

Dorothy Menasco

From: Stright, Lisa [Lisa.Stright@pgnmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 23, 2010 9:17 AM
To: Filings@psc.state.fl.us
Cc: Lee Eng Tan; Vicki Gordon Kaufman; Jon C. Moyle Jr.; John W. McWhirter, Jr.; James Brew; george@cavros-law.com; suzannebrownless@comcast.net; rdc_law@swbell.net; Triplett, Dianne; Burnett, John; Lewis Jr, Paul
Subject: E-filing & E-Service: PEF Responses to Staff's 10th Data Request - Dkt# 100160
Attachments: (Signed) FINAL - PEF Responses to Staff DR10 (100160).pdf

This electronic filing is made by:

Dianne Triplett
299 First Avenue North
St. Petersburg, FL 33733
(727) 820-5184
dianne.triplett@pgnmail.com

Docket No. 100160-EG

On behalf of Progress Energy Florida

Consisting of 5 pages.

**The attached document for filing is PEF's
Responses to Staff's 10th Data Request
in the above referenced docket.**

Lisa Stright

Regulatory Analyst - Legal Dept.
Progress Energy Svc Co.
106 E. College Ave., Suite 800
Tallahassee, FL 32301
direct line: (850) 521-1425
VN 230-5095
lisa.stright@pgnmail.com

12/23/2010

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

10111 DEC 23 09

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK



December 23, 2010

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Ms. Ann Cole, Commission Clerk
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: PEF's Petition for Approval of Demand-Side Management Plan; *Docket No. 100160-EG*
Responses to Staff's 10th Data Request

Dear Ms. Cole:

Enclosed for filing are Progress Energy Florida's ("PEF") responses to Staff's 10th Data Request in the above-referenced docket.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter and please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,


Dianne M. Triplett

DMT/lms

cc: Parties of Record

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

10111 DEC 23 0

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

PEF'S RESPONSE TO STAFF'S 10TH DATA REQUEST

1. On November 29, 2010 PEF filed two Demand Side Management (DSM) plans in response to Order No. PSC-10-0605-PAA-EG. In Order No. PSC-10-0605-PAA-EG, the Commission ordered PEF to file specific program modifications or additions that meet the annual as well as cumulative DSM goals. In the portion of PEF's filing entitled Original Goal Scenario, PEF has proposed program modifications and additions that, taken together, still do not meet the annual DSM goals set by the Commission. Specifically, as shown in the tables below, PEF's Original Goal Scenario continues to fail to achieve the annual and cumulative summer and winter demand (MW) goals for the commercial sector. Please respond to the following:

Year	(A)	(B)	(C) = (B) - (A)
	Commercial/Industrial Summer Demand (MW)		
	Commission Established Goal	PEF Original Goal Scenario Projection	Difference
2010	13.7	0.00	(13.70)
2011	16.2	17.66	1.46
2012	25.5	24.60	(0.90)
2013	25.9	24.88	(1.02)
2014	26.4	25.30	(1.10)
2015	27.6	27.07	(0.53)
2016	27.1	25.76	(1.34)
2017	27.0	25.10	(1.90)
2018	25.7	25.53	(0.17)
2019	22.3	22.70	0.40
Cumulative	237.4	218.60	(18.80)

Year	(A)	(B)	(C) = (B) - (A)
	Commercial/Industrial Winter Demand (MW)		
	Commission Established Goal	PEF Original Goal Scenario Projection	Difference
2010	5.3	0.00	(5.30)
2011	5.3	9.83	4.53
2012	11.4	10.18	(1.22)
2013	11.5	12.44	0.94
2014	11.5	13.55	2.05
2015	11.7	16.42	4.72
2016	11.6	15.91	4.31
2017	11.6	15.65	4.05
2018	11.4	15.81	4.41
2019	11.3	13.15	1.85
Cumulative	102.6	122.94	20.34

DOCUMENT NUMBER - DATE

10111 DEC 23 20

EPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

- a. Please justify why under the Original Goal Scenario PEF continues to plan to fail to achieve the annual and cumulative summer and winter demand (MW) goals for the commercial sector.

RESPONSE:

PEF intended that its Original Goal Scenario plan would meet all energy (GWH) and demand (MW) goals. However, upon receiving this data request, PEF recognized that it inadvertently developed the portfolio of commercial programs in the Original Goal Scenario based upon an estimate of the commercial summer and winter demand (MW) goals "at-the-meter" rather than targeting the actual Commission established demand goals which are "at-the-generator." This resulted in the assumed commercial demand savings being less than the Commission's established commercial demand goals.

Accordingly, PEF is proposing changes to its commercial portfolio, the details of which are reflected in PEF's responses to parts b. through d. of this data request.

- b. Please identify the program modifications or additions that would be required under the Original Goal Scenario to meet the annual as well as cumulative DSM goals for the commercial sector.

RESPONSE:

PEF is proposing to modify anticipated participation in all measures within its Better Business program sufficient to eliminate the reported deficiency in commercial summer and winter demand savings. The following tables reflect the results of these changes to the commercial demand and energy savings.

