

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Commission Review of Numeric) DOCKET NO. 080407-EG
Conservation Goals)
Florida Power & Light Company)
_____)

In re: Commission Review of Numeric) DOCKET NO. 080408-EG
Conservation Goals)
Progress Energy, Florida, Inc.)
_____)

In re: Commission Review of Numeric) DOCKET NO. 080409-EG
Conservation Goals)
Tampa Electric Company)
_____)

In re: Commission Review of Numeric) DOCKET NO. 080410-EG
Conservation Goals)
Gulf Power Company)
_____)

In re: Commission Review of Numeric) DOCKET NO. 080411-EG
Conservation Goals)
Florida Public Utilities Company)
_____)

In re: Commission Review of Numeric) DOCKET NO. 080412-EG
Conservation Goals)
Orlando Utilities Commission)
_____)

In re: Commission Review of Numeric) DOCKET NO. 080413-EG
Conservation Goals)
Jacksonville Electric Authority)
_____)

**REPLY IN SUPPORT OF NRDC-SACE MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
TO FILE TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS**

On June 16, 2009, the Natural Resources Defense Council (“NRDC”) and
Southern Alliance for Clean Energy (“SACE”) filed a motion for a one-week extension

of time to file testimony and exhibits. On June 22, 2009, Florida Power & Light Company, Progress Energy Florida, Inc.,¹ Tampa Electric Company, Gulf Power Company and JEA (collectively “Opposing Utilities”) filed an opposition to this extension request. Florida Public Utilities Company and Orlando Utilities Commission agreed to the proposed extension. NRDC and SACE respectfully seek leave to file the following two-paragraph reply in support of their motion for extension and attached declaration of John D. Wilson, Research Director for the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy. NRDC and SACE state as follows:


1. In their opposition, the Opposing Utilities assert that “NRDC and SACE have had access to substantial amounts of information through their participation in the Collaborative, including . . . the final results of the energy efficiency Achievable Potential Studies.” Opposition at 3, ¶ 5. This is not accurate. As described below in the attached declaration of John D. Wilson, NRDC and SACE have not been provided access to the final Achievable Potential study through the Collaborative. For this reason, an extension is necessary and appropriate.
2. The Opposing Utilities also state that if the one-week extension is granted, they will have substantially less time in which to prepare their rebuttal testimony. Opp. At 3, ¶6. NRDC and SACE suggest that if the Commission agrees that this is a problem, then the deadline for the Utilities’ rebuttal could be extended from July 27, 2009 to August 3, 2009. Because the current schedule does not provide adequate time to take discovery related to the

¹ Progress Energy Florida originally indicated that they did not oppose our motion for extension.

Utilities' rebuttal testimony, this extension should not prejudice the staff or other parties to the docket.

WHEREFORE, for the above and foregoing reasons, NRDC and SACE request that the Motion for Extension of Time to File Testimony and Exhibits be granted.

Respectfully submitted on this 23rd day of June, 2009.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'George S. Cavros', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

George S. Cavros
George Cavros, Esq., P.A.
120 E. Oakland Park Boulevard, Suite 105
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33334
(954) 563-0074
(866) 924-2824
george@cavros-law.com

DECLARATION OF JOHN D. WILSON

I, John D. Wilson, declare as follows:

