1	BEFORE THE						
2	FLORID	A PUBLIC SERVICE	COMMISS	510N			
3	In the Matter of	:					
4	PETITION FOR INC		DOCKET	NO.	090079-	ΕI	
5	RATES BY PROGRES FLORIDA, INC.	S ENERGI					
6	PETITION FOR LIM TO INCLUDE BARTO		DOCKET	NO.	090144-	ΕI	
7	PROJECT IN BASE PROGRESS ENERGY	RATES, BY					
8	PETITION FOR EXP	/	DOCKET	NO	090145-	EU	
9	OF THE DEFERRAL ( EXPENSES, AUTHOR)	OF PENSION	B 0 011.21	1,0.			
10	CHARGE STORM HARI	DENING EXPENSES		4	in West Will he	(C)(0)117	
11	VARIANCE FROM OR RULE 25-6.0143(1)	WAIVER OF		3		ية المراجع	(dg) X
12	(F), F. A. C., B' ENERGY FLORIDA,	Y PROGRESS					
13			/			** (C)	
14	PROCEEDINGS:	PREHEARING CO	ONFERENC	CE	3 010	Carlot .	*
15 16	COMMISSIONER PARTICIPATING:	COMMISSIONER PREHEARING O		A. S	KOP		
17	DATE:	Monday, Septe	ember 14	, 20	09		
18	TIME:	Commenced at Concluded at					
19	PLACE:	Betty Easley			Cantar		
20	FLACE.	Room 148 4075 Esplanac		nce	Center		
21		Tallahassee,	_				DATE.
22	REPORTED BY:	LINDA BOLES, Official FPSO					- 838 -
23		(850) 413-673	-	J.L			DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
24							H.Braf
25							3001

1 APPEARANCES:

2.1

RICHARD D. MELSON, ESQUIRE, 705 Piedmont

Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32312; R. ALEXANDER GLENN,

ESQUIRE, and JOHN T. BURNETT, ESQUIRE, Progress

Energy Service Company, LLC, Post Office Box 14042,

St. Petersburg, Florida 33733-4042; JAMES MICHAEL WALLS,

ESQUIRE, DIANNE M. TRIPLETT, ESQUIRE, and MATTHEW

BERNIER, ESQUIRE, Carlton Fields Law Firm, Post Office

Box 3239, Tampa, Florida 33601-3239, appearing on behalf

of Progress Energy Florida, Inc.

CECILIA BRADLEY, ESQUIRE, Office of the Attorney General, The Capitol PL-01, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1050, appearing on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida.

ROBERT SCHEFFEL WRIGHT, ESQUIRE, and JOHN T. LAVIA, III, ESQUIRE, c/o Young Law Firm, 225 South Adams Street, Suite 200, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of the Florida Retail Federation.

CHARLES REHWINKEL, ESQUIRE, Office of Public Counsel, c/o The Florida Legislature, 111 West Madison Street, Room 812, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400, appearing on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida.

1 APPEARANCES (Continued):

AUDREY VAN DYKE, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Litigation Headquarters, 720 Kennon Street, S.E., Building 36, Room 136, Washington Navy Yard, DC 20374.

JAMES W. BREW, ESQUIRE, and F. ALVIN TAYLOR, ESQUIRE, c/o Brickfield Law Firm, 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW, 8th Floor West Tower, Washington, DC 20007, appearing on behalf of PCS Phosphate - White Springs.

VICKI G. KAUFMAN, ESQUIRE, and JON C. MOYLE,
JR., ESQUIRE, c/o Keefe Law Firm, The Perkins House, 118
North Gadsden Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, and
JOHN W. McWHIRTER, JR, ESQUIRE, Post Office Box 3350,
Tampa, Florida, appearing on behalf of Florida
Industrial Power Users Group.

STEPHANIE ALEXANDER, ESQUIRE, 200 West College Avenue, Suite 216, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of the Florida Association for Fairness in Rate Making.

KATHERINE FLEMING, ESQUIRE, CAROLINE KLANCKE, ESQUIRE, ERIC SAYLER, ESQUIRE and KEINO YOUNG, ESQUIRE, FPSC, General Counsel's Office, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, appearing on behalf of the Commission Staff.

APPEARANCES (Continued): SAMANTHA CIBULA, ESQUIRE, Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, appearing as Advisor to the Commission. 

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

## \_\_

PROCEEDINGS

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Good morning. I'd like to call this prehearing to order. Commissioner Skop presiding. If staff could please read the notice.

MS. FLEMING: Pursuant to notice issued by the Commission Clerk, this time and place has been set for a prehearing conference in Docket Number 090079-EI.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you.

If we could please take appearances of the parties, please.

MR. MELSON: Richard Melson on behalf of
Progress Energy Florida. I'd also like to enter
appearances for the other Progress lawyers and Carlton
Fields lawyers who are identified in the Prehearing
Order. And with me today is Lori Cross, Manager of
Regulatory Accounting at Progress.

MS. BRADLEY: Cecilia Bradley, Office of the Attorney General, on behalf of the citizens of Florida.

MR. WRIGHT: Robert Scheffel Wright, and I'd also like to enter an appearance for John T. Lavia, III, on behalf of the Florida Retail Federation.

MR. REHWINKEL: Charles Rehwinkel on behalf of the Office of Public Counsel. And also enter an appearance for the attorneys listed in the Prehearing Order from the office.

1	MS. VAN DIKE: Audrey Van Dike for the Navy.
2	MR. TAYLOR: Al Taylor for PCS. And if I
3	could enter an appearance for J. Brew also.
4	MS. KAUFMAN: Good morning, Commissioner.
5	Vicki Gordon Kaufman of the Keefe, Anchors, Gordon &
6	Moyle Law Firm on behalf of the Florida Industrial Power
7	Users Group. And I'd like to enter an appearance for
8	Jon Moyle of the same firm, and John McWhirter. Thank
9	you.
10	MS. ALEXANDER: Stephanie Alexander for the
11	Association for Fairness in Rate Making.
12	COMMISSIONER SKOP: And Commission staff.
13	MS. FLEMING: Katherine Fleming, Caroline
14	Klancke, Erik Sayler and Keino Young on behalf of the
15	Commission.
16	MS. CIBULA: Samantha Cibula, advisor to the
17	Commission.
18	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you. I'm going to
19	move to the preliminary matters. Staff, are there any
20	preliminary matters that we need to address before we
21	get to the Draft Prehearing Order?
22	MS. FLEMING: I'm not aware of any preliminary
23	matters, Commissioner.
24	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Thank you.
25	Just to the parties, my staff has advised me

that the parties have been very cooperative to date with respect to not only the issue identification conferences, but also providing the discovery as well as looking at issues that could be stipulated and witnesses that may be stipulated. So I'd encourage the parties to continue that, and I thank the, the parties for their progress that's been made to date. That's very helpful.

At this time I'd like to proceed through the Draft Prehearing Order. And I'm going to identify the sections individually. And if the parties have any corrections or changes that need to be made, if they could bring those to my attention, I'd appreciate it. We'll go through this judicially but as expeditious as possible. So please feel free to speak up if you do have a change or correction that needs to be made.

Okay. Proceeding with the Draft Prehearing Order, Section I, case background. Hearing none from the parties, staff?

MS. FLEMING: No changes.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Thank you. So Section I of the Prehearing Order will be adopted as written.

Section II, conduct of proceedings. Hearing none from the parties, staff?

MS. FLEMING: No changes.

1.5

1 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Section II will be adopted 2 as written. 3 Section III, jurisdiction. None from the 4 parties. Staff? 5 MS. FLEMING: No changes. 6 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Section III will be 7 adopted as written. 8 Section IV, procedure for handling 9 confidential information. Hearing none from the 10 parties, staff? 11 MS. FLEMING: No changes. 12 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Section IV 13 will be adopted as written. 14 Section V, prefiled testimony, exhibits, 15 witnesses. From the parties? 16 MS. KAUFMAN: Commissioner Skop, Vicki 17 I have just talked with Mr. Melson prior to Kaufman. 18 the prehearing, and I think we're all going to be 19 getting together afterwards to talk about the witnesses. 20 But one thing that I had thought might be 21 helpful would be to combine some of the direct and 22 rebuttal as we have done actually in the Florida Power & 23 Light case to see if we could move along more quickly. 24 But I believe the parties will discuss that at the 25 adjournment.

commissioner skop: Thank you. And I would encourage that. If the parties are able to, to work together in good faith, to identify areas that compromise is present, then that's a good thing. And I'll look to the parties to get with our staff. And with respect to Section V, does staff have any additional comments?

MS. FLEMING: We would just note that witness summaries shall be limited to five minutes.

commissioner skop: Okay. Thank you. And, again, I would ask the parties if there is the ability to shorten or dispense with witness summaries or to keep them within the five minutes, that the parties consider that and work with our staff in good faith to try and shorten the length of proceedings, if possible.

Okay. Moving on to Section VI, order of witnesses. I'd just like to hear from the parties as to whether the parties may be willing to stipulate any witnesses at this point.

