APPEARANCES:

JAMES McGEE, Florida Power Corporation,
Post Office Box 14042, 3201 34th Street South,
Petersburg, Florida 33733, appearing on behalf of
Florida Power Corporation.

MATTHEW M. CHILDS, Steel, Hector and Davis,
215 South Monroe Street, Suite 601, Tallahassee,
Florida 32303-0551, appearing on behalf of Florida
Power & Light Company.

KENNETH A. HOFFMAN, Rutledge, Ecenia,
Underwood, Purnell and Hoffman, P. O. Box 511, 215
South Monroe Street, Suite 420, Tallahassee, Florida
32302-0551, appearing on behalf of Florida Public
Utilities Company.

JEFFREY A. STONE and RUSSELL A. BADDERS,
Beggs & Lane, 700 Blount Building, 3 West Garden
Street, Post Office Box 12950, Pensacola, Florida
32576-2950, appearing on behalf of Gulf Power
Company.

JAMES D. BEASLEY, Ausley & McMullen, Post
Office Box 391, Tallahassee, Florida 32302, appearing
on behalf of Tampa Electric Company.

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

VICKI GORDON KAUFNAN, McWhirter, Grandoff & Reeves, Post Office Box 3350, Tampa, Florida

32601-3350, appearing on behalf of Florida Industrial
Power Users Group.

JOHN ROGER HOWE, Deputy Public Counsel,
Office of Public Counsel, c/o The Florida Legislature,
111 West Madison Street, Room 812, Tallahassee,
Florida 32399-1400, on behalf of the Citizens of the
State of Florida.

LESLIE J. PAUGH, Florida Public Service

Commission, Legal Division, 2540 Shumard Oak

Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870, on behalf

of Commission Staff.

PROCEEDINGS

(Hearing convened at 1:45 p.m.)

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's call the prehearing to order. Counsel, would you please read the notice.

MR. KEATING: Pursuant to notice issued

January 13th, 1998, this time and place have been set

for a prehearing in Docket Nos. 980001-EI, fuel and

purchased power cost recovery clause and generating

performance incentive factor; Docket No. 980002-EG,

conservation cost recovery clause; Docket

No. 980003-GU, purchased gas adjustment PGA true-up

and Docket No. 980007-EI, environmental cost recovery

clause.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: We'll take appearances, starting with you, Mr. Palecki.

MR. PALECKI: Michael Palecki, City Gas
Company of Florida, 955 East 25th Street, Hialeah,
Florida 33013.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Which docket are you appearing in?

MR. PALECKI: Appearing in 002 and 003.

MR. BEASLEY: James D. Beasley, of the law firm of Ausley & McMullen, P. O. Box 391, Tallahassee, Florida 32301. I'm representing Tampa Electric

Company in the 980001, 2 and 7 dockets.

MR. McGEE: James McGee, P. O. Box 14042

St. Petersburg 33733, and with me is Ronald M. Bright,

Class B Practioner. Mr. Bright is appearing in the 01

docket, and I'm appearing in the 01 and 02 docket on

behalf of Florida Power Corporation.

MR. CHILDS: Commissioner, my name is

Matthew Childs of the law firm of Steel, Hector and

Davis. I'm appearing on behalf of Florida Power and

Light Company in the 01 and 07 dockets.

MR. STONE: Commissioner, I'm

Jeffrey A. Stone of the law firm of Beggs & Lane.

With me today is Russell A. Badders. We're appearing on behalf of Gulf Power Company in the 01 and 02 dockets, and for the limited purpose of addressing the issue with regard to the annual hearing in the 07 docket.

MR. NICHOLSON: Commissioner, I'm David
Nicholson of the law firm of Macfarlane Ferguson &
McMullen, appearing for Peoples Gas in the 02 and 03
docket, and also for the former West Florida Natural
Gas Company in the 02 docket.

MR. SCHIEFELBEIN: Wayne Schiefelbein appearing on behalf of Chesapeake Utilities
Corporation in the 02 and 03 dockets.

- 1	f .
1	MS. KAUFMAN: Vicki Gordon Kaufman of
2	McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin, Davidson, Rief & Bakas.
3	I'm appearing on behalf of the Florida Industrial
4	Power Users Group in the 01, 02 and 07 dockets.
5	MR. HOWE: Commissioner Clark, I'm
6	Roger Howe with the Office of Public Counsel appearing
7	on behalf of the citizens of the State of Florida in
8	the 01, 02, 03 and 07 dockets.
9	MR. HOFFMAN: Commissioner Clark, my name is
10	Kenneth A. Hoffman. I'm here this afternoon on behalf
11	of Florida Public Utilities Company in the 01, 02 and
12	03 dockets.
13	MR. HORTON: I'm Norman H. Horton of Messer,
14	Caparello & Self, appearing on behalf of Sebring Gas
15	System and South Florida Natural Gas in the 03 docket.
16	MR. GUYTON: Commissioner, my name is
17	Charles Guyton, with the law firm of Steel, Hector and
18	Davis, appearing on behalf of Florida Power and Light
19	Company in the 02 docket.
20	MS. PAUGH: Leslie Paugh on behalf of Staff
21	in the 01 and 07 dockets.
22	MR. KEATING: Cochran Keating on behalf of
23	Staff in the 02 and 03 dockets.
24	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Anyone else? Thank you
25	very much.
- 1	

I want to indicate to the parties that I met briefly with Staff as to how we should go through the issues so that -- in the docket so we could expedite this prehearing. Because as you know we have a rulemaking hearing going on that I would like to get to as soon as I can. I know I won't get there at the beginning, but I do want to expedite it.

It's my intention to start with 01, which is the fuel adjustment. I understand there is the issue of going to annual hearings that is generic to all of them?

MS. PAUGH: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: So we'll take it up at that time and hear from everyone on it. And I understand the annual issue is Issue 22.

MS. PAUGH: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: So I propose to start with 01, go through the issues, and when we get to annual we'll hear on the issue of going to annual hearings. And then we should move quickly through -- 07 would be next, then 02 and 03.

Are there comments from the parties?

MR. CHILDS. Annual for Florida Power and

Light is 10B, we filed a petition. I realize there's

25 22 but I want at least to have it identified. 10B and

10C, which is our proposal for transition into an annual clause for fuel. 2 3 COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. I still propose to take up the issue of annual hearings, 4 5 including your proposal, at the end of considering the issues in 01. 6 7 All right. Are there any changes through Page 6? Or up to Page 6? 8 9 MS. PAUGH: No. Not from Staff. COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. Any changes 10 on Page 6? I understand Issues 1 through 4 are 11 fallout issues, so maybe we should skip them and go to 12 5. Okay. Hearing no objection on Issue 5 --13 MS. PAUGH: Commissioner Clark, on Issue 5 14 15 Staff finds the positions of the parties reasonable if the parties will agree to Staff's language for 16 17 Issue 5. COMMISSIONER CLARK: Which is what you have 18 under your position? 19 20 MS. PAUGH: That's correct. 21 MR. MCGEE: Florida Power will concur with 22 Staff's language. 23 MR. CHILDS: We agree. 24 MR. STONE: So does Gulf. 25 MS. KAUFMAN: FIPUG agrees.

