1		BEFORE THE		
2	FLORIDA	PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		
3	In the Matter o	f:		
4		DOCKET NO. 100155-EG		
5		PROVAL OF DEMAND-		
6	SIDE MANAGEMENT PLAN OF FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY.			
7		/		
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14	PROCEEDINGS:	AGENDA CONFERENCE ITEM NO. 6		
15	COMMISSIONERS	IIEM NO. 6		
16		CHAIRMAN ART GRAHAM		
17		COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISÉ		
18		COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN		
19	DATE:	Tuesday, July 26, 2011		
20	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148		
21		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida	4	11
22	REPORTED BY:	JANE FAUROT, RPR	R-CA	53
23	REFORIED BI:	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR Official FPSC Reporter	UMBE	JUL
24		(850) 413-6732/6734	DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE	299
25			CUME	02
			DC	
		FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Staff, let's get started on
3	Item Number 6.
4	MR. GARL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good
5	morning, Commissioners. I'm Steve Garl from Commission
6	staff.
7	Item 6 is Florida Power and Light Company's
8	petition for approval of its demand-side management
9	plan. On January 31st, 2011, the Commission denied
10	approval of FPL's previously-filed DSM plan, because it
11	did not meet the goals set by the Commission. The
12	company was directed to modify its plan to meet the
13	goals. FPL filed a modified plan and an alternate plan
14	on March 25th, 2011. Staff recommends approval of the
1.5	modified plan, because it is projected to meet or
16	exceed all Commission-established savings goals, it is
17	cost-effective, and it does not create an undue rate
18	impact. The alternate plan need not be considered,
19	because it fails to meet most goals.
20	Staff is available to answer any questions
21	you may have, and representatives of the parties are
22	also present.
23	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: All right.
24	SACE.
25	MR. JACOBS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Leon
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1	Jacobs here on behalf of the Southern Alliance for
2	Clean Energy, and with me is Tom Larson, as well.
3	MS. KAUFMAN: Vicki Gordon Kaufman on behalf
4	of the Florida Industrial Power Users Group.
5	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: FPL.
6	MS. CANO: Good morning. My name is Jessica
7	Cano, and I'm appearing on behalf of Florida Power and
8	Light Company. With me today is Tom Coke (phonetic)
9	from FPL's DSM group.
10	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commission Board.
11	Comments; questions; motions?
12	Commissioner Balbis.
13	COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr.
14	Chairman.
15	And I'm just going to, I guess, bring it up
16	to the Commission. I have a feeling that we are going
17	to have similar discussions as to Florida Power and
18	Light as we did with Progress Energy. And with that,
19	seeing some nods of the heads, I think we could save
20	some time here, especially if we're moving forward with
21	discussions on technical potential, or relooking at the
22	goals. I think we could address this docket by, again,
23	amending their DSM plan to match what they currently
24	have in place, or maintain the status quo with the same
25	band discussion pending closing the docket and moving

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 on with our other discussion.

2

3

7

8

9

10

13

25

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: It has been moved and seconded.

MR. HARRIS: May I -- Larry Harris with staff. Is it your intent to offer essentially the same motion as you did for Progress?

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Really, you had to ask that question?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, sir, I did.

11 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: It would have been very
12 clear before we passed it.

Commissioner Edgar.

14 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I did have one question
15 that I wanted to ask staff to clarify for me.

I think, Mr. Garl, I just heard you say that 16 17 the amended plan submitted by FPL may not be considered because it doesn't meet the goals, but yet the staff 18 recommendation on the last item was to approve a rate 19 mitigation plan for Progress that did not meet the 20 goals. And I absolutely recognize that each case is 21 22 separate and distinct, but yet there seems to be some inconsistency, in my mind, to that. Could you speak to 23 it? 24

MR. GARL: Yes. Primarily, in the case of

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

FPL's DSM plan, the rate impact is probably the biggest 1 player. And, of course, that was the biggest player in 2 staff's recommendation to adopt Progress' alternate or 3 rate mitigation plan. FPL's rate impact with their modified plan falls right in line with Gulf, right 5 above them, and I believe TECO right below them, which 6 the Commission has already approved. So that is why 7 staff recommends adopting the plan, the modified plan 8 which does meet the Commission goals, whereas the 9 alternate plan does not meet most of those goals, so we 10 recommend not even considering that. 11

4

12

13

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: But that's not the same as the Commission may not consider it.

MR. GARL: No. No. It should be considered, 14 yes. Probably a misstatement there. It has been 15 considered; we looked at it; it did not meet the goals, 16 and pushed that aside. 17

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Can you, very quickly, 18 or briefly, or succinctly go over what the differences 19 are generally between -- and I'm putting the modified 20 plan aside for the moment -- but between the more 21 22 status quo current programs continuing versus the alternate plan. 23

MR. GARL: Probably the best measure of that, 24 Commissioner, would be looking at the new programs 25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

under their modified plan. There are a total of 15 new programs, each of them, of course, carrying some cost and very -- relatively small cost. But 15 of them, the cost does add up, and that's where the rate impact comes from that we're discussing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. But I wasn't asking about the modified plan. I was asking about the alternate plan, the difference between the alternate plan and the, as has been suggested by Commissioner Balbis, the more what I would term status quo, current programs continuing.

