effectiveness as a component. And

9 really, what's important, I think, to note is that some

10 people really feel there's one that's better than the

11 other, and from what we've found, it's all a matter of

12 perspective. They're all very valid, and they all

13 provide you with very valid results. It just depends on

14 what perspective you're looking from.

15 What this shows you here is a sampling. It

16 doesn't include all the states, so it's not a full

17 sampling. Fifteen states we weren't able to get to, but

18 over the summer, we just did a quick survey as to how

19 states were looking at cost-effectiveness tests, and it

20 was tied to some of the work we were doing under the

21 National Action Plan. And what we found is that 10

22 states actually don't require any specific test when

23 they're looking at their energy efficiency or DSM

24 program portfolios. Five -- excuse me. Six states

25 require all five tests, the California standard manual
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1 tests. And then the table at the right shows you that

2 there's 20 states that do a little bit of everything,

3 and it's interesting to note that over half of them do

4 require the Total Resource Cost Test to be administered,

5 most of them, as you can see, in conjunction with some

6 of the other tests as well. And if you'll note, it's

7 not entirely -- I don't think you can even see it. The

8 X's that have a little star next to them, that's meant

9 to denote that those states put the most weight on TRC,

10 those that do it in this rubric.

11 So these are the questions and the

12 perspectives that I referred to, and this is directly

13 from the Guide to Resource Planning. And really what it

14 does is just, I think, help people see that each test is

15 designed to give you a specific answer when you think

16 about the program portfolio.

17 And I think what I would like to highlight is

18 that when you think about the Utility Cost Test, that

19 the adoption of efficiency that's cost-effective under

20 this test will reduce the utility revenue requirement

21 relative to traditional utility procurement, and related

22 to the Total Resource Cost Test, that all efficiency

23 that passes TRC will reduce the total cost of energy in

24 the region. The one thing I'll note is that the TRC

25 tests don't include the direct costs and the benefits,
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1 so there's no externalities. If you want the

2 externalities, you need to look at the Societal Cost

3 Test.

4 There are additional components to this

5 discussion which you might have touched on earlier, but

6 again, there's more resources that we can provide to get

7 into more detail on this.

8 And there's two states quickly that I did just

9 want to profile, because it's a nice tie between the

10 policies that were in place that led to programs. So I

11 won't spend a lot of time here, but really, I would like

12 to just take a quick look at Arizona and Nevada.

13 And in Arizona specifically, back in '99 the

14 Commission created a system benefit charge to provide

15 money to fund DSM programs. And what ended up

16 happening, it was largely used to fund renewable energy

17 under their portfolio standard, but the Salt River

18 project, which is one of the largest IOUs in the state,

19 wanted to use some of that money to support their

20 efficiency program, so that was approved by the

21 Commission. There's also up here a couple of different

22 state building or lead-by-example goals that were put in

23 place over the years as well.

24 And the Arizona Public Service Commission

25 (sic), which is another IOU in the state, in 2003 filed
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1 an application for a rate increase, and there was

2 numerous discussions and settlement agreements that

3 happened over the years, and the settlement was actually

4 issued in April of 2007. And it required a $10 million

5 base rate for demand-side management, and it also went

6 further and said you in addition need to spend on

7 average at least another 6 million a year on approved

8 DSM items, and those additional items would be recovered

9 through an adjustment mechanism.

10 These are a sampling of the programs that

11 they're currently implementing, and I put them here

12 really to reference back to that quick start discussion

13 and to show sort of how the suite of programs ties up

14 with some of the policies that are in place. They're

15 all ENERGY STAR related, but there are additional

16 programs that they have in place for some of the

17 commercial customers, and then at the bottom also, just

18 to give you a sense of what goals they have put out

19 publicly for them to achieve for their efficiency

20 program portfolio.

21 Nevada is a slightly different story, in that

22 they enacted a portfolio standard in 2001, and the

23 utilities were having a hard time meeting their

24 requirement the first few years, and so the requirement

25 was revisited, and it was decided that efficiency could
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1 participate as an eligible resource. And in addition to

2 making that change, the goal amount was increased, so it

3 was increased to 20 percent by 2015, and efficiency

4 could meet one-quarter of that. So because of that,

5 they really did an aggressive approach from the

6 utilities' standpoint to maximize the use of efficiency

7 in meeting their portfolio goals, and that was also tied

8 to the idea -- as I mentioned before, they do have a

9 bonus rate of return, so that's the other piece of the

10 Nevada puzzle.

11 So the utility investments really are a

12 product of their planning process, and it really is

13 designed to help them maximize their requirement, but

14 they really do maximize this planning component, so

15 you're treating it as a resource. And it's really

16 interesting to note that the cost recovery is part of

17 the statute of the state and that the utility can try to

18 or petition to recover the costs associated with not

19 only the programs, but the labor, the overhead, the

20 materials, and the incentives. In some cases, depending

21 on the state, there's a different way to slice and dice

22 that.

23 This is a listing of the programs that Nevada

24 Power and Sierra Pacific Power have in place right now.

25 And then it also shows you again the goals that they
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1 were hoping to meet as far as in their historic. And I

2 don't have the future goals. I can get those for you.

3 I apologize. I thought those were on this slide.

4 So the resources, there's a suite of National

5 Action Plan resources that are available now. They were

6 released on November 12th. There's also a Clean Energy

7 Environment Guide to Action that the EPA put out a few

8 years back, and there's also that Quick Start Program

9 Guide that we have available as well. On any of these,

10 we could provide subject matter experts to address

11 follow-up questions or to work with you all going

12 forward on.

13 So I think really, in summary, that you're not

14 the only state that's looking to do more with

15 efficiency, and there's certainly a lot of activity

16 happening across the country. And the issues that I

17 touched on are really just those that we've been hearing

18 the most interest from folks on, and I'm sure that

19 there's other elements and other components happening,

20 but I just was happy to be able to share with you a

21 little bit about what we're seeing when you look across

22 the country.

23 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you, Katrina. And I

24 expect there will be a few questions. I'll go ahead and

25 start us off.
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1 In one of your slides you mentioned, and I

2 appreciate this comment, about perhaps a misconception

3 in some areas, or with some, being that one test or one

4 form of measurement being the right way, and that

5 sometimes that's kind of how you view it with the

6 different tools that are available, depending on the

7 perspective that you're bringing to it. And I was just

8 wondering if you could elaborate on that a little bit

9 and on some of those varied perspectives that can

10 contribute to perhaps a different perspective.

11 MS. PIELLI: It really does depend, I think,

12 largely on what you're trying to achieve. So when you

13 look at the program portfolio that's put in front you,

14 it really does just depend on what element you're trying

15 to maximize. Is it really most important to you that

16 the societal benefits, for example, are included? Is it

17 more important to you that the utility is kept whole at

18 the lowest possible cost? Is it very important to you

19 that you're looking across all of the different ways

20 that you slice it?

21 I think at the Southeast meeting that

22 Commissioner McMurrian was at, Commissioner Wise from

23 Georgia was very excited to hear folks say that all five

24 tests are valid and that it's a policymaker's decision,

25 when you look across the results, it's the policymaker's
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1 decision to make that call as to what's important to

2 you. And I think that from our perspective, we

3 completely agree with that, that it's important to

4 understand what the perspectives are so that you can

5 make an objective decision.

