



Jessica A. Cano
Senior Attorney
Florida Power & Light Company
700 Universe Boulevard
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420
(561) 304-5226
(561) 691-7135 (Facsimile)

June 24, 2015

-VIA ELECTRONIC FILING-

Carlotta Stauffer, Director
Division of Commission Clerk
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 140226-EI; FPL's Prehearing Statement with Corrected Certificate of Service

Dear Ms. Stauffer:

Please find enclosed FPL's Prehearing Statement with a corrected Certificate of Service. The Certificate of Service included with FPL's original filing on June 22, 2015, did not reflect all parties who were served with FPL's Prehearing Statement on that date.

If there are any questions regarding this filing, please contact me at 561-304-5226.

Sincerely,

s/ Jessica A. Cano
Jessica A. Cano
Fla. Bar No. 0037372

cc: Lee Eng Tan, Office of General Counsel
Counsel for Parties of Record

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Request to opt-out of cost recovery for investor-owned electric utility energy efficiency programs by Wal-Mart Stores East, LP and Sam's East, Inc. and Florida Industrial Power Users Group.

Docket No. 140226-EI

Filed: June 22, 2015

**FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY'S
PREHEARING STATEMENT**

Florida Power & Light Company ("FPL" or the "Company"), pursuant to Order No. PSC-15-0149-PCO-EI, issued April 1, 2015, hereby files with the Florida Public Service Commission ("FPSC" or "Commission") its Prehearing Statement in connection with the Energy Conservation Cost Recovery ("ECCR") opt-out proposals submitted in this docket, and states:

I. FPL WITNESSES

Witness	Subject Matter	Issues
Thomas Koch FPL	Rebuts the cost recovery opt-out proposals presented by witnesses for the Florida Industrial Power Users Group ("FIPUG") and Wal-Mart Stores East, LP and Sam's East, Inc. ("Wal-Mart"), identifying, among other flaws, that (i) the proposals would shift prudently incurred ECCR costs from large business customers to smaller business and residential customers; (ii) Florida's Rate Impact Measure ("RIM")-based Demand Side Management ("DSM") goals benefit all customers, regardless of participation in the specific DSM programs offered; and (iii) customers in all classes and of all sizes implement their own conservation measures without utility incentives.	1, 2, 3
Renae Deaton FPL	Rebuts the cost recovery opt-out proposals presented by witnesses for FIPUG and Wal-Mart, explaining that the proposals are inconsistent with established rate making and cost causation principles and discriminatory; also explains that there would be an increased administrative burden and resulting increase in costs associated with any such program.	1, 2, 3

II. EXHIBITS

FPL has not pre-filed any exhibits. FPL reserves the right to utilize any exhibit introduced by any other party. FPL additionally reserves the right to introduce any additional exhibit necessary for rebuttal, cross-examination, or impeachment at the hearing.

III. STATEMENT OF BASIC POSITION

FIPUG and Wal-Mart have presented proposals to allow certain large customers to “opt out” of paying a portion of their electric bills – specifically, the ECCR charges associated with certain Commission-approved programs designed to meet a utility’s Commission-approved DSM goals. These proposals are fundamentally flawed; rely on unsupported, overly simplistic, inaccurate assumptions; and are discriminatory. As a result, they should be rejected by the Commission.

First, the opt-out proposals ignore the fact that regardless of participation, all customers benefit from the RIM-based portfolio of programs approved by the Commission, the costs of which are recovered through the ECCR charges. The Commission has already determined that DSM program participation bears no relationship to a customer’s responsibility to help pay the costs associated with the DSM portion of a utility’s resource portfolio, because all customers benefit from those programs. *See* Docket No. 930759-EG, Order No. PSC-93-1845-FOF-EG, p. 1 (issued Dec. 29, 1993) (citing Docket No. 810050-EU, Order No. 9974 (issued April 24, 1981)). The opt-out proponents also imply that only large business customers implement DSM measures on their own, outside of Commission-approved programs. This is incorrect and fails to support special opt-out treatment for these customers.

