FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 2 In the Matter of: 3 DOCKET NO. 150081-EG 4 PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF 5 DEMAND-SIDE MANAGEMENT PLAN OF TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY. 6 7 In the Matter of: 8 DOCKET NO. 150083-EG 9 PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF DEMAND-SIDE MANAGEMENT PLAN OF 10 DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, INC. 11 In the Matter of: 12 DOCKET NO. 150085-EG 13 PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY'S 14 DEMAND-SIDE MANAGEMENT PLAN AND 15 REQUEST TO CANCEL CLOSED ON CALL TARIFF SHEETS. 16 17 In the Matter of: DOCKET NO. 150086-EG 18 PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF 19 DEMAND-SIDE MANAGEMENT PLAN OF 20 GULF POWER COMPANY. 21 In the Matter of: 22 DOCKET NO. 150087-EG 23 PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF 2.4 MODIFICATIONS TO DEMAND-SIDE MANAGEMENT PLAN BY JEA. 2.5

BEFORE THE

1

In the Matter of:	
	DOCKET NO. 150088-EG
PETITION FOR APPR	
MANAGEMENT PLAN E UTILITIES COMMISS	BY ORLANDO
	/
In the Matter of:	
	DOCKET NO. 150089-EG
PETITION FOR APPEDEMAND-SIDE MANAGE FLORIDA PUBLIC UT COMPANY.	GEMENT PLAN BY
PROCEEDINGS:	COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA ITEM NOS. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11
COMMISSIONERS	
PARTICIPATING:	CHAIRMAN ART GRAHAM COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISÉ COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN COMMISSIONER JIMMY PATRONIS
DATE:	Tuesday, July 21, 2015
PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center
	Room 148 4075 Esplanade Way
	Tallahassee, Florida
REPORTED BY:	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR
	Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6734

2.5

PROCEEDINGS

2 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Now, if I'm not mistaken, we will go to the DSM dockets, which are Items No.

4 5 through 11.

Okay. Staff.

MR. ELLIS: Good morning, Commissioners.

Phillip Ellis, Commission staff. I will be providing an overview of Items 5 through 11, the FEECA utilities' request for approval of their respective DSM plans, with individual docket staff also present to answer any questions you may have.

The recommendations before you today reflect staff's analysis of these plans, including whether the programs offered comply with the FEECA statutes and the Commission's order, whether they are monitorable and measurable, and whether they are cost-effective for both participants and non-participants.

Staff recommends approval of the DSM plans and associated tariffs filed by the FEECA utilities with the following proposed modifications.

Four FEECA utilities, including Duke, TECO, FPUC, and OUC, claim credit for behavioral savings in their audit programs. Staff recommends that given the difficulty in monitoring and measuring the behavioral impact of audits and to more uniformly treat the

utilities, that behavioral savings not be counted towards DSM goal achievements.

2.5

For Duke specifically, staff also recommends that its proposed custom incentive program be modified to eliminate its annual expenditure cap.

In addition to FPL's DSM plan, staff also recommends approval of the company's petition to cancel its residential load control rate schedule RSL, which will -- which was closed to new participants in 2003. Customers on this tariff would be automatically transferred to its open residential load control rate schedule RLP.

Overall, the FEECA utilities are proposing DSM plans that even with staff's proposed modifications to remove behavioral savings meet the Commission's annual goals for seasonal peak demand and annual energy. The only exceptions are OUC, which does not meet its commercial industrial winter peak demand goals because some programs have not yet been quantified, and Duke, for which two of the ten years it falls below its residential winter peak goals but meets them on a cumulative basis.

Staff notes that Duke would still be responsible for meeting its annual goals, and should continue to monitor participation rates, and, if

necessary, seek Commission approval to modify or add programs.

2.5

Lastly, the DSM plans appear to be cost-effective as a whole. While some individual programs may not be cost-effective, these tend to be audit programs and education and outreach programs, which are required by rule or Commission order. The main exceptions are OUC and JEA, which are municipal utilities and, therefore, have their own governing body to determine the reasonableness of expenditures.