6 And I think we can provide you with more

7 information on that. There's another chart that I

8 didn't put in from the planning guide that shows you a

9 little bit more information or you can view the

10 different tests and what outcomes they give you, and I

11 can certainly follow up with staff and provide that to

12 them.

13 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you. Commissioner

14 McMurrian.

15 COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: Thank you, Chairman.

16 I actually had a question about the Arizona

17 Public Service Company's settlement agreement. And if

18 it's something -- we can also follow up on it later if

19 it's something that we need more information on. But

20 discuss the annual $10 million base rate DSM allowance,

21 and I think 6 million annually after that. Was the goal

22 to -- and I realize this is a settlement agreement, so

23 that's a little bit different than a commission making a

24 decision. But was the goal to just increase the amount

25 spending on DSM, or was there still some kind of
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1 cost-effectiveness test on the amount of DSM programs?

2 Do you --

3 MS. PIELLI: I don't know, but I would

4 certainly ask my colleague who worked with them on this,

5 and I can get back to you on that.

6 COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: Okay. I guess it

7 always strikes me when I see goals about the level of

8 spending on DSM, because it -- I just always wonder if

9 there's another part about the cost-effectiveness,

10 because I think we could throw out numbers and say the

11 utilities need to spend more, but I'm not sure spending

12 more is really the goal. It's about getting the results

13 we need.

14 MS. PIELLI: And we've certainly seen that

15 happen more and more. I would note that the settlement

16 was two years ago, and so I'm not sure of the specifics

17 of this case. But I've definitely seen, specifically in

18 the Midwest, that issue become very prevalent, where

19 people will want you to hit a megawatt or a percentage

20 savings, and then they'll work on setting a cap or

21 giving you a budget, but it's really more important to

22 set the goal up front. But I can get back to you on

23 that.

24 COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Commissioners, any further
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1 questions? No. Okay.

2 Katrina, thank you very much. Thanks for

3 coming to Tallahassee.

4 Okay. We are at the point on our agenda where

5 we will open it up and ask for discussion and

6 information from the stakeholders who have signed up to

7 speak, so I'll go to that list here in just a moment.

8 I did want to mention a couple of things as we

9 kind of move into this next stage of our agenda. As I

10 was thinking about some of these issues at lunch, I was

11 reminded of a quote that I have actually used a couple

12 of times, and this is from Dr. Neal Elliott, who

13 represents the American Council for an Energy Efficient

14 Economy. And he knows that I've used this quote of his

15 in other forums, so I think that means it's okay if I

16 use it today. But he has been quoted as saying, and I'm

17 going to read his quote, "The biggest roadblock to wiser

18 energy use in Florida is the way the State regulates

19 electric utilities. We just need to change the

20 regulatory business models that the investor-owned

21 utilities operate under." And again, he knows that I've

22 used that quote in other things, and he agrees that he

23 said that.

24 And that's one of the things I had kind of

25 wanted to throw out there as we have this discussion
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1 today and see, you know, in what direction, if any, we

2 want to continue discussion as this Commission looks at

3 what types of tools and models we want to continue to

4 use or bring into our cost-benefit analysis. We've

5 heard discussion this morning about different pricing

6 structures, about incentives, financial and performance,

7 and other perhaps different or innovative regulatory

8 schemes. I'm not sure I agree completely with what

9 Mr. Elliott said, or Dr. Elliott, but I do think that

10 that kind of charge to continue to look thoughtfully and

11 creatively at how we regulate is very interesting, and I

12 hope we'll continue that.

13 And then I also would draw our attention to

14 one of the recommendations that came out of the

15 Governor's Action Team, and I'll read that as well. And

16 that says that, "The Action Team finds that the current

17 regulatory structure for the electric utility sector

18 within Florida may pose disincentives for investments

19 yielding greater energy efficiency and thus reducing

20 utility sales." And there again, that's a finding that

21 has generated a lot of discussion, and I hope -- I find

22 thought-provoking, and I hope that we can, you know,

23 continue and have some discussion amongst us about those

24 sorts of ideas.

25 And so with that, we can move on to the
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1 stakeholder portion, public forum of our agenda. And

2 the first person that I have signed up to speak on the

3 list is John McWhirter. Mr. McWhirter, please come

4 forward and join us.

5 MR. McWHIRTER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. As

6 always, it's a pleasure to be here, and I found this to

7 be quite an educational and interesting session. I

8 didn't know what it was going to hold when I first saw

9 the workshop agenda, but listening to it, I was quite

10 impressed.

11 But when I was trying to prepare my remarks, I

12 went back to my law school days, and one of the things I

13 didn't understand about going to law school was that the

14 first thing you do is try to identify the problem that

15 you're going to solve. And I think the purpose of this

16 workshop is to get the advice and consent of

17 stockholders, or stakeholders, as to identifying the

18 problem, and then the best way that government can

19 assist in solving that problem.

20 But then I concluded that the stakeholders may

21 have differing interests, and so I tried to identify

22 what those interests are. And obviously, global warming

23 is in the forefront. The need to reduce consumption of

24 limited fuel resources is part of the problem. The

25 nature of the fuel being burned, whether it's coal or
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1 gas or nuclear energy, is important. The need to

2 assimilate funds for capital investment by electric

3 utilities is an extremely important point. How does

4 price elasticity come into play in designing the rates

5 that you're going to be thinking about to deal with

6 this? And the one that's always nearest and dearest to

7 the hearts of my clients, and consequently to me, is

8 high rates, and that's of interest to all consumers.

9 The title of the workshop, interestingly,

10 didn't deal with electricity efficiency. It dealt with

11 energy efficiency. And in dealing with energy

12 efficiency, the first thing you need to know is what is

13 energy. And, of course, you know that energy is

14 measured in Btus. And so if we're going to be energy

15 efficient, you want to use the least number of energy

16 Btus to get to the final point that you want to achieve.

17 And also in preparing, I went to the DOE

18 website, and they have a program called the Industrial

19 Technology Program, and the Industrial Technology

20 Program talks about the energy delivered to industry in

21 order to produce its final output, and it deals with

22 working with industry in a way that we can get the best

23 efficiency out of that energy.

24 And I have with me today a fellow by the name

25 of Bob May from CF Industries, and his company has
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1 worked with the Department of Energy and their experts

2 to deal with what his company can do to improve their

3 energy utilization. And I think you'll find his report

4 to be far more interesting than mine, but I'm going to

5 go ahead and give mine anyway.

6 But one of the tables in the DOE report was

7 absolutely appalling to me. The manufacturing industry

8 in the United States as a whole uses over 24 trillion

9 Btus, or it's a big number. But when it dealt with the

10 types of energy that industry gets, they get fuel from

11 gas and oil and other sources, and electricity. But the

12 electricity thing was most intriguing to me, and that

13 was that in order to deliver 3,102 trillion Btus of

14 electric energy to industry, the electric utility must

15 burn 9,546 Btus of fuel. In other words, if you're

16 looking at energy efficiency, that doesn't look too

17 efficient if you're going to reduce 9,500 Btus to 3,100

18 to deliver your final product.

19 So one of the things that wasn't discussed

20 here today, is there anything we can do with the

21 electric utilities themselves to improve their

22 efficiency?

