| 1 | BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION | | | | | |
|----|--|---|----------|--------|-------------|--|
| 2 | FLORII | DA PUBLIC SERVICE COMM | | | | |
| 3 | In the Matter of: | | DOCKET | NO. | 070650-EI | |
| 4 | PETITION TO DETERMI | | | _ | William Con | |
| 5 | POWER PLANT, BY FLO | 6 AND 7 ELECTRICAL RIDA POWER & LIGHT | | 3 | | |
| 6 | COMPANY. | / | | | | |
| 7 | | | | (1) | | |
| 8 | | | | | SPORMS | |
| 9 | | IC VERSIONS OF THIS T | | | Æ | |
| 10 | THE OFF | VENIENCE COPY ONLY AND ICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF TO ERSION INCLUDES PREFI | HE HEAR | ING, | VY. | |
| 11 | | | | 111101 | | |
| 12 | | VOLUME 1 Pages 1 through 76 | | | | |
| 13 | PROCEEDINGS: | HEARING | | | | |
| 14 | BEFORE: | CHAIRMAN MATTHEW M. COMMISSIONER LISA PO | | | | |
| 15 | | COMMISSIONER KATRINA | J. McM | URRI | AN | |
| 16 | | COMMISSIONER NANCY A COMMISSIONER NATHAN | | NO | | |
| 17 | DATE: | Wednesday, January 3 | 0, 2008 | | | |
| 18 | TIME: | Commenced at 9:41 a. | m. | | | |
| 19 | PLACE: | Betty Easley Confere Room 148 | nce Cen | ter | | |
| 20 | | 4075 Esplanade Way | | | | |
| 21 | | Tallahassee, Florida | | | | |
| 22 | REPORTED BY: | LINDA BOLES, RPR, CR Official Commission | | r | | |
| 23 | | (850) 413-6734 | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | | |
| | | 9 | OCUMENT! | HEM IN | R-DATE | |

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION JAN31 8

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

APPEARANCES:

2.0

R. WADE LITCHFIELD, JOHN T. BUTLER, MITCHELL S. ROSS, BRYAN S. ANDERSON, ANTONIO FERNANDEZ and JESSICA A. CANO, ESQUIRES, Florida Power & Light Company, 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, Florida 33408-0420; STEPHEN L. HUNTOON, Florida Power & Light Company, Suite 200, 801 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W., Washington, DC 20004; and KENNETH A. HOFFMAN, ESQUIRE, Rutledge, Ecenia, Purnell & Hoffman, P.A., 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 420, Tallahassee, Florida 32302-0551, appearing on behalf of Florida Power & Light Company.

ROY C. YOUNG, ESQUIRE, Young van Assenderp, P.A.,

225 South Adams Street, Suite 200, Tallahassee, Florida 32301,

and ZOILA PUIG EASTERLING, ESQUIRE, Orlando Utilities

Commission, 500 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, Florida 32802,

appearing on behalf of the Orlando Utilities Commission.

JODY L. FINKLEA and DANIEL B. O'HAGAN, ESQUIRES,

Florida Municipal Power Agency, Post Office Box 3209,

Tallahassee, Florida 32315-3209, appearing on behalf of Florida

Municipal Power Agency and Florida Municipal Electric

Association.

SUZANNE S. BROWNLESS, ESQUIRE, 1975 Buford Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32308-4466, and BRUCE PAGE, ESQUIRE, 117 West Duval Street, Suite 480, Jacksonville, Florida 32202, appearing on behalf of JEA.

| 1 | APPEARANCES (Continued): |
|----|---|
| 2 | VICKI GORDON KAUFMAN, ESQUIRE, Anchors, Smith, |
| 3 | Grimsley, 118 North Gadsden Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, |
| 4 | appearing on behalf of Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc. |
| 5 | J. R. KELLY, PUBLIC COUNSEL, and CHARLES J. BECK, |
| 6 | ESQUIRE, Office of Public Counsel, c/o The Florida Legislature, |
| 7 | 111 West Madison Street, Room 812, Tallahassee, Florida |
| 8 | 32399-1400, appearing on behalf of the Citizens of the State of |
| 9 | Florida. |
| LO | BOB and JAN M. KRASOWSKI, 1086 Michigan Avenue, |
| L1 | Naples, Florida 34103-3857, appearing pro se (Krasowski). |
| L2 | KATHERINE FLEMING, JENNIFER BRUBAKER and CAROLINE |
| L3 | KLANCKE, ESQUIRES, FPSC General Counsel's Office, 2540 Shumard |
| L4 | Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, appearing on |
| L5 | behalf of the Commission Staff. |
| L6 | |
| 7 | |
| .8 | |
| .9 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 2 | |
| 23 | |
| 4 | |

INDEX WITNESSES PAGE NO. NAME: GORDON HANSEN Direct Statement Cross Examination by Mr. Krasowski BARRY PARSONS Direct Statement Cross Examination by Mr. Krasowski DAWN SHIRREFFS Direct Statement ERIC DRAPER Direct Statement Cross Examination by Mr. Krasowski CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

| L | PROCEEDINGS |
|-----|--|
| 2 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Good morning. I'd like to call |
| 3 | this hearing to order. And before we get started, Commissioner |
| Ŀ | Argenziano, are you with us? |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Yes. Yes, I am, Mr. |
| ; | Chairman. |
| , | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner, what I want to do for |
| . 1 | vou. I know and we hope that you get well soon. I know that |

you, I know -- and we hope that you get well soon. I know that you're still not well and I know that we have you on the line, that you can hear and make your comments and you're also watching us online.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: But what we'll do, Commissioner
Argenziano, I won't call on you. But if you have a question or
an issue or something that you'd like to do, to mention, just
chime in. That way we can protect your voice. Is that okay
with you?

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: All righty. Okay. Thank you. Staff, would you please read the notice.

MS. FLEMING: Pursuant to notice issued by the Commission Clerk, this time and place has been set for a hearing in Docket Number 070650-EI.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Now let's take appearances.

1 MR. LITCHFIELD: Thank you, Chairman Carter. 2 Litchfield, John Butler, Mitchell Ross, Bryan Anderson, Antonio Fernandez, Jessica Cano and Steve Huntoon on behalf of Florida 3 Power & Light Company, with the address as set forth in the 4 5 Prehearing Order, and also Mr. Ken Hoffman of the Rutledge, Ecenia firm here in Tallahassee with his address as set forth 6 7 in the Prehearing Order. 8 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. 9 My name is Roy Young appearing on MR. YOUNG: Yes. 10 behalf of Orlando Utilities Commission, along with Ms. Easterling, who is here somewhere. 11

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BROWNLESS: Suzanne Brownless appearing on behalf of JEA. And with me also entering a notice of appearance is Bruce Page from JEA.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay.

MR. FINKLEA: Good morning, Commissioners. Jody
Finklea appearing on behalf of Florida Municipal Power Agency
and Florida Municipal Electric Association. And with me as
co-counsel is Dan O'Hagan.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay.

MS. KAUFMAN: Good morning, Commissioners. Vicky
Gordon Kaufman. I'm with the Anchors, Smith, Grimsley firm
here in Tallahassee, and I am appearing on behalf of Seminole
Electric Cooperative, Inc.

MR. BECK: Good morning, Commissioners. J. R. Kelly 1 2 and Charlie Beck, Office of Public Counsel, appearing on behalf of Florida's citizens. 3 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. 4 MRS. KRASOWSKI: Good morning, Jan Krasowski, 5 Intervenor as an FP&L ratepayer. 6 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Did we get all of the 7 parties before I recognize staff? 8 MR. KRASOWSKI: I'd like to introduce myself, if I 9 may, Mr. Chairman. I'm Bob Krasowski. I'm Jan's husband and 10 also an Intervenor, and will probably be doing most of the 11 speaking to represent the both of us as a matter of efficiency. 12 Good morning. Thank you. 13 Good. Staff. CHAIRMAN CARTER: 14 MS. FLEMING: Katherine Fleming, Jennifer Brubaker 1.5 and Caroline Klancke on behalf of the Commission. 16 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Staff, preliminary matters. 17 18 MS. FLEMING: Staff is aware of several preliminary We would recommend that those matters be taken up 19 matters. when we convene the technical portion of the hearing. 20 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Let's do it then. 21 Okay. So would you get us in the posture for our 22 public testimony? 23 MS. BRUBAKER: At your preference, Mr. Chairman, we 24

do have a number of members of the public who have signed up to

speak at this proceeding. My proposal would be to call them in turn. If you have any preliminary comments, we can go ahead with those at this time, or you might just want to go ahead and swear in the witnesses.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. I'm going -- in a minute

I'll swear the witnesses in as a group. But I would like to

advise the speakers that you will be subject to

cross-examination by the parties and/or possibly by the

Commissioners.

Any documents offered by the speakers will be identified. And we'll be dealing with documents introduced at a later portion of the program probably as we get into our technical portion of it but not during the public testimony, although they'll be marked for identification.

Let me just say from the standpoint of time, I believe that we do want to hear from the public, and what we're going to try as best as possible, if we can give the, an opportunity for people to be heard, I'm looking at maybe six minutes. That will give a person an opportunity to be heard. That way I won't have to, you know, crunch, you know, take off time from people on the back end and so everybody will have a fair opportunity to be heard. Okay?