MR. BEASLEY: So does Tampa Electric. 1 2 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I guess what I'd like to do is instead of everyone agreeing, I'll hear from 3 those who have an objection. Okay. Then with respect to Issue 5, we'll show the 5 6 language changed to that suggested by the Staff, and 7 we will show it as Issue 4 that has a proposed stipulation. 8 9 MS. PAUGH: That's correct. 10 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Issue 6. MS. PAUGH: Staff finds the positions of all 11 12 of the parties in Issue 6 to be reasonable and agrees thereto. 13 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is there any objection? 14 MR. HOWE: Public Counsel will take no 15 position on this issue. 16 MS. KAUFMAN: The same for FIPUG. 17 COMMISSIONER CLARK: We'll show Issue 6 as 18 one for a proposed stipulation. Issue 7. 19 20 MS. PAUGH: Staff finds the position taken by FPUC to be reasonable and can agree to that. Staff 21 has no position with respect to the remaining issues 22 pending outcome of further discovery. 23 COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. We'll leave 24

that as an issue then. Mr. Childs.

MR. CHILDS: Yes, I would inquire -- I think this may be a fallout, Issue 7, the basic factor, a fallout issue. I'm not sure I understand what is remaining for Issue 7. I realize we have the issue of the annual and we have filed on the basis of nine months.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think they are waiting from a response from Staff.

MS. PAUGH: It's a fallout issue from 4 and

MS. BASS: I believe that this issue, although it's a fallout, it would be affected by the Commission's decisions in Issues 10A, 10B and 10C in the calculation of the transmission revenues.

MS. CHILDS: There's no pending discovery on transmission revenues, which is what is stated as a reason for no position on that.

MS. BASS: There's no pending discovery but we're -- there's no outstanding discovery. We have gotten discovery in. We have not had a chance to review it in order to take a final position on 10A, 10B on -- or 10A, excuse me. And then 7 would be impacted by the Commission's decision on your request for an annual treatment on fuel adjustment.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Do I understand from

- 1	
1	Staff then that there is a potential we could identify
2	Issue 7 as one for proposed stipulation at some later
3	point by Staff.
4	MS. PAUGH: That's correct.
5	COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm sorry, what did you
6	say?
7	MS. PAUGH: That's correct.
8	COMMISSIONER CLARK: And when will we know?
9	MS. PAUGH: Well, to the extent we've
10	recommended deferral of Issue 10A, which is the
11	treatment of transmission, because of the motions for
12	reconsideration that could be some time.
13	COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. We'll just
14	leave it as a pending issue, and to the extent we can
15	have it as a proposed stipulation we'll take it up at
16	the hearing.
17	MS. PAUJH: That would be appropriate.
18	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me just check.
19	FIPUG and OPC. No position, Ms. Kaufman?
20	MS. KAUPMAN: Yes, that would be right,
21	Commissioner Clark.
22	MR. HOWE: That would be correct for Public
23	Counsel also.
24	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Childs.
25	MR. CHILDS: I would hope we didn't have to
- 1	

go to hearing on a basic issue here.

My understanding of the question about the forecasting of the revenues is that first of all, we're talking about a forecast. Secondly, everyone forecasts economy energy sales in the normal course of events. Thirdly, the Commission is used to forecasts potentially being changed or wrong. So I'm not sure that I understand the issue or why, when we're talking about the potential for transmission revenues, this isn't an issue that the Commission ought to address, realizing that if there's some unresolved dispute, that they'll come back and change that in the future, but not hold up the forecast.

we're looking at holding up the forecast right now.

It's just a matter of interrelated issues and resolving what falls out. We'll know at hearing whether or not it has to be deferred longer than the hearing. So if you'd agree to take it up at that time, in all likelihood we can resolve it prior to hearing or at the hearing.

commissioner CLARK: I guess what you're suggesting, Mr. Childn, is that we would have a proposal assuming one outcome on the transmission, and the proposal assuming another. But it wouldn't -- the

notion would be we would still forecast. And with all due respect 2 MR. CHILDS: Yes. 3 I would suggest that the amount that we're talking about seems to me to probably in all cases be in the category of approaching de minimis. Because it's a forecast, the amount; we always forecast economy sales 7 anyway. This only relates to have you forecasted transmission component correctly. If there's some 9 future dispute, jurisdiction will have attached and 10 certainly that could be corrected at some time. 11 MS. PAUGH: Commissioner, I think this 12 argument is premature, frankly. In all likelihood it will be resolved at or prior to the hearing. 13 14 COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. We'll 15 continue to show it as a proposed stipulation. 16 Issue No. 8. 17 MS. PAUGH: Staff finds the positions of all 18 of the parties to be reasonable and appropriate in Issue 8. 19 20 COMMISSIONER CLARK: FIPUG and OPC, no position? 21 22 MS. KAUFMAN: That's correct for FIPUG. 23 MR. BEASLEY: We've one change on Tampa

Electric on Issue 8 and that number has a zero

missing. It should be 1.00083.

24

ì	Ĭ
1	MS. PAUGH: That change has been noted.
2	MR. McGEE: Under Florida Power I think we
3	have too many zeros after the decimal.
4	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.
5	MS. PAUGH: That change has also been noted.
6	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Issue 9A.
7	MS. PAUGH: Staff finds the position of the
8	company appropriate and reasonable if Florida Power
9	will agree to our language which we believe is more
10	complete.
11	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. McGee.
12	MR. McGEE: Where is your language?
13	COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think it's under
14	Staff position.
15	MR. McGEE: Yes. Florida Power concurs with
16	Staff's version of the language.
17	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. We'll show 9A as
18	a proposed stipulation.
19	MS. KAUFMAN: We haven't reviewed the
20	language. If we could just have a minute.
21	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Sure.
22	MS. KAUFMAN: FIPUG will take no issue on
23	9A.
24	MR. HOWE: Same for Public Counsel.
25	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. We'll show it as

- 1	
1	a proposed stipulation. 9B.
2	MS. PAUGH: I'm sorry, on 9B I have just
3	been advised we should hear from OPC and FIPUG before
4	we indicate Staff's position.
5	MR. HOWE: On Issue 9B, the only concern I
6	had was a little bit from the way the issue itself is
7	worded. Whether Florida Power has properly calculated
8	the replacement fuel cost.
9	It's my understanding that Florida Power
10	Corporation has completely eliminated the fuel cost
11	associated with the CR-3 outage. And with that
12	understanding, we have no objection to Florida Corp's
13	position.
14	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah. I guess Florida
15	Power Corporation says they've excluded them.
16	MR. McGEE: Yes.
17	COMMISSIONER CLARK: I guess the issue maybe
18	should be Florida Power Corporation excluded the
19	replacement fuel cost rather than properly calculated.
20	MS. PAUGH: We can make that change.
21	COMMISSIONER CLARK: FIPUG.
22	MS. KAUFMAN: Fine with FIPUG.
23	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. We'll show that
24	as proposed stipulation 9C.