23 And then I wondered, is that a correct number?

24 And I found out from further study that actually it is a

25 correct number. As you know, each year in your cost
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1 recovery proceedings, you also consider generation

2 performance incentive factors to reward the utilities

3 for using their most efficient generation. And when

4 we've got a coal-burning utility or one with an old gas

5 operation, you reward the utility if it's able to

6 convert 10,000 or 11,000 Btus into a kilowatt-hour.

7 Now, to understand the significance of that, a

8 kilowatt-hour has an energy factor of 3,500 Btus. So

9 you presently under your rules reward utilities if they

10 have a 65 percent loss in their energy conversion to

11 convert the fuel into electricity.

12 Since '92 when we started with more innovative

13 models of energy, the combined cycle plants came out,

14 and those plants now are in the range of 7,500 Btus to

15 convert to a 3,500 Btu kilowatt-hour of electricity.

16 That's a loss of only 53 percent. It doesn't consider

17 the loss in transmission and generation, which the

18 Department of Energy considers.

19 So that's a real problem, and so when you're

20 considering conservation programs, maybe the entity that

21 delivers, the utility, you ought to consider its energy

22 efficiency compared to the energy efficiency of a

23 customer converting energy. And if the customer can do

24 it better, perhaps you should give serious

25 consideration, as the Department of Energy has done in
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1 its Industrial Technology Program, to coming up with

2 ways to encourage industry to do the right thing.

3 Now, industry, as long as I've known it, has

4 done the best it can to conserve energy. You have --

5 the key factor there is, is the cost of electric energy

6 a significant part of its overall cost of production.

7 And if it is, they pay a lot more attention to it than

8 other industries that don't have a big electric cost.

9 So with those concerns in the background, I

10 listened carefully to the presentations this morning and

11 what the Commission is presently doing with DSM programs

12 and what it's attempting to achieve and what it has

13 achieved. And Mr. Ballinger said he has been around

14 since the early '90s when the goal studies started, and

15 I reflected a moment and realized I had been around

16 since the early '80s when they first started talking

17 about conservation things and the things we talked about

18 then. And the things we talked about then -- how many

19 years ago? Twenty-seven years ago -- were much the same

20 that Ms. Pielli talked about just a moment ago. They

21 were the same concepts.

22 And the big deal then and one that frightened

23 the utilities and also my clients the most was the Total

24 Resource Cost Test. And Mr. Futrell explained to you

25 what that was, but his explanation was different than

144

1 the explanation I heard of the Total Resource Cost Test

2 back in the 1980s, and the reason that we resisted that

3 approach and favored the rate impact approach. And the

4 reason we resisted it was that the people that came in

5 supporting TRC at the time said you've got to consider

6 all of the costs of producing electricity, including the

7 very important environmental externalities.

8 Well, I didn't hear that today. And maybe the

9 way that Mr. Futrell and his team evaluate TRC, they've

10 taken out environmental externalities. But if that is a

11 cost that has to be considered, it is appalling, and

12 it's more appalling to me today than it was yesterday,

13 because on the way out to the Commission this morning, I

14 was listening to public radio, and an FSU professor

15 testified that -- or has done a paper that I guess you

16 -- it will come to you sooner or later, as to the cost

17 of global warming. And he said the cost of global

18 warming to the State of Florida will be $384 billion a

19 year.

20 Well, if that cost is a cost that's going to

21 be considered in the total resource cost approach, then

22 you better look out if you're concerned about high

23 rates, because almost any conservation program will meet

24 that criteria, and it will throw the utility industry as

25 we know it today into disarray, and I hope we'll give
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1 that serious consideration.

2 The other thing I heard Mr. Futrell say was

3 the rate impact test. And we strongly endorsed the rate

4 impact test when it began because we felt that was an

5 appropriate way. If a conservation program caused the

6 rates to the general customers to go up, then maybe, you

7 know, there was no general benefit. That was back in

8 times when we weren't quite so concerned about the

9 environment.

10 But what we found out was that it's not a rate

11 impact test. It's a revenue impact test. And that's --

12 keep that in mind very carefully when you listen to

13 Mr. May's presentation, because the utility's costs, as

14 you well know, is composed of the base rates it collects

15 plus the fuel costs that it collects, and now you've

16 added a bunch of other cost recovery items to it so that

17 the guaranteed revenue that the utility is entitled to

18 is -- last year it was 70 percent. This year it was

19 only 63 percent of their total revenue.

20 And decoupling struck me as -- decoupling is

21 the icing on the cake that will give them 100 percent of

22 their revenues guaranteed. So when that happens, you

23 don't need to worry about the high returns that are

24 currently awarded. You can reduce the returns

25 substantially closer to the government rate of return.
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1 And I think that's probably why utilities have resisted

2 decoupling in the past, because you'll also examine the

3 return they're getting and ensure that it's commensurate

4 with the risk.

5 In any event, the total resource -- the RIM

6 test as we have it today knocks out good programs, and

7 Mr. May is going to tell you about a good program it

8 knocks out, a program that he has that has no fuel cost

9 with it, it has no environmental impact, and it provides

10 electricity to the utilities at a lower cost than most

11 of the things that you've seen in the renewable

12 portfolio standards, and he'll tell you why that is.

13 But the interesting part is that that doesn't pass your

14 current cost-effectiveness test, and that's because the

15 RIM test is flawed, and it's not a rate impact test,

16 it's a revenue impact test.

17 So the utility may totally displace its cost

18 of fuel, but if it loses revenue, then the program may

19 not pass the test. And you don't look at whether that

20 loss of revenue impacts rates or not, because a utility

21 can be earning a 16 percent return on its investment,

22 and yet if it loses revenue, the conservation program

23 might go down the tubes. So one of the things you need

24 to think about as part of this, of your further studies

25 is, is the rate impact test making disincenti – making
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1 you not want to do some things you might otherwise do.

2 Mr. Masiello did a beautiful job and made me

3 feel like there wasn't anything wrong, that we've had

4 great activity with respect to conservation programs,

5 and they're going full blow, and we've only spent,

6 according to the charts, some $3.5 billion on

7 conservation programs to date. But the interesting

8 thing to me is, from the time I remember back in 1980,

9 where the annual consumption of customers was around

10 12,000 kilowatt-hours a year, it's now up to over 14 and

11 15,000, or it was 10,000 and it's up to 12,500. So what

12 has happened is, with conservation in place, the

13 consumption of the average customer -- and I'm not

14 talking about taking into consideration the new people

15 that came in, but the average customer consumes 25

16 percent more kilowatt-hours than they did back in 1980.

17 And always in my mind is, what's that all

18 about? Well, obviously, it's about some of the things

19 that Mr. Ballinger told you about. We have more

20 appliances and TVs, HDTV uses a lot of electricity, and

21 so forth and so on.