Based on staff's review, staff recommends that the DSM plans with the modifications discussed in the individual recommendations be approved, and the investor-owned FEECA utilities should be allowed to file for cost recovery in the Energy Conservation Cost Recovery clause.

Staff would also note that for Items 6 and 8 an oral modification was distributed to your offices yesterday. Do all Commissioners have a copy of those modifications?

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Yes.

MR. ELLIS: Staff would like to incorporate those changes into the recommendations today. Staff is available for any questions you may have.

Representatives from the utilities are also

present. Staff is aware that three groups also wish to comment on these dockets, including SACE, FIPUG, and Wal-Mart.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, SACE -- excuse me. Thank you, staff. Commissioners, any questions to staff right now?

Okay. Let's start off with the utilities, if there's anything that you guys would like to add. You may want to reply later, but -- okay. Let's start off with SACE.

MR. CAVROS: Great. Thank you, Chairman and Commissioners, for the opportunity to address you today.

The Southern Alliance for Clean Energy is a non-profit, non-partisan clean energy organization that advocates for the use of low-cost and low-risk resources in meeting electricity demand. Energy efficiency is the most obvious low-cost, low-risk resource. It can meet demand at a fraction of the cost of building a new power plant, and it also helps customers reduce energy use and save money on their bills. And I think that's something that we can all agree is a good thing.

In this docket, this Commission will approve plans that will implement the conservation goals that were set last year. And as you may recall, in that proceeding there was a robust debate regarding how the

Commission should address free ridership. Free riders is -- is a term that -- that means a customer that will adopt a measure regardless of whether that measure is included in a utility-sponsored energy efficiency program. And the Commission chose, in setting those goals, a two-year payback screen in setting those goals, which essentially means that any measure that had a customer payback of two years or less was eliminated from the company's conservation goal potential study.

SACE was a party in that proceeding, and we advocated for using actual data on what, you know, actual free ridership is. The two-year payback tends to eliminate high savings, low-cost measures, and those measures tend to be critically important to lower income communities. And it's based -- the two-year payback is based on a couple of assumptions, which was discussed and established at the conservation goal hearings:

Number one, that the customer has to be fully informed; number two, that the customer has to have the financial resources to implement the measure; and, number three, that the customer is going to act rationally.

Now, what are, you know, what are the free ridership rates in Florida? We didn't know and certainly you did not know because the utilities do not collect that data. Commissions in other states,

especially in the southeast, have access to that data:
the Commissions in Georgia, the Commissions in Carolina.
Georgia Power provides that information to its
Commission. Duke Energy Carolinas provides that
information to its Commission. Now those Commissions
and those states may have different regulatory
structures, but nobody can deny that it provides more
information to the Commission and allows them to make
more informed decisions.

2.5

And now the Commission, Commissioners, you adopted a two-year payback screen. You know, in essence, you didn't have information available to you regarding what the actual level of free ridership was in Florida, and you appropriately stated in your order that, you know, we couldn't go retro -- go back retroactively and acquire this information, and that the -- the program approval stage was the most appropriate docket in which to consider this.

So we are before you now asking that as part of an order approving the companies' plans that they also be required to collect data on free ridership as part of their already existing measurement and verification protocol, which they already use a protocol to establish what the impacts are from their already existing demand-side programs.

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

2.5

You know, I mean, I think we can all agree that more information is better than less. I think we can all agree that having to guess at what free ridership is is not as good as actually having the data to do it. And certainly, most importantly, it will help inform the Commission on how many of these high savings, low-cost measures are actually being adopted by low-income communities. I suspect that when the data is in, you will find that very few of those measures are actually being adopted by that community.

The utilities may respond that they already have low-income programs, but those programs are not reaching the low-income community in any meaningful way. If you look at the transcripts from the conservation goals proceedings, FPL's program, for instance, was reaching less than 1 percent of that community.

