

**Brandy Butler**

---

**From:** Ellen Plendl  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 16, 2017 11:02 AM  
**To:** Consumer Correspondence  
**Subject:** Docket 20170007  
**Attachments:** FW Consumer Inquiry - Florida Power & Light Company; Consumer Inquiry - Florida Power & Light Company

See attached email and reply and add to the correspondence side of Docket 20170007.

## Brandy Butler

---

**From:** Randy Roland  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 16, 2017 11:01 AM  
**To:** Ellen Plendl  
**Subject:** FW: Consumer Inquiry - Florida Power & Light Company  
**Attachments:** FPL Charging \$200 Million to Clean Saltwater Plume, Environmentalists Say \_ Miami New Times.pdf; FPL Wants Customers to Pay for \$200 Million Clean-Up - NBC 6 South Florida.pdf; FPL's investment in infrastructure paid off after Irma \_ Letters - Sun Sentinel.pdf

**From:** Beatrice Balboa [<mailto:beatricebalboa@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 16, 2017 10:02 AM  
**To:** Randy Roland  
**Subject:** Re: Consumer Inquiry - Florida Power & Light Company

I am writing regarding the latest news media reports underscoring the woeful and disastrous state of the electrical grid throughout the City of Pompano Beach, Broward County AND the State of Florida, despite strong documentation indicating such problems exist, with fatalities directly related to this issue and "...left as many as 15 million people in the state without electricity...". In addition, FPL is now requesting a slew of additional fees such as \$200 million and \$1.3 billion to prop up their complete lack of thorough operational, technical and logistical maintenance and preparation that should have been part of the FPL mission and business plan to operate in the State of Florida across the board. To compound FPL deep contempt and disrespect of the hardworking taxpayers residents of the City of Pompano Beach, Broward County AND the State of Florida, documented allegations of overbilling, overcharging and overwhelming electrical rates, surcharges, and fees are contributing to a pervasive climate of complete distrust between customers of FPL and the FPL Corporation. Please coordinate, collaborate and cooperate on Federal, State and/or local jurisdictional levels in addressing these egregious concerns potentially impacting adversely the public's safety, health, finances, policies, trust, confidence, and quality of life issues. Thank you for your time in these matters and hope to hear from you soon.

Beatrice Balboa  
1010 South Ocean Boulevard, Apt. 1008  
Pompano Beach, Fl 33062-6631



[ Please read web version for embedded content ]

# FPL Wants to Charge \$200 Million to Fix Water Pollution It Ignored for Years, Environmentalists Say

**JERRY IANNELLI** | NOVEMBER 14, 2017 | 8:30AM

Florida Power & Light made \$1.7 billion in profit in 2016. A reasonable person might assume a company with that much extra cash would quickly be able to use that money to fix, say, leaks in one of its power plants that are polluting the largest source of drinking water in South Florida. But instead of shouldering the cost of fixing its leaking cooling canals at Turkey Point Nuclear Generating Station in Homestead, FPL is asking state regulators for permission to pass that bill – a **reported \$200 million** – onto consumers.

In a legal brief filed yesterday, the company's loudest critic, the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy (SACE), **demanded that FPL pay for the environmental recovery without levying what is basically a tax on its customers.**

In fact, SACE argued in the filing to the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC), the state body tasked with regulating FPL, that the power company has been misleading regulators and state officials for years about the malfunctioning canals seeping saltwater pollution into the Biscayne Aquifer. FPL simply wants to charge customers in order to get away with years of corporate and environmental neglect, they argue.

"FPL's imprudent and negligent operation of the CCS [cooling-canal system] violated drinking water standards," SACE writes. "FPL customers should not have

to pay for FPL's legacy of negligence and deception."

FPL responded to the filing by painting SACE as an environmental extremist group, pointing to the fact that SACE's lead attorney, George Cavros, retracted a statement earlier this month claiming FPL and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection were conspiring to withhold information from the public.

"Today, yet again, SACE is cooking up outlandish theories that are designed to mislead the public and regulators," FPL spokesperson Bianca Cruz said. "Given that SACE recently filed a highly inflammatory motion in this case that was proven to be false and withdrawn in less than 24 hours, SACE has absolutely zero credibility not only in this case, but on energy issues in general."

