



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

July 1, 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. 150085-EG; FPL's Responses to Staff's Amended Third Data Request**

Dear Ms. Stauffer:

Please find enclosed FPL's responses to Staff's Amended Third Data Request, Nos. 1-3. 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

**Q.**

For the Residential Air Conditioning program, please provide the maximum incentive by individual measure that was used to determine the \$208 per participant average maximum incentive. For those measures with incentive levels dependent upon equipment factors such as SEER rating, system type, or other factor, please provide the maximum incentive for each rating, type, or other factor. If measures have an incentive cap associated with them, please identify this cap as well.

**A.**

Only one residential air-conditioning measure passed the cost-effectiveness screening; the 16/17 SEER straight-cool unit for single-family detached homes. (SEER 16 and SEER 17 were combined at the Technical Potential evaluation stage.) The \$208 represents the maximum rebate for that measure. FPL does not have an explicit cap, but this maximum rebate would also represent such a cap.

**Q.**

For the Residential New Construction program, please provide the maximum incentive by individual measure that was used to determine the \$894 per participant average maximum incentive. For those measures with incentive levels dependent upon equipment factors such as SEER rating, system type, or other factor, please provide the maximum incentive for each rating, type, or other factor. If measures have an incentive cap associated with them, please identify this cap as well.

**A.**

FPL's residential new construction program is called BuildSmart®. The program requires the builders, developers or owner-builders (the "builder") to achieve an energy code compliance score for the home better than that required by the Florida Building Code. The program leaves it to the builder to decide which technologies they use to meet the efficiency requirements. Therefore, FPL's "measures" reflect housing types, not technology. Two BuildSmart® measures passed the cost-effectiveness screening. The first was for single-family detached homes which had a maximum incentive of \$951. The second was for single-family attached homes which had a maximum incentive of \$436. The \$894 represents the weighted average of the two based on historical participation. FPL does not have an explicit cap, but this maximum rebate for each measure would also represent such a cap.

**Q.**

For the Residential Ceiling Insulation program, please provide the maximum incentive by individual measure that was used to determine the \$220 per participant average maximum incentive. For those measures with incentive levels dependent upon roofing type or other factor, please provide the maximum incentive for each type or other factor. If measures have an incentive cap associated with them, please identify this cap as well.

**A.**

The maximum rebates for ceiling insulation which pass cost-effectiveness vary by housing type (i.e., single-family detached, single-family attached and mobile homes). The maximum rebate for single-family detached homes was \$273. The maximum rebate for single-family attached homes was \$192. The maximum rebate for mobile homes was \$124. The program-level maximum rebate of \$220 represents the weighted average of these based on historical participation. FPL does not have an explicit cap, but the maximum rebate for each measure would also represent such a cap.