

COMMISSIONERS:
ART GRAHAM, CHAIRMAN
LISA POLAK EDGAR
NATHAN A. SKOP
RONALD A. BRISÉ
EDUARDO E. BALBIS

STATE OF FLORIDA



GENERAL COUNSEL
S. CURTIS KISER
(850) 413-6199

RECEIVED-FPSC

10 DEC 13 PM 3: 32

COMMISSION
CLERK

Public Service Commission

December 13, 2010

John T. Burnett
Progress Energy Service Company, LLC
P.O. Box 14042
St. Petersburg, FL 33733-4042

STAFF'S ELEVENTH DATA REQUEST

Re: Docket No. 100160-EG – Petition for approval of demand-side management plan of Progress Energy Florida, Inc.

Dear Mr. Burnett:

By this letter, the Commission staff requests that Progress Energy Florida, Inc. (PEF or Company) provide responses to the following data requests.

1. Please refer to the Staff-requested tables, found in Section IX of PEF's Revised Goal Plan. Please provide Total Cost tables for the following omitted programs: Business Energy Response, Technology Development, Qualifying Facilities, and Demand Side Renewable Portfolio (including any subcategories, as necessary). Please provide these tables in hardcopy and electronic (Excel) format.
2. Please provide electronic (Excel format) copies of all tables provided in the Revised Goal Plan and Original Goal Scenario. These include Cost Effectiveness (summaries only), Savings Estimates, and Program Participation for each program; and all Staff requested tables.
3. Please provide, for the March 30, 2010, DSM Programs filing, the tables provided in the "Staff Requested Tables." Please provide these copies in hardcopy and electronically (Excel format). These should include Cost Effectiveness (summaries only), Savings Estimates, and Program Participation for each program; and all Staff requested tables from the compliance filing.
4. Please refer to the Business Energy Response Program for both the Original Goal Scenario and the Revised Goal Plan.
 - a. PEF provided an annual cost impact estimate for the Original Goal Scenario for this program, but has not done so for the Revised Goal Plan. Please provide this information.

09902 DEC 13 01
FPSC-COMMISSION-CLERK

- b. Staff notes that the energy savings associated with the program are identical. If the annual cost amounts differ from the Original Goal Scenario, please explain the discrepancy.
- c. As part of this response, please complete the following table and explain, if necessary, any variation in expenditures between the Original Goal Scenario and the Revised Goal Plan.

Business Energy Response		
	Expenditures (\$)	Energy Savings (kWh)
Original Goal Scenario	\$166,258,566	155,370,072
Revised Goal Plan		155,370,072
Difference		

- 5. Please identify specific modifications, on a program-by-program basis, between the original Goal Scenario and the March 30, 2010, filing.
- 6.
 - a. Please explain and describe the differences between the Commercial/Industrial component of the Revised Goal Plan and the Original Goal Scenario.
 - b. As part of this response, please explain the difference in program demand and energy savings and program cost between the two Plans, on a program-by-program basis and for the Plans as a whole.
- 7. Please refer to the Commercial/Industrial New Construction program for the Original Goal Scenario and the Revised Goal Plan. As detailed in the table below, there is an increase in the energy savings for the program in the Revised Goal Plan, but a significant decrease in program costs. Please explain the source of this variation between the two versions of the program, and why the more cost-efficient version was not incorporated into the Original Goal Scenario.

Commercial/Industrial New Construction		
	Expenditures (\$)	Energy Savings (kWh)
Original Goal Scenario	\$31,229,315	30,133,205
Revised Goal Plan	\$16,365,673	31,810,420
Difference	(\$14,863,642)	1,677,215

8. Please refer to the Business Energy Check program for both the Original Goal Scenario and the Revised Goal Plan. As detailed in the table below, there is an increase in program cost for the Revised Goal Plan, but no subsequent increase in energy savings. Please explain the source of this variation between the two versions of the program, and why the Revised Goal Plan has a unique increase in cost without an increase in energy savings.

Business Energy Check		
	Expenditures (\$)	Energy Savings (kWh)
Original Goal Scenario	\$40,751,751	19,699,151
Revised Goal Plan	\$44,975,311	19,699,151
Difference	\$4,223,560	0

9. Please refer to the Business Energy Saver program for both the Original Goal Scenario and the Revised Goal Plan. As detailed in the table below, there is a decrease in program cost for the Revised Goal Plan, but no subsequent decrease in energy savings. Please explain the source of this variation between the two versions of the program, and why the more cost-efficient version was not incorporated into the Original Goal Scenario.

Business Energy Saver		
	Expenditures (\$)	Energy Savings (kWh)
Original Goal Scenario	\$1,425,727	2,580,190
Revised Goal Plan	\$1,319,960	2,580,190
Difference	(\$105,767)	0

10. Please refer to the Better Business program for both the Original Goal Scenario and the Revised Goal Plan. As detailed in the table below, the Revised Goal Plan version features a small increase in program cost but over double the energy savings. Please explain the source of this variation between the two versions of the program, and why the more cost-effective version was not incorporated into the Original Goal Scenario.