The utilities may respond that it costs money, but, in fact, this could be incorporated into their already existing measurement and verification protocol that is part of the program plans that they have submitted to you for approval. And it will also allow them to -- and allow you, Commissioners, to implement better program design, which I'm sure this is something this Commission values.

So in light of all that, we respectfully

9 10

11

12

13 14 15

17

16

19

18

20 21

22

23

24

2.5

request and, I believe, make a reasonable and modest request that any order issued by the Commission also include a component where actual data will be collected by the utility so Commissioners five years from now, four years from now, I don't know when again conservation goals will be considered, but that future Commissions will have access to the information to make the best informed decisions that they possibly can. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, SACE. I have to tell you I am also not a fan of the two-year screen, we talked about that before as we went through this, but I do have to compliment the utilities. I know as we went through the hearing, one of the things that they heard -- at least they heard from me very clearly -- was how we need to do more on the education side of things, and that we need to do more on the low-income side of things. Because I thought what was being lost with the two-year screen was a lot of low-income benefits that could have been realized. And I think with the education and with more low-income programs, I think we've addressed some of those things. Granted, I'm still not a fan of the two-year screen, but I am not as upset about it as I was.

Commissioners, any other questions of SACE or

1 any comments?

2.5

Okay. Let's move to Wal-Mart.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,

Commissioners. Robert Scheffel Wright appearing on

behalf of Wal-Mart Stores East, Limited Partnership, and

Sam's East, Incorporated.

As I think you know, we are parties -- or a party as Wal-Mart to Docket No. 140226, which is our request that the Commission approve an opt-out option by which large commercial and industrial customers may have the option to opt out of the energy efficiency part of the utilities' Energy Conservation Cost Recovery programs.

All we -- this hearing is to be held tomorrow, as you know, and the schedule goes on after that. We simply believe that in these proceedings today, the DSM plans -- we believe that the utilities' DSM plans should include an opt-out option, as we pray in 140226, and we would simply ask that you keep that opportunity or option potential open for inclusion in the DSM plans that are before you today after you rule on our request for the opt-out option in 140226. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you. Questions to staff. If -- depending on the outcome of the hearing, I guess it's tomorrow and the next day -- is there a way

of -- how would we go about making changes if there's changes required to these dockets in front of us today?

MS. TAN: If the Commission were to decide to allow opt out in the 140226 docket, the Commission has the ability to go into the DSM program plans at any time to make modifications. And if that were to be necessary, we would take the necessary steps to do so.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Commissioners, any questions of Wal-Mart?

FIPUG.

MR. MOYLE: Jon Moyle of the Moyle Law Firm on behalf of FIPUG. And to -- to the point made by Mr. Wright, we would -- we would echo it. And FIPUG appears before you a lot to try to help shape and better ideas of utilities. We don't have a lot of petitions that we initiate. The one that a panel of you will hear tomorrow is such a petition, and it's quite important to the FIPUG members, to Wal-Mart, and we -- we would suggest to the state to take a hard look at the opt-out issue. It's something a lot of states have done. I'm not going to stray into the substance because the panel will get -- get to that tomorrow.

But we want to make sure that, assuming we can make our case and the evidence is persuasive and the Commission says, yeah, we ought to take a look at this

and do something, that we're not procedurally foreclosed from doing so because this case and this order got out in front of the opt-out case.

You know, I haven't -- I haven't talked to Mr. Cavros, but he has some issues. I don't know if he's going to challenge the PAA or not. But -- but what we are simply asking is that you -- you not let the procedure overcome the opt-out issue. And a number of you have served in the Legislature. We don't want it to be sort of the equivalent of, you know, that's a good idea, we'll take it up in next year's legislative session, which, you know, sometimes happens and sometimes doesn't happen. So we -- we just want to underscore that point.