Now if there's no other preliminary matters, I guess
I'm ready to swear in the witnesses. Ms. Brubaker, any other?
MS. BRUBAKER: I have none.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Those of you that are wishing to 1 speak and be heard in this matter for the public testimony, 2 3 would you please stand and raise your right hand. (Witnesses collectively sworn.) 4 Thank you very much. 5 Okay. Ms. Brubaker, would you call our first 6 7 witness. MS. BRUBAKER: Thank you, Chairman. First to speak 8 9 is Gordon Hansen. CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Mr. Hansen. Oh, do you have 10 11 some exhibits? Go ahead. Give -- Mr. Hansen, give her a 12 moment to pass those out. Leave one there for Commissioner Argenziano. Leave one right there. Thank you. Thank you. 13 MS. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would note 14 that this handout that's being handed out be identified as 15 Exhibit 91. 16 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Exhibit 91? Let's make it 17 Composite Exhibit 91 so we can kind of keep this as one 18 So all of this will be Exhibit 91. Make sure you exhibit. 19 20 give one to the parties. 21 Okay. Do all the parties have one? Please make sure 22 that the parties -- this would be Exhibit 91. (Exhibit 91 marked for identification.) 23 24 Mr. Hansen, you are recognized. 25 GORDON HANSEN

appeared as a witness and, swearing to tell the truth, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

MR. HANSEN: Thank you. I'm a homeowner from Chuluota, Florida. Thank you for this opportunity to speak. It will take about six minutes. This talk will be very brief. Backup information is included in the handouts.

I am treating this like a slide presentation. I am here to show that a simple solar hot water heating program can offset a billion watt electric generators.

Slide 1 -- and you'll notice that they are labeled in the very low right-hand corner. Slide 1 is contact information.

Slide 2, a national solar hot water heating program will save homeowners \$72 billion a year, save
600 billion pounds CO2 a year, reduce consumption by 1 trillion kilowatt hours per year, eliminate over 100 power plants of one billion watts each, and save mining 1 trillion pounds of coal per year if they're coal plants.

Slide 3, this is the plan of the talk.

Slide 4, solar power, as you know, is about 100 watts per square foot. Our drive up here this morning, 300 miles, would receive about the same amount of power as ten nuclear power plants would produce.

Slide 5, solar panels. Solar electric panels, which

many times are referred to as photovoltaic, I'm going to refer to them as electric. Solar electric panels cost 28 times more than hot water panels and they are seven times less efficient.

Slide 6, solar systems. Solar electric systems receive eight times more incentive money. Utilities make \$30 per month on the systems while the customer makes \$20 per month or saves \$20. Under a solar hot water heater the utilities make zero money and the customer saves \$50 per month.

Slide 7, in my opinion the utilities do not favor solar. Why? Grid tied solar electric does not reduce capacity, at least not very much. And solar hot water does not -- does reduce capacity, but the utilities end up losing \$600 per year per customer.

Slide 8, offsetting power plants. In this case if just two-thirds of the customers of FPL were to install a solar hot water heating system, there would be no need for the two nuclear power plants.

Slide 9, nuclear versus solar. Solar has few unknown costs, provides customers \$600 a year savings, it is a disbursed type of power and has no terrorist, meltdown or radiation problems.

Slide 10, solar and nuclear prevent the same pollution, the CO2 pollution, but nuclear has many other problems, especially with spent fuel storage. Solar is squeaky clean.

Slide 11, getting started. Governor Crist got his tax bill introduced and passed in a very short order. Solar hot water required by law or code could be implemented in a very similar manner. Solar hot water for new homes would require a simple code change.

2.0

Slide 12, solar hot water for existing homes could be phased in over a ten-year period. The key is that no up-front money would be required and it pays for itself over time; for example, three to four years.

Slide 13, I show several other energy sources.

And in summary, Slide 14, solar hot water is a low tech solution that helps everyone. Nationally it could replace over 100 electric power plants. I'm asking you please do not rush to nuclear. Solar is the best option. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Hansen, that was perfect.

Exactly five minutes. And, I mean, very, very well done in the presentation.

MR. HANSEN: I was going to ask then, what was perfect?

CHAIRMAN CARTER: That was --

MR. HANSEN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: And I actually learned -- hold on.

Don't go away. Don't go away. Hold on. It's a very good

presentation and I learned something and it was perfect, five

minutes.

Let me do this, ask, first of all -- Commissioners, 1 before I come to either of you, let me just check with the 2 parties first and see if any of the parties have any questions, 3 and then we'll -- are there any questions from Mr. Litchfield? 4 No guestions from FPL. MR. LITCHFIELD: 5 MR. YOUNG: No questions from OUC. 6 MR. FINKLEA: No questions from the municipals. 7 MR. BECK: No questions. 8 MR. KRASOWSKI: I have a couple of quick questions 9 for clarification, please, Mr. Chairman. 10 11 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. CROSS EXAMINATION 12 13 BY MR. KRASOWSKI: Mr. Hansen, on Slide Number 8, did I hear you 14 correctly that you said if, if, if two-thirds of FPL's 15 4.2 million customers had solar hot water, then the tabulation 16 17 would be accurate? That's correct. 18 Okay. I see on your, your, in the box here it 19 identifies if one-third. So would you say there's a need for a 20 correction there? 21 No. On this slide I started out with calculating 22 based on one-third and say that was for one power plant. 23 24 then if 2.8 million customers, it would offset two.

Okay. Thank you. And then one other question. Are

you speaking of FP&L's Florida operation or the FP&L nationwide 1 in relation to Slide Number 8? 2 It's the Florida operation because they stipulate 3 Α that they have 4.2 customers. 4 4.2 million? 5 So it takes, so it takes two-thirds of that amount of 6 7 customers. MR. KRASOWSKI: Thank you very much. 8 That's all, Mr. Chair. 9 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Commissioners? 10 11 MS. BRUBAKER: Thank you. The next speaker is Eric 12 Draper. CHAIRMAN CARTER: Eric Draper. I said it right, 13 didn't I? Mr. Draper? Okay. Let's call the next speaker. 14 We 15 may double back. MS. BRUBAKER: Next speaker then, Barry Parsons, 16 17 please. 18 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Barry Parsons. Very good. Mr. Before you get started, Mr. Parsons -- welcome, by 19 Parsons. the way, to the Florida Public Service Commission. 20 Do you have any handouts or anything? 21 MR. PARSONS: Yes. If, if the Commission is 22 amenable, I would prefer to hand these out afterwards so that I 23 may have your undivided attention, if that's --24 CHAIRMAN CARTER: I don't know if having our 25

undivided attention is possible. No, just kidding. (Laughter.)

MR. PARSONS: Relatively speaking.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Mr. Parsons, we'll do it that way. You are recognized, sir.

BARRY PARSONS

appeared as a witness and, swearing to tell the truth, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

MR. PARSONS: Thank you. My name is Barry Parsons and I'm from Madison. I'm a 33, 33-year resident of this state. I am a retired State of Florida vocational rehabilitation counselor.

I want to make it clear I'm not an expert witness. I am merely a concerned citizen who has followed these power and environmental issues for the past 45 years.

I feel -- I sense a need here, Commissioners, for some perspective particularly for the benefit of the public and I'd like to make a stab at that, if I may, here.

I find it incomprehensible that this Commission and this state is actually seriously considering approving a new nuclear power plant or two new power plants. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to ask you to think what you have here with nuclear. You have at once an energy choice that requires the single most toxic mining process in the world; that

involves the use of the single most dangerous fuel stock on a day-to-day basis; that demands the single most complex and expensive safety, technology and processes; that produces the single most hazardous, indeed lethal waste product in the world; and that is the single most expensive energy option utterly dependent on ongoing, ongoing subsidies, tax breaks, federal loans, insurance guarantees, exemption from liability in case of release of radioactive substances into the community; and, to top it off, comprises the single most tempting terrorist targets. And I'm using that plural when we're talking about the state and the nation as a whole, because not only the plants themselves, but the many trucks and trains that presumably will be hauling this deadly cargo across 45 states in our country to a single national waste repository, which is probably the greatest terrorist dream of all. Do you really want to be a part of this?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now your very capable staff, I'm told, stands ready to perhaps rubber stamp this proposed plan. I hope I'm wrong. I believe maybe I am. But as you know, Harry Truman's buck stops with you, not with them. And I would remind you that last year at this time your staff was solidly behind the Perry coal plant proposal, but you or the three of you that were on board then listened to issues that many of us raised at those hearings and asked questions about those issues of the applicant, whom, as you may recall, had trouble coming up with

satisfactory answers. And I know Mr. Carter remembers that very well. You all had the courage to reject a contemporaneous coal plant proposal in the Glades and the Perry plant withdrew its application, and a grateful Florida remembers.

I trust it is obvious, Commissioners, that we are once again at a critical juncture. And it is a very big buck that has stopped at your table this time because your decision could contribute to this artificial revival of a formerly moribund industry best left to the dustbin of history. Or your decision, like the coal plant decision, could contribute mightily to a new era of energy, sanity and safety in Florida and perhaps across the country.

Make no mistake about it, folks, we are being watched here in Florida by concerned people all across this country.

It is Florida and Tennessee that are putting up these first new nuclear plant proposals and it's going to have a ripple effect across this country.

Let me leave you with a quick final perspective. The striking example of Germany, and I think this is highly relevant to your considerations here in Florida, Germany is not only not building any new nuclear power plants, it is on track to decommissioning all 16 of their existing nuclear power plants. Ask yourself, why would a leading developed industrial country, a mature democracy purposely take offline a source of one-fourth of its current national electrical power?

And two fresh facts from Germany I want to plug in real fast too. One is a new study that found that children who live near nuclear power plants have higher rates of leukemia. This is done by the Germany Registry of Childhood Cancer. Two, the City of Freeburg, Germany, has become the first solar city in the world, all power being met by solar. This, I would add, in a country that has only one-seventh of the radiant solar power of the State of Florida.

So I hope that you will keep perspective in your minds and vision and courage in your hearts, Commissioners, because we are depending on you. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you very kindly, Mr. Parsons. We sincerely appreciate that.

I notice you said you had some exhibits, but before you pass -- let's let your passing out be the last thing that we do. Let me see if there are any questions from either of the parties or staff or the Commissioners. Any questions from the parties?

MR. LITCHFIELD: None at this time. Although when the exhibits are passed out, if we have a question, we'd like the opportunity to come back and ask that, if that's acceptable.