Second, the opt-out proponents make various unsupported claims, including that utilities will be able to reduce DSM program costs if the opt-out customers’ energy efficiency

achievements are counted toward DSM goals to avoid shifting costs to other customers. However, it is not clear that FPL would be able to reduce any of its DSM program costs if the opt-out proposals are approved, while it is certain that administrative costs would increase.

Finally, the opt-out proposals are irreparably one-sided. For example, FIPUG and Wal-Mart propose to allow certain customers to opt-out of paying for energy efficiency-related DSM programs on the theory that those customers do not or cannot participate in those programs, while requiring all customers to continue paying for business customer load management programs, in which, by design, many customers (such as residential customers) cannot participate. For the foregoing reasons, as supported by the testimony of Thomas Koch and Renae Deaton, the opt-out proposals should be rejected.

IV. ISSUES AND POSITIONS

ISSUE 1: Should the Commission require the utilities to separate their Energy Conservation Cost Recovery expenditures into two categories, one for Energy Efficiency programs and the other for Demand Side Management programs?

FPL: No. The Commission should not require the utilities to separate their Energy Conservation Cost Recovery expenditures into two categories, one for “Energy Efficiency” programs and the other for “Demand Side Management” (e.g., load management) programs. Programs that pass the RIM cost-effectiveness test benefit the general body of customers, both participating and non-participating customers, regardless of their potential characterization as energy efficiency or demand side/load management. Accordingly, distinguishing between the two would serve no relevant purpose nor would it provide a meaningful basis for determining costs that “eligible” opt out customers would be allowed to avoid and pass on to other customers. At best, the only purpose such separation would serve would be to enable the administration of the opt-out proposals. As discussed in the rebuttal testimony of FPL witnesses Thomas Koch and Renae Deaton, the opt-out proposals should be rejected. (Koch, Deaton)

ISSUE 2: Should the Commission allow pro-active non-residential customers who implement their own energy efficiency programs and meet certain other criteria to opt out of the utility’s Energy Efficiency programs and not be required to pay the cost recovery charges for the utility’s Energy Efficiency

programs approved by the Commission pursuant to Section 366.82 Florida Statutes?

FPL: No. The Commission should not allow non-residential customers who implement their own energy efficiency programs and meet certain other criteria to opt out of paying for a subset of the utility's DSM programs approved by the Commission pursuant to Section 366.82, Florida Statutes. As outlined in the rebuttal testimony of FPL witnesses Thomas Koch and Renae Deaton, the opt-out proposals generally described in the testimony of Wal-Mart's witnesses and FIPUG's witness ignore the fact that all customers benefit from the utility's DSM programs and fail to recognize (or deny) that the impact of such proposals would be to shift the recovery of prudently incurred costs for approved DSM programs from large business customers to smaller business and residential customers. The opt-out proposals are one-sided, inconsistent with sound regulatory policy, and should be rejected. (Koch, Deaton)

ISSUE 3: **If the Commission allows pro-active customers to opt out of participating in, and paying for, a utility's Energy Efficiency's programs, what criteria should the Commission apply in determining whether customers who wish to opt out are eligible to do so?**

FPL: There is insufficient evidence in the record to identify any appropriate criteria which the Commission could apply to determine whether customers who wish to opt out would be eligible to do so. At this point, only self-serving criteria have been proposed by the proponents. More to the point, as outlined in the rebuttal testimony of FPL witnesses Thomas Koch and Renae Deaton, the opt-out proposals generally described in the testimony of Wal-Mart's witnesses and FIPUG's witness ignore the fact that all customers benefit from the utility's DSM programs and fail to recognize (or deny) that the impact of such proposals would be to shift the recovery of prudently incurred costs for approved DSM programs from large business customers to smaller business and residential customers. The opt-out proposals are one-sided, inconsistent with sound regulatory policy, and should be rejected. (Koch, Deaton)

V. STIPULATED ISSUES

There are no stipulated issues at this time.