MR. MELSON: Commissioner Skop, on behalf of Progress, we're willing to stipulate to the two staff witnesses Rhonda Hicks and Jocelyn Stephens listed on, toward the bottom of Page 6. And we are also willing to stipulate to the Navy witness James Selecky and the AFFIRM witness Russell Klepper.

1	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Thank you. Any
2	comments from the other parties as to the proposed
3	stipulations by Progress?
4	MR. WRIGHT: We don't have any objection to
5	those, stipulating those witnesses, Commissioner.
6	MR. REHWINKEL: Public Counsel has no
7	objection.
8	MS. VAN DYKE: Navy has no objections.
9	MR. TAYLOR: No objection for PCS.
10	THE COURT REPORTER: You need to turn your
11	microphones on.
12	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Yes. If you could please
13	turn on the microphones and help our court reporter.
14	MS. VAN DYKE: The Navy has no objections.
15	MR. TAYLOR: Nor does PCS.
16	MS. KAUFMAN: FIPUG does not object.
17	MS. ALEXANDER: I believe that AFFIRM would
18	like its witness Klepper to testify.
19	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Could you please speak
20	I could not hear you.
21	MS. ALEXANDER: I would like I believe that
22	AFFIRM would like its witness Klepper to testify. I'll
23	confirm that.
24	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. If you could and
25	get with our staff.

4 5

Ms. Bradley, did you have any comments?

MS. BRADLEY: I have no objection, but would support AFFIRM if they wish to have their witness testify.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. For those witnesses that Progress has been willing to stipulate, if there are no objections, show those witnesses stipulated. And as to the AFFIRM witness, if compromise can be reached, I'll look to the parties to work with our staff on that particular witness.

MR. MELSON: And, Commissioner Skop, we've not identified at this point any Progress witnesses. I think the parties intend to meet after the prehearing conference on issues. And depending on what issues we stipulate, there's a possibility that we might also be able to stipulate to some of the Progress witnesses.

I'll look to the parties. Again, my staff has advised that the parties have been very cooperative on this proceeding, and I hope that would continue in good faith. So any inroads that the parties could make to reach compromise on stipulation of witnesses or stipulation of issues, you know, our staff is more than willing to speak to the parties with respect to those issues that may arise. So, again, thank you for trying

to work forward in a collegial manner on this. 1 2 Okay. Let's move to basic positions. MR. MELSON: Commissioner, I -- excuse me. 3 4 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Mr. Melson. 5 MR. MELSON: I've got one additional change on 6 the witnesses. We're going to need to add Issue 85 to 7 Witness Slusser on the top of Page 6 and then again 8 toward the bottom of Page 7. 9 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Staff --MS. FLEMING: We'll coordinate with the 10 11 parties. If there are any additional changes to the 12 Prehearing Order, we can get with the parties and make 13 those changes in the final Prehearing Order. 14 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Thank you. 15 Any other concerns as to Section VI, order of witnesses? MR. REHWINKEL: We have some changes, but 16 17 I'll, I'll do that afterwards with staff. 18 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. All right. Thank 19 you. Any other concerns of the parties? 20 Okay. Hearing none, we're going to move to 21 Section VII, basic positions. Hearing no comment from 22 the parties, staff? 23 MS. FLEMING: No changes. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you. Show Section 24 VII, basic positions, adopted as written in the 25

Prehearing Order. 1 2 Let's move on to Section VIII, issues and positions. Staff, are there any comments before we 3 proceed issue by issue? 4 MS. FLEMING: Staff would just like to note 5 for the record that several parties have taken no 6 position at this time in, during -- on some of these We just want to make the parties aware that 8 9 based on the Order Establishing Procedure, each party shall take a position on each issue at the time of the 10 11 prehearing conference or by such later time as may be permitted by the Prehearing Officer. If a party fails 12 to take a position, the party shall have waived the 13 entire issue and the party's position shall be shown as 14 15 no position in the Prehearing Order. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. If the parties 16 could briefly comment as to the progress being made on 17 stating their respective positions. 18 19 MR. MELSON: Progress has a position on every 20 issue. 21 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Ms. Bradley. MS. BRADLEY: I'm sorry. Nothing. Appreciate 22 23 it. 24 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Mr. Wright. 25 MR. WRIGHT: We understand the order. Thank