MR. YOUNG: No questions from OUC.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on a second.

Staff, while Mr. Parsons is there, can one of you

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

just kind of -- Mr. Ballinger, could you just kind of pass those out? Let's just see. Let's see now. Mr. Parsons, just hold on for a second, please, sir. We will assist you in passing those out.

MR. PARSONS: I need to apologize to the Commission.

I have only six copies, and so that was one each for the

Commissioners. I'd love to have you all look at it. The one
remaining copy for the applicant, it would have to be

duplicated. Or I could get more of these at a later date.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: No, we'll work through it. We'll work through it. Here's what we'll do is that -- give us, give it to the parties, let them look it over, and then just give it to the Commissioners and we can look it over if we have any questions from there. We have to have one for the court reporter, of course.

MR. PARSONS: I'd like to mention, if I may -- can I mention for the record, sir, that the information in this booklet put out by the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy is based in large part, as was my testimony, on the work of Mr. Peter Bradford, who is former Chair of the New York State Public Service Commission, former Chair of the Maine Public Utilities Commission and former Commissioner of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. One for the court reporter.

And let the parties see it first, and then at that point in

time, if any Commissioner would like to see it, we can look at it and then we'll go from there. Let's just kind of take a second to do that. Commissioners, I beg your indulgence on this. (Pause.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Wait. Wait. Don't go away.

Mr. Litchfield, are you ready?

MR. LITCHFIELD: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This, I assume, is marked as 92?

CHAIRMAN CARTER: This will be Exhibit 92.

Ms. Fleming, is that where we are now, 92? Exhibit 92.

(Exhibit 92 marked for identification.)

MR. LITCHFIELD: Chairman Carter, FPL would simply note that this is really hearsay that's being offered here. We understand that we are in the public portion of this proceeding as opposed to the technical portion, so we would simply state for the record that it is hearsay. It is, purports to be a report by somebody who is not here as a witness today that we have no right or opportunity to cross-examine. But we understand that it'll be given the weight that it deserves, and with that we would not oppose it going into the, into the record as such.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay.

MR. LITCHFIELD: And we have no questions for this witness on this report since, after all, it is not his report.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you. Thank you. Other 1 2 parties? 3 MS. BROWNLESS: No, sir. MR. YOUNG: No from OUC. 4 5 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Krasowski? CROSS EXAMINATION 6 7 BY MR. KRASOWSKI: To be consistent I would just ask the gentleman if 8 he's a volunteer in this regard or if he's being paid by anyone 9 10 to appear here today. Total volunteer. 11 Α 12 MR. KRASOWSKI: Thank you, sir. CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. So you have no questions 13 about the report then? 14 15 MR. KRASOWSKI: No, sir. CHAIRMAN CARTER: So we know that the court reporter 16 17 has a copy, so that's good. So we'll get through it. Commissioners, I'm going to give you a second to kind of make 18 sure that all of us have had an opportunity to look at that. 19 And --20 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Chairman, if I may. 21 22 CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized, Commissioner 23 Edgar. 24 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you very much. 25 wanted to make a brief comment and it seems like it might be

the right time.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. And, Mr. Parsons, I know later we will take up the exhibits that have been offered and the Chairman will rule as to whether they will be admitted or not. And if at that point this document is admitted into evidence, I know our staff will get each of us copies and I will be sure to look at it very closely if we get to that point.

Very brief comment. I want to thank you as well for participating. It's very important to our processes that we have citizens who come and appear before us. So thank you for taking the time to do that.

MR. PARSONS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: You said in your comments that,

I think you said that you would ask us to use vision and

courage, and I assure you that I pray for vision and courage

every night. So thank you for that.

I would say that the comment that you made earlier about the potential for a rubber stamp of this decision is a characterization that I personally do not agree with. I know that our staff work very hard to look at all the issues, as do, as do each of us.

MR. PARSONS: Fair enough.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: But thank you genuinely for your

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

interest and for coming to appear before us. 1 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2 MR. PARSONS: Thank you. I appreciate it. 3 Thank you, Commissioner. CHAIRMAN CARTER: 4 Ms. Brubaker, would you call our next person, please? 5 MS. BRUBAKER: Certainly. The last person we have 6 currently signed to speak is Dawn Shirreffs. 7 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Dawn Shirreffs. 8 9 MS. BRUBAKER: Excuse me. Shirreffs, S-H-I-R-R-E-F-F-S. 10 11 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Spell it this time slowly. You 12 know I'm a product of the South Georgia public school system, 13 so spell it slowly this time. Okay. I'm ready. 14 MS. BRUBAKER: S-H-I-R-R-E-F-F-S. 15 CHAIRMAN CARTER: That sounds familiar. Have we met before? 16 MS. SHIRREFFS: Yes. I was in Miami. 17 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Great. Excellent. Excellent. 18 Do you have any exhibits or anything you'd like to pass out so we 19 can kind of --20 MS. SHIRREFFS: Well, I don't have sufficient copies. 21 22 CHAIRMAN CARTER: That doesn't matter. We can get through that. As long as we get one for the court reporter, 23 she'll put it in the record and then make sure that all the 24 Commissioners get a copy. 25

MS. SHIRREFFS: Okay. I'm going to grab them when I'm done.

2.0

CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized. You may do so.

Okay. We'll do that when you're done. All right?

DAWN SHIRREFFS

appeared as a witness and, swearing to tell the truth, testified as follows:

DIRECT STATEMENT

MS. SHIRREFFS: Thank you. Good morning. I am here on behalf of Clean Water Action's 50,000 members in Florida who are deeply concerned about the unanswered questions and unknown costs of Florida Power & Light's proposed nuclear expansion at Turkey Point. The function of today's hearing is to determine whether the cost of this project is not just reasonable, but according to Florida Statute 403.519 it must be the most cost-effective alternative possible.

The application before you does not identify the source of 70 to 90 million gallons a day. That means you cannot evaluate the cost of pumping, the cost of piping, the need and cost of treatment, the cost of operating a treatment facility, the cost of backup sources in case of destruction if a facility fails, et cetera.

This list of unanswered costs does not even begin to address factors considered in an October 2007 report by Moody Investors which cites, quote, a nuclear generating facility

could come in at between \$5,000 to \$6,000 per kilowatt, but concedes that, quote, our estimate is only marginally better than a guess, end quote.

Nuclear industry construction costs have historically come in two to 300 percent over estimated costs. The bonding record of nuclear is more deplorable than Enron stocks. A guess is simply not good enough for Florida.

Moody's report goes on to acknowledge that, quote, plants are likely to add approximately \$5 to \$10 billion to the rate base, in some cases doubling the existing rate base. It goes on to say, eventually end-use customers may find it very difficult to balance their family budgets if their electric bill continues to go up by roughly 10 percent a year. On Monday -- end quote.

On Monday, MidAmerican, a subsidiary of billionaire Warren Buffett's company, cancelled plans for a nuclear plant citing that it does not make economic sense.

Commissioner Skop in previous hearings has emphasized the importance of a stable regulatory environment. In order to achieve that goal, we must be sure of a plentiful, dependable source of water.

The capacity of the Floridan Aquifer is unknown.

Corrosive minerals would likely require treatment prior to use.

Reclaimed water is reliant on Miami-Dade Water and Sewer's flawless operation.

The relationship between water and nuclear is complex. A January 23rd Associated Press article titled "Drought Could Close Nuclear Power Plants" cited drought-related shutdowns in the southeast U.S.

In Europe, climate change is rendering nuclear plants unusable because source water temperatures have gotten too high to cool reactors. Miami-Dade County is a high-risk drought zone. Climate change threatens severe water temperature rises and sea level rise within the next decade during which this project will still be under construction.

The simple fact is nuclear expansion at Turkey Point is not the most reliable, most cost-efficient or the right choice for Florida as we face a recession, drought and climate change impacts.

Florida Power & Light has not performed their due diligence. MidAmerican invested \$13 million of research before cancelling its plants. Florida Power has not addressed the most basic issues regarding cost, feasibility and water before coming to you today. Instead, they await your approval so that risky investments into due diligence can be done on the ratepayer's dime while Florida Power & Light earns interest. I ask you, if Warren Buffett can't find a way to make this economically viable, are you really willing to give that risk to Florida's ratepayers and citizens? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Would you get the handouts

now and then just, and come back just in case there's some 1 questions, please? And it's wonderful to see you again. 2 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Mr. Chair? 3 CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized, Commissioner. 4 5 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Just a question. proper at this time to ask staff a question? 6 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Sure. Yes, Commissioner, you're 7 recognized. 8 9 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. I've heard many times -- two different -- two questions, please. I've heard 10 many times now that Germany was decommissioning its nuclear 11 power plants. Does staff have -- has staff done any research 12 on this and is there any knowledge as to why, if they are 13 decommissioning their plants, why they are decommissioning the 14 plants? I think that's an important issue, and staff may be 15 able to address that. 16 17 Second question --CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on a second, Commissioner. 18 They're having trouble hearing you. Let me Hang on a second. 19 get this first one out and I'll repeat it for staff. 20 21 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Sorry. CHAIRMAN CARTER: The question was Commissioner 22 Argenziano has heard this about Germany decommissioning its 23

nuclear power plants, and what she wants to know is whether or

not we have any information on that, do we have any

24

documentation to that effect, on Germany's decommissioning of their nuclear power plants?

MR. BALLINGER: I don't believe so.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Nuclear power plants. It sounds like I'm from Texas.

MR. BALLINGER: I don't believe so.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Say again, Mr. Ballinger.

MR. BALLINGER: I'm sorry. This is Tom Ballinger with Commission staff. I don't believe we have information on Germany's decommissioning efforts.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Is it too much to ask if we can find out if that's true or not? I'd like to know. I think it seems to be an equation in the discussion and I'd like to know.