MR. HOWE: Are we going to have both a 9C

and 9F? Are both of those issues necessary? MS. PAUGH: Staff's position is that 9C can 2 be deleted because it is subsumed by 9F. 3 MR. HOWE: We would agree with that. 4 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Delete 9C and move D up 5 to C and make the proposed relettering. All right. 6 7 9D. MR. HOWE: This deals with the Lake Cogen 8 settlement, and we take no position. 9 MS. KAUFMAN: Same for FIPUG. 10 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Staff. 11 12 MS. PAUGH: Staff agrees that FPC's position is reasonable. 13 COMMISSIONER CLARK: We'll show that as 14 proposed stipulation. 9E. 15 MR. HOWE: With respect to Issue 9E, here 16 we're speaking of the transmission revenues. Is it 17 18 assumed that the companies are going to follow the Commission's order until there's some resolution of 19 20 the motions for reconsideration, or are we assuming that there is no order because of the pending motions 21 for reconsideration? 22 23 MS. PAUGH: They will be calculating transmission in accordance with the Commission's 24

order.

MR. HOWE: I'll take no position on that 1 2 issue. MS. KAUFMAN: I just question whether -- I 3 think Ms. Paugh mentioned earlier these transmission 4 issues were simply going to be deferred until the 5 motions for reconsideration are resolved. 7 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think the issue should probably stay the way it is, with a note that 8 it's on reconsideration, and the expectation that if it is changed in any way, it would be changed 10 consistent with what was decided on reconsideration. 11 12 Okay. MR. STONE: Commissioner, would that be the 13 same on similar company-specific issues for other 14 companies? 15 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I would presume so. 16 17 9F. 18 MR. HOWE: Commissioner Clark, Public Counsel would agree with Staff with the understanding 19 we have discussed this with Florida Power Corporation, 20 21 and Florida Power Corporation will be providing our office with a mutually agreed upon form of 22 verification that the unit has complied with the terms 23

of the stipulation; which is that the unit achieved 14

days of continuous full power operation. And that

Florida Power will provide that information as soon a: those conditions are met. 2 MR. McGEE: Mr. Howe and I talked about this 3 4 before the conference began, and we can work out an acceptable arrangement and we will do that. 5 6 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm just wondering how 7 to word 9F then. Should it be shown as a proposed stipulation? Mr. McGee, is Crystal River 3 running 9 now? 10 MR. McGEE: Yes. COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is it up to full power? 11 12 MR. McGEE: Up to full power. It has not 13 been on line for 14 consecutive days. 14 COMMISSIONER CLARK: How many days has it 15 been on line now? 16 MR. McGEE: It came back up last Friday 17 afternoon, I believe. 18 MS. PAUGH: I may be speaking out of turn for Staff here but our position on 9F is that we 19 believe the company's position is reasonable if they 20 21 will accept our language. We could modify our 22 language to include the 14 consecutive days in our 23 position if that would be acceptable to Power Corp and OPC. 24

MR. McGEE: We can accept Staff's language.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: We'll make that change 1 2 and show it as a proposed stipulation. 3 MR. HOWE: We don't have any trouble with the language, even with the inclusion of the 14 days. 5 We understand the Company's interest in having this provision. We were just concerned that the way it's 6 7 worded it apparently gave the Company the latitude to, basically, on the first day of the billing cycle, 8 9 inform everybody that the unit was up and running, and 10 had satisfied the contingencies in the stipulation. And it was for that reason -- we understand why the 11 March 27th date is in there. The Company, I believe, 12 13 fully expects that the unit will satisfy the 14-day contingency well before that time. And they will be 14 informing us when that happens. 15 16 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. So what do I need to do? 17 18 MR. HOWE: I don't think you need to do 19 anything. I quess my point is adding the 14 days to 20 the Staff's position won't really change anything. 21 COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. 22 MS. KAUFMAN: FIPUG could agree with that as 23 long as it receives the same information that's going

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Then I would propose

to be provided to Mr. Howe. Okay.

24

the issue be changed as Staff has indicated. There's no necessity of mentioning the 14 days. But it's with the understanding that that is the criteria to be used. Okay. And you will agree on appropriate verification of that.

MR. HOWE: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. 10A. Is 10A dependent on 10B and C?

MR. CHILDS: No.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

MR. HOWE: Public Counsel would take no position on Issue 10A.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: FIPUG. No position.

MS. KAUFMAN: Yeah. I think this is the same as the one we discussed earlier about the pending motions.

MS. BASS: Commissioner Clark, if I could say something. I think there's a little bit of confusion on these transmission revenue issues.

What we intended with these issues is the companies have calculated the transmission revenues in accordance with the Order that the Commission issued. Our concern was after the Commission vote, if the Commission approves reconsideration and reconsiders their order, the method of calculation will be

different. So what we were trying to do is say
through your position that once the Commission rules
on the motions for reconsideration, whichever way they
go, if there's an adjustment that's needed, the issue
isn't deferred in whole from this hearing, but the
adjustments, as a result of the Commission's decision
on reconsideration, will be included in the next fuel
filings, if necessary. If the Commission does not
approve reconsideration, then there will be no
adjustment and it will be over with, unless it's
appealed. If the Commission does reconsider their
order and approve a different method for calculating
the transmission revenues, then any adjustment
necessary to be included to the next fuel filing.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: The next fuel filing,

you mean the one in August?

MS. BASS: Exactly. Exactly.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Childs, it sounds like you're correct. We're going to use what we project now, and that will be the forecast. And changes will take place in the next fuel filing.

Okay?

Then it appears to me the issue should not read "or as revised by reconsideration." It should just stay the way it is. What I'm suggesting, it

doesn't seem to me necessary to change the language of these issues because for purposes of this docket and the forecast, we're going to use the order, and it isn't until the next fuel adjustment process that we'll use the outcome from the reconsideration, if it's a change.

MS. PAUGH: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is that everyone's understanding? All right.

don't have to change the issue then to take that into account. All right.

MS. PAUGH: No.

MR. HOWE: Commissioner Clark, I'm afraid
I'm going to need some clarification on that.

Is it Staff's position that some of the companies may not have calculated transmission revenues consistent with the Commission's order?

MS. PAUGH: In the case of FPL, Staff's position is that we're still reviewing discovery to determine if they have properly calculated. So regardless of what happens with the reconsideration for now, we have not resolved calculation under the prior order in transmission that just came out in January. Does that make sense?