I appreciate you all letting us speak. We did participate in the underlying proceeding related to energy efficiency, but the opt out is something that, that's important, and we want to make sure procedurally that the ability to address an opt out is preserved and not impinged upon by you taking — taking action in this docket. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Moyle.

Commissioners, any questions of FIPUG?

Utilities, did you have anything else to add

before I brought this back to the Commission?

MR. BEASLEY: I would just say that we support the staff recommendation in its entirety, and they have worked very hard in this process and we're appreciative of that.

MR. GRIFFIN: The same is true for Gulf Power.

And I would just add that at least as I view the DSM

plan, that's not a compulsory document. It just lays

out the programs that are available to customers should

they choose to avail themselves of those.

If the Commissioner were to adopt an opt-out mechanism for a certain subset of customers, I don't know necessarily that that would require a deferral of a ruling on the DSM plan itself.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay.

MS. CANO: Good morning. Jessica Cano on behalf of Florida Power & Light Company.

Just very briefly, with respect to SACE's comments, as noted by staff in their recommendation, FPL's plan does comply with the goals order, including treatment of free riders using the two-year payback criterion, which then was set aside for purposes of the low-income program. So we do support staff's recommendation on approval of FPL's DSM plan.

With respect to Wal-Mart and FIPUG's comments,

I think this highlights some of the uncertainty

surrounding their opt-out proposals. I'm not sure FPL would even include the opt-out approach as a program in its plan. But regardless, putting that aside, I do agree with staff that any necessary modifications could be handled subsequently and that the entire DSM plan doesn't need to be delayed for that reason. Thank you.

2.5

Duke Energy Florida. I agree with all of my colleagues. And I would also just mention with respect to SACE's comments, the fact -- imposing additional requirements for us to collect data would have a cost, and I don't know what that cost would be and I don't think there's any evidence with respect to what that would be because there's really no methodology that has been vetted as far as how that collection of data would occur. So, thanks.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Ms. Keating, do you have something to add?

MS. KEATING: Beth Keating with the Gunster law firm here today for FPUC. We also support staff's recommendation, and echo the comments of the other utilities you've heard today.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you.

MR. PERKO: Gary Perko of Hopping, Green & Sams on behalf of JEA. JEA also supports staff's

1 recommendation. Thank you.

2.5

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you.

Okay, Commissioners, I'll entertain a motion.

Commissioner Brown.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I have just a couple of questions first before we get to that.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Actually these are specific to Duke, so I hope you're here to -- prepared to answer some questions.

Based on staff's recommendations, the DSM -your DSM plan will not be meeting goals for annual
residential winter peak demand in this year, 2015, and
expected in 2016. I'm curious how you intend to make it
up. Through participation in other types of programs,
or how do -- how are you going to proceed?

MS. TRIPLETT: Sure, and I expected that question from someone. So I think what -- what our folks -- we've already been working on it, and I think the good news is that we built in some flexibility in our plan with respect to those audits to -- we didn't specify the types of -- of actual physical equipment that we would give to customers during those audits. And so I think there is a way to tweak what we offer so it would be low-cost additional gadgets, if you will, to

provide to customers that would not -- those are not behavioral savings. Those are actual things that are implemented at the home. And so we think with that tweak we will be able to -- to meet the goals.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: And encourage participation. Right.

2.5

MS. TRIPLETT: Exactly. But, of course, as we always do, we're going to have to keep an eye on that and monitor participation rates. And we may have to make some other modifications, but hopefully that will get us over the goal.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: So do you perceive coming back in with modified plans sometime in this year or next year?

