

COMMISSIONERS:  
ART GRAHAM, CHAIRMAN  
LISA POLAK EDGAR  
RONALD A. BRISÉ  
JULIE I. BROWN  
JIMMY PATRONIS

STATE OF FLORIDA



GENERAL COUNSEL  
CHARLIE BECK  
(850) 413-6199

## Public Service Commission

October 15, 2015

Ken Hoffman  
[Ken.Hoffman@fpl.com](mailto:Ken.Hoffman@fpl.com)  
Florida Power & Light Company  
215 South Monroe Street  
Suite 810  
Tallahassee, FL 32301-1858

### STAFF'S FOURTH DATA REQUEST

RE: Docket No. 150085-EG- Petition for approval of demand-side management plan of Florida Power & Light Company.

Dear Mr. Hoffman,

By this letter, the Commission staff requests that Florida Power & Light Company ("FPL", "utility" and "company") provide responses to the following data requests.

1. Please refer to the FPL Residential BuildSmart Program Standards. As part of its description of the Program Standards, FPL does not mention the Incentive amount to be paid to participating builders, except the Optional Financial Incentives.
  - a. Please specify the amount of financial incentive to be paid to builders, and how this is to be determined.
  - b. Please discuss how the combined value of the total incentives to builders compares to the maximum \$894 per participant cap.
2. Please refer to the FPL Business Custom Incentive Program Standards. Please describe for projects proposed under this program, what type records will be kept and for what duration in the event of a dispute regarding a project's eligibility.
3. Please refer to the FPL Business Custom Incentive Program Standards. Please discuss how FPL intends to address Administrative costs in its evaluation of the cost-effectiveness analysis performed for this program.
4. Please refer to the FPL Business Custom Incentive Program Standards. Under Eligibility Requirements, FPL notes that proposed equipment or standards must "not have failed recent FPL cost-effectiveness screening."

Mr. Hoffman

Page 2

- a. Please explain why this provision is necessary given that any project must demonstrate cost-effectiveness with the RIM and Participants Tests and have payback period in excess of 2 years in order to be approved and receive a rebate.
- b. Please define how FPL interprets “recent” in this context.
- c. Please discuss whether this term prevent a company from revising a proposal to make it cost-effective.
- d. Please discuss whether bundled equipment and measures would be disqualified under this method if one or more of the components failed a recent FPL cost-effectiveness screening.

Please file all responses electronically no later than Thursday, October 22, 2015, from the Commission’s website at [www.floridapsc.com](http://www.floridapsc.com), by selecting the Clerk’s Office tab and Electronic Filing Web Form. Please feel free to call me at (850) 413-6185 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

*s/ Lee Eng Tan*

Lee Eng Tan

Senior Attorney

TLT/dml

cc: Office of Commission Clerk