MR. HOWE: I believe so. My understanding 1 2 is that the order requires the companies to calculate 3 in a certain manner. I kind of assumed they have so 4 I'll take no position on this issue. 5 COMMISSIONER CLARK: But at the beginning of 6 the hearing you may be in a position to identify this 7 as a proposed stipulation. MS. PAUGH: That's correct. 8 9 COMMISSIONER CLARK: By then you may have concluded that they have. 10 MS. PAUGH: That is correct. 11 12 MR. CHILDS: Could I ask, Commissioner, that 13 if there's a way for this to be resolved prior to 14 hearing, that the parties could share that view and perhaps stipulate and avoid having someone make the 15 16 trip to Tallahassee? 17 COMMISSIONER CLARK: How soon can we get that done? 18 19 MS. PAUGH: We were going to request to meet 20 with the parties, all of the parties in the 01 docket after the prehearing to discuss this very issue, and 21 22 it's possible after that short meeting that we'll have 23 an answer by Thursday or Friday of this week.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I would ask Staff if

you can't get it resolved to let me know.

probably have to let Billy Stiles know. 2 MS. PAUGH: Certainly. COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. 10A is 3 taken care of. 10B and C are the -- changing it to 4 annual; is that correct? 5 MS. PAUGH: That's correct. 6 7 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Why don't we skip that for now and when we get to 22 we'll take it up. 11A. 8 9 MS. PAUGH: If I may interject, Staff recommends that 11A be deleted because it is subsumed 10 under Issue 4. 11 12 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Hoffman. MR. HOFFMAN: We agree with that. 13 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. 12A. 14 MR. HOWE: Public Counsel would take no 15 position with 12A. 16 17 MS. KAUFMAN: FIPUG has no position also. 18 COMMISSIONER CLARK: So this would be a proposed stipulation? 19 20 MS. PAUGH: No. Staff is reviewing 21 discovery as 12A. 22 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Why are we listing it as 12A? Why isn't it just 12? 23 24 MS. PAUGH: Because the company-specific 25 issues are broken out in A, B, Cs; that's just format

1	
1	that we've used for some time.
2	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, but my question
3	is why is it "A" and not just "12" I guess.
4	MS. PAUGH: I don't know.
5	COMMISSIONER CLARK: It's just a
6	throwback you know, I was taught you can't go from
7	an "A" unless you have a "B".
8	MS. PAUGH: And you're right.
9	MR. CHILDS: Because there might be one.
10	(Laughter)
11	COMMISSIONER CLARK: 13A.
12	MR. HOWE: Public Counsel takes no position
13	MS. KAUPMAN: Same for FIPUG.
14	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. And that's one
15	that we will endeavor to settle by Friday.
16	MS. PAUGH: That's correct.
17	COMMISSIONER CLARK: 13B.
18	MR. HOWE: 13B. Public Counsel would agree
19	with Staff.
20	MS. KAUFMAN: FIPUG agrees with Staff.
21	MS. PAUGH: Staff agrees with the position
22	of the Company I'm sorry, did I cut someone off?
23	MR. BEASLEY: We agree with you.
24	MS. PAUGH: Starf agrees with the position
	of the Company if the Company will accent our

1	
1	language.
2	MR. BEASLEY: Looks like pretty much the
3	same language.
4	COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. We'll show
5	that language change and show it as a proposed
6	stipulation. 13C.
7	MR. HOWE: Public Counsel takes no position
8	on this issue.
9	MS. KAUFMAN: We'd like to know what Staff's
10	position is.
11	MS. PAUGH: Staff is still reviewing the
12	discovery. Staff has no position at this time.
13	MS. KAUFMAN: We'd like to maintain no
14	position at this time as well.
15	COMMISSIONER CLARK: This will be another
16	issue we'll endeavor to resolve by Friday.
17	MS. KAUFMAN: Yes.
18	COMMISSIONER CLARK: If possible show it as
19	a proposed stipulation. Issue 14.
20	MS. KAUFMAN: FIPUG has no position.
21	MR. HOWE: Same for Public Counsel.
22	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Staff, is this
23	one you need further discovery or further review of
24	discovery and we may
25	MS. PAUGH: No. Staff has found the
- 1	

positions of all of the parties in Issue 14 to be 1 reasonable and can agree to them. 2 3 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Show that as a proposed 4 stipulation. Issue 15. 5 MS. KAUFMAN: FIPUG has no position. 6 MR. HOWE: Public Counsel has no position 7 for this and the remaining GPIF issues. 8 MS. PAUGH: Staff has found the positions of 9 Florida Power Corporation and Tampa Electric to be 10 reasonable and can agree to those positions taken by 11 the companies. With respect to Gulf, Staff is still 12 reviewing the Gulf figures. MR. STONE: It's my understanding prior to 13 14 the commencement of this prehearing proceeding that Staff and the Company have gotten together and 15 16 resolved their difference; just rounding or choices of schedules but that we are in agreement. I hate to 17 speak for Staff but that's my understanding. 18 19 MS. PAUGH: You obviously are more informed 20 than I am, Jeff. Staff has indicated that's a correct statement. 21 22 COMMISSIONER CLARK: We'll show that as a

Ballinger will be withdrawn on Issue 15?

proposed stipulation.

23

24

25

MR. CHILDS: Does this mean that Mr.

MS. PAUGH: Our suggestion at hearing would be to insert his testimony, but it's not anticipated that he would need to testify.

MR. CHILDS: Well, it's important to us because we have rebuttal for Mr. Adjemian. And I don't know how Mr. Ballinger's testimony addressed Issue 15. He proposes a method for GPIF that's somewhat generic, I think, and we had tried to address that issue. But if you're going to settle the issue I'm not sure what you want to do.

MS. PAUGH: Mr. Ballinger's testimony was put forth in a exploratory mode, if you will, to elicit the kind of response we got. We were able to agree with all of the positions of all of the parties that came out in his testimony. Again, we'd like to have it in the record, but we don't anticipate needing to explore the matter further, because Staff is satisfied by the positions taken by the parties. Does that address your concern?

MR. CHILDS: Well, he doesn't talk about -he talks about incorporating some other forecasting
information sort of as for all future GPIF filings,
not just for factors this time around. That's what I
thought his testimony went to.

So if you're going to propose it for

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

consideration by the Commission as a matter to change the GPIF methodology, I don't think it fits Issue 15.

But if you're going to present it we want Mr. Adjemian in there. I simply thought, Commissioner, that if the issue was resolved, that that meant that we're withdrawing his testimony.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: As I recall, though, in

fuel adjustment we stipulate the testimony in. It's not that the testimony is resolved. We just put it all in and the issues are resolved. I think what you're asking is are we going to change it in this proceeding? And I would -- it appears for me there's no issue suggesting it, and with that clarification, are you comfortable leaving it in? And leaving Mr. Adjemian in?

MR. CHILDS: Do the same thing.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: There's no intention on the part of Staff to include in the order any prospective change --

MS. PAUGH: No.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: -- in how that is done.

MR. CHILDS: All right.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: 16.

MS. KAUFMAN: FIPUG has no position on Issue 16 through 20.