As mentioned on page 5 of the Original Goal Scenario plan, given the current anticipated schedule for Commission consideration of the proposed plan, it will not be possible to realize savings impacts in 2010 associated with any new measures or programs included in the proposed plan and that any deficiency between the 2010 goals stated in Order No. PSC-10-0198-FOF-EG and PEF's 2010 demand and energy achievements anticipated to be realized under its currently approved plan are assumed to be achieved over the remaining 9 years (2011 - 2019). Savings anticipated to be realized during 2010 under PEF's currently approved Plan have been included in the tables below. The 2010 savings are consistent with anticipated total company energy savings of 118 GWH for 2010 reflected on Table II-4 of the Original Goal Scenario plan.

Year	(A)	(B)	(C) = (B) – (A)
	Commercial/Industrial Summer Demand (MW)		
	Commission Established Goal	PEF Amended Original Goal Scenario Projection	Difference
2010	13.7	20.2	6.5
2011	16.2	17.8	1.6
2012	25.5	27.5	2.0
2013	25.9	25.9	-
2014	26.4	26.4	-
2015	27.6	27.6	-
2016	27.1	27.1	-
2017	27.0	27.0	-
2018	25.7	25.7	-
2019	22.3	22.7	0.4
Cumulative	237.4	247.9	10.5

Year	(A)	(B)	(C) = (B) – (A)
	Commercial/Industrial Winter Demand (MW)		
	Commission Established Goal	PEF Amended Original Goal Scenario Projection	Difference
2010	5.3	17.6	12.3
2011	5.3	9.9	4.6
2012	11.4	11.4	-
2013	11.5	12.9	1.4
2014	11.5	14.0	2.5
2015	11.7	16.7	5.0
2016	11.6	16.4	4.8
2017	11.6	16.4	4.8
2018	11.4	15.9	4.5
2019	11.3	13.2	1.9
Cumulative	102.6	144.3	41.7

Year	(A)	(B)	(C) = (B) – (A)
	Commercial/Industrial Energy (GWH)		
	Commission Established Goal	PEF Amended Original Goal Scenario Projection	Difference
2010	31.1	65.8	34.7
2011	33.0	33.0	-
2012	35.9	43.7	7.8
2013	37.7	40.6	2.9
2014	39.6	42.6	3.0
2015	46.2	47.7	1.5
2016	42.5	46.1	3.6
2017	40.6	45.9	4.3
2018	36.8	42.3	5.5
2019	34.0	34.0	-
Cumulative	377.4	441.6	64.2

- c. Please provide an estimate of the total system costs, in annual revenue requirements, associated with the program modifications or additions under the Original Goal Scenario that would be required to meet the annual as well as cumulative DSM goals for the commercial sector.

RESPONSE:

The following table is a summary of Original Goal Scenario plan reflecting the changes to the commercial portfolio referenced in b. above, including system costs stated in annual revenue requirements. The increase in total system costs (or annual revenue requirements) associated with modifications referenced in b. above are reflected in column 2a.

Progress Energy Florida DSM Cost Estimates - Original Goal Scenario (*Amended*)

DSM Plan Reductions (GWh @ Generator) (1)			DSM Plan Cost (2)		Residential ² ECCR Impacts @ 1200 kWh (3)	Total System Lost ³ Base Revenue (4)	DSM Plan Cost + Lost Base Revenue (5) (2a +2b + 4)
Year	Increase Associated with Modifications (1a)	Total System (1b)	Increase Associated with Modifications (2a)	Total System ¹ (2b)			
<i>Current</i>	-	118			\$3.24		
2011	0	319	\$116,455	\$319,235,385	\$11.28	\$17,278,868	\$336,514,253
2012	8	339	\$4,844,062	\$363,882,418	\$12.77	\$31,216,712	\$395,099,130
2013	3	342	\$1,900,562	\$412,761,329	\$14.51	\$45,327,382	\$458,088,711
2014	3	350	\$2,108,073	\$465,085,782	\$16.60	\$59,798,487	\$524,884,269
2015	1	376	\$1,126,730	\$546,419,299	\$19.76	\$75,347,525	\$621,766,824
2016	4	363	\$2,880,329	\$543,569,968	\$19.68	\$90,289,025	\$633,858,993
2017	5	356	\$4,358,191	\$563,090,906	\$20.15	\$104,924,888	\$668,015,794
2018	0	341	\$421,989	\$541,288,618	\$19.04	\$118,886,032	\$660,174,650
2019	0	323	\$32,915	\$525,933,467	\$18.20	\$132,238,420	\$658,171,887
TOTALS	24	3,229	\$17,789,306	\$4,281,267,172	\$16.86⁴	\$675,307,339	\$4,956,574,511

¹ Includes revenue requirements associated with renewable expenditures of \$1.78 million in 2010 and \$6.47 million in each of the years 2011-2014.

² Residential Class ECCR impacts of the program costs in 2a and 2b based on PEF's standard ECCR calculation, calculated by applying those program costs to the residential class ECCR demand and energy allocation factors, summing the resulting costs, dividing that sum by the kWh energy sales for that customer class, and multiplying by 1,200.

³ Average residential and commercial base rates multiplied against respective residential and commercial lost GWh (at the meter).

⁴ Average of 2011 - 2019.

- d. Please provide an estimate of the annual residential bill impact, in dollars per 1200 KWh per month, associated with the program modifications or additions that would be required under the Original Goal Scenario to meet the annual as well as cumulative DSM goals for the commercial sector.

RESPONSE:

Please refer to PEF's response to c. above.