

STATE OF FLORIDA



COMMISSIONERS:
GARY F. CLARK, CHAIRMAN
ART GRAHAM
JULIE I. BROWN
DONALD J. POLMANN
ANDREW GILES FAY

DIVISION OF ECONOMICS
JUDY HARLOW
DIRECTOR
(850) 413-6410

Public Service Commission

January 15, 2020

Kenneth A. Hoffman
Vice President Regulatory Affairs
Florida Power & Light Company
134 West Jefferson Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
Ken.Hoffman@fpl.com

STAFF'S FIRST DATA REQUEST

Via E-mail

David M. Lee
Senior Attorney
Florida Power & Light Company
700 Universe Boulevard
Juno Beach, FL 33408
David.Lee@fpl.com

Re: Docket No. 20190223-EI: Petition for Approval of a Permanent Optional LED streetlight Tariff, by Florida Power & Light Company.

Dear Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Lee:

By this letter, Commission staff respectfully request the following information from the Florida Power & Light Company.

1. Paragraph 13 of the petition states that the number of LED fixtures installed increased from 1,691 to over 195,000 during 2016 to 2019. Please state types of customers who have installed the LED lighting and their numbers.
2. Paragraph 13 of the petition also states that FPL has a pipeline of customers interested in new LED fixtures and conversions to LED lighting. Please state the approximate number and type of customers in the pipeline.
3. Paragraph 13 refers to "over 195,000 LED fixtures" installed, while paragraph 17 refers to "over 194,000 LED fixtures" installed. Please clarify the discrepancy.
4. Paragraph 20, section b) states that in the LED matrix, FPL used a standard \$3.00 range within each fixture tier. Is this \$3.00 range standard to FPL or to the LED lighting industry? If FPL standard, how did FPL derive the \$3.00 fixture tier range?

5. Paragraph 21, section a) of the petition states that annual hours of darkness is used when calculating the kilowatt demand for a LED fixture. Please state the annual hours of darkness used to calculate the kilowatt demand and how FPL derived this calculation.
6. Paragraph 21, section b) of the petition states that FPL used a standard \$0.20 range within each energy tier in the LED matrix. Is this \$0.20 range standard to FPL or to the LED lighting industry and how did FPL derive the \$0.20 range?
7. Paragraph 23 of the petition refers to two types of lighting: FPL-owned fixtures on FPL-owned poles and FPL owned fixtures on customer-owned poles. Please state the number of poles in each category under the LT-1 tariff. What are the financial and non-financial advantages or disadvantages to LT-1 customers such as HOAs, builders, parks, municipalities, or businesses having FPL-owned fixtures on FPL-owned poles or having FPL-owned fixtures on customer-owned poles? What factors influence whether a customer uses an FPL pole or its own pole for lighting?
8. Page 1 of the petition and the concluding paragraph of the petition is seeking Commission approval of the revised permanent optional LED LT-1 tariff and LT-1 Agreement. However, paragraph 16 of the petition states that the LT-1 Agreement in Exhibit C is attached for reference purposes and as correctly stated in Paragraph 8 of the petition, the LT-1 Agreement was approved in Order No. PSC-17-0115-TRF-EI, in Docket No. 20160245-EI. Please explain if this is a scrivener's error and if not, why the Company is seeking re-approval of the LT-1 Agreement.
9. Paragraph 20 of the instant petition provides an example of a Tier 5 fixture charge (installed cost) ranging from \$738.57 to \$923.21. In the pilot program tariff in Docket No. 20190245-EI, paragraph 11b) shows the installed costs ranging from \$942.67 to \$1,178.32. a) Please explain the reasons for the installed cost changes and referring to paragraph 20(b) of the instant docket, and b) please provide the calculation of the monthly \$12.00 fixture cost based on the \$738.57 installed costs showing and explaining all steps and inputs of the calculation.
10. Paragraph 21, section c) of the instant docket provides an energy charge example for the Autobahn fixture indicating the manufacturer rating at 268 watts. In the pilot program in Docket No. 20160245-EI, paragraph 12(c) indicates the rating at 260 watts. Please explain the difference in wattage ratings for the Autobahn fixture example.
11. Referring to paragraph 21, section c) of the instant docket, please show the calculation that arrives at the \$2.80 energy charge for a 268 watt fixture. Show each step and input for the calculation.
12. Paragraph 23 of the petition and proposed revised tariff sheet 8.737 indicates a monthly maintenance charge of \$1.29 per fixture on FPL-owned poles and \$1.03 per fixture for

Ken A. Hoffman & David M. Lee

Page 3

January 15, 2020

customer-owned poles as opposed to current maintenance charges of \$1.82 and \$1.27. Please explain the reasons for the cost differences. Please explain the reasons for the cost differences and show the calculations for the \$1.29 and \$1.03 maintenance charge per fixture. Show each step and input for the calculations.

13. Paragraph 24 of the petition and proposed revised tariff sheet 8.737 indicates a LED conversion recovery charge of \$1.87 per fixture as opposed to the current conversion recovery charge of \$1.03 per fixture. Please explain the reasons for the cost difference.

Please file all responses electronically no later than January 29, 2020, via the Commission's website at www.floridapsc.com by selecting the Clerk's Office tab and Electronic Filing Web Form. Please contact me at sguffey@psc.state.fl.us or at 850.413.6204 if you have any questions.

Thank you.

/s/Sevini Guffey

Sevini Guffey
Public Utility Analyst II

cc: Office of the Commission Clerk