MS. TRIPLETT: Based on what we are looking at now, I don't think so, because I think that our plan and even the participation standards for this -- for the audit program historically has not said, you know, we're going to give a water heater coil and we're going to give a refrigerator, you know, doodad or whatever. It's been more of, well, we are going to provide particular measures to customers, and there hasn't been that level of specificity. So I think that gives us the flexibility to adjust those items. And then, of course, the costs that we incur with respect to those audits

would be reviewed in the annual energy conservation cost 1 2 clause. But, I mean, I'm not going to foreclose the --3 we may have to come in and do a bigger modification or 4 adding of a -- of a new program or measure. 5 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. And, you know, I'm 6 7 a big proponent. I think these -- these audits, definitely on the residential side but also on the 8 9 10 11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that.

commercial, they are beneficial and they do lead to savings. And unfortunately our staff has found that the behavioral savings are not quantifiable, so you -- you intend -- you filed your original plans including behavioral savings that were associated with the previous -- under the previous DSM goals proceeding. And so without those savings now, you're unable to meet

the goals. I just wanted some more clarification on

We got a tariff yesterday associated with your item, and there's a couple -- there's a couple of revisions in there. Do you have that in front of you, Ms. Triplett?

MS. TRIPLETT: I'm sorry, I don't. staff flipping pages. Maybe they can help me.

Okay. I have it.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. I don't know if

you were involved in the preparation of these tariffs.

And I just have one question regarding the load

management programs.

6.221.

2.5

For schedule -- let me see. Sorry. Sheet 6.221, 6.132, and I thought there was another one, I thought there were three of them, but if you go to

MS. TRIPLETT: I'm there.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: All right. On Special Provision 8, there's now an inclusion of the company may discontinue service under this rate schedule and bill for prior load management credits received by the customer plus applicable investigative -- investigation costs associated with that if the customer's Wi-Fi network availability has been disrupted, and I see that there's a couple of other areas that we have that. My understanding, though, that the prior provisions and the previous language in that paragraph reflected more discontinuance based on malfeasance or tampering. Why are you including it? So that the utility can just shut off service or discontinue service if, you know, the Wi-Fi is automatically disconnected for a brief period of time?

MS. TRIPLETT: So I think the reason, the purpose of this revision is because there is a change in

2.5

the technology with respect to how the load control devices are that transmit information. Now, with the greater availability of cellular wireless networks --

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Well, yeah. I understand.

that is to -- is to ensure if we move -- we're moving towards -- away from the, you know, this is just a one-time I'm going to just be communicating using a different, a special network device to I'm going to need to use the Wi-Fi. We wanted to have the flexibility to make sure that if there was a disruption, we can't actually -- with the new load control systems we won't be able to disconnect and disrupt and interrupt in the way that we need to to make the program function.

I will tell you I hear what you're saying, and I -- I would not allow my folks to say, you know, it's a may discontinue. I would not allow us to discontinue without further investigating and say is it just your Wi-Fi, is it, you know, one of the Wi-Fi --

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Well, it doesn't have a time period either in there, you know, for any amount of time.

MS. TRIPLETT: Right.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: So it just -- it kind of

struck me as awkward. If there was a time provision in there, some time, you know, with more than 24 hours or something to that effect, that would make sense. But it just -- for, you know, if the Wi-Fi, you know, it goes in and out. If the Wi-Fi gets discontinued, can the utility just go ahead and discontinue their service and bill the customer?

MS. TRIPLETT: I wouldn't interpret it that
way, but I hear what you're saying. This provision
would allow us to do that. I don't think -- I think
that a reasonable time period would be implied in this
such that it would not just hit -- someone just happened
to be out or there was a storm or some other reason for
no fault of the customer that the wireless was out. So
I definitely think there is at least an implied
reasonableness into -- into this interpret -- into this
tariff.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Ms. Triplett, but if there are forces outside of the control, like you said, like a storm or something to that effect, under this — under these tariffs, the utility is entitled to collect the investigation costs as well and also bill the — bill the customer.

MS. TRIPLETT: Right. And I would -- it's a
may, so all I would say is that I think that each

circumstance would be looked at. I think that's why we have the discretion there rather than saying we shall impose the charge. I think that would be one of the circumstances that we would take under consideration.

