

Amanda Griffith

From: Office Of Commissioner Clark
Sent: Friday, February 16, 2018 1:25 PM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: FW: Dania Beach Clean Energy Center Unit 7 - PSC Docket # 20170225

Good afternoon,

Please place the e-mail below in Docket Correspondence, Consumers and their Representatives, in Docket No. 20170225-EI.

Thank you,

Angelena McCoy
Executive Assistant to Commissioner Clark

Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
Office: (850) 413-6004
Fax: (850) 413-6005

From: Mara Shlackman [<mailto:marashl@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, February 16, 2018 1:21 PM
To: Office Of Commissioner Clark; Office of Commissioner Brown; Office Of Commissioner Graham; Office of Commissioner Polmann
Subject: Dania Beach Clean Energy Center Unit 7 - PSC Docket # 20170225

Dear Commissioners:

As a Fort Lauderdale resident and FPL ratepayer, I am writing to ask that you make a determination that there is no need for the facility at issue. Among the criteria that the PSC must consider under Section 403.519(3), Fla. Stat., in making its determination are whether a plant is needed for electric system reliability and integrity, whether the plant is the most cost-effective alternative available, and whether renewable energy sources and technologies, as well as conservation measures, are utilized to the extent reasonably available.

Regarding system reliability and integrity, the proposed facility would come online in 2022, yet there is no need for a new unit prior to 2024, based on FPL's own 2016 Ten Year Site Plan. With respect to cost-effectiveness, delaying the plant for two years would result in greater savings than costs. Moreover, FPL did not evaluate other delay scenarios, such as delay for one year, or delay for more than two years. Given the continually decreasing cost of solar, a delay would allow more implementation of solar to meet demand.

Regarding renewable energy, while FPL salutes itself as a leader in clean energy, less than 1% of the power it provides is derived from solar energy. Moreover, FPL collaborated with other utilities in funding an organization called Consumers for Smart Solar that promoted a misleading ballot initiative that would have thwarted the development of distributed generation of solar power in Florida, an initiative that fortunately was defeated at the polls (<https://www.mediamatters.org/research/2016/10/27/how-florida-newspapers-helped-utility-front-group-promote-deceptive-anti-solar-amendment/214154>). Rather than focusing its

solar efforts strictly on developing solar plants, FPL could alter its business model to finance ratepayers' installation of solar rooftops, which would propagate solar power more rapidly than solar plants. Thus, FPL has not made a reasonable effort to promote the utilization of solar technology.

Thank you for consideration of my comments.

Mara Shlackman
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33316

Sent from [Outlook](#)