1	COMMISSIONER CLARK: 16 through
2	MR. HOWE: Same is true for Public Counsel.
3	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.
4	MS. PAUGH: With respect to Issue 16, Staff
5	finds the positions of the parties to be reasonable
6	and, therefore, accepts them.
7	COMMISSIONER CLARK: We'll show it as a
8	proposed stipulation. How about 17?
9	MS. PAUGH: Staff finds the positions of the
10	parties to be reasonable and, therefore, accepts them.
11	COMMISSIONER CLARK: We'll show 17 as a
12	proposed stipulation. 18.
13	MS. PAUGH: Staff finds the positions of the
14	parties to be reasonable and, therefore, accepts them.
15	MR. BEASLEY: We have one minor change.
16	It's a drastic change; we're changing the word
17	"overrecovery" to "underrecovery" on our issue. But
18	the number is correct. That was just a misstatement.
19	MS. PAUGH: Is that Issue 18?
20	MR. BEASLEY: 18.
21	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Does that change
22	Staff's position?
23	MR. BEASLEY: No. I think they are in
24	agreement. They have "underrecovery." We're agreeing
20	with the chief

1	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Issue 19.
2	MS. PAUGH: On Issue 19, Staff finds the
3	position of Tampa Electric Company to be reasonab.9
4	and, therefore, accepts it. With respect to Public
5	Counsel, if they would agree to change their number to
6	141,034,828, Staff would find that figure to be
7	reasonable.
8	COMMISSIONER CLARK: You mean Power Corp? I
9	thought that's what there is?
10	MS. PAUGH: 827 is what they reflected on
11	prehearing statement.
12	COMMISSIONER CLARK: What I have on the
13	order is 828.
14	MS. PAUGH: I'm confused. I apologize.
15	We're changing our position with respect to Florida
16	Power.
17	COMMISSIONER CLARK: So we'll show Issue 10
18	as a proposed stipulation.
19	MS. PAUGH: That's correct. Issue 20.
20	MS. PAUGH: Staff finds the positions of the
21	parties to be reasonable in Issue 20.
22	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Show 20 as a proposed
23	stipulation. 21A.
24	MS. PAUGH: Are OPC and FIPUG
25	MP. HOWE: Public Counsells position would

1	
1	be yes.
2	MS. KAUFMAN: FIPUG has no position.
3	MS. PAUGH: Staff finds the position of the
4	party to be reasonable in Issue 21A.
5	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Show it as a proposed
6	stipulation. 21B.
7	MR. HOWE: Public Counsel's position would
8	be yes.
9	MS. PAUGH: Staff finds the position of
10	Florida Power Corporation to be reasonable and,
11	therefore, accepts it.
12	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Just to be clear, it's
13	Florida Power and Light on 21B.
14	MS. PAUGH: I'm sorry.
15	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. Show it as
16	proposed stipulation. 21C.
17	MS. KAUFMAN: FIPUG has no position.
18	MR. HOWE: Same for Public Counsel.
19	MS. PAUGH: Staff finds the position of
20	Florida Power and Light to be reasonable in Issue 21C
21	and, therefore, accepts it.
22	COMMISSIONER CLARK: It will be shown as
23	proposed stipulation. 21D.
24	MR. HOWE: 21D. Public Counsel would take
25	no position.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Is that "no position" 1 2 or "no" from FIPUG. 3 MS. KAUFMAN: It's no. COMMISSIONER CLARK: Oh, I'm sorry. I 4 thought it was 22 that this was the issue. 5 6 MS. PAUGH: 21D is capacity cost recovery 7 period being changed to 12 calendar months, so it's a 8 fallout of 22, only it's the company-specific portion of it. 9 10 MS. CHILDS: We are already on 12 months. We're proposing to move it to a calendar 12 months. 11 12 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Got you. Okay. MS. PAUGH: Staff disagrees with the 13 14 Company's position on this. COMMISSIONER CLARK: That's just fine. 15 16 Okay. 21E is related. MS. KAUFMAN: FIPUG's position on that issue 17 18 is no. MR. HOWE: Public Counsel's would be no 19 20 position. 21 COMMISSIONER CLARK: You have no position on 22 which one was that? MR. HOWE: This is, I think, 21E. Our 23 24 position generally with the question of whether we go to an annual and go through the steps to reach an

1	annual, we think it can work at six months; it can
2	work at a year. But we don't have a position one way
3	or the other.
4	COMMISSIONER CLARK: This is just on the
5	capacity or everything?
6	MR. HOWE: This will be true for all of
7	them.
8	MS. PAUGH: Staff's position is no to 21E.
9	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.
10	MS. PAUGH: Commissioner, would you like to
11	go back to issues 1 through 4 at this time?
12	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah. All right. What
13	about Issue 1?
14	MS. KAUFMAN: I have no position on the
15	numbers. Those are just fallout issues.
16	MR. HOWE: Same is true for Public Counsel.
17	MS. PAUGH: Staff finds the numbers
18	submitted by FPUC to be reasonable and, therefore,
19	accepts them. With respect to the remaining numbers.
20	We're working on it pending resolution of other
21	company-specific issues.
22	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask a question:
23	1 through 4 they are all follow-up issues. Do you
24	have any positions?
25	MR. HOWE: No, ma'am.

1	
1	COMMISSIONER CLARK: No positions. Can we
2	just show them for those items that you agree with and
3	know about. We'll show them as proposed stipulation.
4	Let me take that back.
5	Can we decide by Friday if we can show them
6	all as proposed stipulations?
7	MS. PAUGH: I'm not sure if it can be by
8	Friday but in all likelihood it will be by the
9	hearing; we'll attempt by the end of this week.
10	COMMISSIONER CLARK: But that gets to
11	Mr. Child's point about not having the witnesses here.
12	All right. Let's go back to one. Which was
13	the one you found acceptable?
14	MS. PAUGH: With respect to Issues 1 through
15	4, the position taken by FPUC has been accepted by
16	Staff. The remaining issues are still being resolved.
17	COMMISSIONER CLARK: And they are dependent
18	on the other issues, right?
19	MS. PAUGH: That's correct.
20	COMMISSIONER CLARK: From what I understood,
21	you anticipate resolving them by Friday so these
22	should be able to be resolved by Friday.
23	MS. PAUGH: That's our hope, yes.
24	Mr. Childs? Mr. McGee?
25	MR. CHILDS: I don't think there's any

discovery on final true-ups for Florida Power and Light. I don't understand -- I mean I'd be perfectly happy to meet and try to work it out with Staff. I simply am at a loss to understand what remains to be resolved on these issues.

We're talking about the final fuel true-up,
Issue 1; the estimated fuel true-up from October
through March, Issue 2. I didn't think that we had
anything remaining to be addressed there.

MS. PAUGH: Staff has advised me that transmission revenues should have been credited through the fuel clause all the way back for January of 1997 and that's why it affects these other issues. And that those matters will be resolved as we resolve all of this at one time.

MR. CHILDS: I also thought Staff said they didn't have any question about the accuracy of the correction for the current period, but there was an issue if the methodology is changed as a result of request for reconsideration, that you could reach back through the start of this period. You said yes.