Better Business		
	Expenditures (\$)	Energy Savings (kWh)
Original Goal Scenario	\$97,249,136	142,207,751
Revised Goal Plan	\$106,254,585	325,749,301
Difference	\$9,005,449	183,541,550

11. Please refer to the Commercial Green Building New Construction program for both the Original Goal Scenario and the Revised Goal Plan. As detailed in the table below, the Revised Goal Plan version features an approximate six-fold increase in program costs, but an increase in energy savings of less than double the Original Goal Scenario's. Please explain the source of this variation between the two versions of the program, and why costs increase so dramatically for relatively little increase in savings for the Revised Goal Plan.

Commercial Green Building New Construction		
	Expenditures (\$)	Energy Savings (kWh)
Original Goal Scenario	\$1,275,357	5,260,253
Revised Goal Plan	\$8,051,477	9,154,301
Difference	\$6,776,120	3,894,048

12. In PEF's Introduction of the Revised Goal Plan, on Page 6, PEF states that it incorporates two measures from the March 30, 2010, Technical Potential Program filing into the Home Energy Improvement Program. These measures are HVAC Tune-Up and high SEER HVAC w/ECM. The March 30, 2010, filing suggests that HVAC Tune-Up was already incorporated into the Home Energy Improvement Program. The Revised Goal Plan also does not mention high SEER HVAC w/ECM. Please explain or describe how the Revised Goal Plan and Original Goal Scenario versions of the Home Energy Improvement Program differ from the March 30 filing.
13. In PEF's Introduction of the Revised Goal Plan, on Page 6, PEF states that it incorporates two measures from the March 30, 2010 Filing of the Technical Potential Program into the Low Income and Informational Education Initiatives. These measures are HVAC Tune-Up and Window Films. The March 30, 2010, Low Income Weatherization Assistance Program filing already includes both of these measures. Please explain or describe how the Revised Goal Plan and Original Goal Scenario versions of the Low Income Weatherization Assistance program differ from the March 30 filing.
14. PEF's response to Staff's 7th Set of Interrogatories, Interrogatory No. 73, issued in Docket No. 080408-EG, represents the amount of residential annual energy savings based on measures excluded due to a payback of less than two years as 958 GWhs. PEF's Late-Filed Exhibit No. 2 represents the top ten technical potential measures with less than a 2 year payback and includes 8 residential measures that total 1904 GWhs in annual energy savings.
- Please explain how PEF determined the excluded residential measures and their represented savings as provided in response to Interrogatory No. 73 of Staff's 7th Set of Interrogatories.
 - Please explain what data was relied upon to project the residential annual energy savings of 958 GWhs.

- c. Please explain how PEF determined the 8 residential measures and their represented savings as provided in Late-Filed Exhibit No. 2.
 - d. Please explain what data was relied upon to project the 1904 GWhs of residential annual energy savings from these 8 measures.
 - e. Please explain how the savings from the 8 excluded residential measures (1904 GWhs) can be greater than the savings for all excluded residential measures (958 GWhs)
15. Please provide the projected incentive and customer equipment cost, by program and measure, for each of the company's DSM Plans. As part of this response, provide the participant's equipment cost, before and after the incentive is applied. Please also provide the incentive amount per participant, the incentive's unit (such as square feet, equipment unit, or monthly bill credit), and the incentive amount per unit. Please provide a hardcopy and electronic (Excel format) version of this table as part of the response.

Plan		[March 30, 2010 Filing, Original Goal Scenario or Revised Goal Plan]			
Program Name:					
Year	Participant's Cost (Pre-Incentive)	Participant's Cost (Post-Incentive)	Incentive	Incentive Unit	Incentive Per Unit
	(\$/Participant)	(\$/Participant)	(\$/Participant)	(Metric)	(\$/Unit)
2011				List Unit Here	
2012					
2013					
2014					
2015					
2016					
2017					
2018					
2019					

Plan		[March 30, 2010 Filing, Original Goal Scenario or Revised Goal Plan]			
Program Name:					
Measure Name:					
Year	Participant's Cost (Pre-Incentive)	Participant's Cost (Post-Incentive)	Incentive	Incentive Unit	Incentive Per Unit
	(\$/Participant)	(\$/Participant)	(\$/Participant)	(Metric)	(\$/Unit)
2011				List Unit Here	
2012					
2013					
2014					
2015					
2016					
2017					
2018					
2019					

20. Please provide the cost-effectiveness test results for each program, by program and measure, for each of the company's DSM Plans. As part of this response, include the benefits and cost for each test. Please provide a hardcopy and electronic (Excel format) version of this table as part of the response.

Plan		[March 30, 2010 Filing, Original Goal Scenario or Revised Goal Plan]								
Program Name	Measure Name	E-RIM Test			E-TRC Test			Participant's		
		Benefits	Costs	Ratio	Benefits	Costs	Ratio	Benefits	Costs	Ratio
		(\$000)	(\$000)	(-)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(-)	(\$000)	(\$000)	(-)
	Total									

Please file the original and five copies of the requested information by Monday, December 27, 2010, with Ms. Ann Cole, Commission Clerk, Office of Commission Clerk, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida, 32399-0850. Please feel free to call me at (850) 413-6856 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Lawrence D. Harris
 Senior Attorney
 Office of the General Counsel

LDH/gdr

cc: Office of Commission Clerk
 Paul Lewis
 Vicki Kaufman/Jon Moyle
 John McWhirter
 James Brew/Al Taylor
 George Cavros
 Suzanne Brownless
 Rick D. Chamberlain