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 you, Commissioner. 2 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. The rest of the 3 parties? Okay. 4 Does staff have any recommendations as to what 5 the appropriate time frame would be for getting those positions in? 6 MS. FLEMING: We would suggest by tomorrow, Tuesday, the close of business. This order needs to be 8 9 issued by Wednesday. So to the extent that the parties -- I know that the FPL hearing reconvenes on 10 11 Wednesday, so we really would like all the parties' 12 positions and updates by the close of business tomorrow. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Show it done. So 13 14 the parties will provide their initial positions by 15 5:00 p.m. tomorrow. 16 Okay. We will proceed through the issues on 17 an issue-by-issue basis. If there are issues, we will 18 address those by the proponent of the issue that seeks 19 to have those introduced into the Prehearing Order. 20 And we'll start with Issue 1. I believe, 21 Ms. Bradley, you're recognized. 22 MS. BRADLEY: You want me to go ahead and 23 address the motion in limine? 24 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Yes. Wait. I'm sorry. 25 Wait a second. The issue -- I believe that with respect

to a motion in limine, I think we'll get to that as a 1 2 pending motion later. MS. FLEMING: We'll get to that further in the 3 proceeding. 4 5 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Yes. But with respect to 6 Issue 1 that is proposed, "Is the rate increase 7 requested by Progress Energy Florida, Inc., a just and reasonable rate increase for its customers and is it in 8 the public interest," I believe that you're a proponent 9 10 of that, inclusion of that issue. MS. BRADLEY: Yes, sir. We feel that's 11 appropriate and I'll address it further at the 12 13 appropriate time. 14 **COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Okay. 15 MR. MELSON: And --COMMISSIONER SKOP: I'd like to hear from the 16 17 other Intervenors and I'll come back to Progress. MR. WRIGHT: We agree that it's an appropriate 18 19 issue, Commissioner. It really is the ultimate issue in 20 the case. 21 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. MR. REHWINKEL: Public Counsel supports the 22 Attorney General's inclusion of this issue as it is the 23 ultimate issue in Chapter 366 for rate setting. Thank 24 25 you.

1 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you. 2 MS. VAN DYKE: The Navy concurs with that. We 3 agree with the issue. 4 MR. TAYLOR: PCS agrees with the issue. 5 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Use the microphone, 6 please. 7 MR. TAYLOR: PCS agrees that it should be an 8 issue. 9 MS. KAUFMAN: As does FIPUG. **COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Okay. 10 11 MS. ALEXANDER: AFFIRM also agrees. 12 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Thank you. 13 Staff, if you could provide a recommendation as to the 14 proposed issue, please. 15 MS. FLEMING: If we could just hear from 16 Progress. 17 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Oh, I'm sorry. Excuse me, 18 yes. Mr. Melson, I forgot. 19 MR. MELSON: Commissioner, we object to the 20 inclusion of the issue basically for two reasons. 21 First, we don't believe it appropriately reflects the legal standard applicable to the rate case. Chapter 366 22 23 talks in terms of fair, just and reasonable rates. It 24 does not include a public interest component per se in

the rate establishment.

Second, the Attorney General said this really is the ultimate issue in the case. Well, we believe the ultimate issue is Issue 87, which is the, the total revenue increase, and that anything the Attorney General has to say can be taken as a position on Issue 87 rather than having this separate issue.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you. Staff, if you'd please provide a recommendation based on the discussion.

I'm sorry. Ms. Bradley.

MS. BRADLEY: May I be heard briefly on that?

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Yes. You need the

microphone on, please. Ms. Bradley, you're recognized.

MS. BRADLEY: I'll get it on eventually.

Thank you. We feel like this is an appropriate issue because it's the customers' issue. It's an issue that by law the Commission is mandated to consider in their decisions regarding the rate cases. And while there may be bits and pieces of the complaints and concerns that were voiced at the public hearings, they are not completely consumed within these other issues. And regardless of the way this turns out, you know, we feel like the people have the right to know that their issue is specifically addressed and that it was considered, not just consumed within other issues.

So we would respectfully request that it be made an 1 2 issue in this case. 3 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Thank you. Mr. Wright, you're recognized. 4 5 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Commissioner Skop. 6 Just very briefly. I would just like to add that the public interest criterion, while not per se including, 7 8 included in the ratemaking sections of 366, is the 9 fundamental Commission directive from the Legislature in That Chapter 366 is to be broadly construed to 10 11 regulate public utilities subject to the jurisdiction of 12 the Commission in the public interest. Rate regulation 13 is part of that. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you. Rebuttal, 14 15 Mr. Melson. MR. MELSON: Nothing further, Commissioner. 16 17 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you. Staff, do you have a recommendation? 18 MS. FLEMING: Commissioner, I agree with 19 Ms. Bradley and Mr. Wright that this is -- the 20 Commission is charged with looking at whether the rates 21 set in this proceeding will be fair, just and reasonable 22 rates. That authority is granted to the Commission 23 2.4 under 366.06(1). That being said, the Commission, in looking at 25

2.0

all the issues in this proceeding, will be doing so under 366.06(1) and Chapter 366 in totality. I don't think it's necessary to have a separate issue to address something that the Commissioners will already be looking at through the pendency of this hearing.