MS. PAUGH: I don't think we're there yet.

With respect to have the numbers been properly

presented at this time, notwithstanding any effects

reconsideration might have, we're still resolving

that. And my guess is that after we meet after the prehearing and then go back through what we have we will be able to resolve these issues. We're not suggesting that we have outstanding --

commissioner clark: Ms. Paugh, I had understood what came from Ms. Bass is that we're okay with the transmission figures being in accordance with that order. And if that's the case, I think what Mr. Childs said is correct; that we should be okay with Issues 1 through 4.

what I said I misspoke. We understand that the transmission revenues have been calculated in accordance with the Commission order. We're still reviewing the discovery to determine whether or not they were, actually to satisfy ourselves they were calculated in accordance with the order. As soon as we resolve that, that they were calculated in accordance with the order do not accordance with the order.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: And that is the only issue holding up Issues 1 through 4?

MS. BASS: I believe so.

my expectation is that 1 through 4 can likewise be

identified as a proposed stipulation by Friday.

2 Ms. PAUGH: That's correct.

commissioner clark: All right. Without dealing -- having to go with specific issues on the annualization, I understand Issue 22 to be generic as to whether or not we should go to annualize proceedings. Let me just make sure. OPC has no position. But FIPUG does; is that correct?

MS. KAUFMAN: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: You don't think we should do that.

MS. KAUFMAN: That's correct.

commissioner CLARK: And I take it all of the other companies, with the exception of FPL, is it your position we should go to annual, or you don't care?

MR. McGEE: Florida Power's position is that yes, we should go to annual. Florida Power favors a calendar year annual proceeding. However, we don't have a objection to a transition period, if that's necessary, to efficiently accommodate the change.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: And Florida Power and Light, you want to go to an annual, you want it calendar and you want to go to that regardless of what everybody else does.

MR. CHILDS: That is correct. And we have proposed a transition amount, or methodology, to get to the annual by next year.

indicate, in an effort to sort of understand the issue, and perhaps expedite this proceeding, I'm initially inclined to have the whole Commission decide the issue. Now, I appreciate the fact that somebody has identified that we have gone to annual for GPIF for FP&L, and for capacity for FP&L and Gulf, and environmental or FP&L and Gulf. But it's my understanding they are still done in conjunction with either the August or the February hearing. That it doesn't -- there isn't a recommendation for yet another date.

And to me it's more appropriate to have the panel decide it because -- I mean the full Commission -- if the panel decides it we're in effect -- at least for FP&L -- coming up with one more hearing. I at least think the Chairman ought to have a say in that as the person who has to handle our calendar. And the issue of whether it is appropriate to be on a calendar basis or a fiscal year basis or whatever.

I guess, Mr. Childs, what I'm suggesting is

it seems to me -- and as I understand it, the revenues 1 with respect to fuel judgment are considerably wore 2 than GPIF capacity or environmental. And I think 3 those are -- now the notion of increasing potential 5 hearings; the notion of the numbers involved indicates -- and the fact it's a matter of 6 administration -- indicates to me that it should 7 8 involve a decision by the full panel. And I'll 9 welcome hearing from anyone who disagrees with that. 10 MS. CHILDS: If it's appropriate to speak, I 11 will address that. 12 We don't disagree with that at all.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CHILDS: What our position was, we broached this subject before, was that we thought it was important to go to annual but we thought we needed to go to annual 1999, not the year 2000, and that, therefore, the way to address that was now so that there could be a transition for the year 1999; that is next year.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Childs, let me interrupt you. What's the magic about 1999 as opposed to 2000?

MR. CHILDS: Because we thought there were benefits of going to the annual hearing, and that

because of those benefits that it was important to do it sooner rather than later. That if there was a way to achieve that by 1999, we ought to try to, and as it relates to the Commissioners, that also full Commission.

We were aware that the Staff and certain Commissioners, maybe all of them, would want to participate on this issue. On the other hand, we felt we wanted to get it before you, and if we filed it as a generic issue, which was one of the things suggested, that there was probably no way to get it resolved by the year 1999. And, therefore, we went ahead and filed it in order to get the request before you. And if there was a way for the full Commission to participate in this docket, that seemed to be an acceptable way to proceed.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, what I talked to Staff about was possibly doing a PAA. And let me ask Ms. Kaufman. I understand it to be probably your client that's the only one objecting.

MS. KAUPMAN: Well, I guess that's the case. But we do object to moving to the one-year period for some of the reasons you mentioned, most notably the amount of dollars involved; that you're going to be projecting for a 12-month period now instead of 6

month. So even though, yes, we're swimming upstream, we do object.

midcourse correction. I'm embarrassed to say, I can't remember if -- that issue about how much different does it have to be before you notify us; what did we decide to do? 10%. Does that give you any comfort?

MS. KAUFMAN: It gives me some comfort but my client still prefers the shorter projection period because we think that to the extent projections can be accurate, they will be more accurate over a shorter period than a 12-month period, especially given the magnitude of the dollars. We agree with you, also, that this is an issue that the full Commission should take up.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Childs, how fast would you need a decision in order to do it by 1999? What would we have to do?

MS. CHILDS: This is our thought process.

We filed a transition proposal where we would use -instead of six months we would use a nine-month factor
which would carry us through the end of the year.

Incidently, if we don't do that, then our factor goes
up significantly on the six-month period. So we'd
like to stay with that.

In terms of having to know, it seems to me we have to know so that in some way there can be a hearing in time to set a new factor for calendar year 1999. And I guess what we had had in mind was that if you decided this issue now, that you were going to go foward with a calendar year, that we would come back for the hearing in August, subject to somebody saying well, maybe we ought to come back at a different time; we could come back later since you've set the factor through the end of the year. But we could come back either with everybody else in August or --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: But you're the only one who has done the transition?

MR. CHILDS: We're the only one that has filed it. And I'm not sure how much difficulty there is for the other companies to file it.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask a question:

Is there an objection to it being a calendar year? If
we do that -- to me everybody has to be on the same -for it to be beneficial to reducing administration,
everybody needs to be on the same basis.

MR. BEASLEY: Commissioner, we had proposed retaining the current April through March recovery period. That's what we're in now with the conservation cost recovery, and it's what we were

geared up to file for in this proceeding. And it would be of significant involvement in putting together a new filing.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm not sure that answers the question.

MS. PAUGH: Commissioner, if I could interject, I believe TECO's position is a fiscal year is their preference at least for now; is that correct, Mr. Beasley?

MR. BEASLEY: That's correct.

MS. PAUGH: So there's not agreement among the parties whether the time frame would be a calendar year or fiscal year.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: What is your fiscal year?