1. I am the Research Director for the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy (“SACE”).
2. I have worked actively since March 2008 on the above-captioned review of Demand Side Management (“DSM”) Goals and have participated in portions of the Collaborative for SACE and the Natural Resources Defense Council (“NRDC”).
3. Our participation in the technical potential portion of the Collaborative study was productive and at most times we felt included in the flow of information and decisions. SACE and NRDC intend to sponsor testimony outlining some shortcomings in the technical potential portion of the study. However, in general if we had been afforded an opportunity to sponsor the testimony regarding that portion of the study, we would have given that opportunity serious consideration.
4. During the economic and achievable portion of the study, however, SACE and NRDC were not adequately included in key decisions and were not provided copies of important information in most cases. Notably, we did not endorse the Scope of Work because its content was negotiated between the utilities and the consultants without our participation after being shown an early draft.
5. In their Opposition, the Opposing Utilities state that NRDC and SACE “have participated in the development of much of the underlying information and analyses supporting the issues in this docket. They have not been as active in the development of the Achievable potential as they were in the development of Technical Potential, but they have continued to participate in the Collaborative.” The Opposing Utilities’ response implies that we have had access to additional information beyond that filed in the docket.
6. This implication grossly misrepresents what occurred during the Economic and Achievable Potential portion of the study. In fact, we were categorically excluded from receiving important exchanges of methodology, data and results between the utilities and the consultants. We were surprised at the ultimate results of the study and had no access to information that would have indicated the nature of the results in advance of June 1. During this portion of the study, the few documents and limited data that we were provided with are fairly insignificant and of limited relevance to what was actually completed and filed as testimony.

7. In fact, we were quite “active” in this portion of the study, but most of our activity was spent in negotiations with the utilities over whether we would be provided access to basic information and timely opportunity to influence key decisions in the methodology. Ultimately, we were not provided substantial information nor provided an opportunity to influence the analysis.
8. According to the Scope of Work signed by the utilities, task 5 (“Estimate Economic and Achievable Potential”) includes the following tasks. Our access to each deliverable is noted.
 - a. “Estimate economic potential.” We have partial access to the overall results. Data have been submitted on an aggregate level for four of the seven utilities. The four utilities providing economic potential data met the objectives for providing detailed data in varying degrees, but generally provided incomplete data as discussed below.
 - b. “Collect and estimate program and market share data for achievable calibration.” Specifically, the consultant was required to deliver “a memo reviewing and summarizing total program and individual measure savings from program efforts for the past few years, as well as estimates of marginal energy efficiency market penetration rates. In addition the memo will analyze recent trends in utility program spending and savings per dollar by sector and end use, as available.” We have not seen this memo or any of these data as they are presumably forthcoming in the final report.
 - c. “Draft achievable potential estimates for residential and industrial sectors.” We were not provided any opportunity to review draft estimates.
 - d. “Utilities review and comment on draft achievable potential estimates for the residential and industrial sectors.” We were not permitted to participate in this review.
 - e. “Draft achievable potential estimates for the commercial sector.” We were not provided any opportunity to review draft estimates.
 - f. “Utilities review and comment on draft achievable potential estimates for the commercial sector.” We were not permitted to participate in this review.
 - g. “Final achievable potential estimates for all sectors.” This item was scheduled for March 13, 2009. These estimates were not provided until June 1, 2009 and we do not have access to the underlying data.
 - h. “Provide payback acceptance curves for key measures.” We have not seen any of this material.
9. Under the Collaborative schedule, the “Draft economic and achievable potential report” was scheduled for March 20, 2009 and the final report was scheduled for April 3, 2009. We have not seen either a draft or final report.

10. The information provided in the utilities' testimony omits important areas that were to have been included in the final economic and achievability report such as detailed information on the methodology utilized, the economic analysis, the basis for calibrating the achievable analysis to program experience in Florida, or detailed information on the specific measures screened at each step of the process and the data supporting each screening decision
11. As of March 22, 2009 (the deadline to petition for reconsideration of Order No. PSC-09-0152-PCO-EG), SACE and NRDC were aware that the utilities and consultants were behind schedule. However, we reasonably believed that information contained in the report would be made available to us as members of the collaborative sometime in May prior to the utilities filing testimony on June 1, 2009.
12. Prior to filing testimony on June 1, 2009, SACE and NRDC had made several requests for information to FPL, which was the utility coordinating the collaborative. These requests remained unanswered or were rejected.
13. During May, 2009, we anticipated (although were not informed specifically) that we would not receive any further substantive information from the utilities regarding the potential study. However, we fully anticipated that the utilities' testimony would include information substantially equivalent to the final potential study report. Moreover, based on the Collaborative schedule, we expected at the very least that the utilities would have made available all deliverables expected under the Collaborative process to the docket within two weeks of filing testimony. However, they have not done so.