VI. PENDING MOTIONS

FPL has no pending motions at this time.

VII. PENDING REQUESTS FOR CONFIDENTIALITY

FPL has no pending Requests for Confidential Classification at this time.

VIII. OBJECTIONS TO A WITNESS'S QUALIFICATION AS AN EXPERT

FPL has no objections to any witness's qualifications at this time.

IX. REQUIREMENTS OF THE PREHEARING ORDER THAT CANNOT BE MET

At this time, FPL is not aware of any requirements in the Order Establishing Procedure with which it cannot comply.

Respectfully submitted this 22nd day of June, 2015.

Jessica A. Cano
Senior Attorney
Florida Power & Light Company
700 Universe Boulevard
Juno Beach, FL 33408
Telephone: (561) 304-5226
Facsimile: (561) 691-7135

By: s/ Jessica A. Cano
Jessica A. Cano
Fla. Bar No. 0037372

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (CORRECTED)
Docket No. 140226-EI

I **HEREBY CERTIFY** that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Prehearing Statement has been served by electronic mail this 22nd day of June 2015, to the following:

Lee Eng Tan, Esq.
Office of General Counsel
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
ltan@psc.state.fl.us

Beggs & Lane Law Firm
Jeffrey Stone, Esq./Russell Badders, Esq./
Steven Griffin, Esq.
501 Commendencia Street
Pensacola, FL 32502
jas@beggslane.com
rab@beggslane.com
srg@beggslane.com

James D. Beasley, Esq.
J. Jeffrey Wahlen, Esq.
Ashley M. Daniels
Ausley & McMullen
P.O. Box 391
Tallahassee, FL 32302
jbeasley@ausley.com
jwahlen@ausley.com
adaniels@ausley.com

Robert L. McGee, Jr.
Gulf Power Company
One Energy Place
Pensacola, FL 32520
rlmcgee@southernco.com

John T. Burnett, Esq.
Dianne M. Triplett, Esq.
Duke Energy Services Company, LLC
299 First Avenue North
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
john.burnett@duke-energy.com
dianne.triplett@duke-energy.com

Matthew R. Bernier/Cameron L. Cooper
Duke Energy Services Company, LLC
106 East College Avenue, Suite 800
Tallahassee, FL 32301
matthew.bernier@duke-energy.com
cameron.cooper@duke-energy.com

Beth Keating
Gunster Law Firm
215 South Monroe Street, Suite 601
Tallahassee, FL 32301
bkeating@gunster.com

Paula K. Brown
Tampa Electric Company
Regulatory Coordination
P.O. Box 111
Tampa, FL 33601
regdept@tecoenergy.com

Jon C. Moyle, Jr.
c/o Moyle Law Firm
118 North Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
jmoyle@moylelaw.com

Robert Scheffel Wright/John T. La Via
Gardner Law Firm
1300 Thomaswood Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32308
schef@gbwlegal.com

Cheryl Martin, Director – Regulatory Affairs
Aleida Socarras
Florida Public Utilities Company
1641 Worthington Road, Suite 220
West Palm Beach, Florida 33409
cheryl_martin@chpk.com
asocarras@fpuc.com

George Cavros, Esq.
120 E. Oakland Park Blvd., Suite 105
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33334
george@cavros-law.com

J.R. Kelly, Esq.
Charles J. Rehwinkel, Esq.
Patricia A. Christensen, Esq.
Office of Public Counsel
c/o The Florida Legislature
111 West Madison Street, Room 812
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400
Kelly.jr@leg.state.fl.us
Rehwinkel.Charles@leg.state.fl.us
christensen.patty@leg.state.fl.us

James W. Brew, Esq.
Owen J. Kopon, Esq.
Stone, Mattheis, et al.
1025 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W. 8th Floor
West Tower
Washington, DC 20007-5201
jbrew@smxblaw.com
ojk@smxblaw.com

By: s/ Jessica A. Cano
Jessica A. Cano
Fla. Bar No. 0037372