SACE has long been among the loudest critics of the nuclear industry and FPL. The group is also battling regulators to stop FPL from building two new nuclear reactors at Turkey Point and sounded the alarm last year after FPL proposed to inject low-level radioactive waste in an area some scientists warned could leak into drinking-water sources. (FPL won that fight earlier this year.)

But SACE isn't the only group opposed to the proposed rate hike: The Florida PSC's Office of Public Counsel, a state group that argues on behalf of consumers, also opposes the \$200 million charge for many of the same reasons. That group has argued that FPL's "imprudent management decisions" cause the plume, a charge the company has **denied in legal filings**.

In SACE's new documents, the environmentalists claim FPL "knew or should have known in 1978, or by 1992 at the latest," that the cooling canals were leaking. The canals are a long, snaking system of pipes used to cool nuclear wastewater, and they're unique to Turkey Point – the system isn't used at any other nuclear site in the world. The canals have been spewing saltwater for years, but state regulators gave FPL an ultimatum only in June 2016. FPL **now has ten years to clean up the plume**. Environmentalists say the state's demands still don't go far enough.

SACE noted that FPL consultants found in 1978, 1990, and 1992 that saltwater was migrating westward from the plant and toward the aquifer. An FPL witness, Mike Sole, even admitted in 2009 that the plume "may have a problem" and was "causing or contributing to impairment of adjacent waters," but SACE says nothing

was done to stop the leak from getting worse until the state intervened in 2013. (Sole was the Department of Environmental Protection secretary at the time, but in 2010 he left that position to take a job **overseeing FPL's lobbying wing.**)

SACE also says FPL failed to send the South Florida Water Management District any monitoring reports from 2005 through 2007, and when the company finally sent the backlog of data in 2008, it neglected to analyze whether a dam built to stop saltwater leakage was working.

The PSC is now tasked with deciding whether FPL got into this mess by accident or through negligence. If the PSC determines that FPL incurred these latest remediation costs "prudently" (that is, if the salt plume grew even though FPL acted responsibly), state law says the company can charge customers for the cleanup cost. If not, FPL is on the hook.

In a **parallel court filing yesterday**, FPL argued it's been handling the saltwater plume correctly for decades and claimed the South Florida Water Management District would have said something years ago if it noticed the company was polluting local waterways. FPL argued that its critics are "asking this Commission to override the judgment of an agency that has the expertise and mandate to protect Florida's water resources."

But SACE, however, isn't buying that claim.

"The most troubling of FPL's imprudent actions is that it misled regulators," SACE wrote.

RELATED TOPICS: [NEWS](#) [ENVIRONMENTAL](#)

## FPL Wants Customers to Pay for \$200 Million Clean-Up

By [Tony Pipitone](#)

NBC 6's Tony Pipitone reports.

(Published Tuesday, Nov. 14, 2017)

There's no question Florida Power and Light's Turkey Point nuclear power plant is responsible for high levels of salt in groundwater under and around the plant near Homestead.

And there's no doubt salt in the water is a bad thing – as it moves closer to wells that supply water to part of Miami-Dade County, and starts leaching into Biscayne Bay.

What is in dispute: Who should pay the \$200 million to clean up the mess?

FPL says its customers should, through an environmental cost recovery charge tacked on to bills.

But the consumer advocate to the Public Service Commission in Tallahassee and an environmental group say the utility – and its shareholders -- should take the financial hit.

After all, they say, it was FPL's negligence that caused the salt intrusion in the first place.

FPL denies negligence was involved, saying it operated “in full compliance with all applicable regulations, and nonetheless an unintended consequence occurred.”

- [Two South Florida Cities Worst in Nation For Singles: Study](#)

The unintended consequence: salt concentrated and forced into groundwater beneath the cooling canals, which act as an open-air radiator beside the plant, cooling water so that it can be cycled back into the plant.

Over the decades, the salt has migrated for miles outside the plant's boundaries, polluting the water.

Cleaning it up is difficult – and expensive.

- [Man Arrested After Standoff Tells Cops He Was Shooting Rats](#)

“We are working diligently to withdraw hyper-saline water and bring it back on property,” said FPL spokeswoman Bianca Cruz.

“Approximately 3.7 billion gallons of hypersaline groundwater from beneath the (cooling canal system) have been extracted and disposed of in the naturally saline boulder zone formation located 3,200 feet below surface,” she said. “This has resulted already in the removal of 890,000 tons of salt from the Biscayne aquifer beneath the CCS.”