But if it would assist, I mean, we could certainly look at providing another, you know, a revised set of tariffs to tighten this language up to make sure that there is an exclusion for those sorts of events that --

2.5

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Dropped spots or --

MS. TRIPLETT: Right. Maybe like a force majeure, something like that, but something beyond the control of the -- of the customer, and maybe it's a -- when the utility, when we are considering whether an investigative charge will be imposed, we consider a variety of factors including whether the customer was at fault, whether there was storm activity, something like that, and that would make it clear that those are considerations to be factored in when we're imposing a charge.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I would appreciate that.

Again, I got this late yesterday and read it, and so I would appreciate tightening up the language a little bit. So, thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: No suggestions on how to tighten up that language?

1	COMMISSIONER BROWN: I can come up with some.
2	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: We're all ears.
3	COMMISSIONER BROWN: Ms. Triplett, also with
4	that consideration, also if a time frame would be
5	included as well.
6	MS. TRIPLETT: Do you think 48 hours sounds
7	reasonable or
8	COMMISSIONER BROWN: Yeah. I was going to go
9	to 24, but 48
10	MS. TRIPLETT: 24?
11	COMMISSIONER BROWN: Yeah. 24 to 48, whatever
12	time frame.
13	MS. TRIPLETT: Okay.
14	COMMISSIONER BROWN: And tighten the language
15	up on the force majeure events outside of the control.
16	MS. TRIPLETT: Uh-huh.
17	COMMISSIONER BROWN: I mean, I guess the whole
18	purpose is for intentional acts.
19	MS. TRIPLETT: That's right. Uh-huh.
20	COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. So that's kind of
21	my thinking as well.
22	MS. TRIPLETT: Well, yes, intentional
23	tampering but also intentional disconnection. So and
24	I think the the terms and conditions for the program
25	will make it clear that if you are so, for example,

if there's a customer, we're relying on their Wi-Fi and they decide I don't want Wi-Fi anymore, then -- then they will be on notice that they can't just call up and say I don't want Wi-Fi but still have load control.

So I just want to make it clear, because I know sometimes when we say malfeasance, it's -- I think of meter tampering. And this is not necessarily just I'm going to tamper with the device. It's also I'm taking an action that does not -- that no longer allows me to actually do what the device needs to do, which is, you know, control the load from afar.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. And that was really the reason why it came to my attention, too, because that same provision, that same paragraph talks about meter tampering.

MS. TRIPLETT: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: And intentional acts.

So, you know, we all know that Wi-Fi can go in and out.

MS. TRIPLETT: Oh, no, absolutely. I think it's an excellent point. And I think, as I said, I understand that you -- the discomfort. And even though Dianne Triplett is sitting here saying that I may discontinue and I may not charge, I get it. So we can definitely add some language. And I don't know what -- the best way procedurally to do that. I mean, I could,

you know, probably sit down and write some language out 1 2 and we can vote on it today, or we can -- I can work 3 with staff and bring it back before you. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I have somebody right over 4 here that has the perfect answer for you. 5 Mary Anne. 6 7 MS. HELTON: I think that if we can decide upon the conditions this morning that you would like to 8 9 see in the tariff and you suggest to the company that if 10 you approve the tariff with these modifications or with 11 these conditions, you can do that. And then staff can 12 review the modifications that Duke sends in, and those 13 modifications can be approved administratively as long 14 as you've set out the parameters today. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Brown. 15 16 COMMISSIONER BROWN: I think the parameters 17 have been set out pretty clearly. MS. TRIPLETT: Uh-huh. 18 19 COMMISSIONER BROWN: And I think we would give 20 the staff then administrative authority to go ahead and 21 make sure that they're correct. 22 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mary Anne. 23 MS. HELTON: And Mr. Murphy just whispered in 24 my ear this may affect the close the docket issue. So

that if there's any changes that need to be made that

2.5

kind of fall through and flow through that, then we 1 would need to have the ability to do -- to take care of 2 3 the changes to the tariff and the close the docket 4 issue. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Brown. 5 **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** Actually, Ms. -- Mary 6 Anne, it says, "Should this docket be closed?" on page 7 13. It says, "No." It was stricken and already 8 9 circled, so it's already no in your recommendation. 10 There was a modification to the typed --11 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: And I would say with this 12 specific one when they bring it back to staff, if you 13 would reach out to Commissioner Brown's office, because 14 I'm sure she's got more specifics on what she wants to 15 make sure is in there. You don't have to come to my

MS. TRIPLETT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioners, anything else for Items No. 5 through 11?