And also if there are -- do we have an idea -- the young lady who just spoke, I remember her speaking in Miami. Is there an idea -- I mean, when we do have to consider costs, do we know where the water source is going to come from and if the costs are factored into that in expanding the Turkey Point plant? I mean, that's, that's a good point. And I'd like to know if we have determined yet where the water would be coming from and what cost it would be to get the water to that point?

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you, Commissioner.

Did you guys hear the question about the water? 1 was asking about the --2 3 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. My voice is just not working. 4 CHAIRMAN CARTER: That's okay. I'm pleased as punch 5 to repeat it. 6 Did you guys hear that? Mr. Ballinger? 7 8 MR. BALLINGER: Commissioner Argenziano, this is Tom Ballinger again. I apologize. I was writing down what I need 9 to do for decommissioning and I missed the question. Was it 10 about the water supply for this project? 11 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Yes, for the plant. 12 13 young lady who spoke basically made a point that we have to 14 take into consideration all costs. And, of course, the water and getting it to the expansion, to the plant would be part of 15 the cost. And I think that's something that I would need to 16 17 know to make a decision since the statute does indicate that costs are essential in looking at the project. 18 MR. BALLINGER: I believe some of that is included in 19 some of the discovery that we got. 20 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Is it -- are the 21 calculations included also? 22 MR. BALLINGER: I'm going from memory. I believe 23 there was an interrogatory to estimating the cost of different 24

water supply technologies.

1 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: So then the cost, the cost 2 that we will be looking at will have the total cost factored in 3 to the expansion of the plant? 4 MR. BALLINGER: I believe so. 5 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. Thank you. 6 MR. BALLINGER: And that will be, that will be a 7 subject of cross-examination. 8 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. Thank you. 9 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Also, Commissioner, as we get into 10 the technical portion, if there's any of the witnesses that are on the stand that are testifying for specific areas of 11 expertise, if we have any questions, we can ask them or, and 12 13 have them to go further or ask for additional information on that. 14 15 MR. LITCHFIELD: And, Chairman Carter, I would offer Mr. Steven Scroggs appearing on behalf of FPL for both of 16 17 Commissioner Argenziano's questions. CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner, were you able to hear 18 19 that? Steven Scroggs. 20 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Yes, I was. I just want to 21 make sure that, you know, when you have public testimony, that they bring up points, that we address those. And I definitely 22 want to find out if they're correct or if they need to be 23

looked at or if they're not correct. Or, you know, if they are

correct, let's check out why. And I will ask Mr. Scroggs at

24

the appropriate time also. 1 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner. 2 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Scroggs. I'm sorry. Thank 3 4 you. 5 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Not a problem. Not a problem. Thank you for your questions. 6 7 Ms. -- I've drawn a blank here. Ms. Shirreffs, you had some exhibits that you were going to distribute. 8 MS. SHIRREFFS: Yes. 9 CHAIRMAN CARTER: And how many do you have? How many 10 11 copies do you have? 12 MS. SHIRREFFS: It's two full sets. There's four separate documents that I'm submitting, so two full sets of 13 them. 14 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Oh, two full sets. 15 MS. SHIRREFFS: Yeah. When we were in Miami we only 16 17 needed one. CHAIRMAN CARTER: Not a problem. I know you had to 18 make a long trip, and we appreciate you doing that. Let's do 19 this. One stack for the court reporter. Everybody, whether 20 21 you're a party or not, you can get it from the court reporter. Even the Commissioners can do that. Let's do that so we'll at 22 23 least have it on record. 24 And I suppose, could you just, just read the titles

of each one of them so we'll have it in the record?

| 1 | MS. SHIRREFFS: Those documents are a |
|----|---|
| 2 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Because I think you were quoting |
| 3 | from a couple of them, weren't you? |
| 4 | MS. SHIRREFFS: Correct. |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Just read them. |
| 6 | MS. SHIRREFFS: The first one is a January 29th |
| 7 | letter from the Everglades Coalition. |
| 8 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: And excuse me one second. Just so |
| 9 | that we can be procedurally correct, I think we're at Exhibit |
| LO | 93. Is that correct? |
| 11 | MS. BRUBAKER: That's correct. |
| L2 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Exhibit 93. |
| 13 | (Exhibit 93 marked for identification.) |
| L4 | Ms. Shirreffs, you're recognized. |
| L5 | MS. SHIRREFFS: The second document is an |
| L6 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: I'm sorry. Would you again repeat |
| _7 | the first, the title of the first document? |
| L8 | MS. SHIRREFFS: Sure. Sorry. It is a January 29th, |
| L9 | 2008, letter from the Everglades Coalition. |
| 20 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. |
| 21 | MS. SHIRREFFS: The next document is an Environmental |
| 22 | Statement on Nuclear Energy and Global Warming signed by 313 |
| 23 | environmental organizations. |
| 24 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. |
| 25 | MS. SHIRREFFS: The next document is the special |

1 report by Moody's Corporate Finance dated October 2007. 2 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. MS. SHIRREFFS: And the fourth document is the 3 Associated Press article dated January 23rd, 2008, titled 4 5 "Drought Could Close Nuclear Power Plants." 6 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you so kindly, Ms. Shirreffs. 7 Now if you would just hang on for one second; let me see if 8 there are any questions from the parties. And then, 9 Commissioners, we'll come to you and then staff. 10 Any questions from any of the parties? 11 MR. LITCHFIELD: Florida Power & Light has no 12 questions for this witness, but again would note that the 13 articles that she perhaps intends to have admitted into this 14 record are going to be pure hearsay with, with no basis and foundation to be admitted. 15 16 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Duly noted. And what we'll do is 17 as we convene the technical portion, we'll have an opportunity 18 to look at most of these documents so we're going to be fair to all the parties. Okay? 19 20 MR. YOUNG: OUC has no questions of this witness. MS. BROWNLESS: We have no questions, sir. 21 22 CHAIRMAN CARTER: All right. 23 MR. FINKLEA: No questions from FMPA or FMEA. 24 Seminole has no questions. MS. KAUFMAN: 25 MR. BECK: No questions.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Krasowski? 1 MR. KRASOWSKI: We have no questions at this time. 2 We had asked a question of the witness in Miami when she was 3 there. So thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN CARTER: All right. Good deal. Ms. --5 thank you so kindly, Ms. Shirreffs. Thank you for making the 6 7 trip. We had earlier Eric Draper called. But, Eric, have 8 you been sworn? 9 MR. DRAPER: No. 10 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. When you get to the stand, 11 we'll just swear you in. We're kind of backing up there, Ms. 12 13 Brubaker. MS. BRUBAKER: With Mr. Draper, that is everybody I 14 have signed up to speak. 15 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Mr. Draper, if you would 16 approach the place there. And as you're standing, just raise 17 your right hand and I'll be glad to swear you in. 18 (Witness sworn.) 19 You may be seated. You are recognized, sir. 20 FRIC DRAPER 21 appeared as a witness and, swearing to tell the truth, 22 testified as follows: 23 DIRECT STATEMENT 24 Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. MR. DRAPER:

I'm Eric Draper. I'm Deputy Director for Audubon of Florida, a statewide conservation organization with roughly 35,000 members, considerable membership and activities within South Florida; a long-time advocacy organization involved in Everglades restoration issues with a specific highly targeted focus on the area of the Everglades, Biscayne Bay coastal area, in addition to Florida Bay. And in that capacity our organization has long been an advocate of special treatment of the area around Turkey Point, all the lands west of, I'm sorry, east of Carson (phonetic) Road and U.S. 1 are of particular concern to us. Recognizing that's not a basis for your consideration today, I just wanted to, to say that that's why Audubon particularly has a very special interest in the location of additional generation capacity in that particular area.

We have long requested from FP&L, Florida

Power & Light that they look at using their land holdings there
and their activities there as a way to support and advance

Everglades restoration activities so that we can restore a

sheet flow of water across that land into the Biscayne Bay area
helping to restore Biscayne Bay.

That said, I think that the -- I have sent you a letter previously and you should have that in your record dated January 14th regarding this same issue. I won't go through all of the points of the letter. I think that the main thesis of

the points that we want to make today is that you have a responsibility, I think, in finding the need for additional generation to look at whether or not alternative means of reaching the same goals are being met, and I just wanted to touch on those points.

1.0

So you have -- in determining the need for additional electric generation to meet the demands you should be concerned with investment not just in new generation capacity but in demand reduction efficiency and energy conservation. And we would encourage you if in lieu of, if not concurrent with consideration of applications for new need, that you look according to Florida Statutes 403.519 to the need for adequate electric, adequate electricity to reasonable costs, whether renewable sources and technologies, as well as conservation measures are utilized to the extent reasonably available.

And what we would encourage you to do in the context of looking at this plant which would have these additional generating facilities which would have such a tremendous impact in the Everglades and would require a considerable amount of water use is that you look at whether or not the applicant has done everything necessary, available to reduce demand in that region as you're considering the need for the additional demand.

It's our conclusion, having looked at the conservation activities, the demand-side reduction activities

engaged in by all the investor-owned utilities and specifically with FPL, that much more could be done. I think that this is also a finding of the Governor's energy commission, I'm sorry, the Florida Energy Commission that recently met. And if you look at their findings, you can see that there's a recommendation not only that more be done in terms of demand-side management and energy conservation in looking at renewables and energy efficiency, but actually made recommendations about changing the RIM test, which I know that you can't do by yourself, you would need some amount of legislative authority. We would anticipate, and certainly we're going to go to the Legislature this year even though it was not one of the legislative recommendations of the Florida Energy Commission, and ask that they look at the rate structure as a way to accomplish more conservation, utility-funded and ratepayer-financed conservation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now while that is not in place right now and I'm not sure whether legally you can require that to be done at this point, we certainly think it's something that as you're looking at this additional need, you know, you should anticipate that something is going to be done from a policy point of view, and the Public Service Commission should probably push that along in terms of, you know, changing the test, the rate test to encourage more conservation. That coupled with the utility itself making the determination that they could accomplish a

significant amount of conservation, therefore, would not need as much additional generation if they did, that should be, should factor into your, your thoughts on this.