FPL insists it's “entitled to recover prudently incurred costs for an approved environmental project.”

- [Florida Man Fighting to Keep Emotional Support Squirrel](#)

But the consumer advocate and environmental group, the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, argue there's nothing prudent about the neglect that led up to the salt intrusion.

"It is obscene for FPL shareholders to earn a profit on decades of FPL negligence and deception," SACE wrote in its most recent filing to the PSC.

The PSC is expected to issue a ruling next month.

- [Alligator Kills Pet Dog Playing With Owners at Florida Lake](#)

If FPL gets what it wants, the typical residential customer would next year pay an environmental cost recovery charge of \$1.59 a month.

Published at 7:27 PM EST on Nov 14, 2017

Get the latest from NBC 6 anywhere, anytime



Download the App

Available for [IOS](#) and [Android](#)

- Follow NBC 6

[Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#)

Find this article at:

<https://www.nbcmiami.com/news/local/FPL-Wants-Customers-to-Pay-for-200-Million-Clean-Up-457569503.html>

Check the box to include the list of links referenced in the article.



# FPL's investment in infrastructure paid off after Irma | Letters



FPL President, CEO Eric Silagy answers key questions about FPL's response to Hurricane Irma.

NOVEMBER 15, 2017, 1:15 PM

**T**he Sun Sentinel's Nov. 3 editorial ("**Does FPL deserve all \$1.3 billion for Irma?**") that questions FPL's preparedness for Hurricane Irma is both misguided and flat-out wrong. The fact is, FPL's more than \$3 billion investment in strengthening the energy grid since 2006 paid off for customers by shaving more than a week off the time to restore power. That's worth billions of dollars to the Florida economy. We're also taking steps to further improve our service to customers while keeping their monthly bills among the lowest in the nation.

Hurricane Irma was the most devastating and costliest storm in Florida history, affecting service for more than 4.4 million FPL customer accounts — about 9 million people. We responded by activating approximately 28,000 restoration workers, the largest such workforce in U.S. history.

That massive response enabled us to get the lights back on for 1 million customers even before the hurricane cleared our area — more than 2 million within the first full day after the storm. Comparing Irma with Hurricane Wilma (2005), the average power outage was reduced from five days to two. We lost just a fraction of our power



poles: 2,500 during Irma versus 12,400 for Wilma. And all of our electric substations were up and running in just one day versus five after Wilma.

While we understand no one wants to pay more for energy or any other service, the costs of responding to major natural disasters — in Florida as nearly all states — are not covered by the regular rates paid by customers. Later this year, we'll propose a plan to the Florida Public Service Commission to recoup Hurricane Irma recovery costs while keeping electric rates manageable for our customers. We welcome the Commission's comprehensive review and analysis of our forthcoming proposal.

We realize that even one day without power is a hardship for customers. That's why we're continuing to make the electric grid more resilient to future storms by installing stronger poles, better equipment and cutting-edge technology. And we're working to improve our communications with customers during and after storms so they have fast, accurate information about the status of their service.

At FPL, we remain committed to providing customers with what they expect from us: reliable clean energy and affordable monthly bills.

Robert L. Gould, Vice President & Chief Communications Officer, Florida Power & Light

Copyright © 2017, Sun Sentinel

This article is related to: [Florida Power & Light](#)

## Brandy Butler

---

**From:** Randy Roland  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 16, 2017 11:01 AM  
**To:** 'beatricebalboa@gmail.com'  
**Subject:** Consumer Inquiry - Florida Power & Light Company

Ms. Beatrice Balboa  
[beatricebalboa@gmail.com](mailto:beatricebalboa@gmail.com)

RE: Inquiry 1262040C

Dear Ms. Balboa:

This is in response to your October 15, 2016 E-mail to the Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC), regarding Florida Power & Light Company (FPL).

You expressed a concern about FPL's environmental cost recovery clause. We will add your comments to the correspondence side of Docket No. 20170007.

If you have any questions or concerns please contact Ellen Plendl at 1-800-342-3552 or by fax at 1-800-511-0809.

Sincerely,

Randy Roland  
Regulatory Program Administrator  
Florida Public Service Commission