Commissioner Edgar.

office.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to be clear. So to staff, because we do have some modifications on Items 6 and other items, so for Item 6 for the Issue 2, close the docket, is the staff recommendation no?

I can -- I can re-ask. We do have -- to Item
6 in particular and just for clarity on my part, we do
have modifications to this item today. So for Issue 2,
should this docket be closed, is the staff
recommendation yes or no? It is not 100 percent clear
in my copy.

MS. TAN: It is no.

2.5

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Again, I just wanted to be clear since that's one that had been changed at some point along the process.

MR. MURPHY: And I think the hope would be that we would have the revisions and approve them administratively before we put out a PAA order.

My concern is -- is if we're approving a tariff here and then we've -- when does the administrative approval occur and when does the PAA go out? So I just -- I just wanted to make sure that we had some latitude in the order to make sure that if we needed to finesse anything on the logistics of this, that we would -- we would be able to to effectuate your purpose.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you.

And, Mr. Chairman, I do have just a general comment when we are at the point of closing on these items. But I would like to just pose to Commissioner

Brown, have your concerns been addressed and are you clear on the next steps?

2.5

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I am. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: About that time?

Thank you to the parties and to their staff for their work on all of these items. When we went through the part of this process for this Commission to discuss adopting goals, I did have some concerns at that time about the direction and the potential perception of the direction with our decision. I do, however, recognize the vote of the majority and, therefore, the decision of the -- of the Commission as a whole.

At that point in time I believe I made some comments, and I want to again, that I believe very strongly in the cost-effectiveness analysis portion of this process and for these programs. I do -- so, therefore, I am in favor of us moving forward and will vote to approve the items before us as modified.

However, I would like to just reiterate, as I did previously, that I do think with other changes that are potentially ahead, new requirements from EPA, potential other requirements with renewables, that it may be that we should come back and address both the goals and the programs at some point prior to the five-year requirement. And if, indeed, that time occurs, I look

forward to doing that then.

So I would move Items -- I would move Items 5 through 11 reflective of the oral modifications and the additional discussion on Item 6.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: It's been moved and seconded, Items 5 through 11, with the oral modifications and with the changes that Commissioner Brown had requested.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have a question for Commissioner Edgar.

With -- staff wanted -- I believe I heard correctly, and correct me if I'm wrong, that you wanted administrative approval to approve the modified tariff. So could we include that potentially in your motion as a friendly amendment?

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Consider it included.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Second.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Brisé.

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to say that I'm in support of the motion as it stands. And I had a good conversation with staff during my briefing in terms of having the appropriate data that we need in order to take a look at some of the issues that SACE has brought up. And I concur with Commissioner Edgar that, you know, as things change,

that it would be appropriate for -- for this Commission at some point to take a look, even before the five-year period, at where we stand in regards to the environment around us. So I think it -- it would be important for us to do so. But staff reassured me that where we are right now, we are able to glean the information that we currently need in order to move forward. So with that, I'm comfortable with -- with the motion. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Any further discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion, say aye. (Vote taken.) Any opposed? By your action, you've approved the Edgar motion. (Agenda item concluded.)

1	STATE OF FLORIDA)
2	: CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON)
3	
4	I, LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR, Official Commission
5	Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein
6	stated.
7	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been
8	transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.
9	
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor
11	<pre>am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.</pre>
12	
13	DATED THIS 31st day of July, 2015.
14	
15	Linda Boles
16	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR
17	FPSC Official Hearings Reporter (850) 413-6734
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	