Just taking that further, the Governor's action team, the Climate Action Team in their report said, "It should be recognized that under Florida's current utility rate structure for investor-owned utilities, additional energy efficiency conservation measures may have a negative financial impact for utilities; however, historically utility rate structures encourage the sale of power. Florida should examine alternative rate structures that might provide a more realistic economic basis for utilities to implement viable climate change policies without harming return on the investment."

Now with regard to this generation, it clearly doesn't have a climate, you know, the operation doesn't have a climate impact that we know of. There still is an argument for using this point of the require, of the request for additional generation capacity to basically encourage the utility to go back and look first at conservation activities as a way to reduce need as opposed to just claiming the additional need.

I think I'll wrap up there. That's the best I can do.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you. Hold on. Don't go away though. Let me kind of reverse the order and ask the Commissioners first if you have any questions. I know that we

want to do that. Let's just do that before we ask the parties.

Any Commissioners? Commissioner Edgar, you're recognized.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll try to get a question in here, but maybe a brief comment. So I'd note the letter that you referenced that you had sent to us earlier, and I believe that that has been placed in the docket file and is available to, to everyone.

You mentioned the recommendation of the energy commission and also of the action team, and I am familiar with both of those. And I think that the way each of those recommendations, in my mind, are worded is, is asking for, as I think you pointed out, additional examination and analysis, and that is something that I know that I welcome.

I'd point out that this Commission had a workshop to try to begin some of that discussion here in this forum, and I personally was a little disappointed at the level of participation that we had. So I would once again just give a plug for everyone to please participate as we within our role try to look at what alternatives may or may not be possible and how that flows into the legislative discussions as well. So that was my comment.

Very briefly a question, which was right there at the end of your comments, Eric, I think you were asking us to, to look a bit beyond or consider some of the issues that go beyond the more narrow scope of the need determination. But, quite

frankly, I wasn't sure I got your last point. So if you could maybe just repeat that for me.

MR. DRAPER: Yeah. And I apologize. I'm serving on the state's Strategic Advocates Task Force which is meeting right now, so I rushed over here to get this. And I feel a little disorganized and less than coherent in my comments.

So the point that I'm trying to make is that, is that you -- while in your need determination decision-making that you are granted the statutory authority to look at this question about whether or not enough has been done to, to, through conservation. I was just saying that the, the Governor's Climate Action Team, the Florida Energy Commission and just common sense tells us that to the degree that you can possible in this need determination hearing, that you should look at whether or not Florida Power & Light has done everything necessary to invest in, to anticipate using conservation as a way to reduce need before you actually approve a finding of additional need related to these.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. And thank you for your participation. And I know we all understand needing to be in two places at once. So thank you for joining us.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Draper. Would you hang on for one second there. And, again, thank you for -- I mean, don't go away. Don't go away. We may have some questions for you from the parties. But I do want to say even

though you may think that you were kind of harried, we 1 2 understood exactly what you were saying. You did a good 3 presentation. Any questions from the parties? 4 5 MR. LITCHFIELD: No, sir. MR. YOUNG: No questions from OUC. 6 7 MS. BROWNLESS: No, sir. 8 MR. FINKLEA: No, sir. 9 MS. KAUFMAN: No questions. 10 MR. KRASOWSKI: A couple of quick questions, please. 11 CROSS EXAMINATION 12 BY MR. KRASOWSKI: 13 Mr. Draper, as I've asked all the other witnesses, 14 and I think you've addressed this, but could you tell me if 15 you're being paid by anyone to be here today? 16 Well, I'm an employee of the National Audubon 17 Society. 18 Okay. Thank you. And as, for a point of clarification, I believe I heard you say that this plant has no 19 climate impact. Could you, could you straighten me out on 20 that? Do you believe that? 21 I'm glad you asked me, allowed me to clarify 22 Α Yeah. I think that I corrected even as I was making that 23 24 statement that it, it is not apparent, that climate impact.

other words, this plant is a nuclear generation facility. It's

25

our understanding, therefore, it would not be producing carbon emissions.

Now there are other, there may be other carbon -- I mean, there may be other issues associated with climate change associated with the plant. But in the traditional sense of climate greenhouse gases, I don't think so.

Now I do, would acknowledge that the construction of the plant, there's a carbon footprint involved just in the activity of going out and building any kind of facility. There probably is some greenhouse gas/climate change issue there.

But I was not making -- I was trying to make a point to, to make a distinction between the recommendation that the Governor's Climate Action Team had made which was oriented around climate change and was saying that was not relevant here. What was relevant from the recommendation of the Climate Action Team was that more needs to be done in terms of conservation.

Q And one, one last question. The Florida Audubon Society and National Audubon Society is a large, well-respected organization with, with many resources. Is there a reason why you're not represented here legally in this case today as an intervenor?

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Krasowski, I give you a lot of leeway, but I think that's an inappropriate question.

MR. KRASOWSKI: I'll withdraw the question, sir.

Sorry. My apologies.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Good. Okay. That's -- we know the Audubon Society is a well-respected organization, and whether they choose to participate officially or not is not relevant. They're here today and that's what we have before us. So I'm not going to allow that question.

Staff, do you have any questions?

MS. BRUBAKER: No questions.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Draper.

MR. DRAPER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Brubaker.

MS. BRUBAKER: At this time staff has no other persons signed up to speak. Perhaps we might poll the room.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Let me ask this before -- are there -- is there anyone that came in after we swore all the witnesses in that wanted to participate for -- part of the public to testify in this matter before we go into our technical hearing, just in case? We don't want to -- we want to hear from -- okay. Hearing none, let's do this.

Let's, Commissioners, what I'd like to do is take a moment before we go into our technical portion of our hearing. So I'm looking at the clock, this time I'm actually looking at it, and I see 10:33. Is that correct? Close to it? The clock I'm using says 10:33, so that's the clock we're going by today. Okay? And we'll come back about -- staff, what do you need, 15

minutes?

MS. BRUBAKER: I think that would be fine, sir.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Fifteen minutes. Let me do the math here. This is high level stuff here. It would be 10:48. We are on recess.

(Recess taken.)

Okay. We are back on the record with our matter that's before us today. And as we get going, I'm going to look to staff to kind of get us going as we begin our -- I'd like to convene our technical hearing and the preliminary matters.

Ms. Fleming, you're recognized.

MS. FLEMING: Good morning, Chairman and Commissioners. There's several preliminary matters to address. As far as the first preliminary matter staff recommends be taken up, there is a proposed stipulation to Issue 7 between FPL, FMEA, FMPA, OUC, JEA and Seminole. It is my understanding Mr. Krasowski and OPC are not parties to the stipulation. We recommend that the stipulation language that has been handed out be identified as the next hearing exhibit, which would be Exhibit 94.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Exhibit 94. Okay.

(Exhibit 94 marked for identification.)

MS. FLEMING: And at the appropriate time we would ask that this exhibit be moved into the record.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Let's get in our posture on

this so we can move forward and then dispose of other matters. 1 I know it may, because it relates to Issue 7 it also 2 relates to some of our preliminary matters, so let's just kind 3 of take this up now then. 4 MS. FLEMING: That's correct. And as far as -- it is 5 staff's understanding that this stipulation on Issue 7 would 6 7 render moot the motions for reconsideration that have been filed by JEA, Seminole and FPL. 8 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Let's do this. Let me hear 9 from the parties. Is this correct, starting with FPL? 10 11 MR. LITCHFIELD: Yes, Chairman Carter. Ms. Fleming has accurately characterized our position on this. We have 12 reached stipulation with the parties. We think it does resolve 13 the issues. And we would, if the Commission accepts this 14 15 stipulation, move for Exhibit 94 to be entered into the record. 16 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. 17 MR. YOUNG: OUC agrees with the staff recommendation and would likewise agree with the suggestion made by Florida 18 19 Power & Light. 2.0 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Brownless. 21 MS. BROWNLESS: Yes, sir. JEA accepts the stipulation and agrees with the representations made. 22 Excellent. CHAIRMAN CARTER: 23 MS. KAUFMAN: And --24 MR. FINKLEA: And FMPA --25

| 1 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: In stereo. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. FINKLEA: FMPA and FMEA are also in agreement |
| 3 | with the stipulation and in agreement with staff's |
| 4 | characterization of the procedure. |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Ms. Kaufman. |
| 6 | MS. KAUFMAN: And last but not least, Seminole agrees |
| 7 | as well. We agree with the stipulation and that it would |
| 8 | render all the pending motions for reconsideration moot, with |
| 9 | the exception of Mr. Krasowski's. |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. They're not Mr. Krasowski |
| 11 | and OPC are not party to this; right? |
| 12 | MR. KRASOWSKI: Correct. |
| 13 | MR. BECK: Yes. |
| 14 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Good. So, staff, have you |
| 15 | had an opportunity to review this? |
| 16 | MS. FLEMING: Yes. Staff has had an opportunity to |
| 17 | review this and staff recommends that the Commission approve |
| 18 | this stipulation. |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioners, would you take a |
| 20 | moment to kind of look this over? And at the appropriate time |
| 21 | I'll open for a motion. |
| 22 | COMMISSIONER SKOP: Make the motion. |
| 23 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Skop, you're |
| 24 | recognized. |
| 25 | COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Chairman Carter. |