MR. BEASLEY: It's the current period we're using, the April through March cost recovery period.

have a recommendation? I'm still inclined to kick it to the full Commission. And I guess what I thought would be the appropriate way to handle it is for the Staff to do a PAA after meeting with all of the parties to at least identify what there is agreement on, perhaps how to do a transition, and then outlining any differences there are, and outline the concerns

with respect to the magnitude of the dollars and any other concern FIPUG has.

well stated Staff's position with respect to this. We believe PAA would be the most expeditious and most thorough analysis of this. We will do everything in our power to expedite these proceedings, but I think that it needs the full Commission review. I think that's very important. This is a policy issue with large dollar implications.

MR. CHILDS: Could I ask -- I don't mean to belabor it, but is it possible that the full Commission could address this issue in this docket?

The reason I ask that --

COMMISSIONER CLARK: They are not available for hearing next week.

MR. CHILDS: We have filed testimony and it's been on file for some time. If we start PAA, in some respects we start over again in terms of the clock, you know, 'n terms of filing going to hearing. I guess I hold out some hope that we can convince the Commission that it's appropriate to go foward and implement it. And I feel like if we do it the other way we just cannot do it by 1999.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I'm not sure I share

your pessimism on that. I'm, frankly, looking for the 2 parties to resolve -- what does it take to get to annual and how would we resolve it? And then the 3 issue will only be is it appropriate to or not? 4 5 It's my inclination to instruct Staff to deal with this as a separate item to go for the full 6 Commission and do it as PAA. I realize I don't have 7 the authority to do that, but if Staff would take that up /ith the Chair, I guess it would be my ruling to take it out of these dockets. 10 11 MS. PAUGH: We'll be happy to do that 12 immediately. 13 COMMISSIONER CLARK: All right. But with the understanding that it would be my desire to have 14 15 that resolved as quickly as possible so it could be 16 implemented if the Commission decides to by 1999. 17 MS. PAUGH: We'll make every effort to do 18 that. 19 We don't have to have the hearing in August. 20 It could be at a later month in 1998, so to that 21 extent it's still quite possible this could happen in 22 1998. I don't share Mr. Childs' pessimism either. 23 COMMISSIONER CLARK: 1999.

MS. PAUGH: To have a hearing to resolve it

24

25

now.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me explore that.

When did you expect to have a hearing if you went to a calendar basis?

MR. CHILDS: For the calendar year?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: If you did it on a calendar basis, when would we have the hearing?

MR. CHILDS: I don't remember when we were proposing it. Sometime in the fall of the year.

MS. PAUGH: Staff proposed mid-November.

MR. CHILDS: I don't know if you said we could do it later if the other companies are on a six-month factor. I think you're going to have a transition here somehow, because otherwise their factor ends.

MS. PAUGH: That's correct.

MR. CHILDS: That's why I was concerned about whether we could do it on time. Could we leave for the time being, Commissioner, the issue of the transition for Florida Power and Light open? I think Staff said they would check and see whether they could do that.

of the transition open and take all of the information. And that if the Commission decided to go to an annual, then we could also make a decision

whether to use that information provided in the docket. Is that your intent?

MR. CHILDS: Our proposal in this docket is that you use the transition amount for the nine months as if you will be making the decision to go to an annual. And that if you don't make that decision, that we would revise it later. But that we use the current nine-month filing we have made in this docket.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, that's interesting.

MS. PAUGH: If I could inquire of counsel what issues he's referring to specifically?

MR. CHILDS: 7, I think, is one.

MS. PAUGH: Staff has advised they do not feel it's appropriate to put in a nine-month factor when we know it's only going to be for six months. So they disagree with that request.

MR. CHILDS: That's what I'm suggesting, is that we don't know that it will only be for six months. We know that it's going to be addressed independently with the Commission following the Staff's recommendation, and that if the Commission ultimately votes to go to an annual, and votes to do that for 1990, we're prepared, at least for us, to do that with the transition. If not, if they vote

against it, then we will be as everyone else, filing for the new factor later this year.

MS. PAUGH: I don't believe it's appropriate. I'm sorry.

1.7

MR. CHILDS: Well, okay. I nevertheless ask that you at least tentatively leave that as an issue. I think you were going to check and see what the next step was going to be.

commissioner CLARK: Mr. Childs, it seems to me what you're suggesting, is you're willing to bet you're going to get the annual and you're willing to go to the nine months; and then if we decide not to, we'll go back and adjust if we need to.

MR. CHILDS: We can because we will have the hearing in August. We're setting a factor at this time to go nine months through the end of this year starting in April. So we have a nine-month factor that carries us through 1998. I'm saying we've already prepared that, and if the Commission, in fact, decides it's appropriate to go to an annual hearing, then we would be able to continue to use our nine-month factor. If they decide not to, then we can come back in August and change the factor, if that's the what Commission wants to say.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: You have supplied for

this proceeding both information on the six-month and nine-month.

MR. CHILDS: We have. We have both.

commissioner CLARK: What you would like us
to do is to -- would be your request that we approve
the nine-month, regardless of what is done -- even
kicking out the annual full Commission.

MR. CHILDS: Right.

commissioner clark: If it is decided that we not go to the annual, then an adjustment will be made in August.

MR. CHILDS: Right.

MS. PAUGH: I believe that's premature,
Commissioner Clark.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: It has some appeal in the sense that what that means, however, is that it still remains an issue; not a proposed stipulation. And it would be something we would have to take up at the hearing. I don't think I can decide that.

MR. CHILDS: I thought that Staff was going to check as to the way the generic issue would be handled. So I am assuming -- I'm assuming that the issue is preserved, either as an issue in this docket or as an issue and generic issue with a proposed agency action procedure, that it is preserved.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: But we're going to set the factors prior to a decision on that.

MR. CHILDS: I understand. I understand.

And I'm just saying that we would ask that you go ahead and set our factor on the basis of the transition.

We do have the information for it to be a six-month basis; it's been filed, can be quantified and ready to go there. It will be a higher factor and we would prefer not to do that. That's one of the benefits we thought we had with the annual anyway, is that there's a little bit more change in the level of the factor.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Howe.

MR. HOWE: I was just going to ask

Mr. Childs to clarify which factor is higher and he's

done so.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I guess I'm inclined to let the panel decide, you know, even given the fact that we would allow the decision on the annual to go to the Commission, for the purposes of this proceeding should we approve either the six months or the nine months?

MS. PAUGH: We can certainly handle it that way. I think there are some procedural due process

problems with this, and I'd like to take a look at that between now and the hearing. 2 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I suspect there would 3 because FIPUG is opposed to the annual; is that 4 correct? So you would be opposed to a transition. 5 MS. PAUGH: It would be ineffective 6 7 preemptive ruling to that extent. 8 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Then we don't have a 9 proposed stipulation. 10 MR. CHILDS: I guess I understand that. But 11 I'm saying if it's an issue, and I understand that 12 FIPUG disagreed with it. I'm not suggesting that 13 that's stipulated. I'm suggesting if that issue 14 remains, that the panel may decide whether to permit us to go foward with a fuel adjustment on that basis, 15 16 and they may not. We have the information to do it 17 both ways. 18 MS. PAUGH: We can just let the panel 19 decide. 20 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah. But what issue 21 does it come under? How do we identify it so the 22 panel knows --23 MS. CHILDS: It's 10C. 24 MS. PAUGH: Does this also relate to Issue 7

25

as you previously indicated?