22 Mr. Sotkiewicz came out with -- talked to you

23 about revenue decoupling, as did the EPA lady. And

24 apparently, that's a hot topic again, as it was right

25 after the Vietnam War. I remember right after the
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1 Vietnam War, one of my clients said -- I said, "What is

2 this revenue decoupling, this RD all about?" He said,

3 "Johnny, RD is worse than the VD that we got in

4 Vietnam." And I said, "My goodness." And then he went

5 on to explain it, and what happened, the explanation

6 kind of bears out what ELCON has come up with in its

7 policy report that we gave -- I gave copies to you, and

8 I'm not going to go into that.

9 But that's a very interesting study, and that

10 study, surprisingly, tracks exactly what Mr. Sotkiewicz,

11 the academician, came here today and told you. He said

12 that properly structured rates will ensure revenue

13 stability, and you may not need the other stuff, but if

14 you want to do the other stuff to cross-subsidize some

15 customer classes and make the rich pay more for the poor

16 and so forth, that's still available to you.

17 My concern about that is, the people that

18 consume the most electricity are poor people in poorly

19 insulated houses with big families, and they aren't rich

20 people, and the people that consume the least

21 electricity are the people who live in condominiums and

22 have come down here as snow birds.

23 So if you set rates the way Mr. Sotkiewicz

24 said -- it's very interesting. He says, "Set them so

25 that your fixed costs cover your fixed costs." And
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1 they's not a novel idea. You've been doing that in

2 water and sewer cases for as long as I can remember.

3 You have a base facility charge and a consumption

4 charge. The base facility charge covers fixed costs,

5 and the consumption charge covers the water you consume.

6 Well, the other biggest problem that I

7 visualize -- and I'm going on too long -- wasn't spoken

8 about today, but it was addressed tangentially.

9 Mr. Masiello told you that there are 1.2 million of his

10 customers that engage in demand-side management

11 programs, and statewide, I think there are over -- maybe

12 that's statewide. I thought it was just about a

13 million, but he said a million 2.

14 But what that means is, the demand-side

15 management programs they have, you can cut off the heat

16 on the coldest day of the winter or the cooling on the

17 warmest day in the summer, but they ameliorate that by

18 passing it around. But the reason it's bad is not

19 because those people are disturbed when they can't get

20 cooling or heat when they want it. It's bad because it

21 gives you artificial price signals.

22 In Florida, when they measure a thing called

23 reserve margin to see if we have enough capacity to meet

24 our demand, what happens is, they don't count this

25 1.2 million residential customers. And those 1.2
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1 million residential customers, if they get upset, they

2 can get off that program with 30 days notice, and then

3 you've got a demand. When you look at the capacity

4 margin as opposed to reserve margin, like most other

5 states in the United States do, we have a capacity

6 margin of about 2 percent. So we have a serious

7 capacity problem that no one is really addressing here

8 today, but conservation is a good way to deal with that

9 if we can do it effectively, and that's a big burden and

10 a big chore for you to do.

11 But I'm going to tell you what some of my

12 clients have done, and that deals with price elasticity.

13 When I first started representing industrial customers,

14 Tropicana was the largest customer of FP&L. Tropicana

15 left the system and went to cogeneration. In the Gulf

16 Power territory, Monsanto was far and away the biggest

17 customer. It left the system and began to sell power to

18 Gulf Power because the price got too high. Florida

19 Steel moved away from Tampa, went to Jacksonville and

20 got into the JEA area. Anheuser-Busch closed its

21 brewery in Tampa. Several cement companies have gone

22 out of business, and they import cement from Mexico and

23 other places rather than manufacture it, although

24 they've started manufacturing again.

25 But those people respond to price, so if you
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1 think you can shift the cost of electricity to the

2 industrial sector, it probably won't happen. Tampa

3 Electric tried it in 1986. They came up with a rate

4 methodology that went after the interruptible customers

5 and raised their rates. Within five years, those people

6 constructed 600 megawatts of their own capacity, and

7 they made their own electricity more efficiently than

8 the utility was able to provide it.

9 Now, Mr. May is going to elaborate on this.

10 And I've talked too long. But this is an exciting time

11 here, and probably this time is more exciting than any

12 time since I've been doing this job many years ago. And

13 you are kind of like an open book learning, and you

14 bring in to you people who know about this stuff, but

15 you always need to think about the rest of the story.

16 And as long as I'm around, I'll try to tell you the rest

17 of the story.

18 Now it's my pleasure to introduce Bob May with

19 CF Industries.

20 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. McWhirter.

21 Mr. May.

22 MR. MAY: Thank you very much. I would like

23 to thank the Commission for the opportunity to come and

24 speak with you this afternoon. And let me just give you

25 a little overview of what I would like to discuss with
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1 you this afternoon. I want to tell you a little bit

2 about CF Industries, who we are, what we do, give you a

3 few examples of energy efficiency that we employ and how

4 we generate renewable energy at our complex in Plant

5 City, and also talk to you more importantly about some

6 of the challenges and issues that we face as we look to

7 improve the energy efficiency of our facilities and as

8 we seek and consider the generation of additional

9 renewable energy at our facility.

10 Let me give just a little bit of an overview.

11 We have -- CF has four Florida facilities, one at Plant

12 City. That's where our chemical plant is located. We

13 have a mine in Hardee County, which produces 100 percent

14 of the rock for our chemical plant. We also have a

15 warehouse and ammonia terminal in the Port of Tampa.

16 And then we have a facility at Bartow where we've closed

17 the gypsum stack, and that facility is actually being

18 demolished at the present time.

19 These facilities consume approximately 581

20 million kilowatt-hours of electricity annually. Our

21 products, we produce about 2 million tons per year of

22 dry granular fertilizer products. And we cogenerate at

23 Plant City about 260 million kilowatt-hours from waste

24 heat from sulfuric acid production. And I'll talk a

25 little bit more about that in detail.
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1 On average, we're exporting about 2 megawatts

2 to our utility, TECO. And the things that we're looking

3 at right now is, we have a strategic plan to increase

4 fertilizer production by about 10 percent by 2009. We

5 have the capital approved. We have the permits

6 approved. And as we increase production, we're going to

7 have the opportunity to generate additional renewable

8 energy, and that's something we want to talk more about.

9 And the last bullet I've got up there, we're

10 also considering additional fertilizer production

11 increases of another 10 percent. And, of course, to

12 support that production, we will need additional

13 sulfuric acid production and will have additional

14 opportunities to generate additional renewable energy

15 electricity.

16 Let me give you a couple of examples. I

17 mentioned cogeneration, and I'm going to explain exactly

18 what that is to you. But basically, we generate

19 electricity at Plant City. About 30 to 32 megawatts of

20 electricity are used by the complex itself, and we

21 export on average to our utility about 2 megawatts.

22 The second item I want to discuss is natural

23 gas consumption. We've recently in the last five years

24 reduced our natural gas consumption by about 1 million

25 therms per year, and that has happened in the last five
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1 years as the price of natural gas has continued to

2 increase. But if you go all the way back to, let's say,

3 the early 1980s, when the price of natural gas was

4 originally deregulated, we originally installed dry air

5 preheaters that used low pressure steam that reduced

6 natural gas consumption by about 4 to 5 million therms

7 at that point in time. So basically, at this point in

8 time, we use very little natural gas at our facility.

9 I would like to take a few minutes and explain

10 how we generate electricity at Plant City. The facility

11 has three basic raw materials. We have sulfur, we have

12 phosphate rock, and we have ammonia. And what we do is,

13 we take the sulfur, and we need to produce sulfuric acid

14 as an intermediate chemical in this fertilizer

15 production process, and in that sulfuric acid production

16 -- we have four sulfuric acid production plants at the

17 facility. And in that process, there is a tremendous

18 amount of waste heat that's generated, and we have to do

19 cooling, and that cooling takes place and creates steam.