12 MR. BALLINGER: If I may answer that, 13 Commissioners, because in the recommendation we have a 14 comparison of the alternate plan to the modified plan, which isn't compared to the status quo. I would refer 15 16 you to FPL's petition that they filed in this docket where it describes the alternate plan on page 3. And 17 it says, "FPL's alternate DSM plan continues the 18 19 programs currently in place under FPL's existing DSM 20 plan, includes the solar pilot programs approved by Order Number PSC-11-0079-PAA, and adds a new DSM 21 22 program targeted at low income customers."

So to me, reading that, their alternate plan adds a low income program and then the solar programs that the Commission has already approved. And I'd, I'd

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1	ask if we could get clarification from FPL if that's
2	correct or not, but that's reading from their petition.
3	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: May I, Mr. Chairman?
4	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Sure.
5	MS. CANO: Good morning. Yes. I believe
6	Staff's statement was correct. I would just add to
7	that though that we do currently have a low income
8	program, and that would remain in place if we went with
9	the status quo approach that you're considering.
10	Additionally, I would just point out that the
11	status quo as far as total achievement goes currently
12	falls, I believe, somewhere between the two plans that
13	we have before you. So it would be sort of a middle,
14	middle-of-the-road type decision there.
15	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Which of those
16	three, if we have the modified, the alternate and the
17	current, current programs, which did you say you
18	thought would be more of the middle of the three?
19	MS. CANO: The status quo approach that's
20	being considered is in between the alternate plan and
21	the modified plan that meets the new higher goals.
22	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. And then just for
23	clarification, since I understand and am supportive of
24	kind of tracking in this docket what we did just in the
25	previous issue that was before us, would that solar

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Ì

piece need to be included or is that included in the 1 way the motion was put before us? Do you understand 2 where I'm --3 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, is 4 5 it for me or for --CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Well, I thought Staff was 6 going to answer that. 7 8 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. 9 MR. HARRIS: This is Larry Harris. Ι understood that the solar pilot programs were part of 10 11 that status quo motion that Commissioner Balbis made. 12 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: That is correct. 13 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And I just wasn't sure if it -- I thought that was the intent, I just wasn't 14 15 sure if it was included. So with all of that painful, 16 detailed questioning -- sorry, Mr. Chairman -- I appreciate the chance and I'm ready to support the 17 18 motion. 19 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Did you want to clarify 20 something, Commissioner Balbis? 21 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: I did, and it just fled 22 from my skull. 23 No, I just wanted to point out that the other benefit as far being, you know, the middle, middle of 24 25 the road, if you will, with the status quo is that, FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1	again, it alleviates my concern of starting and
2	possibly stopping a program in a short period of time.
3	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: And no other lights? All
4	in favor of the Balbis amendment, say aye.
5	(Affirmative vote.)
6	Anybody opposed?
7	Okay. We are done with item number 6.
8	Staff, is that the agenda?
9	MR. JACOBS: Mr. Chairman, one point of
10	clarification.
11	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Sure.
12	MR. JACOBS: In the, in the statutory
13	provisions where you choose not to approve plans, it
14	generally anticipates that those, that the company has
15	to refile or, and this is a point of clarification, the
16	Commission would adopt a plan because you're not
17	requiring any refiling. I'm assuming that you're
18	choosing to adopt the prior, prior DSM plans of the
19	company for these goals.
20	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Is that your question?
21	MR. JACOBS: Yes, sir.
22	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Brisé.
23	COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
24	I think the intent of the motion and the
25	intent of the vote is to continue to apply the current
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1	plans as they stand at this time.
2	MR. JACOBS: Thank you.
3	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: That all being said, we're
4	adjourned.
5	(Proceeding adjourned at 11:58 a.m.)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 STATE OF FLORIDA) : CERTIFICATE OF REPORTERS 2 COUNTY OF LEON) 3 4 WE, JANE FAUROT, RPR, and LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR, Official Commission Reporters, do hereby certify 5 that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated. 6 IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that we 7 stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under our direct supervision; and that this 8 transcript constitutes a true transcription of our 9 notes of said proceedings. 10 WE FURTHER CERTIFY that we are not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the 11 parties, nor are we a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorneys or counsel connected with the 12 action, nor are we financially interested in the action. 13 DATED THIS 299 day of July, 2011. 14 15 16 JAŃ FAUROT, RPR ידיד BOLES, ČRR. 17 FPSC Official Commission FPSC Official Commission Reporter Reporter 18 (850) 413-6732 (850) 413-6734 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION