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1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (Transcript follows in sequence from

3 Volume 3.)

4 CHAIRMAN CARTER: We're back on the record.

5 And when last we left, Mr. McGlothlin, you were on

6 redirect. You're recognized, sir.

7 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Thank you.

8 CONTINUED REDIRECT EXAMINATION

9 BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:

10 Q. Mr. Putman, during his cross-examination

11 Mr. Burnett asked you about some of your comments with

12 respect to the duration of test burns. Do you recall

13 that question and answer?

14 A. I do.

15 Q. What experience do you have with respect to

16 test burns of different coals over time?

17 A. I was involved with several at Plant Barry and

18 at Plant Miller and Plant Gorgas at Alabama Power

19 Company when I was in the operation area there. And I

20 was involved through the fuel procurement business of

21 observing and being involved on the periphery of other

22 test burns at Miller and Scherer for PRB coal.

23 Q. With respect to the test burns of PRB coal

24 prior to the time the Southern Company units began

25 burning 100 percent PRB coal, what length of test burn
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1 was necessary to provide the information necessary to

2 make that judgment?

3 A. Plant Scherer was the first one we burned

4 sub-bituminous coal in in Southern Company, and we went

5 through a test period of less than a week to determine

6 that that was a coal we were very, very interested in.

7 And at Miller it was even less than that, and I was less

8 involved with that because the plant people were so

9 enthused about Scherer's success that they sort of took

10 that and ran with it. But it was also a very short test

11 burn.

12 Q. In your experience, is a test burn of that

13 duration adequate to provide the utility with sufficient

14 evidence, sufficient information to make a decision to

15 purchase quantities and volume?

16 A. If the test burn is successful, if there's not

17 any real problems, then the answer is yes. Obviously it

18 also could provide enough information to decide what you

19 have to do on the next step. But if it's successful,

20 there's not any big issues that come up in that, then

21 you would move on to, to burning the coal on a longer

22 term basis.

23 Q. Have you seen any documents provided to OPC in

24 discovery from Progress Energy that would support your

25 view as to the adequacy of a test burn of that duration
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1 for its purpose?

2 A. I've seen a test report from the 2006, two

3 thousand -- May 2006 test burn. Is that the right date?

4 Yeah. Yes.

5 MR. McGLOTHLIN: We're going to distribute

6 that document at this point. Chairman Carter, may I

7 have a number assigned to this?

8 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Yes, you may, Mr.

9 McGlothlin.

10 Commissioners, for your record that will be

11 Exhibit Number 59. Number 59. Short title,

12 Mr. McGlothlin, recommendation?

13 MR. McGLOTHLIN: PEF Test Burn Data.

14 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Great. Outstanding. PEF

15 Test Burn Data.

16 (Exhibit 59 marked for identification.)

17 You may proceed.

18 BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:

19 Q. Mr. Putman, we've provided you a document that

20 is in two parts. The first part indicates it's

21 Late-Filed Exhibit Number 1 prepared by Jennifer

22 Stenger. Do you see that?

23 A. I do.

24 Q. Do you recall that we requested Progress

25 Energy to provide some information with respect to the
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1 duration of test burns that they had performed?

2 A. Yes. I was there for that deposition.

3 Q. And do you recognize this as the company's

4 response?

5 A. I do.

6 Q. With respect to the length of the test burns

7 by Progress Energy that were provided to us, what do you

8 glean about the duration?

9 A. That they really don't take very long. You

10 can learn an awful lot in a short number of days.

11 Q. The second part of the Exhibit 59 is captioned

12 Crystal River 5 PRB/CAPP Blend, May 2006 Test Report.

13 Do you have that in front of you?

14 A. I have it in front of me.

15 Q. Have you reviewed this document before?

16 A. I have.

17 Q. Do you, do you recognize it to be the document

18 provided to us in response for our desire to see the

19 report prepared by the company after the test burn of a

20 20 percent PRB/CAPP blend at Crystal River?

21 A. I do recognize it as that.

22 Q. Okay. With respect to the duration of that

23 test, do you know how long that test required?

24 A. It was over a three-day period. There was a

25 period of ramping up, there was a period of a whole day
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1 operation and then a period of ramping down over three

2 days.

3 Q. And with respect to the information provided,

4 what is your judgment as to whether the test was

5 successful?

6 A. The document itself declares it to have been

7 successful, and I would agree with that assessment based

8 on the information contained.

9 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Could I have just a moment in

10 place, Chairman Carter?

11 CHAIRMAN CARTER: You may take a moment.

12 (Pause.)

13 BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:

14 Q. I'd direct you to Page 3 of 16 of the

15 document, Mr. Putman.

16 A. I'm there.

17 Q. And if you'll see the last bullet point on

18 Page 3, what does the author indicate with respect to

19 the duration of any subsequent burns that would be

20 needed to thoroughly assess boiler impacts?

21 A. I'll read it. It says, "Upon receipt of a

22 modified air permit to evaluate benefits of a longer

23 burn with sub-bituminous/bituminous blend, this

24 performance burn should be several weeks in duration and

25 conducted on CR4 and CR5 concurrently to allow for a
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1 thorough analysis of long-term impacts on boiler

2 operations and fuel handling system." Then it says,

3 "This would not be a trial per se but rather an extended

4 burn."

5 Q. Now if you'll turn to Page 4 of 16.

6 A. I'm there.

7 Q. Under the caption Next Steps, would you read

8 Items 3 and 4 of the test report?

9 A. Number 3 says, well, the lead-in is, "The

10 following steps are recommended," and number three says,

11 "Conduct several week burn on both units of a

12 sub-bituminous/bituminous coal blend. Selected

13 sub-bituminous coal should be one that has future supply

14 available at a discounted price over current contract

15 coal." And number four, "If extended burn is

16 successful, implement additional improvements as deemed

17 necessary and add sub-bituminous/bituminous coal blend

18 to Crystal River North's fuel portfolio."

19 Q. Based upon what you've read, what is your

20 conclusion with respect to the author's judgment as to

21 the additional test that would be necessary before the

22 unit was ready for purchases of blended coal in

23 commercial quantities?

24 A. I view that they're ready to do that now by,

25 with a, what is called an extended burn. That they
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1 would buy coal, not necessarily under contract, but

2 certainly buy it in commercial quantities and begin to

3 burn this coal on an ongoing basis.

4 Q. Is this test report with respect to the

5 parameters of the report and with respect to

6 recommendations for next steps and the duration of

7 additional extended burns consistent or inconsistent

8 with your own experience and your own recommendations in

9 this regard?

10 A. It is. It follows a good path. It was well

11 laid out, well done, and the result is what I would

12 expect, that it's ready to go.

13 Q. With this test burn in place, would it, would

14 it be relevant to the duration and parameters of test

15 burns of different sub-bituminous coals, sub-bituminous

16 coals other than the specific PRB coal that was tested

17 in blend?

18 A. It would be my view that this test would put

19 you into the same kind of condition shown on that front

20 page that if you were going to burn a different coal

21 that was sub-bituminous in nature in blends with Central

22 APP coal, you'd be talking maybe two days to absolutely

23 verify that that blend matches the original test. But

24 it really would be just a check.

25 Q. Now you were asked several questions about
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1 whether you had undertaken an analysis of the unit

2 itself to gauge whether the proposed blends in your

3 recommendations would have any adverse impacts. Do you

4 recall that?

5 A. I do.

6 Q. And what document did you review when you,

7 when you told Mr. Burnett that you had performed such an

8 analysis?

9 A. It was instruction information sheets from B&W

10 that were provided to Florida Power Corp. at the time

11 about the new units.

12 MR. McGLOTHLIN: And forgive me. Did we

13 accomplish the passing out of that one before the break

14 or do we need to do that now?

15 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Staff?

16 MS. BENNETT: We did not get that finished

17 before the break.

18 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Okay. If I may have a

19 moment.

20 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay.

21 (Pause.)

22 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Thank you for your

23 indulgence. We're going to just change sequence for a

24 moment and take up something that was going to be next.

25 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. You may proceed.
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1 BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:

2 Q. Mr. Putman, on the subject of the potential

3 impact of the sodium content of Spring Creek coal on the

4 operations at Crystal River Units 4 and 5, I believe you

5 indicated in answers to prior questions that when the

6 Vista model takes that into account, there likely would

7 be some quantification of cost associated with sulfur

8 content; is that correct?

9 A. That's correct.

10 Q. In the absence of a thorough Vista analysis,

11 is it possible to discern definitively whether the

12 result of that exercise would alter the place that the

13 Spring Creek coal occupies in terms of the ranking of

14 the western coals in the 2004 RFP?

15 A. Yes. I think I responded that I was a little

16 surprised that Spring Creek coal continued to be number

17 one in the evaluation. It would not have surprised me

18 for Progress Energy to decide, like Scherer did, that

19 maybe those costs were not fully accounted in the

20 evaluation, and that if they were fully accounted for,

21 maybe that would not be the low-cost supplier, in which

22 case they would have hopefully documented that fact,

23 like Plant Scherer did, in their report and then moved

24 on to the next lowest-cost option available of the coals

25 offered to them.
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1 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Turn your mike off there.

2 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Now I think I've got it.

3 BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:

4 Q. If we make the assumption for the purpose of

5 the next question that it's determined that the Vista

6 model when taking into account the sodium content

7 produces a slightly different outcome such that the

8 Spring Creek coal is no longer the number one ranking,

9 does that mean that there's no good alternative

10 available in the 2004 RFP for the purpose of a

11 20/80 blend that could be used at Crystal River 4 and 5

12 in 2006?

13 A. No. There were several coals offered from the

14 Powder River Basin that would then be available as the

15 next best-priced coal before you ever got down to the

16 Central APP coal.

17 Q. And what was the second-ranked bid of those

18 PRB coals?

19 A. The second-ranked coal that was available in

20 2005 and 2006 is one that's listed as from Triton and

21 it's the North Rochelle mine. And if you were to look

22 on my Exhibit DJP-6, which is bids from May 2004, you

23 would look down and you would see two, three Triton

24 bids, one of which is Triton. And the next column is

25 05/07, meaning it was offered for all three years. And
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1 the third column is PRB North Rochelle. That's the coal

2 that would be next on the list. And it has a valuated

3 cost of $2 per million.

4 Q. And that $2 compares to what with respect to

5 the corresponding values of the Spring Creek coal?

6 A. The lowest-cost Spring Creek coal was one

7 dollar and -- I can't read my own -- I think it's $1.84.

8 The second Spring Creek coal was $1.97 valuated cost.

9 And then we move to the $2 Triton North Rochelle coal.

10 Q. And describe for the Commissioners the nature

11 of the characteristics of the North Rochelle PRB coal.

12 A. North Rochelle would, is an 8,800 Btu coal.

13 It comes out of Wyoming. It comes out of a particular

14 county in Wyoming that we've talked about. It has

15 sulfur, .34 percent sulfur, which results in an SO2

16 output of .8. So it's a good, low-sulfur, high-quality

17 coal, and it's what you would call the standard Wyoming

18 Powder River Basin coal.

19 Q. Would the concerns expressed about the sodium

20 content of the Spring Creek coal apply to the North

21 Rochelle coal?

22 A. It would not.

23 Q. If you know, does Progress Energy have any

24 reason to be familiar with this coal?

25 A. Yes. This is the coal -- this mine is the
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1 coal, is the mine that supplied the coal for the attempt

2 to have a test burn in 2004 that was aborted because

3 they did not have the permit.

4 MR. BURNETT: Mr. Chairman, excuse me.

5 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Burnett.

6 MR. BURNETT: I'm not objecting here, but I'm

7 not clear if OPC is now withdrawing its Spring Creek

8 case and now putting forward a case on Triton PRB coal.

9 If that is their position, I think some of the things

10 that we've talked about with Commissioner Skop and what

11 we'll continue to talk about with Mr. Weintraub will be

12 adequate to address that. But I just want to get some

13 clarification if OPC is abandoning their original case

14 now and is trying to bring a PRB case that they did not

15 bring originally.

16 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. McGlothlin.

17 MR. McGLOTHLIN: We're not abandoning the

18 original case. We're, we're showing that there's a

19 record basis for two good alternatives, and we're going

20 to show what the effect of each would be with respect to

21 the comparison with the bituminous coal that was

22 actually delivered.

23 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Helton.

24 MS. HELTON: I'm going to need some help. Let

25 me talk to Ms. Bennett for one minute, please.
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1 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. We'll take a minute.

2 (Pause.)

3 We're back on the record. Staff, you're

4 recognized.

5 MS. HELTON: Mr. Chairman, I think that

6 Mr. Burnett has said that he is not objecting to this

7 line of redirect examination by Mr. McGlothlin. There

8 have been, as I understand it, by the different parties

9 to the case several alternatives raised, and I think

10 that staff believes that fleshing out this issue would

11 be helpful in formulating its recommendation to you for

12 your final decision.

13 MR. BURNETT: Mr. Chair, if I may.

14 CHAIRMAN CARTER: You may, Mr. Burnett.

15 MR. BURNETT: Thank you, sir. And I do want

16 to be clear that at this point I'm not objecting.

17 Certainly anything that's in the record in this case, as

18 I think everything we've discussed to date about these

19 PRB alternatives have been, and anything that we plan to

20 discuss after with Mr. Weintraub is already in record

21 evidence.

22 My only concern is that we don't get outside

23 of what's been fairly presented in the record, and that

24 would leave me with no opportunity to cross-examine or

25 effectively hear this before. So I just don't want to
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1 be ambushed here at trial with a brand new case. But as

2 long as they stay within the record evidence, I have no

3 objection. I just wanted to make that clear.

4 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Well, Mr. McGlothlin,

5 just, you may proceed. Just stay within the four

6 corners of the case. You may proceed.

7 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Okay. Well, if I may respond

8 to that very, very briefly.

9 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Yes, sir. You're recognized

10 to respond.

11 MR. McGLOTHLIN: The basis for the contention

12 by our office that the utility should have purchased

13 Powder River Basin coal and blended it with CAPP coal as

14 a result of the offers submitted to the 2004 RFP is the

15 evaluated cost of those, of those several coals. And

16 the witness performed some calculations based upon the

17 coal that Progress Energy ranked to be number one. Now

18 that they have raised concerns about that, the point of

19 this line of questioning is to make the point that there

20 are others within the, within the same RFP that have

21 also been quantified in terms of the evaluated cost and

22 that do not share the same concern. And so that's the

23 purpose of the redirect.

24 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Let's stay within the

25 redirect. You're recognized. You may proceed.
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1 BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:

2 Q. Mr. Putman, based upon the evaluated cost

3 reported in the, your Exhibit Number DJP-6 and using the

4 same methodology that is reflected in your exhibits have

5 you calculated the effect of substituting that evaluated

6 cost on the refund that you recommend in this case?

7 A. I have done that for the coal. I have not

8 done it for the SO2 portion of the --

9 Q. I see. Would you report to the Commissioners

10 the effect of the substitution on the coal portion?

11 A. You want to pass that out?

12 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Yes. We have a document that

13 I'd like to pass out now.

14 I'm sorry. That's the wrong one.

15 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Do you want to wait a

16 minute? Hang on, hang on a second. Hang on a second.

17 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Earl, use this one.

18 (Pause.)

19 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Skop.

20 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21 Just a point of information with respect to

22 the revised Exhibit DJP-7 that was just passed out. Do

23 we know the date of this exhibit? When was this

24 created?

25 BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:
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1 Q. Mr. Putman.

2 A. When it was created?

3 Q. Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Turn your mike on.

5 THE WITNESS: Not exactly. Probably within

6 the last week. And I guess I would point out that this

7 is not a full replacement of everything in the DJP-7.

8 It does not cover the two ways that you could replace

9 the Btus and, again, it does not include the SO2

10 adjustment. It really was just an effort to look at how

11 this coal, the Triton coal would fit into this equation.

12 MR. McGLOTHLIN: May we have a number,

13 Chairman Carter?

14 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Absolutely. I think our

15 next number would be Number 60. A short title,

16 Mr. McGlothlin.

17 MR. McGLOTHLIN: All right.

18 THE WITNESS: You did a great job the last

19 time, by the way. Let's keep the streak alive.

20 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Effect of North Rochelle Coal

21 on Refund Calculation.

22 CHAIRMAN CARTER: You want to just say Revised

23 Exhibit Number DJP-7?

24 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Well, unfortunately we

25 already have a revised 7, and so --
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1 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Okay. Then give me

2 the title again.

3 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Effect of North Rochelle Coal

4 on Refund Calculation.

5 (Exhibit 60 marked for identification.)

6 MR. BURNETT: Mr. Chairman.

7 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Yes, sir. Mr. Burnett.

8 MR. BURNETT: Thank you, sir. This is exactly

9 what I feared would happen and why I raised my concern

10 earlier. I would certainly object to this. Again, I've

11 certainly had no problem with the introduction of

12 information that was clearly in the record. And, in

13 fact, as I mentioned earlier, we had planned to respond

14 to some of Commissioner Skop's requests that he had made

15 from our witness on the record yesterday to provide some

16 updating of data that is in the record already with

17 other data that's in the record already, and certainly I

18 have no objection to that.

19 But this, what you've been presented here as

20 Number 60 is a brand new analysis, in fact, that simply

21 scratches out Spring Creek and now replaces another coal

22 and even purports to replace exhibits. This is a brand

23 new case. If we're going to go to this level, I think

24 this case should be suspended, I should get to take his

25 deposition again, we should be able to file rebuttal
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1 testimony in this. And fairly, since I have the burden

2 of proof, I should be able to have the last word on

3 this.

4 Right now basically this witness is

5 introducing a brand new case where I have no opportunity

6 to cross him again, take his deposition, test any of his

7 math. And it's one thing to go to what we've been

8 talking about, but this is a brand new exhibit to a

9 brand new case.

10 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. McGlothlin, you're

11 recognized to be heard on the, on the objection.

12 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Well, I think Mr. Burnett has

13 exaggerated the situation. The, the basis for the

14 calculation is in the record and that's the evaluated

15 cost. The methodology has been displayed and explained

16 and supported by the, by the witness already. And this

17 is simply the product one receives when one substitutes

18 the different, the Btu content and the different

19 evaluated cost for the corresponding figures that were

20 associated with the Spring Creek coal to see what the

21 impact is on the calculation.

22 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Helton.

23 MS. HELTON: Mr. Chairman, I think you have

24 afforded Mr. McGlothlin and his witness a great deal of

25 latitude in his, the way they've conducted their
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1 redirect examination. I have to say though I agree with

2 Mr. Burnett. I think we are way beyond the scope of the

3 testimony filed by the witness and way beyond the scope

4 of his cross-examination. And my suggestion to you,

5 Mr. Chairman, is that this exhibit not be admitted and

6 not be allowed to be used for cross-examination

7 purposes.

8 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay.

9 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Very well.

10 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Show it done. Move on.

11 BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:

12 Q. Mr. Putman, based upon your review of the

13 specifications for the unit, what did you conclude with

14 respect to the potential impacts of the blend containing

15 either the Spring Creek coal or the Indonesian coal on

16 the items that Mr. Burnett listed for you beginning with

17 the pulverizer?

18 A. It is my evaluation based on review of the

19 design documents that there would not need to be

20 additional pulverizers. I'm not sure I remember exactly

21 the way Mr. Burnett phrased the pulverizer question, so

22 maybe you could just ask the question.

23 Q. Well, would there be any adverse effects -- or

24 let me say it differently. Would the design of the unit

25 as constructed accommodate the blends that you recommend
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1 without adverse effects on pulverizer capacity or

2 operation?

3 A. Okay. Yes. I reviewed that and there would

4 not be any adverse impact on the pulverizers.

5 Q. What about the boiler efficiency?

6 A. Boiler efficiency would be very similar. Like

7 all different coals, it would have, could have some

8 minor maybe even unmeasurable effect, but there would be

9 some effect.

10 Q. What about the heat rate of the unit?

11 A. It should be the same.

12 Q. Would the ash levels of either of the blends

13 that you recommend be problematic for the design of the

14 unit?

15 A. It would not be problematic. The Indonesian

16 coal would obviously have lower ash levels, which would

17 be a plus.

18 Q. The base-to-acid ratio, would that be a

19 problem for this unit?

20 A. Again, part of the base-to-acid ratio is

21 sodium, but it also includes calcium and iron. And the

22 combination of all three of those that go into a

23 base-to-acid ratio would actually be lower than the

24 Peabody coal blend, Peabody/PRB coal that was blended

25 for the test burn in May of '06. So it would be better.
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1 Q. You've addressed sodium to some extent

2 already. But would you summarize your opinion with

3 respect to whether the units as designed and built could

4 successfully burn the blends recognizing the sodium

5 content of the blend?

6 A. They could successfully burn the coal

7 recognizing the blend, and they could burn it in a 50/50

8 blend based on the design document.

9 Q. What about the calcium content of the blended

10 coals?

11 A. It would again fit well within the design

12 specifications.

13 Q. And with respect to the impact on the

14 performance and efficiency of the electrostatic

15 precipitator, do you have a judgment on that?

16 A. The electrostatic precipitator was designed to

17 handle coal within these low sulfur levels.

18 Q. You were asked some questions about

19 spontaneous combustion. Do you recall that question and

20 answer?

21 A. I do.

22 Q. What -- do you have any information from the

23 experience of the Southern Company units that might shed

24 some light on whether it is possible to burn

25 sub-bituminous coal safely?
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1 A. Yes, I do. Plant Miller is the one I'm most

2 familiar with. It converted in the '99 time period,

3 2000 time period to 100 percent sub-bituminous coal.

4 They did spend money to upgrade their coal handling.

5 They also worked very hard at keeping a very clean

6 plant. And so they are doing all the right things. And

7 as a result of that, they recently received an award

8 from the State of Alabama for going ten years without

9 lost time accidents. This is a plant burning a

10 dangerous fuel, 330 people, and they have not had a lost

11 time accident. So I think it says it can be done if

12 you're careful in how you handle the coal.

13 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Those are all of my

14 questions.

15 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you. Commissioner

16 Skop.

17 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18 I just have some follow-up, and I'm going to

19 try and hopefully focus on, on points that will help me

20 have a better understanding of the facts in this case.

21 Mr. Putman, in the 060658 docket is it correct

22 that the Commission compared Progress's average price of

23 delivered CAPP coal to Crystal River CR4 and CR5 units

24 for the years 2003 through 2005 to the Progress

25 evaluated price of PRB to determine the majority of the
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1 refund for those years?

2 THE WITNESS: No. I believe what they

3 compared was the highest-cost coal actually purchased

4 and delivered during those years based on the process

5 that was recommended, adopted by the staff and then

6 adopted by the Commission.

7 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Well, let me,

8 let me stop you there and go back to your revised

9 testimony. Because, again, I'm pretty good at following

10 along, but I will say I'm thoroughly confused by that

11 response.

12 So on Page, on Page 2 of your revised

13 testimony you stated that you believe the intent of the

14 Commission in the prior docket was to calculate a refund

15 by substituting the sub-bituminous coal for the highest

16 costing 20 percent of the tons actually delivered on a

17 ton-for-ton basis, and then you seemed to back away from

18 that. So in response to my last question, didn't the

19 Commission use the average price of CAPP coal in the

20 prior docket?

21 THE WITNESS: No, sir, they did not. They

22 used the highest cost -- 20 percent tons equal to the

23 20 percent of the waterborne coal as what would be

24 replaced.

25 COMMISSIONER SKOP: May I have a moment,
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1 Mr. Chair, to confer with --

2 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Sure. Take five, but nobody

3 leave the building.

4 (Recess taken.)

5 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

6 I'll ask Mr. Heller on rebuttal whether he

7 believes that to be true.

8 Mr. Putman, going back to that, the other part

9 of that refund was the SO2 allowance calculation. Would

10 you agree with that?

11 THE WITNESS: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Is your mike on?

13 THE WITNESS: Sorry.

14 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Now is it correct

15 that we know the delivered price of the CAPP coal in

16 this docket for Witness Heller's JNH-3 exhibit for 2006

17 and 2007 as it was filed in this docket?

18 THE WITNESS: We do know that, and I agreed

19 with his numbers for the highest-cost coal delivered by

20 water in his original testimony.

21 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Thank you.

22 To your knowledge, do we know what the price

23 of the delivered PRB coal to Crystal River would have

24 been for 2006 and 2007 as offered in the response to the

25 April 2004 RFP that was issued by Progress but
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1 accounting for adjustments for any inflators to be

2 considered in both the coal and transportation contracts

3 that would have been entered into at the time of the bid

4 evaluations?

5 THE WITNESS: We know the evaluated cost as

6 produced by Progress Energy. That should have taken

7 into account any and all of those things that you just

8 listed. They should have either been accounted for in

9 the evaluation, or if they were going to actually buy

10 the coal, they should have taken action to determine and

11 fix in place what those numbers would be.

12 COMMISSIONER SKOP: If, if those numbers in

13 fact did not include all of those aspects though, I

14 mean, could that be the case in your knowledge or do you

15 not know specifically whether those, that evaluation by

16 Progress encompasses all of those factors?

17 THE WITNESS: Based on the testimony that's

18 been given by Mr. Weintraub about how they conduct their

19 evaluation, then I based my decision on the fact that

20 all those costs would be included. If they were not

21 included, if the evaluation did not fairly and

22 completely represent the cost of that coal, then I guess

23 I placed my assumption wrongly.

24 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. And, again, I'll

25 reserve to go back to Mr. Heller on my first question.
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1 Just a couple of follow-up questions to

2 questions you were asked by Mr. McGlothlin. With

3 respect to the interrogatory response on, to staff

4 Interrogatory 29A, did you review that as the basis for

5 preparing your testimony or in conjunction with

6 preparing your testimony?

7 THE WITNESS: I did not.

8 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. I've got a bunch of

9 scribbled notes, so bear with me for a second, Mr.

10 Chairman.

11 What in your opinion was wrong with the, or

12 what did you disagree with in that analysis in terms of

13 the responses provided for the dollars per MMBtu

14 delivered to the terminal for the coal that was

15 purchased?

16 THE WITNESS: I guess part of it is that it's

17 the difference in time and geography. Those prices were

18 based on apparently purchases made in 2007. We saw a

19 chart that was put up by Mr. Weintraub showing

20 transportation costs that I think add up to these 3,224

21 transportation costs for PRB. I have not had any

22 information about those numbers and how accurate they

23 are and where they came from. That information I don't

24 think was even admitted into testimony. So I'm totally

25 unprepared because these things are dealing with a
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1 different location as the final point, the terminal

2 versus the plant, a different time, 2007 versus 2004.

3 It's just a mixed bag that I am not prepared to even

4 really say whether they're right or wrong.

5 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. But to that point,

6 in your testimony you gave, you were familiar enough to

7 opine that in addition to taking advantage of what you

8 deemed be a missed opportunity in 2004, that it would

9 also be incumbent upon Progress to take advantage of

10 this opportunity and leverage both of them, am I correct

11 in understanding that that --

12 THE WITNESS: I did say that, but I also said

13 if it was a real savings.

14 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Now, if you

15 expected them to do that, if there were real savings,

16 and they had committed in 2004, I guess the question had

17 come up earlier this morning about contractual damages

18 in terms of transportation costs, and if they had

19 entered into long-term contracts how would they be able

20 to avail themselves of this other opportunity that you

21 suggested that they should take advantage of.

22 THE WITNESS: Now we are getting back into the

23 hypothetical that is a little uncomfortable to deal

24 with. Every time a procurement decision is made it

25 impacts all future procurement decisions. And if they
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1 had made the procurement decision in May 2004, it may or

2 may not have limited their opportunity to take advantage

3 of the next opportunity. But I really can't sit here

4 and say that without --

5 COMMISSIONER SKOP: And I agree, that could

6 have inured exactly the opposite way for them, also.

7 But, again, part of trying to undertake prudency

8 determination is also if you find that action was

9 imprudent, you have to assess damages, so that's where

10 I'm trying to gain a better appreciation of what you

11 feel in your testimony that they should have been held

12 responsible for, and so I'll move on in the interest of

13 time.

14 If burning a blend of domestic bituminous coal

15 and international bituminous coal was proven to be more

16 cost-effective, vis-a-vis if these numbers were

17 accurate, then would you admit that it would have

18 been -- that this should have been burned over an 80/20

19 blend of CAPP coal and PRB?

20 THE WITNESS: There's a lot of ifs in there,

21 so I think that's, in all honesty, a little too

22 hypothetical for me. I would make the general statement

23 that any time an offer comes along that is more

24 beneficial than what else is on the table at that time,

25 then it's up to the utility to take advantage of that
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1 opportunity. And if this was a real opportunity, as I

2 said earlier, I would commend them for doing this

3 innovative thing, if it was a real opportunity.

4 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Fair enough. Let's move

5 on to a brief discussion of the Indonesian coal for a

6 second. I think in your testimony you discuss some of

7 the favorable properties of the Indonesian coal, low

8 sulfur and such, and there is also an exhibit, and I

9 believe that was part of JS-9 that was handed out, and

10 the last page I think Mr. Burnett had put up in a sheet,

11 and I'll hold that up generally. Do you remember seeing

12 that exhibit?

13 THE WITNESS: I do.

14 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Now, in that

15 exhibit it refers to a test -- that Georgia Power had

16 made a deal to perhaps test Indonesian coal in the first

17 half of 2006, is that correct?

18 THE WITNESS: That's what the article implies,

19 yes.

20 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Do you know the origin of

21 that article?

22 THE WITNESS: It's something like Coal

23 America. I'm not 100 percent sure. There is a --

24 what's known as a coal rag.

25 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. So obviously
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1 that probably -- if article speaks to -- that Georgia

2 Power would do something in the early half of 2006, and

3 certainly it would stand to reason that that article was

4 prepared prior to early 2006, is that correct?

5 THE WITNESS: Correct.

6 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. I guess one of the

7 central points I'm struggling with, too, again, if you,

8 as a professional consultant, who appeared in the last

9 docket was aware of this coal, and, I mean, I think

10 through your testimony we should search the world over

11 to find the cheapest options, then why was that not

12 raised in the prior docket, because certainly you would

13 have been aware of it at that time, is that correct?

14 THE WITNESS: The reason I think it wasn't

15 raised in the last one is that there was never in the

16 record an offer made to Progress Energy for that coal

17 until February of 2006, so it was not an opportunity.

18 COMMISSIONER SKOP: That helps clarify that

19 point. On that same regard, given your extensive

20 transportation background, are you familiar with fuel

21 surcharges?

22 THE WITNESS: I am.

23 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Could a fuel surcharge

24 make it cost prohibitive to burn Indonesian coal on an

25 as-delivered basis?
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1 THE WITNESS: Hypothetically, yes, it could.

2 It could make it cheaper to burn.

3 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Cheaper or more expensive?

4 THE WITNESS: Well, fuel charges generally

5 move with the market for fuel. And sometimes that

6 market goes up, as we know, and sometimes it goes down.

7 Normally the process is that if you are going to build

8 that into your rate system, whether you're a railroad or

9 a shipping line, you put in a base level and then say if

10 it goes up, I'm going to charge you more, but if it goes

11 down, I'm going to charge you less, so it could go

12 either way.

13 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Fair enough. Just a few

14 more questions. On DJP-8, I guess you made an analogy

15 or a cross reference that basically showed how the data

16 on that page fell into the exhibit or corresponded to

17 the data shown on DJP-6 for the Central Appalachian

18 coal, and I appreciate you clearing that up.

19 In that same regard looking at the western

20 coals at the top of the page, I know that the tonnage is

21 listed, and I guess the question that I have that I

22 think that was part of the graphical representation that

23 I tried to use as a basis for discussion, and a basis

24 for discussion only, was that the total tons listed

25 there is a multi-year quantity for coal over and above
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1 what would be burnt in a single year. Is that your

2 understanding? I think you stated that due to

3 transportation constraints, only 500,000 tons or so of

4 PRB could have been utilized per year for the CR4 and

5 CR5 units.

6 THE WITNESS: The number is 20 percent of the

7 coal moved by water, and that comes out to 500,

8 525,000 tons.

9 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. And you would

10 agree, though, looking at the PRB North Rochelle for the

11 Triton quote, I guess the fourth quote up from the

12 bottom for the years '05 through '07, that was for three

13 million tons, am I correct on that?

14 THE WITNESS: It's for a million ton a year

15 for three years. That first column is a total of the

16 tons offered.

17 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. All right. Now

18 would that higher quantity have an impact on price?

19 For instance, if you are purchasing a large volume over

20 the -- in one purchase versus the spot price that was

21 also at issue here, is there, again, I think you

22 testified that there is not really a straight-line

23 correlation, but how would you view that or look at

24 that?

25 THE WITNESS: Well, there is an example on
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1 this very same sheet of paper. That very first offer is

2 for 504,000 tons from DTE, and it is the lowest price on

3 this sheet. It's only for one year, so it was not

4 available in 2006, so we didn't use it, but it is the

5 lowest price, and you have got coal on here for a

6 million tons a year that are higher.

7 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Let's speak to that

8 for a second. In your testimony you spoke about the

9 Vista model and how you thought that either coal from

10 the Spring Creek mine was not properly evaluated by the

11 Vista model or something along those lines, isn't that

12 correct?

13 THE WITNESS: I have a real concern about

14 whether or not the Vista model was ever run for this

15 2004. But I also said -- yes, I said that it did not

16 appear that the evaluation of the impact of that coal in

17 the boiler was properly accounted for.

18 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. So I guess to

19 better understand, if the model was run for Spring Creek

20 coal, then the model does not properly account for

21 sodium or undervalue -- underweight sodium, is that

22 correct?

23 THE WITNESS: I would agree with that

24 statement. Again, I do not know whether the Vista model

25 was run. If they tell me it was, I'm more than willing
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1 to agree that it was.

2 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. So even though you

3 had some technical concerns with respect to the accuracy

4 of the data, you picked that number anyway because it

5 was lower priced, is that correct?

6 THE WITNESS: Because I was committed to using

7 the numbers prepared by Progress Energy without second

8 guessing them.

9 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. I want to just turn

10 your attention -- I guess you had done an effect of

11 blending sodium and different coals calculation, and

12 that was, I believe, previously entered as Exhibit 57.

13 THE WITNESS: Correct.

14 COMMISSIONER SKOP: And I think in your answer

15 to my question with respect to the sub-bituminous coal,

16 you indicated that that calculation was based upon the

17 coal from the Spring Creek mine, is that correct?

18 THE WITNESS: For the sodium we're talking

19 about, yes.

20 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Now, is it also

21 true you said you relied on the Progress data when you

22 performed your analysis?

23 THE WITNESS: When I performed my refund

24 analysis, yes.

25 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Is there any reason
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1 in this calculation for percent of sodium you list

2 8 percent, whereas I'm looking at JS-9, which shows the

3 quantities for various coals, but for the Spring Creek

4 coal it lists the sodium content at 8.24 percent. Is

5 there any difference in terms of why you might have

6 picked a lower number?

7 THE WITNESS: The bid itself talks about a bid

8 quality of 8 percent. It does contain information that

9 says it could range up for -- a specific set of numbers

10 indicate 8.24 or eight-point something.

11 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Assuming for the

12 sake of discussion, and, again, looking at the JS-9 in

13 the light most favorable to Progress, and assuming that

14 8.24 percent is correct, would you agree that your

15 calculation, subject to check, would increase slightly

16 to a number of 1.64 percent?

17 THE WITNESS: I would agree with the increase,

18 I'll trust your math.

19 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Like Mr. Burnett said, we

20 are all three attorneys, and it's not good to trust

21 lawyers doing math, because I haven't done that in a

22 long time. But --

23 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Mr. Chair. You keep

24 talking about how you trust lawyers. There's a lot of

25 other things that go along with that. There's a room
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1 full of lawyers, so be careful.

2 CHAIRMAN CARTER: They are only talking about

3 some lawyers, not all of us.

4 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Yes, yes.

5 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Some of us can do math real

6 well.

7 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Trying to get back on

8 track, I guess you had mentioned in a question to -- I

9 guess in response to a question that Mr. McGlothlin

10 asked you, and you had discussed the design fuel, and I

11 thought that your answer was a little bit incomplete, so

12 I'm going to go back and ask some questions along the

13 line of that. You mentioned that the Babcock and Wilcox

14 design specification was for a 50/50 blend of eastern

15 and western, correct?

16 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

17 COMMISSIONER SKOP: And then you further

18 elaborated that western was specific to PRB, Powder

19 River Basin coal, sub-bituminous coal spanning a

20 multi-state region, is that correct?

21 THE WITNESS: From two different sources, yes.

22 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Now, I guess on the

23 exhibit that I passed out yesterday, the design fuel was

24 specified as a combination of Type 1 and Type 7, which

25 focused on Campbell County, Wyoming, as the source of
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1 the Powder River Basin coal, would you agree with that?

2 THE WITNESS: That document did say that, and

3 I don't disagree with that.

4 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. And in the

5 evaluation of that alternative in the Babcock and

6 Wilcox, I guess, evaluation and I'm referring back to

7 Witness Sansom from the prior docket, RS-2, Babcock and

8 Wilcox did at least seven evaluations of different

9 blends of coal using coals from the Powder River Basin

10 to determine what was ultimately selected as the design

11 or performance coal, is that correct?

12 THE WITNESS: There were seven coals, as I

13 understand it, that were looked at in different

14 combinations, yes, to test the wide range of the

15 capability of the unit.

16 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. But in terms of a

17 performance guarantee, that performance guarantee

18 centered upon a blend specifically of CAPP coal and PRB

19 coal from Campbell County, Wyoming, is that correct?

20 THE WITNESS: I don't believe it is correct to

21 tie the design coal directly to a performance guarantee.

22 COMMISSIONER SKOP: But will you admit,

23 subject to check, that that is exactly what Babcock and

24 Wilcox did?

25 THE WITNESS: No, sir, I can't. Because any

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

519

1 guarantee on the unit was based on steam flow,

2 pressures, temperatures. And so, therefore, it was

3 based not on the coal that was being burned, but on the

4 flows that would be guaranteed. And they did say if you

5 had coal in a wide range around this design coal that

6 you could produce the design steam flow pressure and

7 temperature to produce 750 to 770 megawatts.

8 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Mr. Chairman, just to

9 complete the record, and I don't know if the witness has

10 a copy of RS-2, but I'm happy to give him mine, but I

11 would like to ask him to reevaluate the last statement

12 in light of the --

13 CHAIRMAN CARTER: What was the exhibit you

14 mentioned, Commissioner?

15 COMMISSIONER SKOP: It's RS-2 from Witness

16 Sansom, Page 6 of 6.

17 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Staff, do you have a copy

18 that you could provide to the witness, so we'll be on

19 the same page?

20 MS. BENNETT: I do not, but we can make

21 copies.

22 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Yes, let's do that. He

23 needs to be able to see what we're talking about here.

24 Can we get a copy of that?

25 Commissioner, can you go to another question
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1 while staff is getting that?

2 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Yes. I guess my remaining

3 question centers, basically, on this sheet.

4 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Well, then, hang on

5 one second and we'll just kind of run in place. Let's

6 give staff a second to get that. Nobody leaves the

7 building. Nobody leaves the room. (Pause.)

8 Why don't we just take five, Commissioners,

9 and give him an opportunity get the paperwork together.

10 And when Commissioner Skop is done, I'll come back to

11 the bench and see if we have anything further, and then

12 we will go ahead on and deal with the exhibits and move

13 further.

14 We are on recess.

15 (Recess.)

16 CHAIRMAN CARTER: We are back on the record.

17 Commissioner Skop, you're recognized.

18 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 Where we are left off before the break is I was asking

20 Mr. Putman with respect to performance guarantees being

21 based upon the designed fuel blend, and he indicated

22 that that was not the case. I have asked staff to hand

23 out Witness Sansom's -- which was an OPC witness from

24 the last docket, RS-2, Page 6 of 6.

25 And, Mr. Putman, if you could read the title
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1 of that table, please, for me. That would be Page 6 of

2 6, Table 3.2-2.

3 THE WITNESS: Okay. The title is Alternative

4 Florida Power Corporation Performance Goals Weight Blend

5 50/50 Basis.

6 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. And with respect to

7 the type of coals evaluated, you would note for the

8 record that there were seven scenarios run, is that

9 correct?

10 THE WITNESS: There were seven coals and this

11 shows seven scenarios with those seven coals.

12 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. And the third

13 column on that chart has an asterisk by it, is that

14 correct?

15 THE WITNESS: It does.

16 COMMISSIONER SKOP: And that's Type 1 and Type

17 7 coal, which is CAPP coal and Powder River Basin coal

18 from the Campbell County, Wyoming, mine, is that

19 correct?

20 THE WITNESS: I am aware that that is what

21 that 1 and 7 says.

22 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. And can you please

23 read at the bottom the -- there is an asterisk by the

24 type of coal that was selected as the performance coal.

25 Can you please read what that asterisk designates,
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1 please?

2 THE WITNESS: It says performance guarantee

3 shall be based on this blend.

4 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you.

5 With respect to that performance blend that

6 was chosen on that same table, if you could please look

7 at the sodium oxide that is indicated by percentage in

8 the ash analysis, and can you please for the combined

9 blend coal, please indicate what that percentage is for

10 the sodium oxide.

11 THE WITNESS: For the Number 1 and 7

12 combination it is 1.50.

13 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Now, in terms of

14 your analysis that you did in Exhibit 57, you show the

15 effect of blending high sodium Powder River Basin coal

16 and the effect of that blend in terms of the percentage

17 of sodium oxide, I believe, that would be in the ash, is

18 that correct?

19 THE WITNESS: Correct.

20 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Now, you would agree,

21 would you not, that your blended sodium analysis for the

22 Spring Creek coal indicated a result that was 1.61

23 percent, but -- is that true?

24 THE WITNESS: I think my example was

25 1.54 percent for sodium. I think you're looking at
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1 sulfur.

2 COMMISSIONER SKOP: No, I'm looking at the

3 sodium, and I believe that percentage is 1.61 percent,

4 and that is on Exhibit 57. And I also think that

5 previously you testified in response to a question that

6 if that sodium percentage for the sub-bituminous coal

7 was actually corrected to the JS-9 value that that

8 number would, in fact, increase, subject to check, to

9 1.64 percent, is that correct?

10 THE WITNESS: I guess I'm confused now. I'm

11 looking at the sheet that seems to say the blend of

12 sodium is 1.54.

13 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Well, I have a

14 sheet in front of me, the effect of blending sodium in

15 different coals, which was entered into the record as

16 Exhibit 57, which was prepared by you, and you showed

17 the effective sodium on an 80/20 blend. And all things

18 being equal, you were, I believe, commenting that sodium

19 really doesn't contribute a whole lot here, and the

20 calculation that you made, the blend sodium, was

21 1.61 percent. Is that correct?

22 THE WITNESS: I am now looking at the actual

23 exhibit and, yes, you are correct, 1.61 is the number.

24 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. And when I referred

25 you previously back to JS-9 where it showed a sodium
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1 content for the Spring Creek coal of 8.24 percent, I

2 believe you agreed, subject to check, that if you

3 inserted that or substituted that number for the

4 percentage listed in that exhibit, that subject to check

5 the revised final number would be 1.64 percent. Is that

6 correct?

7 THE WITNESS: I said that, yes.

8 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Now, you would agree,

9 based on your analysis and the calculation that was

10 performed in Exhibit 57 and relating that back to the

11 designed fuel blend, that the percentage of sodium that

12 was selected based upon significant evaluation of

13 various options for selecting the performance coal, that

14 the Spring Creek coal and the use of that coal would

15 result in a higher sodium content than that specified

16 for the performance coal that was selected on the basis

17 of the unit design, is that correct? The 1.5 percent

18 versus the 1.61 or 1.64 percent depending on how you

19 want to calculate it.

20 THE WITNESS: I guess the piece I'm missing is

21 what is the number one coal and what was the sodium

22 content of the number one coal.

23 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Actually I think that

24 is -- yes, basically, assuming your number is correct

25 for the sodium on the CAPP coal which, I mean, that
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1 appears to be a standard number, and I guess we could

2 always look to it. But I think the number I have for

3 that CAPP coal is similar to the 1 percent that you

4 have, or I would accept your 1 percent just subject to

5 check for the discussion. But what I'm trying to

6 articulate is looking at the sodium on the performance

7 coal versus the sodium calculation that you allege that

8 would result from using the Spring Creek coal and trying

9 to illustrate how that percentage by your calculation

10 and your choice of fuel is higher than that selected for

11 the performance coal.

12 THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm going to agree with

13 you that all of those things would cause that number to

14 go higher.

15 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you. No further

16 questions.

17 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Mr. Chair.

18 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Argenziano,

19 you're recognized.

20 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Thank you.

21 And I guess with Commissioner Skop's speaking

22 to the chemistries and stuff, and I guess what my

23 questions come down to is I guess that they are -- I am

24 now not guessing, I'm surmising that different coals

25 have different chemistries. And I guess the chemical
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1 compounds or their different chemistries cause them to

2 burn differently, is that accurate?

3 THE WITNESS: That's correct, and to leave

4 different residues in the boiler.

5 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. And I guess

6 what I need to figure out, because Commissioner point is

7 making a point here, is how big a deal it is, and do the

8 plant managers deal with that every time they change a

9 coal source? And with this particular plant, since it

10 was is designed to handle more sorts of coal, I'm trying

11 to figure out where that argument fits in.

12 So could you tell me is it a big deal -- and

13 I'm not trying to trivialize it or to make it more than

14 it is, I need to know for me. Is it a really big deal,

15 or do plant managers have to really regularly deal with

16 that every time they change the source of coal.

17 THE WITNESS: Even when they don't change the

18 source of coal, they may be getting the same sets of

19 coal into the plant every day, but when it gets into the

20 boiler, because they are buying from South America, or

21 Central App, or all of these normal kinds of coals they

22 have been getting, on any given day there is a different

23 modified chemistry going into the boiler. And so, yes,

24 the operators are running equipment to modify all of

25 those pieces to make it work. They may have to run the
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1 sub-boilers more, they may have to run the pulverizers

2 faster or slower, it is an ongoing human interaction

3 with the chemistry. And they make it work, yes.

4 As far as what is this unit designed to burn,

5 then I would go to this other document that the

6 Commissioner passed out that has seven different

7 combinations. And what this reflects, it reflects the

8 design fuel in the middle, this one in seven with the

9 asterisk, but it also reflects all the other

10 combinations of coals that were considered in the

11 design.

12 And what the design says is that with any of

13 these combinations, the unit will operate successfully

14 and will produce a level of steam pressure and

15 temperature necessary to produce 750 to 770 megawatts.

16 It was an amazing unit, the Lexus of the time, but the

17 design fuel is exactly what the Commissioner says, but

18 it can burn a wide range around that.

19 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: But it is something

20 that a plant -- I guess the plant managers, because I

21 don't know who else will deal with it, have to deal with

22 on an ongoing basis.

23 THE WITNESS: Correct.

24 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. So I'm trying

25 to figure out whether it's overstated or it's not, and
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1 I'm trying to actually really sincerely try to figure

2 out how much of a problem it is. And that's the reason

3 for the questions, and trying to figure out Commissioner

4 Skop's continued questioning on those issues.

5 Obviously something is there, and I guess

6 what -- I guess the final question I could ask you is

7 then would it be safe to say that if Commissioner Skop

8 in his argument about the particular chemistries and how

9 they burn differently, if a plant wasn't designed the

10 way this one was, it could be more of a problem for that

11 plant. I'm not trivializing, you know, what you have to

12 do to accommodate for different coals, but I imagine if

13 a plant is designed that way, or if you are in the

14 business of burning coal, you have to plan for different

15 coal types coming in.

16 THE WITNESS: You're absolutely right. And

17 the piece of information we have is Plant Scherer

18 burning Powder River Basin coal with a different

19 designed boiler said we don't want Spring Creek coal

20 because even though it was a cheap offer, it was going

21 to cause us more problems and more expenses and more

22 issues, so we don't want it. We are going to buy

23 something else. It is a different boiler, but it says

24 that there are coals where it becomes necessary even

25 though on some basis it's the cheapest one, it doesn't
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1 make real sense to buy it.

2 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you.

4 Commissioner Skop.

5 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6 Just a quick follow-up, because I thought --

7 with all due respect, I thought, Mr. Putman, something I

8 heard may have overstated what I thought that the

9 performance guarantee was based on.

10 I think in evaluating these coals shown on

11 these sheets, that was basically, you know, considering

12 engineering trade-offs to optimize the design and what

13 was settled on for the performance fuel or performance

14 coal for that unit was not -- you know, I guess you

15 could burn anything, it's just -- as you just mentioned,

16 what damage is that going to cause or what is that going

17 to do to your emission profile. But if you were to

18 look, basically, at the sodium oxide on this page, and

19 look at the sulfur percentage for the coals that were

20 considered, it seemed to me that they optimized around

21 not only the sodium, but also the sulfur and picked the

22 best choice.

23 So, again, I don't want to make more out of

24 this than it is, but what I'm merely trying to talk to

25 is that Babcock and Wilcox when they did this design put
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1 extensive thought and consideration into some of these

2 issues. And I just -- again, I'm not the one that

3 designed the plant, I'm not the one that runs the plant,

4 but you said, I think, by your own admission, that no

5 other coal plant to your knowledge is using Spring Creek

6 coal, so there must be a reason for that.

7 THE WITNESS: No, I did not say that. I said

8 to my knowledge, because they are selling

9 15 million tons somewhere. I think it would be

10 appropriate if I might ask, that this is one page out of

11 an exhibit from Mr. Sansom. I think it would be

12 appropriate to look at the rest of that, because there

13 is a paragraph in the rest of that information that

14 deals directly with the question you are asking. And so

15 I think it would be appropriate to look at that.

16 CHAIRMAN CARTER: I think that is in the

17 record. We took care of that?

18 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN CARTER: So that's available to all

20 the parties. Thank you.

21 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Do we have that

22 available to look at?

23 CHAIRMAN CARTER: It has been admitted when we

24 did the preliminary, but it's not -- I don't know if

25 staff has it handy or not, but we admitted it when we
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1 did our preliminary statement -- I mean, preliminary

2 matters.

3 MR. McGLOTHLIN: I believe we may be talking

4 about two different documents. Let's find out. This is

5 the one that the witness had in mind.

6 CHAIRMAN CARTER: I beg your pardon, Mr.

7 McGlothlin?

8 MR. McGLOTHLIN: I believe we may be talking

9 about two different documents. This is the one the

10 witness had in mind. I don't believe it has been

11 distributed.

12 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Oh, okay. This is a

13 different document?

14 MR. McGLOTHLIN: I believe so.

15 COMMISSIONER SKOP: What I had shown the

16 witness was this document, excerpts from the document

17 that was just handed out, plus excerpts from Witness

18 Sansom which basically spoke to the performance coal

19 specifically. So, again, the performance coal, I think

20 you have to take the two in context. I think one does

21 not really give detail on what the performance coal was,

22 whereas this specifically does. So, anyway, I'm just

23 relying on what I read in the prior document which was

24 previously entered by OPC. And that would be RS-2, Page

25 6 of 6, along with -- along with the last page of the
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1 document that was just -- yes, that's it.

2 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Let's do this.

3 Mr. Putman has been an outstanding witness, and he has

4 been asked, you know, pretty much -- he has been on --

5 he did his summation for direct, he has been on cross

6 examination, and -- Commissioner, do you have further?

7 You're recognized.

8 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: If this is what he

9 referred to, I would like him to speak to it, the

10 paragraph that you were talking about.

11 THE WITNESS: I would ask you to turn to the

12 third page of this.

13 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. The third page from

14 the front?

15 THE WITNESS: Yes. Right in the middle of the

16 page it has got a fuel paragraph, and I'm going to read

17 it if I may. "The guarantees for this unit are based on

18 firing a 50/50 blend of eastern bituminous and western

19 sub-bituminous coal. The performance coal is classified

20 as high slagging and medium fouling. Performance was

21 also checked on Illinois deep mine coal, which is

22 classified as severe slagging and high fouling. The

23 furnace and convection pass are designed for a severe

24 slagging and severe fouling coal."

25 And what that means in layman's terms is the
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1 performance coal is a high slagging, medium fouling.

2 They looked at these other coals to come up with a wide

3 band that included severe slagging and high fouling, but

4 then it was designed even a wider step than that. Wider

5 than any of the coals they considered that are included

6 on those one through seven, and that is what they built

7 it around. And that graph down below is the performance

8 coal and it also includes the Illinois coal that was

9 considered.

10 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you. Staff, was this

12 part of the --

13 MS. BENNETT: It's part of Staff's Composite

14 Exhibit.

15 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. I just wanted to make

16 sure it was in the record. And, of course, I don't envy

17 staff having to do a recommendation on this, but thank

18 you. It's in the record.

19 Commissioners, anything further from the

20 bench? Okay. Let's deal with exhibits. You may be

21 excused. Thank you so kindly.

22 THE WITNESS: Thank you for your patience.

23 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. McGlothlin, you're on

24 first. Let's deal with the exhibits. And let me turn

25 my page here. That would be Exhibits 14 through 29, I
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1 believe it is.

2 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Yes. I move 14 through 29,

3 and I also --

4 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on, hang on. Any

5 objections?

6 MR. BURNETT: No, sir.

7 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Shown it done, 14

8 through 29 entered in.

9 (Exhibit Numbers 14 through 29 admitted into

10 the record.)

11 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Now let's flip over to

12 Exhibit 55.

13 MR. BURNETT: Yes, sir. That was mine, and I

14 would move 55 and 56.

15 CHAIRMAN CARTER: 55 and 56. Any objections?

16 MR. McGLOTHLIN: No.

17 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Without objection, show it

18 done.

19 (Exhibits 55 and 56 admitted into the record.)

20 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. McGlothlin.

21 MR. McGLOTHLIN: I move 57, 58, and 59.

22 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Any objections?

23 MR. BURNETT: No, sir.

24 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Without objection, show it

25 done.
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1 (Exhibit Number 57 through 59 admitted into

2 the record.)

3 MR. McGLOTHLIN: I believe we also assigned

4 Number 50 to the declassified version of one of

5 Mr. Putman's exhibit.

6 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Just for the record, in case

7 no one is clear, we did that into -- Exhibit 50 is

8 entered into the record. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Sansom

9 (sic).

10 Mr. Burnett, call your witness.

11 MR. BURNETT: Thank you, sir. We call Sasha

12 Weintraub.

13 SASHA WEINTRAUB

14 was called as a witness on behalf of Progress Energy

15 Florida, and having been duly sworn, testified as

16 follows:

17 DIRECT EXAMINATION

18 BY MR. BURNETT:

19 Q. Mr. Weintraub, you were sworn earlier,

20 correct?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. Have you filed prefiled rebuttal testimony and

23 exhibits in this matter?

24 A. I have.

25 Q. Do you have your prefiled rebuttal testimony
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1 and exhibits with you?

2 A. I do.

3 Q. Do you have any changes to make to your

4 prefiled rebuttal testimony?

5 A. I do not.

6 Q. If I asked you the same questions in your

7 prefiled rebuttal testimony today, would you give the

8 same answers that you give in your prefiled testimony?

9 A. I would.

10 MR. BURNETT: Mr. Chair, we request the

11 prefiled rebuttal testimony be entered into the record

12 as read here today.

13 CHAIRMAN CARTER: The prefiled testimony of

14 the witness will be inserted into the record as though

15 read. You may proceed.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25
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1 BY MR. BURNETT:

2 Q. Do you have a summary of your prefiled

3 testimony, sir?

4 A. I do.

5 Q. Keeping in mind the seven-minute constraint,

6 would you please summarize your testimony.

7 A. Sure.

8 The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to

9 address the multiple errors, mistakes, and omissions in

10 Mr. Putman's testimony in this matter. In addition to

11 multiple mistakes that I provide testimony on, my

12 rebuttal testimony also takes the mistakes, errors, and

13 omissions that Witness Heller and Witness Stenger

14 identify and presents them in conjunction with the

15 mistakes that I identify to provide a bottom-line result

16 for the Commission.

17 The first problem with Mr. Putman's testimony

18 is that he uses two types of coal that the PSC never

19 considered, analyzed, or heard testimony on in Docket

20 060658. As explained in detail in Witness Stenger's

21 rebuttal testimony, the Spring Creek and Indonesian coal

22 that that Mr. Putman advances in his testimony are very

23 different than the PRB coal that the Commission

24 considered in Docket 060658, and for that reason alone

25 the Commission should not consider that coal here.
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1 In fact, even Mr. Putman agrees that Spring

2 Creek coal should not have been ranked as number one

3 when the cost of handling the elevated sulfur is

4 included. In Docket 060658, the PSC analyzed Wyoming

5 coal from the Powder River Basin. Others in that case

6 intended to assert claims that the other types of coal

7 from Colorado and nondomestic sources would have been

8 more cost-effective. Both the Commission staff and the

9 Commission itself properly found that it could not make

10 reasonable and proper decisions on the prudence of PEF's

11 actions with regard to such coals without having a full

12 set of facts regarding these coals before it.

13 In its ultimate finding, the PSC specifically

14 limits its consideration to the coal that it did

15 actually hear complete and competent evidence on, that

16 is Wyoming PRB coal that PEF tested in 2004 and 2006.

17 Further, as Witness Stenger will explain, PEF could not

18 have reasonably tested these coals in the time frame

19 that Mr. Putman sets forth in his testimony. So even if

20 Spring Creek and Indonesian coal were proper for

21 consideration, PEF could not have burned them in '06 and

22 '07.

23 Further, the cost of capital upgrades that

24 would potentially be necessary to burn these coals could

25 dwarf the alleged savings that Mr. Putman advances in
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1 his testimony. Even if the PSC looks beyond that fact

2 that Mr. Putman uses improper coal that was not at

3 issue, the Commission should reject the conclusions in

4 his testimony because they are based on selective

5 hindsight look back that applies incomplete, outdated,

6 or incorrect information and that ignores the real life

7 implications of the actions that he suggests PEF should

8 have taken.

9 While Mr. Putman has attempted to cure one of

10 the most critical mistakes he made in his testimony by

11 filing amended testimony which reduces his alleged

12 damages by approximately $27 million, he still has left

13 uncorrected over 13 mistakes that are summarized on Page

14 17 of my rebuttal testimony. For example, in both 2006

15 and 2007, Mr. Putman changes three-year contract bids to

16 one-year bids without accounting for the fact that there

17 would have been financial consequences for shaving off

18 66 percent of the contract's duration. Mr. Putman

19 significantly understates transportation costs of the

20 coal he uses because instead of closely examining actual

21 bid documents and transportation agreements, he instead

22 simply reviewed summary sheets that did not account for

23 all transportation prices.

24 Further, Mr. Putman does not account for the

25 consequences of the purchases he advances, such as the
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1 damages PEF would have to pay barge companies for

2 minimum transportation requirements that have been in

3 place prior to 2004, and the additional transportation

4 costs that PEF would have to incur to bring the right

5 amount of coal to Crystal River to keep the plants

6 running.

7 Mr. Putman also makes simple mistakes that

8 could have easily been cured in his amended testimony,

9 such as using outdated SO2 emission cost projections

10 instead of the actual cost of those emissions. All of

11 these mistakes combined with the errors that Witness

12 Heller discusses in his rebuttal testimony reduces

13 Mr. Putman's alleged damages from the original

14 $61 million to a negative $1.525 million. These

15 calculations are also included at Page 17 of my rebuttal

16 testimony.

17 This concludes my summary and I'm happy to

18 answer any questions that you may have.

19 MR. BURNETT: We tender Mr. Weintraub for

20 cross-examination.

21 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. McGlothlin, you're

22 recognized.

23 CROSS EXAMINATION

24 BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:

25 Q. Good afternoon, sir.
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1 A. Good afternoon.

2 Q. Mr. Weintraub, I have several questions about

3 the assertion in your testimony that the Montana

4 sub-bituminous coal and the Indonesian sub-bituminous

5 coal are somehow out of bounds because of the coal that

6 was the subject of evidence in 060658. And I want to

7 explore with you the implications of that position.

8 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Excuse me, Mr. McGlothlin.

9 I'm having trouble hearing you. Could you bring your

10 mike closer.

11 MR. McGLOTHLIN: I'll do better.

12 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Maybe we can get your volume

13 turned up. Chris.

14 Commissioner Skop.

15 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16 Was Mr. Weintraub's microphone on, too,

17 because I had some trouble.

18 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Oh, you had trouble hearing

19 him, as well?

20 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN CARTER: I think it was on.

22 THE WITNESS: It should be on.

23 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Good. You may proceed, Mr.

24 McGlothlin.

25
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1 BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:

2 Q. Mr. Weintraub, this is a hypothetical, but for

3 the purposes of the question assume that a new deposit

4 of sub-bituminous coal is discovered in Montana and is

5 opened to mining, and that the specs of that coal are

6 identical to the characteristics of the Wyoming coal

7 that was considered in 060658. Assume for -- make the

8 silly assumption for purposes of the question that it's

9 offered to Progress Energy at substantial savings

10 compared to the alternatives, but that the company

11 chooses to buy more expensive bituminous coal in lieu of

12 that Montana coal.

13 In that situation, based upon your view of the

14 import of the last docket, could the Commission fault

15 the utility for its choice and require it to make a

16 refund of any difference in the fuel costs?

17 A. If you are asking me if we should follow the

18 Commission order for 060658, I think we should.

19 Q. Well, my question goes beyond that. In this

20 situation would the effect of the order preclude the

21 Commission from finding that the utility made a poor

22 choice and requiring it to refund the difference between

23 the less expensive Montana coal?

24 A. Well, I think my rebuttal testimony shows that

25 the Montana coal was not the most cost-effective for the
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1 option that PEF put out.

2 Q. This is purely a hypothetical, Mr. Weintraub.

3 It is designed to simply understand your view of the

4 effect of the order in the last case. You contend that

5 because of the order in the last case, the coals that we

6 contend should have been purchased are out of bounds,

7 and I'm trying to understand what there is about that

8 order when applied to different circumstances has that

9 result. Now, did you understand the hypothetical that I

10 presented?

11 MR. BURNETT: Mr. Chair, excuse me. I don't

12 want to object that it seems to call for a legal

13 conclusion, but I will stipulate that under that

14 circumstance, the legal interpretation of that order is

15 you could issue a refund.

16 CHAIRMAN CARTER: I think he can ask him a

17 hypothetical based upon the perspective that he was

18 asking, and he was asking primarily based upon some

19 things that are within the confines of the record, but

20 also he can give him opinion. Was that correct, Mr.

21 McGlothlin?

22 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Yes, and it goes beyond that,

23 because it is this witness who has sponsored testimony

24 in which he asserts that only the coal that was the

25 subject of evidence in 060658 is a legitimate candidate,
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1 and that for that reason the Spring Creek coal and the

2 Indonesian coal are ineligible for consideration, and so

3 I think it's appropriate to ask --

4 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Let's see -- proceed. Let's

5 see where it goes.

6 BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:

7 Q. What is your answer to the question, Mr.

8 Weintraub?

9 A. My answer would be in your hypothetical that

10 in reviewing the Spring Creek and Indonesian coal, they

11 would not be the most cost-effective for PEF to have

12 purchased, and my rebuttal testimony addresses your

13 hypothetical directly. My direct testimony shows in

14 following the Commission order with all the PRB evidence

15 that I provided that the purchases that PEF made were

16 the prudent choice when compared to PRB. My rebuttal

17 testimony specifically addresses the Spring Creek and

18 the Indonesian coal.

19 Q. Yes, and your rebuttal testimony also contains

20 your contention that because these coals were not the

21 subject of evidence in 060658 they are not candidates

22 for consideration in the utility's choice. If I may, my

23 hypothetical is very simple. It is we are not talking

24 about Spring Creek, we are not talking about Indonesian.

25 For the purposes of the hypothetical we are talking
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1 about Montana sub-bituminous coal, which is identical in

2 terms of the specifications to that generic and typical

3 Wyoming coal that you contend was the subject of

4 evidence in the last case.

5 Was the fact that it is in Montana and not

6 Wyoming render it immune from criticism because it

7 wasn't the subject of evidence in the last case?

8 A. I think the Power River Basin coal is what is

9 in evidence for and 060658 and following into this

10 docket.

11 Q. So the answer to my hypothetical is what? In

12 that instance, could the Commission fault the utility

13 for failing to purchase the less expensive Montana coal

14 and order a refund?

15 MS. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, I have to

16 objection again, but he is asking can the Commission

17 fault the utility. That is a legal conclusion, and I am

18 stipulating you could.

19 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. McGlothlin.

20 MR. McGLOTHLIN: All right. I will move on to

21 the next question.

22 BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:

23 Q. Now, you recognize, do you not, sir, that in

24 the order the Commission defined Powder River Basin as

25 coal as that mined in the states of Wyoming and Montana?
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1 A. We are talking about Powder River Basin coal.

2 We are talking about 8800.8, and I do believe in the

3 order it does talk about whether it would be in Wyoming

4 or Montana.

5 Q. Okay. And my next illustration is this,

6 assume that there is a new deposit of sub-bituminous

7 coal that is found and opened to mining in Alabama, and

8 that it is beyond dispute that this is not Powder River

9 Basin coal, but is identical in terms of its

10 characteristics and specifications to the PRB coal in

11 Wyoming that you say was the subject of evidence in the

12 last case.

13 Now, this is Alabama coal identical in

14 characteristics and is offered to Progress Energy at a

15 price that represents a substantial savings over the

16 alternatives. In my hypothetical, under the silly

17 assumption that Progress Energy would instead buy more

18 expensive bituminous coal, it's not Powder River Basin

19 coal, but is identical in properties, could the

20 Commission disallow the differential between the cost of

21 the offered coal and the cost of the more expensive

22 bituminous coal?

23 MR. BURNETT: Mr. Chairman, the same

24 objection, the same stipulation. If the specs are

25 identical, I'll stipulate all day long you would have
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1 the right. If the specs are identical to the coal you

2 considered in the last case, I will go ahead and

3 stipulate. As a legal matter you can make a prudence

4 determination.

5 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Well, then will you stipulate

6 that the fact that the coal considered in 060658

7 happened to reside in Wyoming is no limitation on the

8 geographical location of coal that can be candidates for

9 consideration of disallowance?

10 MR. BURNETT: May I respond to you, Mr. Chair?

11 CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized.

12 MR. BURNETT: Thank you, sir.

13 Mr. Chair, I will stipulate that the physical

14 location of the coal of where it hails from is

15 irrelevant to us as far as the state. The

16 specifications of what -- under this hypothetical

17 scenario, if the specifications were 100 percent

18 absolutely identical to the thing you discovered in the

19 last case, that is our only beef, that is out only

20 problem.

21 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. McGlothlin.

22 BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:

23 Q. In response, I believe you addressed the

24 Indonesian coal in your rebuttal testimony, and I

25 believe you said that you were interested enough to seek
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1 more information and were interested in performing a

2 test burn of the Indonesian coal, is that correct?

3 A. That's correct.

4 Q. Here's a hypothetical. Assume that you

5 acquired the information you were looking for. You

6 assured yourself that the Indonesian coal was suitable

7 for the unit and that the price was right, but that

8 Progress Energy elected to burn a more expensive

9 bituminous coal. In that scenario, could the Commission

10 impose a disallowance for the differential?

11 A. In that situation, while the price is right,

12 while we were doing a test burn there would be

13 operational considerations that would come out of the

14 test burn that we would also take into consideration.

15 Like we talked about, even though sometimes the price as

16 far as the coal is right, the operational issues that

17 might add to the cost, the capital upgrades, all of that

18 would have to be considered.

19 Q. Okay. Assume that's all considered and you

20 are satisfied that there is no problem. There is no

21 problem operationally, the price is advantageous, but

22 you choose to buy a more expensive coal. But this is

23 Indonesian coal. In that situation, could the

24 Commission impose a disallowance?

25 A. The Commission could what they please to,
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1 absolutely.

2 Q. And they would not be precluded from that by

3 the fact that this coal was not the subject of evidence

4 in 060658?

5 A. The Commission can have any opportunities in

6 the fuel hearings that we have in this docket to deal

7 with what we do whether or not it is prudent. That is

8 my job is to make sure that what we do is prudent.

9 Q. In your summary you reiterated the point in

10 your rebuttal in which you say that Mr. Putman did not

11 take into account the effects of entering a contract for

12 two years of a three-year offer, is that correct?

13 A. That's correct.

14 Q. Do you have available to you, Mr. Weintraub,

15 two exhibits from Mr. Putman's testimony? They were

16 marked as DJB-5 and 6. Five is the letter from Mr.

17 Pitcher to management reporting the results of the 2004

18 RFP, and 06 is the summary of the bids to the April 2004

19 RFP.

20 A. I have them.

21 Q. Okay. On Page 3 of 4 of the letter report --

22 and check me if you need to, but under Delta coal, the

23 author is describing the purchases that resulted from

24 the 2004 RFP for two years, 2005 and 2006. And do you

25 see the statement, "We also purchased 360,000 each year
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1 from Progress Fuels Marketing and Trading. This product

2 will deliver into CR at $2.735 per MMBtu." Do you see

3 that statement?

4 A. No, I do not.

5 Q. Well, let's see if we're on the same page. I

6 have the memo to Charlie Gates that has been marked

7 DJP-5.

8 A. Yes, sir.

9 Q. And Page 3 of 4 under domestic rail, Delta

10 coal?

11 A. Yes, sir.

12 Q. That refers to a two-year purchase from

13 Progress Fuels Marketing and Trading at a cost of $2.735

14 per MMBtu, correct?

15 A. Correct.

16 Q. Now, if you'll turn to the bid summary of

17 2004. This particular transaction was for a Central App

18 coal, correct?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. And it's listed there as the fourth under the

21 middle column, which is called Central Appalachian

22 coals, correct?

23 A. Correct.

24 Q. And so you see that Progress offered a term

25 for all three years that were encompassed by the RFP?
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1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And if you'll check me, isn't it true that

3 with respect to the cash price, the price did not change

4 from that offered for the three years as a result of the

5 two-year purchase transaction that resulted?

6 A. For the Delta coal by rail, the 360,000 tons,

7 it looks like it was two years at 48.50 and 49.50, which

8 I believe when you take into account all those three

9 years, it all averages to about the cash cost.

10 Q. And that is the Diamond May (phonetic) origin

11 for Progress' bid for '05, '06, and '07, correct?

12 A. Correct.

13 Q. And so in that particular transaction, the

14 utility was able to receive a bid for all three years

15 and was able to negotiate a transaction for two years at

16 the same price, correct?

17 A. Well, it was the two years including the

18 prompt year, meaning '05 and '06.

19 Q. Yes.

20 A. Typically, the prompt year is the one that our

21 coal supplier would be very concerned with. So, yes, I

22 can see how a three-year bid for '05, '06, '07 got

23 truncated to an '05/'06 at the cash cost there.

24 Q. Okay. And in this period of time, were you

25 with the entity that submitted that bid?
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1 A. I believe I was.

2 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Those are all my questions.

3 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you, Mr. McGlothlin.

4 Ms. Bradley, you're recognized. And good

5 afternoon.

6 MS. BRADLEY: Good afternoon. No questions,

7 Mr. Chairman.

8 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you.

9 Commissioners, I want to go to -- okay, I will

10 come to the bench and then I will go to staff.

11 Commissioner Skop, you're recognized.

12 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

13 Mr. Weintraub, I guess in the interrogatory

14 response to 29A there were some prices listed in terms

15 of dollars per MMBtu delivered to terminal for coal that

16 was actually purchased in the time frame of 2006 through

17 2007. Are you generally familiar with that?

18 THE WITNESS: Yes, I am.

19 COMMISSIONER SKOP: And Progress, I guess, has

20 asserted via its response that those prices were cheaper

21 than the PRB alternative. Do you generally agree with

22 that?

23 THE WITNESS: I do.

24 COMMISSIONER SKOP: The question I have for

25 you, and I will narrow it to one specific question, in
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1 terms of the dollars per MMBtu delivered to terminal, am

2 I correct to understand with the exception of the one

3 purchase in May 2006 that those are a blend of

4 bituminous, domestic bituminous with imported bituminous

5 coals?

6 THE WITNESS: 29A talks about the change in

7 market conditions that occurred in dealing with the time

8 frame for '06 and '07. That is in conjunction with the

9 Attachment B to staff's interrogatory where staff asked

10 us to apply the Commission order to all of our purchases

11 that were made in '06 and '07. And when you compare --

12 first of all, all of the purchases that were made in '06

13 and '07, as well as the purchased that were laid out in

14 29A, it shows that the purchases that PEF made were

15 prudent when compared to PRB coal, and that's what's

16 specifically laid out in Attachment B.

17 And 29A shows examples of the purchases that

18 were made specifically in the '06 and '07 time frame. I

19 compared those purchases in the '06/'07 time frame to

20 the spot price of PRB coal at the time. I also used the

21 actual bid for the actual coal that was purchased for

22 the May 2006 test burn and compared the purchases that

23 were made to that test burn. Per your question

24 yesterday, we also included the SO2 for that particular

25 example, and with your permission can share that with
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1 you.

2 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Yes. That was going to be

3 what my question was, do those numbers encompass, since

4 you are burning bituminous coal versus the blend, would

5 there be a corresponding difference in terms of the

6 additional SO2 allowances and whether those were

7 reflected in those dollars per MMBtu, or would those

8 need to be added on extra?

9 THE WITNESS: They do need to be added on.

10 MR. BURNETT: May I approach?

11 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Burnett, you may

12 approach.

13 MR. BURNETT: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Just a moment here,

15 Commissioners, to get the information out to the bench

16 and to the parties.

17 Commissioner Skop, you're recognized.

18 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 If Mr. Weintraub could briefly, and I do mean

20 briefly, because we are strained for time, walk me

21 through what this additional handout purports to offer.

22 THE WITNESS: Sure. What I've done, the

23 original 29A was delivered directly to the terminal.

24 There would be additional cost to deliver the coal to

25 Crystal River, which I have included. So the additional
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1 cost, you see a column on the cents per million

2 delivered to Crystal River. The purchases that were

3 made during the '06/'07 time frame would be spot

4 purchases. This is also in Attachment B delivered to

5 Crystal River, so we extend that as well as an

6 Attachment B.

7 I then compared the PRB coal that I was

8 comparing to and carry that through to Crystal River. I

9 then also apply the SO2 value, I use an emission

10 allowance of $731 in '06 and $524 in '07 for the

11 appropriate time frame. I then add on the SO2 for the

12 purchases that we made and for the spot PRB coal. And

13 when you compare with the SO2 included, if you go all

14 the way to far right to the additional cost of PRB coal,

15 that would be the additional cost that PEF would have

16 incurred if we purchased PRB coal instead of the

17 bituminous coal that we purchased. That is also laid

18 out in Attachment B of staff's interrogatory.

19 I also went so far, since Mr. McGlothlin even

20 asked me questions about the Triton bid, the Triton bid

21 as we talked about in '06 and '07, I take the $8.25,

22 which was the actual bid, I include the transportation

23 costs that Mr. Heller proposes in his direct testimony,

24 these are the actual costs, carry those actual costs to

25 Crystal River, then also apply the same SO2 that would
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1 be applied. Differently than what Mr. Putman talked

2 about in his testimony, because the way, quite frankly,

3 Mr. Putman explained how SO2 is handled on DJP-6 and 8

4 is offensive, as he is trying to declare our company as

5 being imprudent when he does not understand how even

6 this bid sheet works.

7 So I have correctly accounted for SO2, the

8 all-in costs, and when you compare the Powder River

9 Basin coal for the purchases that we made, when you

10 compare the one particular bid that was being talked

11 about, when you take into account the actual PRB bid

12 that we received in the RFP, the evidence shows that

13 what PEF made was prudent, and to come to a different

14 conclusion would be just wrong.

15 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Two brief

16 follow-up questions, Mr. Chair. The last column, I am

17 assuming that is in dollars per MMBtu.

18 THE WITNESS: That is.

19 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. So the far right

20 column basically is the incremental cost, the

21 incremental additional cost that it would take to burn

22 PRB over and above what was actually done. Is that

23 correct?

24 THE WITNESS: Well, and then if you also look

25 at my bullet points, it doesn't take into account any

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

574

1 additional capital costs, that doesn't take into account

2 any type of contract duration that could have occurred

3 for skipping 2005, it doesn't take into account any

4 delivery constraints that we talked about, Mr. Putman

5 talked about quite extensively for '05 and early '06,

6 and it doesn't take into account the incremental barge

7 costs that I talk about in my rebuttal testimony because

8 of the fact that you will be leaving coal on the ground

9 and you would have to go and hire additional barges to

10 move the coal to Crystal River such that the plant

11 doesn't run out of coal. And those costs are not

12 included in that column.

13 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. And just one final

14 question with respect to the Indonesian coal, I guess,

15 that you would generally agree that Indonesian coal does

16 have some favorable properties, such as low sulfur, is

17 that correct?

18 THE WITNESS: Correct. That's what led us to

19 investigate testing it.

20 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. And, I guess I'm

21 going to ask you the same question I just asked Mr.

22 Putman. In terms of the fuel surcharge that would be

23 involved typically with marine transport of coal,

24 whether it be, you know, by barge on the Mississippi,

25 across the Gulf, or all the way from Indonesia, could
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1 the fuel surcharge at any point if you entered into a

2 long-term contract have made it cost prohibitive to burn

3 Indonesian coal on an as-delivered basis?

4 THE WITNESS: It would, and I can give you a

5 good example. If you look at the Spring Creek coal bid,

6 the Spring Creek coal bid had a fixed transportation

7 component to it in the offer. And on the cover page of

8 that bid it talks about including fuel surcharges as

9 well as a rail cost adjustment factor. These are

10 typical escalation charges that you would have for

11 transportation. And when you look at the actuals that

12 would have occurred, it would have increased the fixed

13 transportation component of that by over 35 percent.

14 COMMISSIONER SKOP: And do those costs, those

15 fuel surcharges, are those based -- are they just

16 constant charges or are they based typically on

17 distance?

18 THE WITNESS: The fuel surcharge can be based

19 upon the base rates, so it can change the base component

20 up and down. That is very typical of how it is done.

21 It is changing the fixed component up or down depending

22 upon the fuel surcharge.

23 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Thank you.

24 THE WITNESS: Commissioners, I'm going to

25 staff unless there is anything further from the bench.
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1 Staff, you're recognized.

2 MS. BENNETT: Thank you.

3 CROSS EXAMINATION

4 BY MS. BENNETT:

5 Q. Mr. Weintraub, when we started I thought I

6 understood DJP-6, but I want to make sure that I'm

7 completely clear. On DJP-6 is an evaluation by Progress

8 Energy of the different coals that were bid, is that

9 correct?

10 A. Correct. This is a tabulation of the bids

11 that were received to determine what type of short list

12 that we would then want to contact our suppliers to

13 start negotiating the contracts, which is typical

14 industry standard.

15 Q. And my next question, this is where I'm not

16 quite so clear, does that include the transportation to

17 get it to the Crystal River plant?

18 A. It does include the forecasted transportation

19 to get it to the transportation costs. So, for example,

20 on DJB-6, these are forecasted prices. We talked a

21 little bit about a barge contract in my deposition, and

22 you asked me when was that barge contract entered into.

23 It was entered into -- the RFP went out in roughly July

24 of 2006, I believe, and it was returned and entered

25 into. The new barge contract that we would have had for
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1 '05, and '06, and '07 would not have been known when

2 this particular bid sheet was put together. It was our

3 best estimate at the time, but the actuals that would

4 have incurred to move coal would have been different

5 than what is on that spreadsheet.

6 Q. And anywhere in our testimony does it include

7 the actuals to get the coal from the mine to Crystal

8 River?

9 A. Everything in my testimony is actuals.

10 Q. Okay. And that includes the transportation

11 costs?

12 A. That is correct. That if you took out the

13 coals, so we have actual coal movements that happened in

14 '06 and '07. OPC is saying let's take out that coal and

15 put in an alternative coal. And I'm applying the same

16 transportation costs to the alternative coals in my

17 rebuttal testimony, that being Spring Creek and the

18 Indonesian coal, those same actual coal costs that would

19 have incurred are what is in my rebuttal testimony.

20 Q. Okay. And then on Page 15 of your testimony,

21 you have talked about -- of your rebuttal testimony, you

22 have talked about some penalties that a breach of the

23 contract would incur for Progress, or Progress would

24 incur because of a breach of contract. And I want to

25 understand how much flexibility you have with that
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1 contract, the MEMCO contract, I believe. How much of

2 the option, if any, was used in order to blend with

3 other bituminous coals? I think you talked about an

4 Illinois Basin. How much of that option in that

5 contract was used to blend with the Illinois Basin coal?

6 A. I guess I'm confused. What Illinois Basin

7 coal are you referring to?

8 Q. Let me back up. The additional bituminous

9 coal that you blended with the CAPP coal, was any of

10 this contract used for that option?

11 A. Yes. So we used the MEMCO barge contract to

12 move bituminous coal in '06 and '07, '07 being the year

13 that if we followed through with OPC's recommendation we

14 would breach the contract. That coal was hauled in '07

15 on that barge contract.

16 Q. How much additional CAPP coal could have been

17 displaced by PRB and blended in an 80/20 blend using

18 this contract?

19 A. Well, the contract allows for a minimum of

20 500,000 tons and a maximum of 2.3 million tons. So any

21 portion of the contract could be utilized to haul the

22 coal as required for any type of blend.

23 Q. Okay. Then would there be a penalty for CAPP

24 coal if you were to -- for any of your contracts for

25 CAPP coal if you were to blend with the PRB coal, would
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1 you have any type of penalty there?

2 A. No. The MEMCO contract itself had different

3 points that we could haul coal on with different freight

4 rates. Those points would be in docks in the

5 Central Appalachian region as well as on the upper

6 Mississippi River, the Cora, the Cook, and the Kohokia,

7 which are typical midwest docks where sub-bituminous

8 coal would flow in. That barge contract could have been

9 utilized for any one of those particular origin points.

10 The default contract, the default would have occurred

11 because in doing the Indonesian coal and not burning the

12 Central App coal that OPC alleges, we would have

13 defaulted on the MEMCO contract by being below the

14 minimum volume.

15 MS. BENNETT: That's all the questions I have.

16 Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you.

18 Commissioner Argenziano.

19 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Yes. In the

20 questions that you gave to the witness in the

21 transportation charges, and I may ask the witness, too,

22 I don't know, was the answer that the actual transport

23 costs were the same no matter what the source was?

24 MS. BENNETT: I think I'd like to have the

25 witness answer that question.
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1 THE WITNESS: No. They are specific freight

2 rates depending upon where the coal is loaded and where

3 it ultimately is going to.

4 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: And if I may, are

5 those usually negotiated on?

6 THE WITNESS: They are negotiated on, so in

7 the RFP process we would typically receive in the RFP

8 process for transportation the different freight rates

9 for the various points, and there would be negotiation

10 around those rates.

11 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Is there any -- I

12 guess it is hypothetical. How does one find out what

13 the cost would be for the different -- how would a

14 Commissioner, myself, find out what the cost would be

15 and if there would be, you know, greater expense, and if

16 it is not, I guess, a rail that you normally use, does

17 that factor in?

18 THE WITNESS: Well, the transportation

19 contract itself is part of this discovery process. The

20 RFP process allows us to compete to get the best rate

21 for the various different points.

22 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: And does it

23 typically cost more -- well, we know with transportation

24 the farther away the more it cost, but I guess it's

25 similar -- it's hard to do that, isn't it? It would be
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1 in individual RFPs and negotiating.

2 THE WITNESS: Well, the MEMCO barge contract

3 came out of an RFP process. And out of that the one

4 that they -- the MEMCO contract, the contract was

5 awarded to MEMCO. They had the best rates for the

6 various different points to deliver it down into the New

7 Orleans area.

8 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioners, anything

10 further? Staff?

11 Mr. Burnett, redirect.

12 MR. BURNETT: Sir, I do not have any redirect,

13 but I would like to mark the handout, if I could, as the

14 next exhibit number, and move it.

15 CHAIRMAN CARTER: This is the exhibit that --

16 Mr. McGlothlin, Ms. Bradley, have you had an opportunity

17 to look this over?

18 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Not really, and I do object

19 to its admission.

20 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay.

21 MR. McGLOTHLIN: This is the first time we

22 have seen this, and it isn't clear to me what all the

23 information is, but from what I glean by his comments,

24 among other things, he said he took offense at something

25 Mr. Putman said, and the references to the Triton bid
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1 here tells me that it is neither a response to a

2 Commissioner for information nor is it proper rebuttal

3 of the prefiled testimony that Mr. Putman submitted

4 earlier. And it arrives at a time when we have already

5 said we have no further cross questions, so I object to

6 its admission.

7 Finally, it looks more complicated to me than

8 my Exhibit 60, which I also submitted on this subject of

9 Triton coal that was not allowed.

10 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. And, Ms. Helton, I'm

11 inclined to agree with Mr. McGlothlin on this matter

12 here.

13 MS. HELTON: That works for me, Mr. Chairman.

14 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Because in fairness to the

15 parties, it was not an exhibit of the parties. They

16 brought this in response to a question that one of the

17 Commissioners had, and I think it is probably -- I think

18 Mr. McGlothlin is right on that. I'm going to rule

19 inadmissibility of this.

20 Commissioner Skop.

21 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

22 And I apologize for that, because that is the

23 same issue when I was asking a question in the interest

24 of being fair to OPC and counsel. Certainly they should

25 be able to ask questions of the witness with respect to
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1 this document. So if the Chair would deem to exclude

2 it, sobeit, but what I had admitted to offer via the

3 Chair to Mr. McGlothlin would, in the interest of

4 fairness, certainly they would be able to ask additional

5 questions as to this document if they chose to do so.

6 So whichever is their preference.

7 CHAIRMAN CARTER: I'm going to leave it out,

8 because a lot of times from the bench you may get a

9 question that just kind of helps us to frame what we are

10 asking, but based upon advice of our counsel,

11 Commissioners, I'm going to rule it inadmissible in this

12 matter.

13 MR. BURNETT: Yes, sir. We would move then

14 the prefiled rebuttal testimony into evidence as well as

15 Exhibit 30.

16 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Are there any

17 objections?

18 MR. McGLOTHLIN: None.

19 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Without objection, show it

20 done.

21 (Exhibit Number 30 admitted into evidence.)

22 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Weintraub, you may be

23 excused.

24 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Call your next witness.
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1 MR. BURNETT: Yes, sir. We call Mr. Heller.

2 JAMES N. HELLER

3 was called as a witness on behalf of Progress Energy

4 Florida, and having been duly sworn, testified as

5 follows:

6 DIRECT EXAMINATION

7 BY MR. BURNETT:

8 Q. Mr. Heller, I'm going to try to keep moving

9 fast, so I might read a little fast here. Have you

10 already been sworn as a witness?

11 A. Yes, I have.

12 Q. Have you filed prefiled rebuttal testimony and

13 exhibits in this matter?

14 A. Yes, I have.

15 Q. Do you have your prefiled rebuttal testimony

16 and exhibits with you?

17 A. I do.

18 Q. Do you have any changes to make to your

19 prefiled rebuttal testimony?

20 A. I do not.

21 Q. If I asked you the same questions in your

22 prefiled rebuttal testimony today, would you give the

23 same answers that are in your prefiled rebuttal

24 testimony?

25 A. Yes.
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1 MS. BENNETT: We request, Mr. Chairman, that

2 the prefiled rebuttal testimony be entered into the

3 record as if read here today.

4 CHAIRMAN CARTER: The prefiled testimony will

5 be inserted into the record as though read. You may

6 proceed.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25
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1 BY MR. BURNETT:

2 Q. Do you have a summary of your prefiled

3 rebuttal testimony, sir?

4 A. I do.

5 Q. And, again, keeping the seven minutes in mind,

6 will you please provide that summary.

7 A. I'll actually summarize the summary.

8 In my rebuttal testimony I was asked to review

9 Mr. Putman's testimony and identify anything that were

10 errors that relate to the cost-effectiveness test that

11 staff performed in their primary recommendation in

12 Docket 060658.

13 Consistent with that, I found that there were

14 four major errors in Mr. Putman's calculations that need

15 to be corrected, and those are the ones that I have

16 addressed in my testimony. The first one had to do with

17 what we have been calling Btu displacement, and Mr.

18 Putman corrected part of that in his revised testimony,

19 but it still is wrong in two serious respects. One of

20 them is that it does not use the Commission methodology

21 in terms of Btu displacement as I understood it. It

22 uses different tonnage amounts than that was supposed to

23 include. And, secondly, when he goes to actual tonnages

24 he includes tonnage going through the Port of Mobile,

25 and there has been discussion about the inability to do
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1 blending there that would make that impractical.

2 The second one which was discussed in great

3 detail in my previous testimony had to do with the

4 question of capital costs and whether or not they should

5 be included. I believe they should be included in the

6 cost-effectiveness test and Mr. Putman does not.

7 The third major error, although I'm not sure

8 there is a disagreement having listened to his testimony

9 this morning, had to do with transportation constraints.

10 In my analysis, I imposed a transportation constraint in

11 the first quarter of 2006 because of the disruption in

12 PRB rail deliveries. I think that should be included,

13 Mr. Putman does not. But listening to him this morning,

14 he seemed to acknowledge that that was a problem, as

15 well.

16 And the final question had to do with SO2

17 emission allowances. And Mr. Putman does not do them

18 correctly, either in the revised testimony or in the

19 initial testimony. And the methodology is laid out in

20 what I have done, and those errors together are

21 substantial. The total amount of alleged damages, which

22 are reduced through those -- reduced down to

23 $29.6 million, that's a combination of what Mr. Putman

24 did in his revised testimony, but there is another

25 $13.6 million in differences that we have. Six million
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1 dollars of those relate to the Btu displacement, which I

2 think is still not done correctly; $477,000 of that

3 relates to the capital cost exclusion; $983,000 relate

4 to the transportation constraints both at Mobile and the

5 difficulty in unloading the Indonesian coal if it were

6 to be received; and then $6.2 million which relates to

7 the SO2, what I call the double count because it was

8 included in Progress Energy's evaluation sheets and

9 shouldn't be counted again as a separate calculation.

10 That's a summary of my testimony.

11 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you.

12 Let me do one thing before we do the

13 housekeeping matter. Ms. Bradley, for the record, it is

14 duly noted that you objected on the same basis as Mr.

15 Reilly did on that last -- I'm sorry, I didn't look over

16 there.

17 MS. BRADLEY: I didn't get a chance, but I

18 would have.

19 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Yes. Thank you.

20 Just for the record, I wanted to make sure

21 that we are clear that you did enter an objection to

22 this admission of that. Thank you so kindly.

23 MS. BRADLEY: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Argenziano,

25 you're recognized.
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1 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Thank you.

2 Just a couple of questions, because it keeps

3 coming up, and I haven't had a real clarification. In

4 regards to the blending that you mentioned of the coal,

5 that it can't be done or it would be impractical. Can

6 you tell me why? I am under the understanding that they

7 do blending in Mobile. What would be the difference?

8 THE WITNESS: You are correct that they do

9 blending at Mobile. There are actually two facilities

10 at Mobile, there is the McDuffie terminal that Mr.

11 Putman referred to where Southern Company takes in and

12 does do blending. There is another facility called the

13 bulk facility, or bulk terminal, and blending cannot be

14 done at that facility.

15 My understanding is that Progress Energy

16 approached Mobile, the Port of Mobile about being able

17 to blend at the facility, and there were two kinds of

18 problems. One is the McDuffie terminal is highly

19 utilized. Southern Company actually is the principal

20 user of that. It's also an export terminal, meaning

21 that there are metallurgical coals in particular out of

22 Alabama that come through it. There can be blending of

23 those, and then they are shipped abroad.

24 It's my understanding that Progress Energy,

25 when they went out for a solicitation, did not get a
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1 response from McDuffie terminal. However, they were

2 offered the bulk plant as a possible place that they

3 could operate from. The bulk plant does not

4 have blending capability, meaning you couldn't bring in

5 the Indonesian coal, and as Mr. Putman explained, put it

6 on the ground and have a place to mix them together with

7 the Central Appalachian coal or bituminous coal and then

8 ship them to the plant.

9 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: I'm sorry, who

10 offered the bulk terminal?

11 THE WITNESS: The Alabama state docks. In

12 other words, as I understand it there is a set of

13 facilities there. Normally you can have more than one

14 peer, for example, at a port, and the capabilities of

15 the different -- the different facilities within the

16 port can differ.

17 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Did Progress, to

18 your knowledge, get a denial, or just McDuffie said

19 sorry, we can't do?

20 THE WITNESS: My understanding was McDuffie

21 could not handle it. They offered -- the authority

22 offered them the bulk plant. Let me say one other thing

23 about -- one of the areas that's important when you are

24 moving ships in and out is you want to avoid demurrage,

25 and the problem is there would be no priority. What
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1 Progress Energy wanted was priority for their vessels so

2 that if they were to use the McDuffie terminal they

3 would get the ability to bring a vessel in, have it

4 loaded quickly, move it back out. They would have gone

5 into a queue had they gotten the ability to use it with

6 the ocean-going vessels that are exporting coal and with

7 the Drummond or Southern Company vessels that are coming

8 in, so. The ability to be able to dispatch those

9 vessels quickly is something that wouldn't have been

10 available to them.

11 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: So timing then was

12 an issue as far as being able to rely on getting the

13 blending done and moving in and out in a quicker manner.

14 THE WITNESS: Ships cost money. When a ship

15 sits it can cost -- well, a big ship can cost $30,000 a

16 day.

17 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. And

18 transportation constraints at Mobile, is that the one

19 you are talking about, meaning getting it from Mobile to

20 the plant?

21 THE WITNESS: No, Mobile is the blending. You

22 asked me about the blending constraint. The

23 transportation constraints that I referred to in terms

24 of the --

25 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: In the rail, I think
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1 you had mentioned that there were disruptions in rail.

2 THE WITNESS: Right. In 2005 there was a

3 virtual meltdown in the western rail delivery system

4 because of problems at the origination. I think

5 Southern Company purchasing coal at $4 a million Btu was

6 a desperate result to try and fill that hole. In the

7 last docket, Mr. Sansom and I both agreed that there was

8 a problem, and there was 7-1/2 -- of the amount that was

9 to be available for blending in the Commission

10 effectiveness test, that was actually reduced to account

11 for this disruption. And this disruption went into

12 2006. And in my analysis, I have taken the 7-1/2

13 percent, but only applied it to the first quarter of

14 2006 saying that even if they had been buying

15 sub-bituminous coal from the Powder River Basin, they

16 would have had trouble getting it delivered.

17 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: And those conditions

18 still exist with that rail?

19 THE WITNESS: No. Those conditions actually

20 got relieved by the middle of 2006. The other area that

21 deals with the transportation constraint has to do with

22 the ability to unload the vessels that would have been

23 coming from Indonesian at the terminal in New Orleans.

24 Again, a vessel comes in -- these are 70,000-ton

25 vessels, and the dock will provide a guarantee for how
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1 quickly they can unload the vessel.

2 My recollection is that in the bid the

3 assumption was that you could unload 20,000 tons a day.

4 The terminal itself also has to make a commitment, and

5 their guarantee was 12,000 tons a day. As a result, the

6 vessel wouldn't have turned as quickly, and then these

7 demurrage charges apply and that -- it's not a bar to

8 doing transportation, it is just an additional cost.

9 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: And that would, I

10 guess, be a risk factor in a timely -- or I guess it's

11 more costly, but the disruption of the rail would be

12 more of a risk factor if it was a continued type of

13 operation, I guess.

14 THE WITNESS: The rail -- and that's

15 hindsight, but it's part of the cost-effectiveness test

16 because in a practical -- it would have been impossible

17 to tell in 2005 had they committed to western rail early

18 in the year what was going to happen in 2006. But as a

19 practical matter, they wouldn't have been able to get

20 all the coal delivered. And so if there is a penalty

21 assessed in assessment it, would be reduced by that

22 amount.

23 The other, which is the demurrage, I think as

24 a practical matter somebody who is actually shipping

25 using that route would almost certainly incur those
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1 kinds of additional transportation costs, plus a risk

2 factor that is an additional cost --

3 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Skop.

5 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6 Mr. Heller, I guess I had asked a couple of

7 previous questions to Mr. Putman, and I'm going to ask

8 you the same questions. One, I think, may have been my

9 mistake, so I just want to clarify that. In our prior

10 order, the 060658 order -- I mean docket, the

11 Commission -- and I think it's in your direct testimony,

12 and maybe you can help me find it, but I'm trying to get

13 a handle on whether the Commission compared the average

14 price of delivered CAPP, or whether we used it to offset

15 the highest 20 percent in terms of the PRB.

16 THE WITNESS: The PRB is used to offset the

17 highest 20 percent, but it's actually -- the number is

18 the average of that highest 20 percent, so it could have

19 been confusing.

20 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. And in this

21 docket we know the delivered price of the CAPP coal from

22 your JNH-3 exhibit for 2006 and 2007 as it was filed in

23 this docket, is that correct?

24 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

25 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. And to your
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1 knowledge, do we know what the price of delivered Powder

2 River Basin coal to Crystal River would have been for

3 the 2006 and 2007 years as offered in response to the

4 April 2004 RFP that was issued by Progress, and

5 accounting for any adjustments that would need to be

6 made for inflaters that consider both the coal and

7 transportation contracts that may or may not have been

8 entered into at the time of the bid evaluations?

9 THE WITNESS: I think the only data that may

10 have addressed that was the exhibit that just went in

11 and out. It may have had the proper information on

12 there, but I'm not sure if it's anywhere else.

13 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. To your knowledge,

14 has OPC provided the delivered price of PRB coal to

15 Crystal River? I guess that's where -- I'm trying to

16 figure out what we have and what we don't have so I can

17 condense in my mind what comparisons would need to be

18 made when ultimately I'm asked to decide this. But I'm

19 trying to find what I feel to be, perhaps, some missing

20 pieces. And I was wondering if you could point to any

21 specific reference that shows the delivered price of PRB

22 coal that would be -- you know, if, in fact, Progress

23 had bought the coal and entered into contracts and the

24 contracts had been adjusted for whatever inflater

25 factors that would be in the contracts, or however the
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1 structure of those contracts would have been, do we have

2 any data that suggests what those delivered prices would

3 be?

4 THE WITNESS: You do have data. I have given

5 you the transportation costs in my original analysis

6 that give you the cost of actually transporting the coal

7 to the plant. The treatment of Powder River Basin bids

8 in response to the 2004 RFP, the prices are included in

9 those. The escalation that would have occurred under

10 those, or the adjustments that would need to have been

11 made because of the fact that those weren't for bids

12 beginning in 2006 and 2007, but for 2005, that data is

13 here, but I don't think anybody has put in anything

14 other than what I have put in in terms of what the

15 delivered Powder River Basin coal looks like under the

16 test. I think that is the data you have got.

17 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you. Mr. McGlothlin.

19 CROSS EXAMINATION

20 BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:

21 Q. Mr. Heller, in your calculation of the Btu

22 adjustment, what do you assume to be the source of the

23 additional Btus?

24 A. I assume it to be a sub-bituminous Powder

25 River Basin coal.
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1 Q. And of what blend?

2 A. I'm sorry, the PRB coal itself is not blended.

3 The PRB coal itself goes in as a blend with the

4 bituminous coals.

5 Q. I think we may be talking past each other.

6 After the differential in Btu content is taken into

7 account and the differential in Btus between -- that

8 would have been provided by pure bituminous and that

9 which is provided by the blend is quantified. There is

10 an adjustment to balance the Btus, correct?

11 A. Correct, you have to deliver all the Btus to

12 the plant.

13 Q. And as you approach it, what assumption do you

14 make with respect to the coal that constitutes those

15 additional Btus?

16 A. The methodology, I think, is fairly

17 straightforward. Under the Commission effectiveness

18 test, we assume 2.4 million tons of coal for water

19 delivery, 20 percent of that is -- 20 percent of that is

20 what we are supposed to be blending. So if I take

21 2.4 million tons, and I take 20 percent of that, that

22 gets me 480,000 tons. Then if I use a Btu of -- 8800

23 Btu, which is the Powder River Basin, typical Powder

24 River Basin coal, that is 8800 Btus per pound is 17.6

25 million Btus per ton. That gives me the 8.448 trillion
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1 Btus. That's my blending target. That's what I need to

2 displace. That's 20 percent of the tons.

3 Q. Are you saying that at the end of the day

4 after you have balanced the Btus, 20 percent of the

5 total Btus come from the sub-bituminous coal?

6 A. It's 20 percent of the -- it's 20 percent of

7 the tons delivered to the plant, the waterborne tons.

8 Q. Yes.

9 A. If they were to be PRB coal at 8800 Btu, that

10 would be 8.448 trillion Btus. If the coal that you used

11 to get that isn't exactly 8800 Btu coal, then you are

12 going to end up with slightly -- it could be slightly

13 more or less coal actually being delivered, but it's

14 those tons that would match the -- that would hit those

15 trillion Btus.

16 Q. Okay. Let me ask a slightly different

17 question. You are aware that the Commission determined

18 in the last docket that Progress Energy can burn a blend

19 consisting of 20 percent sub-bituminous coal, 80 percent

20 bituminous coal at Crystal River 4 and 5, correct?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. Now, in terms of quantifying the total Btus to

23 be delivered to maintain that -- necessary to maintain

24 operations, does your approach maintain the 20 percent

25 PRB by weight ratio that the Commission specified in its
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1 order?

2 A. It might vary it. If the Btus are not exactly

3 8800 Btus, then you may end up with slightly more or

4 slightly less. But the cost-effectiveness, I understand

5 the pieces of the order, but the math of the

6 cost-effectiveness test is laid out in the methodology I

7 just described to you.

8 Q. Is the objective of your calculation to

9 attempt to come as close to the 20/80 as possible by

10 weight?

11 A. The objective of the calculation is to

12 displace 20 percent of the 2.4 million tons with

13 sub-bituminous coal.

14 Q. In response to some questions from

15 Commissioner Argenziano you referred to the Alabama

16 state dock situation. At Page 4 you say, "Furthermore,

17 a significant portion of the waterborne coal supply for

18 CR4 and CR5 is delivered via the Alabama state docks

19 near Mobile, Alabama, where Progress Energy does not

20 have a contract that allows for coal blending."

21 That's all you said about that subject in your

22 prefiled testimony, isn't it, sir?

23 A. I'm sorry, what was the question?

24 Q. That is everything you had to say about that

25 subject in your prefiled rebuttal in terms of that
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1 situation?

2 A. Yes. They don't have the ability to blend.

3 Q. Okay. Now as I understand your answer to the

4 Commissioner, there has been some back and forth between

5 Progress Energy and the terminal facility. And do you

6 know whether the transaction that was contemplated at

7 the time involved Progress Energy's request for blending

8 services?

9 MR. BURNETT: I object to the form; confusing,

10 ambiguous, and I believe lacks foundation.

11 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Just rephrase.

12 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Did I do all of that?

13 (Laughter.)

14 BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:

15 Q. All right. Correct me if I am wrong, Mr.

16 Heller, but as I understood your answer to the

17 Commissioner on the subject of the Alabama state docks,

18 you said that the terminal had offered Progress Energy

19 one aspect of the facility, but that did not include the

20 blending capability. Am I correct or incorrect in that?

21 A. My understanding is they offered the bulk

22 plant. The bulk plant does not have blending

23 capability.

24 Q. Do you know whether Progress Energy requested

25 the blending capability specifically when it approached
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1 the terminal for a contract?

2 A. My understanding is they did. They requested

3 the use of the McDuffie docks, which does have blending

4 capability.

5 Q. Okay. Does the bulk terminal presently have

6 the blending capability?

7 A. No. I'm sorry, does the bulk plant?

8 Q. Yes.

9 A. No.

10 Q. In your experience, do parties respond to

11 economic incentives?

12 A. Is that like a very general question? Yes,

13 people generally will.

14 Q. If the terminal had the opportunity to provide

15 additional blending services for compensation, wouldn't

16 it have the incentive to install the blending capability

17 at that point?

18 A. If your question is could Progress Energy have

19 underwritten development of a blending facility at the

20 bulk plant, I don't know if the capability is there or

21 if that would be at all an economic option.

22 Q. Well, basically to summarize the situation,

23 the utility doesn't presently have a contract for

24 blending services. Mr. Putman assumes that the parties

25 would have -- I mean, it would be in their mutual
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1 interest to work something out and that that could

2 change. Your assumption is that the status quo would

3 continue, is that where we are?

4 A. No. I inquired, and my understanding is that

5 Progress Energy approached the Alabama state docks to be

6 able to use the McDuffie facility. The McDuffie

7 facility is highly utilized. The Alabama state docks

8 was not interested in them as a customer. However, the

9 bulk plant, which does not have blending capability, is

10 available and they could use that. So they could move

11 coal through there, but they can't blend.

12 Q. Well, your assumption in the answer to my

13 question was that only the McDuffie would continue to

14 have a blending capability, but that could also change,

15 could it not?

16 A. Meaning they could lose the capability or the

17 bulk -- you are saying they could -- they have expanded

18 the facility. In the future it could expand again, but

19 at the time -- when they inquired, it was not available.

20 Q. In your rebuttal you also address the capital

21 cost, and you and I have conversed about that more than

22 one time, haven't we?

23 A. Yes, sir.

24 MR. McGLOTHLIN: I believe I'll not repeat

25 that question and answer session. I have no further
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1 questions.

2 CHAIRMAN CARTER: I just wanted to give Mr.

3 McGlothlin a compliment. He is a gentleman and a

4 scholar.

5 Commissioner Argenziano, you're recognized.

6 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Just one other

7 question. If the Mobile site could not do the blending,

8 or they are congested as you say, or just busy, is there

9 any other plant close by, or any other port close by, or

10 dock close by that could do that?

11 THE WITNESS: The best blending facilities are

12 the ones that they use currently either at IMT or the

13 United bulk terminal. Those are in New Orleans. There

14 are no other facilities -- I'm pretty sure about this,

15 there are no other facilities along the Gulf Coast which

16 would be the logical place to go where you could do that

17 blending. So the Alabama state docks would be the right

18 next area, but it's unavailable.

19 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: And is there a plant

20 in Theodore, Alabama? I am just pulling that, I don't

21 know. I'm asking you if you know.

22 THE WITNESS: If there were a major port there

23 I would know about it.

24 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: You would know about

25 it. Okay.
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1 THE WITNESS: I don't know about it.

2 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: There is not a major

3 port. Okay, thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you. Ms. Bradley.

5 MS. BRADLEY: No questions.

6 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you very much, Ms.

7 Bradley.

8 Commissioners, I'm going to go to staff and

9 then I will come back to the bench. Staff, you're

10 recognized.

11 MR. YOUNG: No questions.

12 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Back at the bench. Anything

13 further from the bench?

14 Mr. Burnett.

15 MR. BURNETT: Hoping to also get the gentleman

16 and scholar designation, no redirect, sir.

17 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Absolutely. You are a

18 gentleman and a scholar, sir.

19 MR. BURNETT: I would move the prefiled

20 rebuttal testimony into evidence, as well as Exhibits

21 31, 32, 33, and 34.

22 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Are there any objections?

23 MR. McGLOTHLIN: No.

24 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Without objection, show it

25 done.
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1 (Exhibit Number 31 through 34 admitted into

2 the record.)

3 CHAIRMAN CARTER: And you, Ms. Bradley, are a

4 gentle lady and a scholar.

5 MS. BRADLEY: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Plus one, because you were

7 better than these guys. Okay.

8 You may be excused, Mr. Heller.

9 Call your next witness.

10 MR. BURNETT: Yes, sir. We call Jennifer

11 Stenger. Mr. Chair, while Ms. Stenger is approaching

12 the bench, I wanted to say that if at anytime during her

13 questioning that she refers to any of the JS-9 blowups

14 that we have over there, that does not represent the

15 full JS-9. The full JS-9 would be what you would see in

16 your testimony, and the difference is at the bottom of

17 the full JS-9 there is also an analysis of what the

18 blends would look like, a blend comparison. So I just

19 wanted to make that clear that if she does use one of

20 those boards, you would need to turn to her actual

21 testimony to see the blend comparison, as well.

22 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Looking forward to

23 it.

24 MR. BURNETT: I'm not sure that will happen, I

25 just wanted to fairly disclose that.
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1 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Oh, it's time for the blue

2 folder.

3 MR. BURNETT: Mr. Chair, if I may.

4 CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized.

5 MR. BURNETT: Any of these boards should be in

6 your blue folder. That is a good point. And I don't

7 know if Ms. Stenger plans to move; if she does, we may

8 want to get the mobile microphone issue taken care of

9 before she starts.

10 Thank you, Mr. Chair. May I proceed?

11 CHAIRMAN CARTER: You may proceed.

12 JENNIFER STENGER

13 was called as a witness on behalf of Progress Energy

14 Florida, and having been duly sworn, testified as

15 follows:

16 DIRECT EXAMINATION

17 BY MR. BURNETT:

18 Q. Good afternoon. Will you please introduce

19 yourself to the Commission and provide your business

20 address.

21 A. My name is Jennifer Stenger, and my business

22 is 299 First Avenue North, St. Petersburg, Florida, zip

23 code 33701.

24 Q. Have you already been sworn as a witness, Ms.

25 Stenger?
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1 A. Yes, I have.

2 Q. Who do you work for and what is your position?

3 A. I work for Progress Energy Florida, and my

4 position is Lead Technical Project Management

5 Specialist.

6 Q. Have you filed prefiled rebuttal testimony and

7 exhibits in this matter?

8 A. Yes, I have.

9 Q. Do you have your prefiled rebuttal testimony

10 and exhibits with you?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Do you have any changes to make to your

13 prefiled rebuttal testimony and exhibits?

14 A. I do not.

15 Q. If I asked you the same questions in your

16 prefiled rebuttal testimony today, would you give me the

17 same answers that are in that testimony?

18 A. Yes, I would.

19 MR. BURNETT: Mr. Chair, we request that the

20 prefiled rebuttal testimony be entered into the record

21 as if read here today.

22 CHAIRMAN CARTER: The prefiled testimony of

23 the witness will be inserted into the record as though

24 read. You may proceed.

25 MR. BURNETT: Thank you, sir.
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1 BY MR. BURNETT:

2 Q. Ms. Stenger, do you have a summary of your

3 prefiled rebuttal testimony?

4 A. Yes, I do.

5 Q. Keep the seven minutes in mind, please, and

6 summarize your testimony.

7 A. All right. Thank you.

8 Good day, Commissioners. My name is Jennifer

9 Stenger, and I have been employed as an engineer with

10 Progress Energy Florida for the last 17 years since I

11 graduated from the Georgia Institute of Technology. My

12 position resides as strategic engineering under the

13 power operations group, and I am responsible for

14 assessing impacts to PEF's power generation fleet for

15 significant strategic initiatives and industry

16 challenges. These initiatives range from evaluating

17 impacts to our fleet from major regulatory and

18 legislative activities to leading a task force to review

19 fuel flexibility issues for our generating units.

20 I want to start my testimony, or my summary by

21 addressing what you have heard from Mr. Putman regarding

22 operational impacts, coal evaluation durations, and

23 evaluation processes for Unit 4 and 5. Said simply,

24 virtually everything that you heard is either wrong or

25 highly misrepresented. For example, Mr. Putman told you
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1 that you can blend away slagging and fouling impacts for

2 high sodium content. This is an incorrect analysis due

3 to the low melting temperature of the sodium in the

4 coal.

5 It's real easy to sound fancy and technical

6 when you are talking to people who may not understand

7 all of the technical details, but unless you first

8 understand the chemical reactions associated with this

9 mineral constituent and other components you cannot make

10 these claims that Mr. Putman has. If you let me, I will

11 address these issues in more detail when I complete my

12 summary.

13 Now, turning to my rebuttal testimony. Before

14 coals of a different type or coals with different

15 qualities are burned at CR4 and 5, PEF carefully

16 evaluates these coals to determine the impact that they

17 will have on operation and production of these units.

18 Without previous burning experience or knowledge of how

19 their coal characteristics will impact operation, PEF

20 places these units at a risk of an outage, a derate, an

21 environmental permit violation, or other operational

22 difficulties.

23 PEF's operational obligations at Crystal River

24 Units 4 and 5 require a demonstration of performance

25 impacts of any new coal so that we can evaluate those
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1 impacts and make an educated decision about the use of

2 the new coal at our plants. Typically, this means

3 predictive modeling, equipment evaluations, and test

4 burns need to be conducted. In the previous case,

5 Docket 060658, the Commission considered and accepted

6 PEF's process to test PRB coal, a coal that it had no

7 previous experience with. The accepted process included

8 predictive paper tests, benchmarking, test burns,

9 independent analysis and studies, environmental

10 permitting, and other related activities.

11 The Commission also recognized that an

12 analysis had to be done during the course of test burns,

13 and such analysis may include various degrees of

14 engineering studies as well as determining potential

15 capital upgrades to the plants. And the Commission

16 recognized that it would have taken PEF over two full

17 years to be ready to burn PRB coal had PEF begun the

18 process in 2001.

19 The process that PEF continues to use when it

20 considers burning a new type of coal in Crystal River

21 Units 4 and 5 is the same one the Commission heard

22 evidence on and ruled on in the previous case. With

23 this in mind, however, it is critically important to

24 understand that in the previous case the Commission

25 heard testimony and evidence only on Wyoming Powder
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1 River Basin coal and how that coal may perform at

2 Crystal River 4 and 5.

3 Wyoming PRB coal is a very different coal from

4 Spring Creek coal and Indonesian coal that OPC Witness

5 David Putman alleges PEF should have purchased in 2006

6 and 2007. The company has not previously tested either

7 of these coals, nor did the Commission hear evidence on

8 them in the previous case.

9 As you can see from my Exhibit 9 to my

10 prefiled testimony, Spring Creek coal has over 400

11 percent more sodium than the PRB coal that the

12 Commission considered in the previous case, as well as a

13 51 percent higher base-to-acid ratio. Pages 19 to 22 of

14 my prefiled testimony describe the dramatic slagging and

15 fouling effects that these differences may have on the

16 operational performance of Units 4 and 5, and Exhibit 14

17 provides pictures to illustrate what slagging and

18 fouling look like in other units.

19 Exhibit 9 to my prefiled testimony also shows

20 the dramatic differences between the Indonesian coals

21 that Mr. Putman uses in his testimony and the coals that

22 the Commission actually heard evidence on in the

23 previous case. That exhibit shows sulfur differences of

24 78 percent, iron differences of 119 percent,

25 base-to-acid ratio differences of 142 percent, and most
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1 important for safety, self-heating temperatures which

2 indicate the potential for spontaneous combustion at

3 ambient conditions that are up to 56 percent lower than

4 Wyoming PRB coal and the Commission considered in the

5 previous case.

6 Pages 38 through 43 of my prefiled testimony

7 discuss what impacts these Indonesian coals may have at

8 Units 4 and 5. If PEF could have safely and effectively

9 burned Spring Creek or Indonesian coal on a long-term

10 basis, a fact that only proper testing and evaluation

11 could prove, it would have been at least January to

12 October of 2007 before PEF could have completed proper

13 testing on the Spring Creek coal offered in 2004 RFP for

14 2006 delivery; and at least November 2008 to October

15 2009 before PEF could have completed testing on

16 Indonesian coal offered in the 2006 RFP for 2007

17 delivery.

18 My supporting analysis for these dates are

19 provided in Exhibits 11 and 12 to my testimony, and

20 potential capital upgrades that may be needed, upgrades

21 that are incremental and different from the ones that

22 the Commission addressed for PRB coal in the last case,

23 are included in Exhibit 8.

24 In conclusion, PEF could not have reasonably

25 been able to burn the coals that Mr. Putman addresses in
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1 his testimony in 2006 and 2007 as Mr. Putman suggests

2 because PEF could not have completed the evaluation,

3 testing, permitting, and any necessary capital upgrades

4 and integration of those coals until times well after

5 2006 and 2007, assuming that everything went perfectly

6 without any issues in the testing process.

7 Also, PEF may have to spend up to $176 million

8 in new capital upgrades to burn these coals. Mr.

9 Putman's assertions that no testing or a short four-day

10 test is all that is needed to burn these coals is

11 completely out of line with any reasonable process that

12 I am familiar with and simply does not pass the test of

13 logic and common sense when scrutinized.

14 Thank you for your time, Commissioners, and I

15 ask you to please ask me any questions that you may have

16 so that I can provide you with further detail on the

17 points that I have raised in this brief summary.

18 MR. BURNETT: We tender Ms. Stenger.

19 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you.

20 Mr. McGlothlin, you're recognized, sir.

21 CROSS EXAMINATION

22 BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:

23 Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Stenger. You began your

24 presentation and made some references to Mr. Putman, and

25 then you said, "Now, I am turning to my rebuttal
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1 summary." Were those two different presentations?

2 A. That was part of my summary.

3 Q. Do you recall the statement that you said,

4 "Now, turning to my rebuttal testimony," do you remember

5 saying that?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Well, do I understand correctly that your

8 remarks were not part of the summary of your rebuttal

9 testimony?

10 A. It's a summary of information that I have.

11 Q. Well, it's a summary of information that you

12 may have, but it wasn't a summary of the content of your

13 prefiled rebuttal testimony, was it? That was

14 something --

15 A. Well, yes, actually it is, because it is

16 assertions that the information that Mr. Putman provided

17 is different from anything that's in my rebuttal

18 testimony, yes.

19 COMMISSIONER McMURRIAN: Commissioner

20 Argenziano.

21 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Well, if you can

22 point that out in that summary where that is.

23 THE WITNESS: Excuse me?

24 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: I think what's being

25 asked -- what you are indicating is that her first
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1 remarks were not part of her original direct?

2 MR. McGLOTHLIN: That's correct.

3 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. And you're

4 saying it is.

5 THE WITNESS: Well, the information that has

6 been suggested by Mr. Putman is different from the

7 information that is part of my rebuttal testimony.

8 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. I'm not a

9 lawyer and that just went around in circles. Is what

10 you first said part of your direct testimony?

11 THE WITNESS: Rebuttal testimony.

12 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Isn't that what you

13 asked? Can you repeat the question that you asked her.

14 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Yes. I'm not trying to make

15 this hard. I don't think it has to be this hard.

16 BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:

17 Q. Ms. Stenger, you first began with some remarks

18 which included some references to Mr. Putman and whether

19 he understands chemistry or not, and then you said at

20 one point, "Now, to my rebuttal testimony," which

21 suggested to me that there was a line of demarcation

22 there, and that your first remarks were an addition to

23 your summary of what was -- of the content in your

24 rebuttal that was prefiled. Am I correct?

25 A. It's information -- when I say in regards to
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1 my rebuttal testimony, I got into the specifics of the

2 exhibits that I have included as part of my rebuttal

3 testimony.

4 Q. I don't know how else to ask the question to

5 get a response.

6 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. Can we get a

7 yes or no if it is part, and if it is can we find out

8 where?

9 MR. BURNETT: Mr. Chair.

10 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Burnett.

11 MR. BURNETT: Mr. Chair, I can help. I think

12 Mr. McGlothlin in a round about way is asking is sodium

13 part of her rebuttal testimony. It's on Page 11

14 beginning at Lines 4, to Page 12, Line 2.

15 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Well, nice try, Mr. Burnett,

16 but that was not my question.

17 I'll tell you what, I will move on.

18 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Let's move on.

19 BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:

20 Q. Ms. Stenger, I am looking at Page 10 of your

21 prefiled rebuttal testimony. At Line 14 you say for the

22 purpose of my testimony, I assumed that by 2004 PEF had

23 completed all its testing for PRB coal and completed all

24 of the capital upgrades for PRB coal that the Commission

25 recognized in Order 070816, and I assumed that PEF had

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

673

1 an environmental permit in place that would allow PEF to

2 burn up to a 20 percent blend of PRB coal. Do you see

3 that statement?

4 A. I do see that.

5 Q. And by PRB coal, you are there referring to

6 what others have described as the typical Wyoming Powder

7 River Basin sub-bituminous coal?

8 A. Yes, the coal that was part of the final

9 order.

10 Q. Would you agree that under the assumptions you

11 have presented here that with those in place by 2004

12 Progress Energy would have been fully positioned to burn

13 that PRB coal on a commercial basis?

14 A. Based on the assumptions I used to prepare my

15 testimony, that is correct. And, again, those

16 assumptions go into the capital upgrades that are listed

17 in Exhibit 8, Exhibit 11 and 12, which go into the

18 evaluation timeline, and you will note that at the very

19 top of those exhibits those assumptions are clearly

20 stated. And in addition to that, in the Exhibit 9 that

21 I have here, the distinction between the percent change

22 between the various coals is basing that change on the

23 new coals that Mr. Putman suggests that we should have

24 burned with the PRB coal that was reflected in the final

25 order.
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1 Q. My question had nothing to do with the coals

2 that Mr. Putman has suggested. My question had only to

3 do with what you described as the typical PRB coal from

4 Wyoming. Do you understand that question?

5 A. Well, I believe your question was that you

6 were talking about my assumptions, and I'm just letting

7 you know what those assumptions were used in this

8 rebuttal testimony, and where that was reflected.

9 Q. Well, the assumptions as delineated at Page

10 10, Line 14, are you completed all of your testing for

11 the PRB coal, completed all the capital upgrades for PRB

12 coal that the Commission recognized in its order, and

13 you assumed that the environmental permit is in place

14 that would allow the utility to burn up to a 20 percent

15 blend, correct?

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. With those assumptions and only those

18 assumptions, do I understand correctly that Progress

19 Energy would have been fully positioned to burn that PRB

20 coal on a commercial basis as of the beginning of 2004?

21 A. Based on the assumptions of working through

22 the exhibits that I have in this document, yes.

23 Q. It's true, is it not, that you began your

24 research on the Spring Creek coal and the Indonesian

25 coal in approximately February of this year?
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1 A. That is correct, and that is about a week

2 after the actual direct or rebuttal testimony of Mr.

3 Putman was filed which mentioned Spring Creek coal and

4 Indonesian coal as a coal that we should be looking at.

5 Q. And is it true, Ms. Stenger, that you have

6 never conducted a test burn?

7 A. It depends on how you define test burn.

8 Q. I define it as we discussed the subject matter

9 in your deposition at Pages 17 and 18.

10 A. Then, no, from that respect I have not

11 conducted test burns. However, I am very familiar with

12 the testing process.

13 MR. McGLOTHLIN: No further questions.

14 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you, Mr. McGlothlin.

15 Ms. Bradley.

16 MS. BRADLEY: No questions.

17 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you.

18 Commissioner Skop, you're recognized.

19 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

20 I just have a few questions, and I need to

21 find one page, so if we can pause in place for one

22 moment.

23 With respect to your rebuttal testimony that

24 you filed, and I guess Mr. McGlothlin just questioned

25 you on Page 10, Lines 14 through 17, and then I'm
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1 looking also at JS-9, which basically articulates -- and

2 correct me if I'm wrong, I think JS-9 articulates only

3 those incremental capital improvements that would need

4 to be made to burn the Indonesian coal and the Spring

5 Hill coal to the extent that I think Mr. Weintraub

6 alluded to differences in particulate matter and

7 opacity, specifically on the Indonesian coal. Can you

8 elaborate briefly on that?

9 THE WITNESS: Yes. And you were talking about

10 Exhibit 8, right? Because originally you had said

11 Exhibit 9, which is this exhibit.

12 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Yes. Sometimes I twist my

13 words around, but, yes.

14 THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, these capital

15 additions that I have on here that are potential capital

16 additions for burning these two types of coals are

17 incremental and above what was discussed and part of the

18 final order. If you want me to go into more detail

19 about the specifics of any of these, I'll be happy to do

20 that.

21 COMMISSIONER SKOP: No, I think that is what I

22 wanted to ascertain, specifically to the extent whether

23 those were incremental capital improvements that would

24 be required specific to those two alternate coals, or

25 whether they are capital improvements necessary to just
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1 burn PRB. Because if it were just the general, I think

2 I would have some significant issues based upon --

3 THE WITNESS: No, they are definitely

4 incremental.

5 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. All right. And so

6 I think that answers that question, and let me find one

7 or two follow-ups. I need to find it in Mr.

8 Weintraub's. But, basically on another area, what

9 specific steps, if any, has PEF taken since our last

10 order to remedy the inherent capability of the CR4 and

11 CR5 units to burn a blend of PRB coal of the kind that

12 we talked about last time?

13 THE WITNESS: Right. Well, at this point

14 following the 2006 test burn of PRB coal, at that point

15 a decision analysis -- a decision point becomes evident,

16 as you can tell from my Exhibit 11 and 12. That same

17 process was used for PRB coal. And at that point we

18 were under -- we had been given instructions that PRB

19 coal was no longer economic, and so we did not continue

20 with the expense of upgrading or making those specific

21 changes in order to be able to burn PRB coal because it

22 was no longer economic to do so.

23 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. And I guess to that

24 point, and help me better understand, instead of moving

25 forward with that, they looked at the other alternative,
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1 which I think is in 29A, which I believe Witness Putman

2 stated that if those numbers were accurate that that was

3 probably an equally innovative way of saving money for

4 the consumers.

5 I don't want to put words in his mouth, but am

6 I to correctly understand that in lieu of burning the

7 80/20 blend, that in subsequent years 2006 and 2007 that

8 Progress burned a blend of bituminous coal, whether that

9 be the CAPP coal plus some international bituminous coal

10 that it received to accomplish the same thing at a lower

11 cost?

12 THE WITNESS: That is my understanding, and I

13 believe that that was also done without any additional

14 capital upgrades needed.

15 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. And I guess in

16 speaking to those capital upgrades, I guess Mr.

17 Weintraub on Page 13 of his rebuttal testimony at Line 2

18 basically speaks to the Indonesian coal being extremely

19 low in sulfur, but has much -- and it has different

20 opacity and PM discharge properties as compared to the

21 PRB coal that the Commission previously considered. So

22 those issues in terms of the opacity and the PM

23 emissions are at the bottom of your chart in JS-8, is

24 that correct? That capital costs, and I am reading --

25 THE WITNESS: Yes, those are potential capital
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1 costs that would be needed to address any issues that

2 would be -- that would come from reduced ESP efficiency

3 from the low sulfur coal.

4 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. And that is

5 basically the bag house conversion, the 80 to

6 $100 million, that is to capture the reduced particulate

7 matter, the change in particulate matter and basically

8 the opacities, the -- making sure you are able to

9 measure what those particulates are to adjust?

10 THE WITNESS: Yes. Opacity is -- for those

11 that may not be familiar, opacity is the actual smoke

12 that you see coming out the stack, and we have very

13 specific requirements, environmental requirements of

14 what that permit limit is.

15 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. All right. And I

16 think I just have one final question, and it's not to

17 belittle the point, but it goes back to the inherent

18 capability of these units to be able to burn an 80/20

19 blend. And I don't want to get out the stick, but,

20 again, that was built into the units. And I know that

21 there may be currently cost-effective alternatives

22 which, again, Progress has alleged in 29A that it is

23 currently doing in terms of the blend of bituminous

24 coals. But if that changes at some point in the future

25 and it becomes cost-effective to burn an 80/20 blend, I,
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1 as a Commissioner, want to know are we -- or Progress

2 adequately positioned to leverage that opportunity on a

3 forward-going basis should it ever arise again. And

4 that is, I think, my concern from the prior order. So

5 if you could briefly speak to that.

6 THE WITNESS: Yes. And that would definitely

7 be our position, as well, that we would want to make

8 sure that if there was a coal that was economically

9 viable and it was economically viable for the

10 foreseeable future, not something that was a

11 fly-by-night as has been mentioned previously in this

12 hearing, then, yes, we would look at performing the

13 evaluation and the steps that I have laid out. If that

14 meant that after doing our evaluation that capital

15 upgrades were needed, then we would move forward with

16 that, as well.

17 Now, I would like to mention, if I may, some

18 additional information that I have that goes back to the

19 concept of that these units were designed for burning

20 some of these other types of coals. I actually have

21 some documentation that has already been entered in as

22 an exhibit that goes to show for a severe slagging and

23 severe fouling unit that the information that was

24 represented is not necessarily what we have on Crystal

25 River Units 4 and 5. And if I may, I would like to talk
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1 to that a little.

2 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Well --

3 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Let me ask Mr. McGlothlin

4 a question on that. Again, I think this overlaps a

5 little bit with restoring the inherent capability of the

6 unit. So, again, I don't want to impede upon any case

7 that OPC is making, but, again, I would like to know

8 where we are at on being able to leverage whatever

9 capability that was inherent to those units, and I think

10 what the witness may be suggesting is perhaps the

11 as-built condition of the unit is not as it was designed

12 by B&W. I don't know, but I just want to -- I would

13 like to get some clarity in the interest of being able

14 to save consumers money on a forward-going basis to burn

15 an 80/20 blend if that was the inherent capability of

16 the unit.

17 Now, if that is going to be called into

18 question, and OPC has some heartache with that, then I'm

19 willing to let it go. But by virtue of my strong

20 position I took in the last docket where I said that

21 that inherent capability should be restored because,

22 again, it was allowed to lapse, you know, I have a

23 vested interest in that. But I don't know whether Mr.

24 McGlothlin would have objections.

25 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Well, hang on. Before the
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1 witness says anything, let's just see where Mr.

2 McGlothlin is. We obviously want to make sure that we

3 don't -- if we are going to ask you not to tread down a

4 certain path, we probably shouldn't do that, as well.

5 You are recognized, sir.

6 MR. McGLOTHLIN: It is sort of the eleventh

7 hour and then some for us to receive additional

8 documents on a subject that is somewhat tangential to

9 the matter in front of Commission. But I don't know if

10 I will object until I see it, so I would like to

11 preserve my objection until we see where this goes.

12 MR. BURNETT: Mr. Chair.

13 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Burnett.

14 MR. BURNETT: Hold onto your seats, because

15 I'm about to agree with Mr. McGlothlin. I believe we

16 are talking apples and oranges. I understand, I think,

17 where Ms. Stenger is going, and I think her intention

18 was to offer documentation with respect to Spring Creek

19 and Indonesian coal. That is fairly not what

20 Commissioner Skop was talking about, so I think we could

21 avoid this whole issue. I believe -- she's talking

22 apples and he's talking oranges, so I don't --

23 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Well, let's stay on point.

24 It's too late to do something new.

25 MR. McGLOTHLIN: I agree with Mr. Burnett's
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1 objection.

2 (Laughter.)

3 MR. BURNETT: In summary, I don't think Ms.

4 Stenger needs to get into these documents. I would

5 agree that it is beyond the scope of anything. She is

6 going back to the other cause.

7 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay.

8 Commissioner Argenziano, you're recognized.

9 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Thank you.

10 A couple of things. One, is it -- I guess

11 it's my understanding that Progress couldn't burn any of

12 those coals without a permit anyway, right?

13 THE WITNESS: Excuse me, could you repeat

14 that?

15 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Progress couldn't

16 burn any of those coals in question without a permit

17 anyway, right?

18 THE WITNESS: At what point in time?

19 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: At the point in time

20 we are discussing, when the bids came in and the testing

21 was --

22 THE WITNESS: Yes. When the bids came in,

23 that is a true statement. The permit had not been

24 modified at that point in time. The final permit came

25 in 2007.
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1 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. And let me

2 ask you another question. Would you ever burn Spruce

3 Creek, or Indonesian, or any coal with the same

4 characteristics?

5 THE WITNESS: From my understanding and the

6 research that I have done on these coals, I would have

7 serious concerns about the operational impacts and

8 safety impacts with these coals, and environmental

9 impacts with these coals.

10 Now, I would not come back and say that we

11 would never burn those coals, but my job would be to go

12 to our management and operational staff and make sure

13 that they are fully aware of the risks associated with

14 these coals and make sure that the availability of the

15 coal and the economic benefits of these coals made it

16 worth our while to move forward with the evaluation

17 process as I have it laid out.

18 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Sure. Are you aware

19 of other plants that burn those coals?

20 THE WITNESS: I am aware of some other plants

21 that burn those coals. And for the most part, just to

22 get into that a little bit, the other plants from the

23 research that I have done have completely different

24 boilers than what we have. Their manufacturer is

25 completely different and the type of boiler that they
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1 have is completely different.

2 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: And it is my

3 understanding that those plants, the Crystal River

4 plants were built for the use of different -- with

5 different coals being more, I guess, I'm trying to use

6 the word.

7 THE WITNESS: Flexible.

8 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Yes. That's a good

9 word, yes. Flexible for the types of coal mixes and

10 blends. Is that your understanding?

11 THE WITNESS: That is my understanding to a

12 certain extent. However, again, am I now allowed to

13 introduce this document that goes into the --

14 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Well, let me finish

15 my questions first.

16 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hold the phone. Hold the

17 phone.

18 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Did you graduate

19 with a Bachelor's of Mechanical Engineering?

20 THE WITNESS: Civil engineering.

21 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Civil engineering.

22 Do you have any experience in plant managing,

23 just curious, or procurement of coals?

24 THE WITNESS: My experience is related to the

25 environmental field operationally from outage management
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1 and outages, and testing, environment testing, and air

2 testing. That's the bulk of my experience. However,

3 the role that I am in now is to look at the operational

4 impacts to all of our generating fleets. And that

5 includes Crystal River, but it also includes every

6 single other generating asset that we have. And

7 basically what I am doing now is working with the fuel

8 flexibility initiative, which I have been doing for the

9 past year looking at this exact same issue but for a

10 different coal.

11 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: And the pictures

12 that you showed of the slagging and fouling, as you

13 mentioned, I guess, when you opened your statement, you

14 said that anybody could come here and talk to people

15 that may not really understand the issue, and I guess

16 you were saying could be led to believe certain things.

17 Couldn't I be led to believe certain things with your

18 pictures and your statements, also? And I'm sorry to

19 ask that, but I'm just trying to -- you said it, so I

20 want to ask.

21 THE WITNESS: I understand what you're saying.

22 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Could those be pictures

23 that happen -- I don't know the time frame of the

24 slagging or fouling, and couldn't that be just what

25 happens in plants? And then as Mr. -- I think it was
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1 Mr. Putman mentioned before, that sometimes when that

2 occurs then you have to blast those things out.

3 Couldn't that be normal and you -- I don't know where

4 those pictures came from, so I guess I'm putting the

5 question back to you because you mentioned that to me,

6 as a Commissioner, that people with experience could

7 come here and try to buffalo maybe some people who

8 can't. How do I know you're not?

9 THE WITNESS: Well, mainly because I have all

10 of my reference documents right here for all of the

11 information that I cover in my prefiled testimony.

12 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: And when were those

13 pictures taken and how long was that fouling and

14 slagging?

15 THE WITNESS: Those particular pictures were

16 just for illustrative purposes. But the rest of my

17 documentation I have actual reference information that

18 goes back to everything that I have mentioned in my

19 prefiled testimony.

20 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: But you used those

21 pictures to indicate that possibly using that mixture or

22 to leave an impression in my mind that possibly using

23 that mixture could cause that, and that is one of the

24 concerns you may legitimately have. But I would like to

25 know if in the real world of practice how -- or that
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1 picture that you used, what would that represent in the

2 time frame of using maybe the coals, the blends that we

3 are talking about as far as fouling and slagging? What

4 time frame would that take place in? Would that be a

5 normal process that does occur?

6 THE WITNESS: For these type of coals,

7 specifically the Spring Creek coal with the high sodium

8 content, slagging and fouling is a known industry issue.

9 I have plenty of documents that discuss that exact

10 issue. I understand where you're going, but --

11 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: I'm not asking you

12 that. I asked you a question. Is that a normal

13 reaction when using a blend, and isn't there another

14 reaction to that reaction that one would take? Because

15 otherwise what you are saying is you never use a blend

16 and that is the end. That's what I'm really hearing

17 from you, I never really think you should use a blend

18 because I have real problems with it. Even though the

19 industry may be aware of those problems and have

20 corrections to those problems, and I'm trying to

21 differentiate the differences between the two arguments

22 that I have heard. And that's what I'm getting from

23 you. Is that a normal reaction when using a blend in

24 facilities, especially plants that maybe are capable or

25 more flexible to use blends?
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1 THE WITNESS: That particular statement kind

2 of mixes up a couple of different pieces, so I'm not

3 quite sure I understand where you're going with that

4 statement, because you started talking about the

5 impression that those pictures would leave, and then you

6 start talking about blends. And when you start talking

7 about blends, especially with this particular type of

8 coal, the sodium content is a huge factor. And having

9 the sodium content in there, which is one of the things

10 that I mentioned in my summary, is that you cannot blend

11 away sodium. So whether you have that in a blend, you

12 can't just all of a sudden say, okay, we have 8 percent

13 here and now all of a sudden we have blended it away.

14 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: I heard you say

15 that. What are the pictures supposed to represent?

16 THE WITNESS: Those are illustrations of what

17 slagging and fouling can look like in a boiler.

18 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: From what, from what

19 type of coal?

20 THE WITNESS: From any type of coal that has

21 significant slagging and fouling capability.

22 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Okay. Then is that

23 a normal reaction to any type of coal that has slagging

24 and characteristics as you mentioned?

25 THE WITNESS: Yes.
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1 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: That would happen,

2 and it is dealt with in plants that are using those

3 coals?

4 THE WITNESS: Yes, that is potentially what

5 they have.

6 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: There can be

7 problems, I understand, but it is not like that is

8 abnormal. It is a known effect.

9 THE WITNESS: It is a known effect that needs

10 to be mitigated.

11 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: And is mitigated in

12 plants that are using them?

13 THE WITNESS: To some degree. There are

14 different ways to mitigate them, but, yes.

15 COMMISSIONER ARGENZIANO: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you.

17 At the risk of -- Commissioner Skop, you're

18 recognized.

19 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

20 I will try and respect the parties' desire not

21 to get another exhibit into evidence, but I do have one

22 question kind of along the same line. But, again, we

23 are not going to enter anything in. I am just trying

24 to --

25 THE WITNESS: It is actually an exhibit that
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1 has already been admitted, but that is a different

2 issue.

3 COMMISSIONER SKOP: I guess I'm wondering

4 based upon, you know, inquiring minds want to know, but

5 something you said jogged my brain, and I am trying to

6 get clarity on an issue that, again, I may think one

7 thing and the truth may be something completely

8 different.

9 So with that in mind, I'm wondering if you are

10 suggesting that the as-built configurations of the

11 CR4/CR5 units were different from the design

12 configuration to the extent that the as-built

13 configuration would preclude being able to burn a 50/50

14 blend of CAPP coal and PRB, and also an 80/20 blend, if

15 you are comfortable answering that. If not, I will just

16 withdraw the question.

17 THE WITNESS: I would say from a 50/50 blend

18 that may be the case, but from the 80/20 blend, again,

19 we would have to go back and -- well, we did do some

20 initial testing with an 80/20 blend, so that may not

21 necessarily be the same issue.

22 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you. Staff, you had

24 no questions, correct?

25 MR. YOUNG: No questions.
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1 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Mr. Burnett.

2 MR. BURNETT: Yes, sir. Just some very brief

3 ones.

4 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

5 BY MR. BURNETT:

6 Q. Ms. Stenger, do you remember when Commissioner

7 Skop asked you about what, if anything, the company had

8 done to preserve the optionality to burn PRB in the

9 future?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And you are familiar with what has been marked

12 and entered as Exhibit 59, it is Late-filed Exhibit 1 to

13 your deposition? Are you familiar that you had that

14 late-filed exhibit to your deposition?

15 A. Yes. Yes, the one that has the --

16 Q. And I would like to read a couple of things

17 ask if these are true statements. Cascade room. You

18 say on there, "Funding has been budgeted for

19 installation of a misting and fogging system in 2009 to

20 address dusting. This system addresses the broader

21 purpose of minimizing dusting from coal lines for a

22 number of coals, not just PRB."

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. So do I understand that correctly that the

25 cascade room upgrades would further preserve optionality
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1 to burn PRB if that ever became economic?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And on that same exhibit, dust suppression,

4 you say as mentioned above the project has been funded

5 in 2009 to address dusting. Is that also preserving the

6 optionality to burn PRB in the future?

7 A. Yes, it would.

8 Q. And mill inerting, you mentioned that

9 additional valves were installed for a manual inerting

10 system in Unit 5, and then the same modification was

11 made to Unit 4. Is that also something that would

12 preserve optionality to burn PRB in the future?

13 A. Yes, it would.

14 Q. And with respect to the environmental

15 equipment being installed and some of the modifications

16 being made to the boilers today at Crystal River 4 and

17 5, what, if anything, in that would preserve optionality

18 to potentially help burn PRB in the future?

19 A. Some of the additional equipment relates

20 specifically to slagging and fouling, such as

21 installation of new soot blowers, and like an

22 intelligent soot blowing system, all of those things

23 would be beneficial to PRB coal as well as other types

24 of coals.

25 MR. BURNETT: Thank you.
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1 I have nothing further, sir.

2 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you.

3 Commissioner Skop.

4 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you.

5 Just a point of information, Mr. Burnett.

6 With respect to the exhibit that was listed, can you

7 help me. Is that 59? I thought I heard correctly.

8 MR. BURNETT: Yes, sir, it is 59. It was

9 entered in today, and it also Exhibit 1 to Stenger's

10 depo.

11 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. And just one final

12 question to the witness. Again, just so I'm clear in my

13 mind, because we have had a lot of evidence entered, and

14 I am even having trouble finding Exhibit 59, but I'm

15 sure I will locate it in a moment. But on JS-8, those

16 capital improvements are incremental over and above

17 those that would be necessary to preserve the capability

18 to burn an 80/20 blend, and those are specific to using

19 alternate coals, whether it be the Indonesian coal and

20 whether it be the Spring Creek high sodium coal, is that

21 correct?

22 THE WITNESS: Yes. And keep in mind

23 incremental above and beyond what was issued in the

24 order, which was at 3 cents per MMBtu function.

25 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Thank you.
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1 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Young.

2 MR. YOUNG: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, we do

3 have some questions after all.

4 CHAIRMAN CARTER: You're recognized.

5 CROSS EXAMINATION

6 BY MR. YOUNG:

7 Q. Very quickly. Looking at what has been marked

8 as Exhibit Number 59, Page 4 of the exhibit.

9 A. Hold on. Let me get my actual copy.

10 Q. While you find the copy, I'll ask you a series

11 of questions in terms of setting it up. Page 4 of the

12 exhibit lists a series of recommendations. Now, earlier

13 you said that you -- correct me if I'm wrong, that you

14 guys, Progress Energy Florida discontinued implementing

15 some of these recommendations. And correct me if I'm

16 wrong, these are the recommendation you are talking

17 about, correct?

18 A. I need to get to that page, that exact page so

19 I can address it properly. And what page was that, 4?

20 Q. Page 4 of the exhibit.

21 A. Yes. Under next steps?

22 Q. Well, if you look at Number 3, the page before

23 that, it says recommendations.

24 A. Oh, okay. I see, recommendations, yes.

25 Q. These are the recommendations that you are
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1 talking about in terms of you discontinued after PRB

2 coal became not economical?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Of these lists, from this list what

5 recommendations have you implemented thus far?

6 A. Well, the permit has been modified to burn

7 sub-bituminous coal as of now. The soot blowers for the

8 most part have become operational again. Unfortunately,

9 in the nature of soot blowers, they can become

10 operational and getting them to 100 percent operational

11 and keeping them 100 percent operational is another

12 issue.

13 The mill inerting system was done. Again, it

14 was a manual type system, not necessarily a fully

15 automatic system. But there is a manual version of the

16 mill inerting system that has been completed.

17 Increased housekeeping. You know, we haven't

18 necessarily done anything specific to that because we

19 don't have the same type of issues with bituminous coal

20 as we would with a sub-bituminous coal.

21 Installation of vacuum lines to improve

22 cleaning in the cascade room. I think that particular

23 recommendation is being switched with this fogging and

24 misting in the cascade room to address the dusting

25 issues. There are two difference types of mechanisms to
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1 address that same issue.

2 However, we have not -- for the last piece of

3 that, we have not conducted a longer test burn to

4 determine what the operational impacts would be from

5 burning this on a longer term basis. So that last

6 recommendation there has not been done.

7 Q. What about the next page, Page 4?

8 A. Yes. The refurbishment of the conveyor,

9 nothing was done with the refurbishment of the conveyor.

10 The cascade room we have already addressed. The dust

11 suppression systems. Again, we've addressed the dust

12 suppression system that has been -- that we have funding

13 for in the cascade room. We have not, to my knowledge,

14 done anything with the dust suppression systems at the

15 north or south coal yard turning points.

16 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay.

18 Having had redirect, having had questions,

19 anything further from the bench? Okay. Let's do this

20 -- you may be excused.

21 Exhibits. Mr. Burnett.

22 MR. BURNETT: Yes, sir. We would move the

23 prefiled rebuttal testimony in as well as Exhibits 35

24 through 48, sir.

25 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Are there any objections?
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1 Without objection, show it done.

2 (Exhibit Number 35 through 48 admitted into

3 the record.)

4 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Staff, you're

5 recognized. Go ahead.

6 MS. BENNETT: Transcripts will be due on

7 April 29th and available. Briefs are due May 26th.

8 Staff will have a recommendation for the June 15th

9 agenda conference.

10 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Are there any other

11 concluding matters from any of the parties?

12 Mr. Burnett?

13 MR. BURNETT: No, sir.

14 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. McGlothlin.

15 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Nothing here.

16 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Bradley, you're

17 recognized.

18 MS. BRADLEY: I just need to clarify one

19 thing. I know that Mr. McGlothlin's Number 60 wasn't

20 admitted, but it was marked for identification and as

21 part of the record is marked.

22 CHAIRMAN CARTER: We actually didn't -- I

23 don't know if we -- did we give it a number? I don't

24 think we gave it a number.

25 MS. BRADLEY: I think it was given Exhibit 60
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1 and then was not admitted.

2 MS. HELTON: One minute. I started closing

3 up. I'm sorry.

4 CHAIRMAN CARTER: I didn't have -- I've got my

5 list here and I didn't give it a number.

6 MS. BENNETT: I don't have it listed in my

7 numbering.

8 CHAIRMAN CARTER: No, there is no 60.

9 MS. HELTON: My recollection is, Mr. Chairman,

10 that we had marked it as Number 60, but we didn't get

11 much further than that. So it would be identified as

12 Exhibit Number 60 for purposes of the record, but it has

13 not been admitted into the record.

14 MS. BRADLEY: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you, Ms. Bradley.

16 MS. BRADLEY: Let me ask you one thing

17 further, actually. And I will be happy to address it in

18 my brief, but in an abundance of fairness, since Mr.

19 McGlothlin wasn't allowed to question Mr. Putman

20 regarding the information in that exhibit, I would move

21 to strike Mr. Weintraub's testimony in regard to the

22 same issue.

23 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Regarding this particular

24 issue as related to what has been marked as Exhibit

25 Number 60?

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

700

1 MS. BRADLEY: Yes, sir.

2 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Ms. Helton.

3 MS. BRADLEY: Their exhibit was not admitted

4 also, but he had been questioned about it.

5 COMMISSIONER SKOP: On that point, I will move

6 to strike my own questions, because -- in the interest

7 of fairness. It's a valid point.

8 MS. BRADLEY: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN CARTER: I love it when a plan comes

10 together.

11 Let me do this before we adjourn. Let me just

12 say to the attorneys thank you so kindly for your

13 professionalism, and I sincerely appreciate how you

14 presented your witnesses and presented yourselves in

15 this matter before us. Every now and then things get a

16 little testy, but we try to keep it professional, and I

17 appreciate the sincerity and the professionalism of the

18 attorneys that were before us in this matter.

19 Commissioners, I appreciate your time, and

20 sorry about -- I was just kind of going on and on and on

21 and didn't think a break or anything like that, but

22 sometimes you get your best efforts when you keep going

23 like that.

24 Commissioners, anything further?

25 Staff, any further matters? Did you give the
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1 briefing schedules?

2 MS. BENNETT: Yes, but I did, but I will be

3 willing to do it again, if you would like.

4 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Do all the parties have the

5 briefing schedules? Any questions from any of the

6 parties?

7 MR. BURNETT: No, sir.

8 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Staff, anything further

9 before we adjourn?

10 MS. BENNETT: No, sir.

11 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioners, anything

12 further?

13 With that, we are adjourned.

14 (The hearing concluded at 5:35 p.m.)
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