20 We use the steam in our process plants, and we also use

21 that steam in a steam turbine and a generator just like

22 a utility to generate electricity.

23 So you can see, there are no emissions. We're

24 not burning a fossil fuel specifically to generate

25 power, so there are no emissions from the process.
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1 We're making sulfur -- we're burning sulfur as part of

2 our fertilizer manufacturing process. We're going to do

3 that whether we produce electricity or not. Really, the

4 electricity for us is a by-product as such. So we're

5 merely looking at the economics of is it economic to

6 generate additional electricity.

7 If you look at the schematic, you see -- from

8 the sulfuric acid plant, you see an arrow that says

9 waste heat from cooling towers. That's our energy

10 efficiency opportunity. Today we can recover more of

11 that heat in the form of steam and generate more

12 electricity, but obviously, it requires capital

13 investment, so we need to talk about that a little bit

14 more.

15 Benefits of cogeneration, I touched upon

16 those. There are no environmental emissions associated

17 with our cogeneration facility, and there is no

18 consumption of fossil fuel resources. We're burning the

19 sulfur in that process as part of our fertilizer

20 production process. The sulfur itself only has

21 emissions associated with that process. There are no

22 emissions associated with the cogeneration unit.

23 So why do we have a current opportunity to

24 generate additional electricity? We're looking at

25 increasing sulfuric acid production in support of this
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1 10 to 20 percent increase in our production of

2 fertilizer, and to do that, we're going to make more

3 sulfuric acid. We're going to generate more steam.

4 We're going to have the opportunity to generate more

5 power. It takes capital investment.

6 As part of the decision-making process, you

7 know, I mentioned that we had four plants at the

8 facility. Some of those plants are 40 years old. They

9 were built in 19 -- built in the 1960s. They do not

10 lend themselves well to energy retrofits where we could

11 recover more energy from the process, so we're looking

12 at maybe replacing those plants, and that requires

13 additional capital investment, obviously.

14 We also have -- the plants that we have today,

15 we're considering the retrofit of what's called heat

16 recovery technology into these sulfuric acid plants.

17 It's a technology that has been used in the industry for

18 a number of years. We have not employed it as yet to

19 improve our energy efficiency because we just really

20 haven't been able to get, you know, the economic

21 incentive to be able to make that investment. But if

22 you look at what we're talking about in our strategic

23 plan, depending on where we go and what the incentives

24 are, we have the potential to increase our net export of

25 power somewhere between about 10 and 37 megawatts.
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1 So what's the problem, and what's the

2 solutions? Okay. Well, from our perspective, I can

3 tell you that we're looking at improving our energy

4 efficiency and producing more renewable energy, but the

5 problem is, we feel like we do not get the fair market

6 value for the energy that we produce. I mean, you can

7 look at things like, you know, rate structure

8 incentives. Certainly if you have an energy source that

9 does not burn fossil fuel, it does not generate

10 emissions, certainly there should be some incentives

11 there.

12 There have been solutions talked about such as

13 net billing or wheeling. And obviously, we have other

14 facilities within the state, so we could take advantage

15 of a strategy such as that. And the only thing I can

16 say here, I guess to summarize and kind of conclude my

17 remarks, is to say that we would just ask that you would

18 take a look at the facts that we've presented and

19 consider as you move forward on improving energy

20 efficiency and providing incentives for renewable energy

21 that you would consider these things as you move forward

22 on renewable energy issues.

23 That basically concludes my remarks. If you

24 have any questions, I'll be happy to take them.

25 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Mr. May, sir -- and, of
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1 course, it's right here in front of me, but from what

2 you've said, from the perspective of your company,

3 regulatory changes that would be more favorable to net

4 billing and to wheeling would be helpful in encouraging

5 your --

6 MR. MAY: Certainly.

7 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: -- company to produce

8 additional megawatts --

9 MR. MAY: Certainly.

10 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: -- beyond what you're already

11 producing.

12 MR. MAY: Certainly.

13 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Commissioners, any questions

14 for Mr. May? No. All right. Thank you so much.

15 MR. MAY: Okay. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: And the next person that has

17 signed up to sleep -- to speak. I hope everybody is

18 awake. Is Mr. David Christian.

19 MR. CHRISTIAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

20 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you.

21 MR. CHRISTIAN: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

22 My name is David Christian. I'm the Vice President of

23 Regulatory Affairs at Verizon.

24 As you know, our company, Verizon, is a

25 broadband network company. Our wireless, landline, and
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1 global IP networks create a web of connectivity that

2 supports broadband applications and the people that use

3 them to conduct their daily business. Our networks

4 include the only large-scale fiber optic network in

5 America called FiOS, a wireless broadband service that

6 is available to more than 200 million Americans and a

7 global enterprise network. No matter what you are

8 doing, whether you are on the road or in your home,

9 advances in technology allow us to get more productivity

10 out of our days and decrease the amount of energy we

11 use.

12 For example, broadband facilities facilitate

13 video conferencing and teleconferencing, which helps

14 individuals and businesses substitute the exchange of

15 information and ideas for physical travel and reduce

16 energy. It enables smart building strategies that allow

17 customers to remotely monitor and adjust the energy

18 efficiency of their residences and businesses. As we

19 heard about this morning from Mr. Masiello, this is

20 exactly the strategy that Verizon believes our broadband

21 networks will be able to foster, even greater

22 applications that haven't even been dreamt up yet.

23 These are just a few examples of how our broadband and

24 IP services can assist individuals and businesses

25 globally to increase their productivity, reduce their
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1 energy use, and minimize the impact of their activities

2 on the environment.

3 We've commissioned a paper from the American

4 Consumer Institute that primarily focuses on how

5 broadband technology can reduce greenhouse gas

6 emissions, but it also addresses how IT and broadband

7 applications will and can reduce energy consumption even

8 more, and we would just like to share that study with

9 you today.

10 And those are my remarks.

11 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you. You want to go

12 ahead and pass out some copies? Thank you, David.

13 Obviously, of course, be sure and give some to our

14 staff. Thank you.

15 And our next speaker is Mr. Bob Krasowski.

16 Mr. Krasowski.

17 MR. KRASOWSKI: Good afternoon, Commissioner.

18 It's so nice to see you again. My name is Bob

19 Krasowski. I'm here as a 27-year resident of Florida

20 and also a member of the Florida Alliance for a Clean

21 Environment, a small group that is active in advocating

22 for clean environmental policy.

23 I want to thank you for a very, very

24 interesting meeting. It's so good to see that these

25 type of meetings occur in Florida. These are very, very
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1 important issues that we deal with. I've learned a lot

2 through the presentations of the utilities and the other

3 speakers, and I just wanted to get up and make a few

4 points and questions that will roll on into the future

5 that we'll looking for answers for.

6 There was a question about the population

7 projections that Mr. Ballinger mentioned earlier. That

8 has always been of interest to us, and I think we all

9 need to know, have a real good assessment of that,

10 because so much is based on that. He mentioned a

11 thousand people a day, more or less. But I also was

12 aware of a newer report I think had it down to 750 or

13 something. And then with that trend, we don't know

14 where it's going to go, and I don't want to say the sky

15 is falling. Actually, the sea is rising now. But, you

16 know, we don't know exactly what the future might hold

17 for us. And we have to -- I think it's really important

18 that we try to find some assortment of sources to give

19 us a good idea what the population is as far as a

20 projection, because it is going to be a matter of

21 discussion in the future. And as we know, in the past,

22 other projections of population from the experts have

23 not been accurate. Okay?