| 1 | Based on the stipulation of the parties to issue 7, 1'd |
|-----|--|
| 2 | recommend the Commission approve the proposed stipulation as |
| 3 | presented herein. |
| 4 | COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Second. |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Seconded, moved and properly |
| 6 | seconded. Commissioners, any questions? |
| 7 | Hearing none, all those in favor, let it be known by |
| 8 | the sign of aye. |
| 9 | (Unanimous affirmative vote.) |
| 1.0 | Those opposed, like sign. |
| 11 | Show it done. |
| 12 | Next preliminary matters. |
| 13 | MS. FLEMING: Commissioners, if I may, it's my |
| 14 | understanding that the parties that were part of the |
| L5 | stipulation will ask to be excused from this proceeding. |
| L6 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Show it done. |
| L7 | MS. FLEMING: Except for FPL, of course. |
| L8 | (Laughter.) |
| L9 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Let the record reflect it's done. |
| 20 | Show it done. |
| 21 | Our next preliminary matter. |
| 22 | MS. BRUBAKER: Actually if I could also interject |
| 23 | just briefly. |
| 24 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Brubaker, you're recognized. |
| 25 | MS. BRUBAKER: Just for clarification of the record, |

| | ii ee e |
|----|---|
| 1 | Issue 7 remains itself a live issue so that FPL, OPC, |
| 2 | Mr. Krasowski and staff can address that issue. |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. And the language will be |
| 4 | part of the record. |
| 5 | MS. BRUBAKER: That's correct. |
| 6 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: It will be entered into part of the |
| 7 | record as a stipulation. Okay. But the parties to the |
| 8 | agreement other than FPL are released. Thank you so kindly. |
| 9 | Our next preliminary matter. |
| 10 | MS. FLEMING: Chairman, there is a motion for |
| 11 | reconsideration and request for oral argument that was filed by |
| 12 | Mr. Krasowski. Staff understands that Mr. Krasowski intends to |
| 13 | withdraw the motion for reconsideration, but I'll allow I |
| 14 | would ask Mr. Krasowski to address that, please. |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Krasowski, you're recognized. |
| 16 | MR. KRASOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, thank you. It is our |
| 17 | intention to withdraw the motion for reconsideration and the |
| 18 | accompanying requests for oral argument. We apologize. Our |
| 19 | understanding of the process was not accurate. Our issue with, |
| 20 | on this subject is addressed within the docket and, as a matter |
| 21 | of fact, it relates to number seven that's being discussed now. |
| 22 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Good deal. |
| 23 | MR. KRASOWSKI: And we had thought that a complete |
| 24 | application was required before the proceeding, and now we |

understand this is the proceeding to determine whether or not

25

that application is going to be --

1.7

CHAIRMAN CARTER: That is correct.

MR. KRASOWSKI: So thank you very much. Our humble apologies to everyone.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you, and show it done.

And let's move to further preliminary matters, staff.

MS. FLEMING: And at this time I'd like to address exhibits. Staff has prepared a Comprehensive Exhibit List, which is identified as Exhibit Number 14, and staff has a Composite Stipulated Exhibit, which is identified as Exhibit Number 15. At this time staff would ask that Exhibits 14 -- well, excuse me. Let me backtrack.

Exhibits 1 through 13 pertain to exhibits that were provided at the service hearing, at the Miami service hearing for public testimony.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on a second. They are identified, they are marked on the exhibit list for identification purposes only just so that the parties understand. It's primarily, it's for identification purposes.

MS. FLEMING: That's correct. And the list also includes all the prefiled exhibits as well so that when the witnesses take the stand we can take those up in turn.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: And this document, Exhibit 14, is actually staff's list of the prefiled documents during the hearing in Miami and then also the documents that have been

filed by the parties. Is that -- that's correct? 1 MS. FLEMING: That's correct. 2 CHAIRMAN CARTER: So what staff is really saying at 3 this point in time is to accept the exhibit list, Exhibit 14, 4 which is actually the composite exhibit list. Are we clear on 5 that? Clear as mud; right? Is that right? 6 MS. FLEMING: I'm getting little looks from FPL. 7 To make it clear, Exhibit 14 is the Comprehensive Exhibit List, 8 which includes the exhibits from the service hearing, the 9 prefiled testimony, as well as any exhibits we've had raised or 10 submitted this morning. Generally it's identified as Exhibit 11 Number 1. But since we had a service hearing in this docket, 12 13 it's Exhibit Number 14. MR. BUTLER: You're only moving the exhibit itself. 14 MS. FLEMING: At this point we're asking to move in 15 the exhibit list, and then we can address --16 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Just the exhibit list, just the 17 exhibit list itself. 18 MR. LITCHFIELD: No objection. 19 MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman? 20 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Yes, sir. 21 MR. YOUNG: Hector Sanchez is a Florida Power & Light 22 witness, and I believe that everyone agreed that he could be 23 excused other than OUC. And based on the action taken just 24 recently, we would also agree that he could be excused from the 25

hearing. 7 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. So all the other parties 2 3 have already agreed, it just was OUC. Commissioners, is there any reason why Mr. Sanchez should -- okay. Show it done. 4 Thank you so kindly. Appreciate that. 5 MR. YOUNG: Thank you. 6 7 CHAIRMAN CARTER: We just -- Mr. Krasowski and Mr. Beck, what we had done was we explained to FPL that the 8 list presented here as Exhibit 14 is just the list of exhibits. 9 We're not saying that the exhibits are entered or anything, 10 just the list. So any objections or any --11 12 MR. BECK: No objection from OPC. MR. KRASOWSKI: We have no objections. 13 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Show it done. Thank you 14 kindly. 15 (Exhibit 14 marked for identification and admitted 16 17 into evidence.) All righty. Let's take a moment to kind of give 18 everybody a chance to get settled in and we'll begin with 19

opening statements in fairly short order.

MS. KAUFMAN: Mr. Chairman?

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Yes, ma'am, Ms. Kaufman.

MS. KAUFMAN: I wondered if it would be appropriate to move Exhibit 94, which is the stipulation that you all just voted on.

| 1 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. I see. When you say move |
|----|--|
| 2 | materials, you're saying if I'm going to leave, I want to make |
| 3 | sure that my document that makes sense. Ms. Fleming. |
| 4 | MS. FLEMING: If I may before we get to Exhibit 94, |
| 5 | staff would request that the stipulated exhibit, staff's |
| 6 | stipulated Exhibit Number 15 be moved into the record. |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Staff exhibit. |
| 8 | MR. LITCHFIELD: No objection. |
| 9 | MR. YOUNG: No objection. |
| 10 | MS. BROWNLESS: No objection, sir. |
| 11 | MR. BECK: No objection. |
| 12 | MS. KAUFMAN: No objection. |
| 13 | MR. KRASOWSKI: No objection. |
| 14 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Show it done. |
| 15 | (Exhibit 15 marked for identification and admitted |
| 16 | into evidence.) |
| 17 | MS. FLEMING: And at this point it may be appropriate |
| 18 | to discuss the Exhibits 1 through 13 from the Miami service |
| 19 | hearing as well as Exhibits 91 through 93 that were submitted |
| 20 | during public testimony today. |
| 21 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: 91 through 94? No. 91 through 93. |
| 22 | MS. FLEMING: 91 through 93, just the public |
| 23 | testimony. |
| 24 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Because 94 is the agreement that |
| 25 | Ms. Kaufman just raised for us here. |

Okay. Let's hear from FPL.

MR. LITCHFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

From FPL's standpoint, we recognize that there are two phases to this hearing and that one involves receiving input from the public, which is certainly within the purview of this Commission and I think an appropriate public policy initiative.

The drawback from our standpoint, however, is that a number of the articles and publications that are offered by members of the public who show up at the hearing really is nothing more from an evidentiary standpoint than pure hearsay. It's not sworn testimony, we really don't have an opportunity to cross-examine the authors of those articles, there's no real showing that the authors themselves are experts in the fields for which the subject matter is offered and so on and so forth. So we have a little bit of difficulty with that. Having said that, we recognize the special place that that part of the process has in the overall framework of the hearing. We feel as though we have the witnesses here that can respond to questions from the Commission to the extent that they came up during the public portion of the hearing.

I would note that many of the subjects that, that came up during this morning's public hearing and the Miami edition of the public hearing are largely outside the scope of the proceeding that this Commission is going to be deciding and

relate more properly to other matters that may be before other 1 agencies. So there's that issue as well. 2 So having said all of that, we're not going to object 3 to the materials going in. We recognize that the appropriate 4 weight will be given those materials. 5 Thank you very kindly. We, we do, CHAIRMAN CARTER: 6 in our republic we do value citizen input and public input, and 7 the ratepayers as well as the citizens that are within the 8 confines of the area. And you're right, Mr. Litchfield, we'll 9 give it the appropriate weight that's required. 10 Any objections? There was none by FPL. Are there 11 any objections about any of the exhibits that were presented by 12 the, during our public testimony portion? Any objections? 13 MS. BROWNLESS: No, sir. 14 15 MR. BECK: No objection. MR. KRASOWSKI: No objections. 16 17 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Show it done. (Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18 91, 92 and 93 admitted into evidence.) 19 Ms. Fleming, you're recognized. 20 MS. FLEMING: And that would lead us to Exhibit 94. 21 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Exhibit 94. 22 And staff would recommend that we move MS. FLEMING: 23 this into the record. 24 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Which is the stipulation of the 25

| 1 | parties and also it's been approved by the Commissioners. So I |
|----|--|
| 2 | suppose out of courtesy I'll just ask if there are any |
| 3 | objections. |
| 4 | MR. BUTLER: No. |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: But I don't think there would be. |
| 6 | MR. KRASOWSKI: No objection. |
| 7 | Mr. Chairman, can I ask a question? |
| 8 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized for a question. |
| 9 | MR. KRASOWSKI: Thank you. I appreciate it. |
| 10 | In regards to the public testimony of Mr. Hansen, |
| 11 | Mr. Hansen's work that was represented is his own. So FPL had |
| 12 | an opportunity to |
| 13 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Let's don't do that, Mr. Krasowski. |
| 14 | MR. KRASOWSKI: Okay. |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: We'll give it the appropriate |
| 16 | weight. |
| 17 | MR. KRASOWSKI: The appropriate weight. Yes. That's |
| 18 | what my question was about. |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: All right. |
| 20 | MR. KRASOWSKI: Thank you. |
| 21 | CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hearing no objections, Exhibit |
| 22 | Number 94 entered into the record. |
| 23 | (Exhibit 94 admitted into evidence.) |
| 24 | MS. FLEMING: And now I'm not aware of any other |
| 25 | preliminary matters. |