1	MS. CHILDS: I think it's 4 and 7.
2	MS. PAUGH: So the full list is 4, 7 and
3	10C; is that correct?
4	MS. CHILDS: For what?
5	MS. PAUGH: For the nine-month factor that
6	we have been discussing. I'm trying to get clear what
7	it is we need to
8	MR. CHILDS: We got to talking on something
9	else. I'm not sure I had done that review. I think
10	it's 4, 7 and 10C.
11	COMMISSIONER CLARK: 4, 7 and 10C would all
12	be influenced by going to an annual factor, the
13	transition?
14	MS. CHILDS: Yes. And the wording on five,
15	because of the way the wording about it terminating, I
16	think in the Staff's wording, that it would terminate
17	in September, which is not a big deal.
18	COMMISSIONER CLARK: 4, 5, 7 and 10C?
19	MR. CHILDS: Correct.
20	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Ms. Kaufman.
21	MS. KAUPMAN: Commissioner Clark, I guess
22	I'm just a little bit confused. And I'm not sure that
23	I have a problem with talking about whether or not the
24	transition factor should be in place for Florida Power
25	and Light for the next nine months. But I would be
- 1	

concerned with the language of Issue 10C right now, which would seem to suggest that there would be a decision made in regard to whether the 12 months is appropriate.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think at the very

least 10C has to be changed to reflect that a decision

on the annual has been deferred to the 'ill

Commission, and that it should be -- with the

understanding that it's deferred, is it still

appropriate to establish FP&L's proposed fuel cost

recovery factors for a period of April through

December?

MS. KAUFMAN: Then I would wonder -- I would hope that we would not be discussing, getting into all of the policy ramifications we're going to talk to the entire Commission about.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: No. But I would presume your position on this would be no, that they shouldn't do it.

MS. KAUPMAN: I think for consistency that would probably be correct.

commissioner clark: Okay. I'm comfortable with having the panel decide whether or not that's appropriate to do and send a decision on annual.

MS. PAUGH: We'll defer to your judgment.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: But, Mr. Childs, I 1 2 suppose you'll have to make that argument at the 3 beginning of the --MR. CHILDS: I understand. 4 COMMISSIONER CLARK: -- of the hearing. 5 6 MR. CHILDS: Okay. 7 The other Commissioners are Commissioner Jacobs and Garcia, right? Perhaps what we should do 8 9 is a little memo to sort of give them a road map on this one. Okay? 10 11 MS. PAUGH: We'll do that. 12 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Are we finished with 01? 13 14 MS. PAUGH: Have we fully addressed 10B to 15 your satisfaction? 16 MS. CHILDS: I think we have. The only 17 thing I want to ask is that it's understood that the 18 filing for the factors for Florida Power and Light 19 Company are based upon -- we have proposed them on nine months, we have the data for six months, and that 20 21 they can be calculated for six months from that data 22 and there's no objection to that. 23 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I think we do need to agree. We need to make sure that prior to the hearing

we do agree on what is appropriate if it is six

25

months.

MS. PAUGH: That we intend to do.

MR. STONE: You asked whether they were through with 01. I would propose that we stipulate the admission of the testimony of two of our witnesses who are not involved in the transmission cost issue, which, as I understand, is the only issue remaining outstanding as to Gulf Power Company.

commissioner clark: This is a good time to indicate. I would propose -- it's my recollection what we do is stipulate all of testimony into the record at the beginning of the hearing, either before or after we do the stipulations, and we do not expect them to show up.

MR. STONE: Certainly if there's no contested issue. If the transmission issue remains contested, we would probably have a witness here on that, and we'd also be prepared to address the fallout issues as a result of that. But we do have two witnesses that are not impacted by that outstanding issue one way or the other.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let's talk about the transmission. I don't see why even they have to be here if any change in the transmission on reconsideration, it's Staff's position that would only

take place in the next proceeding.

MS. PAUGH: That's correct.

MR. STONE: Then I've heard some inconsistent statements from Staff. I understood Staff to say they were not prepared to accept the company's numbers on transmission at this time. If that's the case, then we need to have a witness here. If they are prepared to accept our numbers as they exist at this time, then I agree with your previous statement.

MS. PAUGH: I think we have been down this trail before. Staff has not finished its analysis of the current numbers supplied by all of the parties with respect to transmission based on the order that has been issued. But we will have that resolved by the end of this week. In all likelihood, yours will be resolved along with everyone else's.

MR. STONE: And I agree. But I have two witnesses that could be excused today based on what we know today. That's all I'm saying.

commissioner clark: We're going to excuse everyone if there are proposed stipulations on the issue. So if they are on an issue for which we have currently identified it as a proposed stipulation, they don't need to show up.

1 MR. STONE: That's what I needed to have 2 clarification of. 3 MS. PAUGH: Assuming we can agree. I'm not 4 saying that we will. 5 COMMISSIONER CLARK: No. We're not talking 6 about that. If by Friday we also clear up the 7 transmission, the same -- if it becomes a proposed stipulated issue, the same applies, the witnesses do 8 not have to be here. 9 10 MS. PAUGH: That's correct. MR. STONE: If it may be of benefit to the 11 12 process, I can identify two witnesses that can be 13 shown as stipulated because they will not be impacted 14 by the absence of an agreement on that issue. 15 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I guess I'm of the view 16 it will confuse it. But it's my anticipation that 17 every witness will be excused in 01. Would that be 18 correct? 19 MS. PAUGH: That's correct if with respect to the outstanding issues we're able to reach 20 21 agreement with the parties. 22 COMMISSIONER CLARK: What are the outstanding issues? 23 24 MS. PAUGH: All of the transmission issues,

and there are other issues throughout that we're still

25

resolving matters with the companies. It is anticipated that we will resolve all of the matters but we certainly can't guarantee that. COMMISSIONER CLARK: Here's what I propose to do. By Friday when we know what is proposed to be stipulated, then we would also identify all of the testimony that will be stipulated into the record and identify those witnesses who do not have to be at the hearing. MS. PAUGH: We'll do that. COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay. We'll have a complete list by Friday. Does that conclude 01? MS. PAUGH: As far as Staff is concerned, yes.

STATE OF FLORIDA) 1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 2 COUNTY OF LEON 3 I, JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR, Chief, Bureau of Reporting, Official Commission Reporter, 4 DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Prehearing 5 Conference in Docket No. 98001-EI was heard by the Prehearing Officer at the time and place herein stated; it is further 7 CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this 8 transcript, consisting of 59 pages, constitutes a true 9 transcription of my notes of said proceedings. DATED this 18th day of February, 1998. 10 11 12 13 14 15 Chief, Bureau of Reporting 16 (904) 413-6732 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25