24 And then, let's see. There was a question

25 Commissioner Carter asked as to whether or not DSM
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1 programs should be mandatory or voluntary. And the way

2 we look at it, we think that what we should be doing is

3 taking advantage of what the marketplace and the people

4 who have been active in the marketplace have provided

5 for us over the years as far as innovations and

6 efficiencies. And I'm talking about everything -- let's

7 use appliances. In the past 20 years, the efficiency of

8 appliances has increased enormously, refrigerators or

9 washing machines, so we should raise the standard to

10 meet those efficiencies. And I know an efficient

11 refrigerator is a lot more expensive than an inefficient

12 model. Sometimes there are not justifiable reasons for

13 that in terms of the difference in cost of producing

14 those, so it's something we should look at.

15 So along those lines, I feel that DSM should

16 be mandatory, although Mr. Masiello earlier mentioned

17 how when the standard was raised, it kind of killed the

18 DSM program in replacing strip electricity with heat

19 pumps. Well, that's not a bad thing necessarily. It is

20 if it stops the replacement of the old with the new, but

21 -- and I'm not suggesting that was his point, but we

22 shouldn't look at the raise of the standard as a

23 negative thing, although we do have to look at the cost.

24 So I just want to be real sensitive to the DSM programs

25 and whether or not efficiency -- implementation of
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1 higher standards has a negative impact on them.

2 There was a comment about the program to trade

3 out old freezers, people bringing in new higher energy

4 efficiency. Well, we could couple the benefit of doing

5 that along with the requirement that the old freezer has

6 to be removed and returned for recycling, so that's a

7 pretty easy thing to do. It's sort of like when you get

8 a new starter for your car. You have to bring in the

9 core to get the better price on the new starter.

10 Let's see. Just in general terms, once again,

11 I've certainly enjoyed this. But as far as the PSC's

12 role and the utilities' role in providing our community

13 with needed power, I think we're still kind of inside

14 the box here. Okay? Because while DSM programs show to

15 be beneficial in savings, there are a lot of things,

16 external impacts of power and opportunities for solar

17 and other things outside of the realm of the PSC.

18 So I wonder -- you know, this is all good, and

19 I appreciate it and think you're doing a good job, but I

20 wonder if this arena here is enough to really pull off

21 the transition that we need to get away from the old

22 dirty power to new power. And it might be. I don't

23 know. I'm still cloudy on that and trying to kind of

24 envision what we might to do to expand this, because

25 there's more -- of course, everybody knows there's more
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1 than just our interests, the PSC's interest or the

2 utilities' interest at heart here. And if we're going

3 to believe global warming and climate change and all of

4 those things, and the new report about the cost of doing

5 nothing, and then, of course, the other -- the clean,

6 nuclear, carbon-free option that has a lot of other

7 issues associated with it, we just have to, I don't

8 know, sort of think out of the box.

9 But enough for me. Nice to see you all again,

10 and I appreciate your attention to my comments.

11 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Mr. Krasowski, thank you

12 again for your participation. And just to respond to

13 your kind of comments there at the end, generally I

14 don't -- let me put it this way. I don't always

15 appreciate being told I'm in the box. But at this

16 point, I understand your comments, and I do think it

17 certainly all goes beyond us and beyond some of the

18 issues that we're talking about. But one of my personal

19 goals for the discussion today was to look at what our

20 piece of the puzzle or piece of the box, to mix

21 metaphors, may be, because it does all go beyond us,

22 certainly, but yet I think it is very much my

23 responsibility as one Commissioner and ours collectively

24 to look at what is our piece of it and continue our own

25 analysis and discussion.
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1 Commissioners, other thoughts before the next?

2 Okay. We'll move on to the next person on the list,

3 which is George Cavros. George.

4 MR. CAVROS: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

5 George Cavros with the Southern Alliance for Clean

6 Energy and the Natural Resources Defense Council. It's

7 a pleasure to be with you this afternoon. My comments

8 are going to be very brief, because I have a plane to

9 catch.

10 First of all, I want to thank you for holding

11 this workshop. Energy efficiency is so, so important,

12 especially given the goals that we're trying to meet,

13 the benchmarks that the Governor has set out. As you

14 know, energy efficiency is critical to reducing our

15 carbon footprint. It's the fastest, the cheapest, the

16 most effective way to reduce our greenhouse gas

17 emissions, plus it shrinks the demand pie, which makes

18 the renewable portfolio standard that you're working on

19 so much more viable.

20 My main concern today and the reason I'm

21 speaking was that I didn't -- I kind of want to give you

22 sort of a complete picture or try to complete the

23 picture on where we are today on energy efficiency in

24 Florida. I didn't want you to leave with the impression

25 that, you know, we're doing a great job on energy
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1 efficiency in Florida, and all we have to do is maybe,

2 you know, tweak a program here or tweak a measure there.

3 With all due respect to the representatives

4 from the utility industry that are here today, our

5 energy efficiency programs and the way the incentives

6 are designed right now produce very, very, very average

7 results. And one of the reasons for that is a

8 regulatory barrier called the Rate Impact Measure test.

9 I think that Mr. Futrell put it best in his presentation

10 when he said that programs with relatively higher

11 kilowatt reductions will result in higher revenue losses

12 and reduce the potential to be cost-effective under the

13 Rate Impact Measure. And simply put, the Rate Impact

14 Measure doesn't capture the most aggressive energy

15 efficiency measures. And I think you realize that,

16 because from time to time, you do grant utilities cost

17 recovery on programs that don't pass the Rate Impact

18 Measure, but probably do pass the Total Resource Cost

19 Test.

20 So, you know, we look forward to engaging in

21 the conversation as we go forward regarding, you know,

22 what is the proper test. Often the argument is made --

23 the argument that's made for the Rate Impact Measure

24 test is that there is no cross-subsidization of rates.

25 And at least in my mind, I find that to sort of be an
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1 unfair argument, because if we don't use aggressive

2 energy efficiency, we're going to have to go out and

3 build a new power plant, and when we build new supply

4 generation, everyone is cross-subsidized. So I don't

5 understand what the fear is for cross-subsidization when

6 it's applied to demand-side measures, and I would like

7 to see a more level playing field in that regard.

8 There were a couple of things in

9 Mr. Masiello's presentation, a couple of statistics.

10 The first one was that Florida placed two utilities in

11 the top ten of nation in megawatt on ER -- on EE and

12 load management. Well, to put that in perspective,

13 that's a total megawatt savings, a total cumulative

14 megawatt savings. And Florida being one of the larger

15 states, it should be in the top ten on total megawatt

16 savings. But when you look at per person or per

17 customer savings, you find that we're somewhere in the

18 middle of the pack.

19 Additionally, there was a slide that showed

20 three pies. One of them showed the percent of customers

21 that we have, which is 6.5 percent. You might remember

22 that slide. And the other one was percent total from

23 energy efficiency and load management is 17 percent.