CHAIRMAN CARTER: No other preliminary matters. 1 Okay. Now let's get ourselves together because we're getting 2 ready to go for our formal opening statements and all. And the 3 parties that have been excused, you can take a moment. 4 MS. BROWNLESS: Thank you. 5 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Let's -- I've got 11:06 on the 6 clock here. We'll reconvene at 11:11. 7 (Recess taken.) 8 Okay. We're back on the record in our proceeding. 9 And it's just come to my attention we've got another 10 11 preliminary matter before we go forward with our opening 12 statements. Ms. Fleming, you're recognized. 13 MS. FLEMING: That's correct. During the break I had 14 15 an opportunity to speak with FPL, and they would like to introduce the notice of publication as Exhibit Number 95. 16 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Number 95. 17 MS. FLEMING: And ask that it be moved into the 18 record at this time. 19 CHAIRMAN CARTER: No objection? I know that you guys 20 have provided it to her, but this is a formality. So show it 21 done. This will be Exhibit 95, the proof of publication. 22 (Exhibit 95 marked for identification and admitted 23 into evidence.) 24

Ms. Fleming.

25

MS. FLEMING: And FPL would also like to identify the 1 Need Study and Appendices as Exhibit 96. 2 CHAIRMAN CARTER: One second. Let me write my notes 3 4 here. Exhibit 96 will be the Need Study. 5 (Exhibit 96 marked for identification.) MS. FLEMING: And we would recommend as far as that 6 7 exhibit be moved into the record after the witnesses that 8 address the Need Study and Appendices are heard. CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Commissioners, so that we're 9 all on the same page, Exhibit 95, proof of publication, is into 10 the record. Exhibit 96, the Need Study, is marked for 11 12 identification and it'll be presented at a later point in time for introduction. 13 With that, Ms. Fleming, do we have any other 14 preliminary matters? 15 MS. FLEMING: I'm not aware of any more. 1.6 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Hearing none --17 Commissioners, any preliminary matters? Hearing none, let's --18 we shall proceed with our opening statements. And that is ten 19 20 minutes per party; correct? 21 MS. FLEMING: That's correct. 22 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Mr. Litchfield, you're 23 recognized. 24 MR. LITCHFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 25 We have distributed during the break a set of four

slides that I'll be referring to during the course of my opening statement.

This is an historic opportunity for this Commission, for Florida Power & Light Company and for the State of Florida, as today we take the first step toward preserving nuclear generation as an important potential baseload resource option, a choice that would bring many benefits to FPL's customers in the State of Florida, including a diversification of fuel mix, less reliance on fossil fuels and reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.

Cost structures for generating resources are changing. Natural gas and oil prices have increased both in absolute terms and in their volatility. Concerns about continued supply reliability of such fuels delivered into the state also have manifest, particularly in the event of severe storm events or other possible supply disruptions, and fuel diversity, therefore, has become increasingly important.

Collectively also our consciousness of the potential impact of greenhouse gases on our environment has certainly sharpened. We look to Europe and we see some countries with as much as 80 percent of their power supplied by nuclear, while here in the United States we generate no more than 20 percent of our power through this same source.

FPL's resource need leading up to the anticipated in-service dates of the proposed nuclear units is immense. Now

as you know, FPL's conservation and demand-side management efforts are industry leading. But despite these efforts, we anticipate that we will need approximately 6,200 additional megawatts of power supplied by 2020. That's more load than the vast majority of utilities in this country serve today. As FPL's total load grows, so too does the need for additional generating resources that can run cost-effectively around the clock, something that is often referred to as a baseload option. And nuclear power is that backbone for Florida Power & Light Company's system, providing safe and continuous low-cost energy 24/7. But if we do not initiate steps today to preserve new nuclear as an option, the relative contribution of nuclear on our system will drop from 21 percent to 16 percent by 2021 and, conversely, the contribution of gas could increase to as much as 75 percent.

1.5

Now the sheer magnitude of FPL's resource needs also demonstrates another key point, and that is that Turkey

Point 6 and 7 will only be a part of the solution. And I would refer you to the first graphic in your, in your package there.

And as you can see on this chart, what shows on the one side,

FPL's resource needs, and on the other side, known resource additions, there is a significant gap. We will need nearly

4,000 megawatts of additional resources over and above the addition of Turkey Point 6 and 7. And this means that there is plenty of room within FPL's portfolio for additional

renewables, more cost-effective conservation and demand-side management.

Now some will contend that renewable energy and conservation programs can defer or even displace the need for new baseload generating capacity such as nuclear, and this is simply not the case. Renewables and conservation do occupy a very important place in our resource portfolio today and will continue to do so, but most of these resources are just not capable of providing needed baseload capacity in any material amounts.

Now I'll refer you to the next graphic in your packet there, and this is simply a checklist that shows the additional benefits illustrated throughout the testimony in this case, including enhanced fuel diversity, reduced reliance on natural gas, reduced greenhouse gas emissions and compliance costs, low and stable fuel costs, and overall system reliability and integrity, in addition to the baseload benefits that I mentioned earlier. These are all criteria relative to this proceeding and the determination of need.

I'll refer you to the next graphic, which is RS-2. This is out of Mr. Silva's testimony. And as he depicts, relative to building a comparable amount of gas-fired generation, these nuclear units will increase our share of nuclear generation from about 16 percent to about 27 percent and will also significantly reduce FPL's share of gas

generation.

Another significant point: FPL's existing nuclear fleet has already helped FPL to avoid over 500 million tons of carbon dioxide emissions since 1972, and the addition of Turkey Point 6 and 7 will result in the additional displacement of hundreds of millions of tons of CO2.

Now I'll refer you to the last of the graphics in your package. As illustrated in this exhibit sponsored by Mr. Kosky on behalf of FPL, new nuclear generation is essential if we are to meet any meaningful CO2 reduction goals such as those that have been articulated by Governor Crist. As Mr. Kosky will demonstrate and as this graphic shows, the addition of these two units alone would contribute 76 percent of the actual reductions required by Florida Power & Light to meet such targets in 2021. There is no other resource option that can achieve such reductions.

Now in addition to all of these benefits under a broad range of fuel and environmental cost compliance scenarios, FPL Witness Sim and others will show that Turkey Point 6 and 7 also represents the most cost-effective source of power based on current projections.

Now it is important to keep in mind that the continued feasibility of this project will be evaluated on an annual basis in proceedings contemplated by the Commission's Nuclear Power Plant Cost Recovery Rule. This annual step-wise

approach does recognize the unique character of new nuclear generation, the lengthy development schedule and the licensing process involved, and the many uncertainties that will be related to this project.

Now this approach to the development of potential new nuclear here in Florida is intended to be very different; different relative to the more recent experience in developing fossil-fueled options and different relative to the approach taken in the last round of nuclear expansion.

I'll mention one unique aspect of this project already is the need to make significant financial commitments for certain long-lead procurement items such as heavy forgings in order to obtain and maintain a spot in manufacturers' queues.

We have asked the Commission in this docket to approve the need for us to make such a commitment, not because it is a conventional or a necessary part of past need proceedings for fossil units, but because it is a necessary decision to allow us to take steps intended to preserve the projected in-service dates for these units and because the first annual cost recovery proceeding will not be completed before that commitment has to be made. It is simply a question of timing and there is no other available docket. The amount of that commitment, however, would be subject to the Commission's prudence review in a subsequent annual proceeding.

Nuclear generation provides today the country with an exceptionally attractive source of power providing a safe and steady stream of low-cost, reliable energy. But the path of the last generation of nuclear construction was anything but smooth. As FPL Witness Reed will testify, the regulatory and permitting processes in general were lengthy, extremely adversarial and in some cases highly politicized, resulting in enormous disallowances and destroying significant shareholder value. Florida's experience, I would note, was significantly better than the national experience overall.

Nevertheless, the national experience in combination with relatively low-cost fuel-fired generation, fossil fuel-fired generation at the time, options that are far easier to permit and to construct, has effectively resulted in a hiatus of nearly 30 years since an order was placed for a nuclear power plant in the United States and nearly 25 years since the last nuclear power plant was completed in Florida.

But conditions are changing at the federal level, and here in the State of Florida we have seen public policy move steadily to a position that favors nuclear. Legislation supportive of nuclear has been passed both by Congress and the Florida Legislature, Governor Crist and members of his Cabinet have individually expressed support for nuclear, and this Commission has taken steps intended to promote the development of this resource option specifically by adopting the Nuclear

Cost Recovery Rule. We will need this Commission's strong support throughout this entire process.

An affirmative, an affirmative determination of need that merely recites that this project meets the individual criteria we do not believe will be sufficient to alleviate many of the concerns of the industry and the investment community over a project of such enormous scale and challenge. Explicit and consistent regulatory support will be imperative to the successful development and deployment of new nuclear generation in this state.

We believe, Commissioners, that the petition before you presents the right project at the right time and the right location and to be pursued in the right way, and we urge you to grant the determination of need and to indicate your strong support and commitment for the project and for the framework within which it is to be pursued in order to preserve this important resource option for the benefit of FPL's customers. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Litchfield.

Mr. Beck.

MR. BECK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners.

Good morning.

