

## Crystal Card

---

**From:** Ellen Plendl  
**Sent:** Monday, December 23, 2013 8:38 AM  
**To:** Consumer Correspondence  
**Subject:** Docket 130007-EI  
**Attachments:** FW: Concerns; Consumer Inquiry - Florida Power & Light Company

See attached customer correspondence and PSC response for correspondence side of Docket 130007-EI

## Crystal Card

---

**From:** Consumer Contact  
**Sent:** Monday, December 23, 2013 7:59 AM  
**To:** Ellen Plendl  
**Cc:** Randy Roland  
**Subject:** FW: Concerns

**From:** Beatrice Balboa [mailto:beatricebalboa@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 22, 2013 10:50 AM  
**To:** Consumer Contact  
**Cc:** Eduardo Balbis; Office Of Commissioner Graham; Office of Commissioner Brown; Office Of Commissioner Edgar; Ronald Brisé  
**Subject:** Re: Concerns

I was reading the latest news media article(s) regarding the latest Florida Power & Light Co. (FPL) proposed electrical bill rate increase and ongoing extremely poor electrical infrastructural activities in the City of Pompano Beach, Broward County and/or the State of Florida with great interest. Please review and implement an action plan to thoroughly address this extremely troubling issue. Media reports continue to underscore the proposed spiraling out-of-control emissions charge rate increase in a overwhelming recessionary/depression economic climate adversely impacting taxpayer citizens. It is way past time to immediately commence a forensic audit throughout the entirety of Florida Power & Light Co. (FPL) administrative and upper management salary(ies) to eliminate, consolidate and reduce all non-essential functions by initiating cost cutting budget measures of 5, 10, 25, 50, 75 and/or 90%, starting at the highest levels of management and working downward to the local level, trying to keep the day-to-day operational and logistical electrical services delivery as much as fiscally prudent to relieve the ongoing unsustainable and unconscionable typical electrical bill inflicted on its senior citizenry. Please coordinate, collaborate and cooperate on Federal, State and/or local jurisdictional levels in addressing these concerns potentially impacting adversely the public's finances, policies, trust, confidence, and quality of life issues. Thank you for your time in this matter and hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

Beatrice Balboa

1010 South Ocean Boulevard, Apt. 1008

Pompano Beach, Fl 33062-6666

====

FPL to pitch PSC on emissions charge increase

BY MARY ELLEN KLAS December 16, 2013

TALLAHASSEE — When the federal government issued new air quality guidelines in 2010 to protect the elderly, children and people with asthma from nitrogen oxide emissions, Florida Power & Light took notice.

The 48 gas turbines the company uses to fire up quickly during peak demand rely on 1970s-era technology. Although the company touts a record of having power plants “67 percent cleaner than the national average,” it also acknowledges these older so-called “peaker” plants emit some of the most toxic pollutants.

In order to comply with the new standard, FPL decided to replace all peak-demand turbines between now and 2016 and, in June, it proposed a \$822 million project. The costs would be borne by customers based on a monthly fee — FPL estimates it is less than 75 cents a month for customers using 1,000 kilowatt hours — and added to the portion of the bill used to comply with environmental regulations.

The proposal would allow the company to replace aging generators in Broward and Lee counties, avoid a lengthy rate review by utility regulators, update emissions technology and still give the company a revenue boost that would increase profits.

On Tuesday, FPL will ask the Public Service Commission to dismiss its proposal while it conducts a series of environmental tests. The goal, the company said, is to come back and ask for the rate increase again once tests are complete.

“It could be the same project; it could be a different project,” said Mark Bubriski, FPL spokesman. When the new proposal does come back, it will have to overcome several hurdles.

The Florida Department of Environmental Regulation, which regulates power plant emissions, said it wanted FPL to conduct tests first to determine the extent to which the existing plants are polluting now.

JR Kelly, director of the Office of Public Counsel, which represents consumers in utility cases, opposes FPL’s request, calling it an inappropriate use of the environmental cost recovery clause. He said FPL should go through a full rate review. Kelly also suggested FPL had not explored less expensive alternatives, such as purchasing other power plants rather than replacing its old ones.

The companies paying some of the biggest utility bills, the Florida Industrial Power Users Group, said complying with federal regulations “does not compel FPL to install new generating capacity” and FPL is not allowed to raise its rates until 2017 under the terms of a settlement agreement it entered into with them.

Even environmentalists are not siding with FPL on this one.

“This is another example of where FPL is gaming the regulatory system to add to their rate base,” said Susan Glickman, Florida director of the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy. “We have no confidence these are legitimate costs because Florida does not have a transparent, least-cost utility planning process. We should look at how solar and energy efficiency competes to get the best deal for consumers.”

Because peaker plants fire up during the hottest summer days and coldest winter nights, often at times when auto traffic is heaviest, the odds of the plants violating federal standards are high, Bubriski said.

Nitrogen oxide is formed from vehicle, power plant and industrial emissions and the new federal standard requires concentration of the dangerous gases not exceed the standard within a one-hour period. The previous standard had been based on a yearly average of emissions.

Bubriski said FPL is committed to its project, and to using the environmental cost recovery clause that allows the PSC to approve it as a pass-through cost, even if it allows it to avoid the deeper scrutiny of a rate review. He said the company used the clause to pay for construction of its solar power plant in Arcadia, for example.

“This is what we have determined to be the most cost-effective to our customers,” he said. “We believe we need to comply. We’re proud of our clean record. This is the right thing to do.”

## Crystal Card

---

**From:** Randy Roland  
**Sent:** Monday, December 23, 2013 8:37 AM  
**To:** 'beatricebalboa@gmail.com'  
**Subject:** Consumer Inquiry - Florida Power & Light Company

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

Dear Ms. Balboa:

This is in response to your E-mail to the Florida Public Service Commission (PSC) regarding Florida Power & Light Company (FPL). You expressed a concern about Docket No. 130007-EI regarding FPL's environmental cost recovery clause.

Thank you for sharing your views. We will add your comments to the correspondence side of Docket 130007-EI. If you have any questions you may 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