24 You may remember that slide. I'm just curious how much

25 of that is from load management, you know, just
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1 basically shifting load from one point to another point.

2 There's an implication in one of the later slides that

3 as much as 16 percent of that 17 percent might be from

4 load management, and it would be nice if we had a

5 clarification on that.

6 Lastly, it's important to note that on any

7 given year, any Florida utility in order to meet its

8 demand will meet that demand with energy efficiency, but

9 that energy efficiency will be less than -- much less

10 than 1 percent of what that total demand is on any given

11 year. And there have been, you know, utilities in other

12 parts of the country with aggressive energy efficiency

13 measures that capture quite a bit more. San Diego Gas &

14 Electric in 2005 caught 2 percent of their total demand

15 for that year from energy efficiency measures.

16 Likewise, Southern California Edison captured 1.7

17 percent of their demand that year through energy

18 efficiency measures. That was 2005. And Massachusetts

19 Electric Company captured 1.3 in 2005 through energy

20 efficiency measures. So we have the potential here in

21 Florida to increase our energy efficiency by a magnitude

22 of three to four times, and that's the kind of

23 reductions we will probably have to see in order to

24 reach certain greenhouse gas reductions and renewable

25 portfolio standard targets.
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1 So in closing, we look forward to working with

2 you as you move forward to establish an energy

3 efficiency framework. We do support decoupling, and we

4 look forward to further discussion on that as well.

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you, George.

7 The next person who has signed up to speak is

8 Dee Barton, if I'm saying that right, Dee Barton. No?

9 Okay. Arthur Annis.

10 MR. ANNIS: Good afternoon, Madam Chairman and

11 Commissioners.

12 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Good afternoon.

13 MR. ANNIS: I work for AirEnalasys Corporation

14 and Enalasys Corporation, which does a lot of the

15 verification service providers from California and

16 Nevada Power & light. And the one thing that I want to

17 bring out this morning, we just got this information in

18 from -- and this came from Pacific Gas & Electric. By

19 using the verification service provider and the

20 verification performance incentives, they have saved

21 50 megawatts of electricity this year. So that shows

22 there -- you know, that's Pacific Gas & Electric

23 stepping out and saying it. It's not me saying it.

24 It's readily available for everybody.

25 The rebates not being used by 25 percent of
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1 the people, that upsets me, because that's money that is

2 allotted them for, you know, saving that energy and

3 upgrading their systems. And using verification service

4 providers, that actually gets filled out by the third

5 party and gets sent in for the homeowner, and it gets

6 directly mailed to them. So that's out there that will

7 cut down on that lost money going to the homeowners.

8 And the question that I had for the committee

9 is in regards to deemed, you know, savings versus

10 verification performance incentives. Is there a greater

11 credit that would be given to the utilities for using a

12 performance based incentive versus deemed savings? So

13 that was my question to the committee.

14 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you.

15 Leon Jacobs.

16 MR. JACOBS: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

17 Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you. My

18 name is Leon Jacobs, and I'm appearing here also on

19 behalf of the Natural Resources Defense Council and for

20 the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy.

21 I want to echo the sentiments of the other

22 speakers in thanking you for taking on this subject.

23 This is truly, I believe, a watershed event, an

24 important event, and we welcome the opportunity and the

25 dialogue that you've opened. We highly endorse the
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1 underlying sentiment that you bring to this that it is

2 time to look at this with a fresh and open air and

3 really see how the Commission's role is important,

4 because we believe it is an incredibly important role

5 that you play.

6 Things have changed considerably in the whole

7 electricity markets, and I won't go into all of that.

8 But particularly for the State of Florida, the dynamic I

9 think is incredibly -- this is an incredibly important

10 time, the transition, the paradigm shift, the whole --

11 all the kind of adjectives or pronouns or nouns you want

12 to give it. This an incredibly important time. Yes,

13 there are some important initiatives that are being

14 undertaken with regard to climate change. Those are

15 very important, and those issues are very important to

16 us. But as you know, I can appreciate particularly the

17 tensions that you face.

18 There's an incredibly important need to look

19 at diversity of fuels. Consumption in the state is

20 growing. We're at a point where we're trying to

21 understand how we're going to address that demand, what

22 kind of technology is going to win out, what are going

23 to be the environmental issues that are going to be

24 raised by what technology wins out. You face some

25 really incredible and challenging points.
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1 The essential message I would like to leave

2 with you today is that you have a winner already before

3 you. We believe that energy efficiency is without

4 question a win-win proposition for energy planning in

5 this state today. It is a least-cost option resource

6 that can be put into the demand mix of this -- demand

7 portfolio of this state to address many of the issues

8 that you're facing. We have not done the best job of

9 looking out and searching out energy efficiency

10 resources.

11 You probably will recall a recent proceeding

12 that we had on siting a facility. And I won't go into

13 all the details, but it was really telling to me, an

14 analysis that was done in that proceeding by one of the

15 potential owners. And essentially what that utility did

16 was, they went out and they did a discrete analysis.

17 They looked at how energy efficiency end use patterns

18 worked into the system demand, and then they determined

19 what energy efficiency measures would address their

20 system operations on a real-time basis.

21 And when they completed their analysis, they

22 found that they could engage a lot more efficiency

23 measures, and they would in turn realize a reduction in

24 their system costs. Their overall long-term costs to

25 produce electricity would go down, which is quite a
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1 different story from what you've heard from a lot of

2 people. The automatic assumption is if you do more

3 energy efficiency, your costs go up, and now you figure

4 out whose ox gets gored. We don't think that that's the

5 full analysis. We do believe that there's a business

6 case for doing energy efficiency in this state. A lot

7 has to go into how you design it and how it gets done.

8 Now, I want to talk a big important point that

9 we've all talked about today: How do you open the gate?

10 What is the most appropriate cost-effectiveness measure?

11 A lot has been said about it. I believe you have some

12 great background and input to help guide you in this,

13 and I provided you some comments here that came from a

14 prior Commission proceeding on this issue. When this

15 policy was being formulated, this was exactly at the

16 forefront of the consideration of the Commission when it

17 was developing these policies. And I won't go through

18 all this. I'll leave this for your reading. But the

19 point that I think it really makes clear is that it was

20 never intended by the Commission to adopt a RIM-only

21 effectiveness test.

22 The analysis that Ms. Pielli gave you today I

23 think is -- I would probably favor more of TRC, but

24 absolutely, I think you can see clearly that it was the

25 intent of this Commission to be very open-ended and well

174

1 rounded in how it looked at cost-effectiveness of energy

2 efficiency. While Florida is perceived to be a RIM-only

3 state, you do take -- it's my understanding that staff

4 does receive that information for the other tests. But

5 unfortunately, the way policy has evolved, we basically

6 wound down -- when it all gets said and done, we wind up

7 always only talking about RIM.

8 And as Ms. Pielli indicated, that's because of

9 our perspective. We are wholly and almost exclusively

10 concerned on -- and I'll bow off on Mr. McWhirter's

11 perspective there. We're almost totally and exclusively

12 concerned about revenue impact. And interestingly

13 enough, I'm not sure if we can distinguish whether or

14 not that's up or down. I think it's almost exclusively

15 about whether or not there is any impact.