I declare under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: this 23rd day of June, 2009.



John D. Wilson

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy and correct copy of the foregoing was served on this 23rd day of June, 2009 via email (*) and/or US Mail on:

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Katherine Fleming, Esq. * Erik L. Slayer, Esq. * Florida Public Service Commission Gerald L. Gunter Building 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850 KEFLEMIN@PSC.STATE.FL.US esayler@PSC.STATE.FL.US</p> | <p>J.R. Kelly / Stephen Burgess * Office of Public Counsel c/o The Florida Legislature 11 I W. Madison Street, Room 8 12 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400 kelly.jr@leg.state.fl.us</p> |
| <p>Jessica A. Cano Florida Power and Light 700 Universe Blvd. Juno Beach, FL 33408 Jessica.Cano@fpl.com</p> | <p>Mr. Paul Lewis, Jr. * Progress Energy Florida 106 East College Avenue, Suite 800 Tallahassee, FL 32301-7740 paul.lewisjr@pgnmail.com</p> |
| <p>John T. Burnett / R. Alexander Glenn * Progress Energy Service Company, LLC Post Office Box 14042 St. Petersburg, FL 33733-4042 john.burnett@pgnmail.com</p> | <p>Paula K. Brown * Tampa Electric Company Regulatory Affairs P. O. Box 111 Tampa, FL 33601-0111 regdept@tecoenergy.com</p> |
| <p>Susan D. Ritenour * Gulf Power Company One Energy Place Pensacola, FL 32520-0780 sdriteno@southernco.com</p> | <p>John T. English Florida Public Utilities Company P. O. Box 3395 West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3395</p> |
| <p>Chris Browder * Orlando Utilities Commission P. O. Box 3193 Orlando, FL 32802-3193 cbrowder@ouc.com</p> | <p>Teala M. Milton * JEA V.P., Government Relations 21 West Church Street, Tower 16 Jacksonville, FL 32202-3158 milta@jea.com</p> |
| <p>Suzanne Brownless, Esq. * 1975 Buford Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32308 suzannebrownless@comcast.net</p> <p>James D. Beasley, Esq., * Lee L. Willis, Esq. * Ausley Law Firm PO Box 391 Tallahassee, FL 32302 jbeasley@ausley.com lwillis@ausley.com</p> | <p>Jeremy Susac * Florida Energy Commission 600 South Calhoun Street, Suite 251 Tallahassee, FL 32399-001 jeremy.susac@eog.myflorida.com</p> <p>Susan Clark, Esq. * Radey Law Firm 301 South Bronough Street, Suite 200 Tallahassee, FL 32301 sclark@radeylaw.com</p> |

Steven R. Griffin, Esq. *
Beggs and Lane Law Firm
501 Commendencia Street
Pensacola, FL 32502
srg@beggslane.com

Vicki Kaufman, Esq. and
John Moyle, Esq.*
Keefe Anchors Gordon and Moyle
118 North Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
vkaufman@kagmlaw.com
jmoyle@kagmlaw.com


Jack Leon, Esq., *
Wade Litchfield, Esq. *
Florida Power & Light Company
215 S. Monroe Street, Suite 810
Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1859
Jack.Leon@fpl.com
Wade_Litchfield@fpl.com

Norman Horton, Jr., Esq. *
Messer, Caparello and Self, P.A.
2618 Centennial Place
Tallahassee, FL 32308
nhorton@lawfla.com

Charles A. Guyton
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey
215 South Monroe Street
Suite 601
Tallahassee, FL 32301
cguyton@ssd.com

John, W. Mcwhirter, Jr., Esquire*
PO Box 3350
Tampa, Florida 33601
jmcwhirter@mac-law.com

This 23rd day of June, 2009.



George Cavros