Section 403.519, Florida Statutes, provides a number of factors the Commission must consider when determining whether there is a need for the two nuclear plants proposed by

Florida Power & Light. Some of those factors are the effect of the proposed plants on system reliability and integrity, the effect on fuel diversity and whether the plants are the most cost-effective source of power available. I'd like to take a few moments to address the issue of whether the plants are the most cost-effective alternative available.

These plants, if built, will be the most expensive power plants ever built in Florida. Cost estimates for two 1,100 megawatt plants range from about \$12 billion to almost \$18 billion, and for two 1,520 megawatt plants the cost estimates range from about \$16 billion to about \$24 billion.

As expensive as these plants are from the customer's perspective, the total cost of these plants includes not only the cost to build the plants, but also the cost of fuel for the plants and the cost of any emission taxes which might come into place during the 40-plus-year-economic lives of the plants.

One of the dilemmas facing the Commission in this case is that you have to make a judgment as to what these costs will be even though you don't know exactly what they are.

Among emission costs carbon taxes present what is perhaps the most difficult issue because there aren't any carbon taxes or cap-and-trade systems in place in Florida or in the United States, but it's widely believed that they will be in place in the not too distant future.

We think the Commission must make its best judgment

about the level of this cost in this case because you can't make a determination about cost-effectiveness of the plants if you don't take this into account.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In the recent Glades coal plant need determination case the Commission never adopted a specific forecast of emission costs. Instead, the Commission determined that Florida Power & Light had failed to demonstrate that the proposed plants were the most cost-effective alternative In making this decision, the Commission cited available. uncertainty associated with future natural gas and coal prices and the uncertainty associated with emerging energy policy decisions at the state and federal level. There is uncertainty about fuel prices and emissions taxes, but that can't stop you from making decisions about the most likely fuel prices and emission costs that will be in place during the lives of these proposed plants. If it did, we'd be frozen in our tracks and the Commission would be unable to make decisions about meeting the energy needs of our citizens. We all have to live with uncertainty in our lives, but we deal with it by making our best judgments about the future and then acting on those judgments.

In this case, Florida Power & Light presents three fuel cost scenarios and four emission cost scenarios for a possibility of 12 different scenarios. FPL claims that they have not selected a most likely scenario out of the many

possibilities they present, but the evidence will show you that their scenarios should not all be given equal weight.

With respect to carbon emission costs, the evidence will show a mild emission cost case, an expected emission cost case, a stringent, and a stringent case provided by a firm specializing in such forecasts, and then there's a fourth scenario more stringent than the stringent case which Florida Power & Light created in this proceeding. We will urge you to use the second scenario, which is the expected scenario, as the scenario to which you should give the greatest weight.

The Commission can take some comfort from the fact that not only is this scenario for emission cost the scenario which the outside firm considered as the expected case, but also from the fact that this same scenario was presented in the Glades coal case. And it compares well with the middle scenario for emission cost that was presented by the Sierra Club and the Natural Resources Defense League in the coal case.

Forecasts of emission costs cut in different directions for a coal plant and a nuclear plant. For coal, the more stringent the scenario, the less likely the coal plant would be the most cost-effective alternative. For nuclear the opposite is true. The more stringent the scenario, the more likely the nuclear plant would be the most cost-effective alternative.

What is good for analyzing the emission costs for a

coal plant should also be good for analyzing the emission costs 1 2 for a nuclear plant. It's our position that you should give 3 greatest weight to the same emission cost projection in this case that we asked you to consider in the Glades case, and that 4 is the emission cost scenario number two. 5 That concludes the opening statement. Thank you, 6 Commissioners. 7 8 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Beck. Mr. Krasowski or Mrs. Krasowski. 9

MR. KRASOWSKI: Good morning. I'm Bob Krasowski for

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Before you get going, you're going to share. So you've got ten minutes. So you're going to do five minutes each, is that the way you're going to do it?

the record, and I will lead off, if I may.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KRASOWSKI: No. Actually I was going to take a few minutes to make our initial statement. But as we proceed, one or the other of us, if it's, if it's okay, would like to cross-examine.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Right now we're just doing the opening statements and you've got ten minutes to state your case.

MR. KRASOWSKI: Yes. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized.

MR. KRASOWSKI: Okay. Good morning once again. Bob Krasowski speaking for Bob and Jan Krasowski, Jan and Bob Krasowski.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We are 27-year residents of Florida. Through the course of our entire lives we have pursued our personal education in environmental and energy-related issues. So being that we fully recognize the seriousness of the matter before you, we would, we would like to say that essentially the reason -- and I apologize for this because my things aren't well-organized. But primarily the reason we're here today is that we are ratepayers with, and customers of FP&L. We have in reading the testimony provided by FP&L come to see that they provide information that contradicts what we have learned through the course of our life in relation to energy opportunities or technologies. And so pretty much the reason we're here is to take advantage of the opportunity to engage their witnesses in cross-examination so that we can draw them out to explain some of the positions they represent so we could have a better understanding of, of what is accurate so as this, as you have the difficult task to make a determination in this case, a full representation, a greater representation of ideas is before you.

In particular, we've noticed comments about CO2 emissions, emissions in general that are associated with, with this project, the cost of the project in relation to alternative options, all of the issues that are identified in the Florida Statute 403.519, these criteria established by the

Legislature that have to be considered before determination of need is allowed or permitted.

1.1

So I'll just leave it with that. It's -- we have an interest in a broad view of, of this issue, this project, and as it moves through the different venues, we plan to monitor it. But we firmly believe that this, some of these issues and positions presented should not pass by the Public Service Commission without an effort to expand the discussion on those issues, and that's what we hope to do here over the next day or two or three. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Krasowski.

And let me kind of lay the lay of the landscape before we swear in the witnesses and get on with our direct. It seemed like a good breaking point before we get started in the next phase of the trial. So, Commissioners, why don't we -- Commissioner Edgar, you're recognized.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wondered if there would be an opportunity to ask, I promise, a brief question of the parties that came up from their opening statement?

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Of course. You're recognized.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you.

Mr. Litchfield, I, I think I heard you say that if this Commission were to approve Issues 1 through 8, that that would not be enough but that more would be needed. And I was

unclear as to what more it is or was that you were asking of this Commission in this proceeding is my first question. And as part of that, I would think if, and I do mean if because I, you know, each of us will listen to all of the testimony and we'll go through the process, but if this Commission were to approve Issues 1 through 8, I would think that that would be a significant policy statement and affirmation of the project as proposed. And so to hear you already say that that would not be enough gives me some concern. And if you could just respond to that. Thank you.

MR. LITCHFIELD: Thank you, Commissioner Edgar. No. It is an excellent question, a very fair question. And I think we're approaching this proceeding -- we recognize, we recognize as well as anyone the size of the investment that is going to be required over the next several years in order to construct and eventually operate this plant. It is going to be enormous, you know, Mr. Beck is right, on all counts.

Now we, we've done need proceedings in the past and more or less the Commission has gone through the list and they have made a decision as to whether it meets those particular criteria. And I think what we're saying -- and I'm not disputing your proposition that, in fact, that would send a very solid signal if you go through that list and you determine that we have met the criteria and it is eligible for determination of need from this Commission. But I think what,

what we're suggesting to you, what our witnesses are suggesting to you in testimony, Mr. Reed in particular who's got extensive knowledge with, regarding the experience of the nuclear construction during the last generation of nuclear expansion, there are some very, very unsettled investors, I think, out there. I think everybody believes that nuclear has to be constructed in this country, I think everybody is willing to move forward on that premise, but I think there is still a tremendous amount of uncertainty out there as to whether these projects can get done given the last round of nuclear expansion and the painful experience that it was for regulators and for companies and for their shareholders.

And so I think what, what we're asking for -- and I don't think we're asking for a supplemental issue. In fact, what we're really asking for is that as you go through this case and as you decide Issues 1 through 8, that to the extent that you can as a matter of policy that you evidence your clear public policy support for nuclear in this state. And I think that can be done within the context of addressing the issues, frankly. So I think -- does that answer your question? I'd be happy to elaborate if I didn't quite cover it.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. Actually it was helpful. And, you know, I may have further comments and questions, but I will hold them to the opportunity as we

proceed through. But thank you for the opportunity. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you, Commissioner Edgar.

Commissioners, any further questions before -- okay. Well, here's what I was thinking from a housekeeping standpoint. And we, we have completed the public portion of our testimony, we've completed the preliminary issues and matters and we've had a good day so far. And I want to have a better day. We want to go -- we wanted to kind of go ahead on and take lunch now and come back in an hour so we can hit the ground running. And my plans are to go until 5:00 today. So if that helps you with your witnesses and their planning times and those of you that are from out of the city and all like that, if that helps you with the planning time, we'll try to work on that.

Commissioners, I hope that that will help you -- I know that a lot of you have got calls to make and things to do in the office and all like that, but I want to be respectful of your time.

So with that, I'm looking at us returning -- this time I'll change to the clock on the wall and we'll come back -- oh, I don't like the clock on the wall. Come back at -- I'm looking at 11:45 now by my watch. So why don't we come back at 12:45 -- I mean, no, no, not -- yeah. 12:45.

That's an hour. Is that right? I'm really struggling with

| 1 | STATE OF FLORIDA) : CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER |
|----|--|
| 2 | COUNTY OF LEON) |
| 3 | |
| 4 | I, LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR, Official Commission Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was |
| 5 | heard at the time and place herein stated. |
| 6 | IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been |
| 7 | transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said |
| 8 | proceedings. |
| 9 | I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative |
| LO | or employee of any of the parties' attorneys or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in |
| L1 | the action. |
| L2 | DATED THIS $3/5t$ day of January, 2008. |
| L3 | Lit below |
| _4 | LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR |
| .5 | FPSC Official Commission Reporter (850) 413-6734 |
| .6 | (000) 110 |
| .7 | |
| .8 | |
| .9 | |
| 10 | |
| :1 | |
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| | |