16 These are the questions that we're urging you

17 to really be very clear and very precise about how you

18 proceed forward. Obviously, we believe that a RIM-only

19 process is not appropriate for Florida. I think you saw

20 in the analysis that the City of Tallahassee did that

21 when they brought in measures that clearly did not pass

22 RIM, they were able to lower their system costs. The

23 City of Gainesville has adopted not exactly the same

24 process, but a similar process where they have looked at

25 measures that do not pass RIM. They're just now doing
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1 analysis of their outcomes from that, and they're seeing

2 positive results from adopting energy efficiency

3 measures that do not pass RIM, but positively affect

4 their system outcomes.

5 That's a question that's begging right now,

6 and I think if you're going to look very seriously at

7 the energy efficiency question, you have to address that

8 one. We highly encourage you to do that.

9 Decoupling, we do support decoupling. We

10 believe it's important. I was really interested in our

11 example that was discussed today for several reasons.

12 They put a cap on it. They held it accountable to

13 putting in effective energy efficiency, not just looking

14 at what the impact is on rates. I think those are the

15 critical issues that you want to look at. Yes, you do

16 have to be concerned about whether or not it's impacting

17 fixed cost recovery. And if it's not impacting fixed

18 cost recovery, don't break -- it's not broken, and so

19 you may not need to fix it.

20 With that, I'll end my comments. Again, I

21 want to thank you. I think this is a very exciting

22 time, and we welcome the opportunity to participate in

23 this proceeding.

24 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Jacobs.

25 And that is the last person that I have on the
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1 sign-up sheets that we had out. Is there anybody else

2 who would like to take advantage of this opportunity to

3 speak on these issues at the time? And I'm seeing none.

4 Okay. Commissioners, that is the last item on

5 our agenda for this afternoon. I will mention that the

6 transcripts will be available of these proceedings on

7 December 10th.

8 Commissioners, as you've heard from our staff

9 and from our speakers, a lot of issues involved in all

10 this. I am excited about the opportunity that we'll

11 have in the future to discuss some of these ideas and

12 concepts as we move forward. I'm expecting that there

13 will probably at some point, nothing set yet, but as we

14 begin to move into that conservation goal setting

15 process that I mentioned when we started and that others

16 have referred to, that we will have additional workshops

17 on some of the ideas that we've had, incentives, other

18 mechanisms for pursuing energy efficiency,

19 cost-effectiveness tests, which is something that, you

20 know, I have a particular interest in, and other related

21 issues. And I'll open it up for comment and discussion

22 before we adjourn. I know our staff would be interested

23 -- if there are other items or specifics that we would

24 like to ask them to pursue or bring back to us, I know

25 they would be interested in that.

177

1 Commissioner Carter.

2 COMMISSIONER CARTER: A comment first, Madam

3 Chairman. I think that the perspective that we have

4 here today is, in my opinion, to create an environment

5 where all of the disparate interests, the stakeholders,

6 the public at large, customers, to have a nonadversarial

7 perspective where we can put the best ideas possible on

8 the table. And I think that a lot of times when we have

9 proceedings before us, it's mostly adversarial. There's

10 nothing wrong with that, but we don't necessarily get

11 the best bang for the buck.

12 So I'm hopeful that we can look at this, a lot

13 of great ideas, a lot of fantastic energy -- no pun

14 intended. But in terms of the passion that a lot of

15 people had in terms of the concepts here, I would hope,

16 and it's my goal, and I know the goal of all of us as

17 Commissioners, to look at opportunities, to, one, make

18 sure that energy efficiency in Florida is more than just

19 a slogan; second, to create an environment where we can

20 keep the lights on. Let's be real. You know, no matter

21 what, we've got to keep the lights on, keep the lights

22 on.

23 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Don't pull the plug.

24 COMMISSIONER CARTER: Don't pull the plug.

25 And maybe look at some new technologies. I mean, we
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1 have 11 schools in our state university system. We have

2 tremendous private colleges in the State of Florida. We

3 have a tremendous reservoir of bright, young minds out

4 there, and some, Mr. McWhirter, no pun intended, not so

5 bright -- not so young, I mean, minds out there, but

6 certainly some great ideas.

7 (Laughter.)

8 COMMISSIONER CARTER: But certainly some great

9 ideas out there. And our staff is invigorated, and

10 we're excited about it. And, Madam Chairman, I really

11 look forward for us continuing this. The Governor has

12 not only issued his policy statement in terms of his

13 executive orders, but he has followed up from that with

14 some outstanding opportunities. One was the events that

15 we went to down to in Miami, with the workshops on

16 those, and then the follow-up with the commission that

17 he appointed.

18 And I think it's a great time to be in

19 Florida. It's a great time for us, and I see us as

20 being a leader. I don't want those people to stop

21 coming here. Whether it's a thousand people a day or

22 1,004 people a day, I don't want them to stop coming

23 here. Come on down, you know, enjoy the weather. It's

24 the idyllic paradise that we call Florida.

25 But I do want to see us as a Commission to
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1 continually create an environment where the utilities,

2 the stakeholders, the Office of Public Counsel, the

3 customers, the NRDC, and other community-based

4 organizations, Sierra Club, where we'll come to the

5 table and say, "Look, let's work together to do this,

6 because you know what? In the final analysis, if the

7 lights go out, we're all in the dark."

8 Thank you, Madam Chairman.

9 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you, Commissioner.

10 Commissioner McMurrian.

11 COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: Thank you, Chairman.

12 I can't say any of that any better than Commissioner

13 Carter has. This has been a very informative workshop,

14 and I thank staff and all the stakeholders involved that

15 have given us lot of information.

16 Also, I know the Chairman did this earlier,

17 but I neglected to thank Ms. Pielli for all her help on

18 this topic and all the other topics before us, and

19 especially for inviting me to that Southeast Energy

20 Efficiency meeting that you mentioned. I should show

21 you, I have my notebook right here still, my takeaway.

22 And I'm happy to say that with the good agenda that

23 we've had lined up here today that I think we've touched

24 on a lot of those same issues that I had the benefit of

25 hearing about in Atlanta.
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1 But I guess as closing thoughts -- and I know

2 that it's not appropriate probably to do this today, but

3 I guess where I want to hear more from the utilities and

4 the other stakeholders, of course, the consumers, and

5 maybe even the munis and coops, to the extent that

6 they've got good ideas to share with us about the things

7 that we can do as a Commission to help encourage even

8 greater success in the energy efficiency and DSM areas.

9 And to me, that includes the outreach area. If there

10 are specific ideas that you all have and you've seen

11 opportunities that we're not taking, I think we would

12 like to look at those.

13 The rate design area, a lot of that has been

14 discussed today. Specifically the incentive approaches,

15 I think there are a lot of ideas out there that we can

16 look into further, and then, of course, the

17 cost-effectiveness test that the Chairman mentioned.

18 I'm interested in all those things, and looking at best

19 practices in other states and with other utilities.

20 So thank you very much for all the information

21 today.

22 CHAIRMAN EDGAR: Thank you. And I think it

23 absolutely is appropriate, so I appreciate that.

24 Commissioners, any other thoughts?

25 Okay. Seeing none, thank you to all of our
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1 participants, and thank you to all who have attended.

2 We look forward to further discussion, and are

3 adjourned.

4 (Proceedings concluded at 3:25 p.m.)
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