In addition, if this issue is truly needing a place to address quality of service or customer comments, I think we do have an Issue 6 which addresses the quality of service. If it's a fundamental issue with respect to the revenue requirements, we do have Issue 87 to address the revenue requirements. Thus, staff does not believe that this issue is necessary in this proceeding.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Just in the interest of fairness, I'm going to go briefly back to the parties to respond to the staff recommendation.

Ms. Bradley.

MS. BRADLEY: I would just note that we had a lot of concerns that were voiced at public hearings around the state, people talking about they simply cannot afford a rate increase, and I think some of those concerns are not addressed within the other issues. And the people -- you know, if there's a rate increase that's granted after they've testified they simply cannot afford one, I think they need to know that the

PSC did specifically consider their concerns. 1 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you. 2 Mr. Melson. 3 MR. MELSON: Nothing further. 4 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Thank you. 5 I'm going to defer ruling on this issue until the end of 6 the prehearing. We're going to move forward, and I'll take the comments of the parties and the staff 8 recommendation under advisement. 9 Let's move on to Issue 2. Any comments from 10 the parties? Hearing none, any comments from staff? 11 MS. FLEMING: No, no comments. 12 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Show Issue 2 13 included as written. 14 Issue 3. Hearing no comments from the 15 parties, staff? 16 MS. FLEMING: No comments. 17 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Show Issue 3 included as 18 written. 19 MR. REHWINKEL: Commissioner Skop. 20 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Mr. Rehwinkel. 21 MR. REHWINKEL: I can do this one of two ways. 22 If we have -- we have taken no position at this time and 23 it is our intent to revert to no position on this issue. 24 I am perfectly okay with not taking time to say that 25

1 every time if that's all we want to do, if that would be 2 okay. 3 COMMISSIONER SKOP: That's fine. I quess you have until 5:00 p.m. tomorrow to put your initial 4 5 position in as previously ruled upon. 6 Ms. Bradley. 7 MS. BRADLEY: The Attorney General's Office 8 may wish to revise their position on this, and I'll get 9 that to staff as quickly as possible. 10 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. Thank you. 11 MS. BRADLEY: Thank you. 12 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Issue 3 I believe 13 was the issue that we were on. Hearing no comments from 14 the parties, staff? 15 MS. FLEMING: No comments. 16 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Show Issue 3 17 adopted as written. 18 Issue 4. 19 MR. REHWINKEL: Commissioner, the Public 20 Counsel has a substantial revision to Issues 4 and 5, 21 our positions. And if it would suit you, I'd like to 22 read our new position into the record. 23 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. 24 MR. REHWINKEL: For Issue 4 and the same 25 issue, position would be on Issue 5: "No. To the

extent the revised forecast is a material revision to 1 the MFRs filed on March 20, 2009, PEF's eight-month 2 clock may need to be restarted from the date of filing 3 of the rebuttal testimony." And I can provide that in 4 5 written form to staff. 6 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. Any other comments as to Issue 4, Ms. Bradley? 7 MS. BRADLEY: Yes, Mr. Commissioner. 8 9 Attorney General's Office would also change their 10 position on 4 and 5 to say: "No. And support the position of the Office of Public Counsel." And we'll 11 12 get that to staff. 13 **COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Okay. Okay. 14 MS. KAUFMAN: Commissioner Skop. 15 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Yes, Ms. Kaufman. MS. KAUFMAN: FIPUG is also going to be 16 provided, providing revised positions on Issues 4 and 5 17 along the lines of Mr. Rehwinkel's comments. 18 19 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Thank you. 20 Any other comments as to Issue 4? Staff? MS. FLEMING: No comments. 21 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Show Issue 4 2.2 23 adopted as written reflecting the changes in the position expressed by the parties. And --24 MR. WRIGHT: Commissioner? 25

**COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Yes, Mr. Wright, you're recognized.

MR. WRIGHT: Thanks. I'll be, I'll be at least striking the tentative from our previous position. It's my understanding that, that we still have until 5:00 tomorrow to change positions. And if that's consistent, then I'm not going to jump in every time I might otherwise.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. That's fine. My understanding is if, my understanding is that based upon the staff recommendation I've affirmatively ruled on the fact that the parties will provide their initial positions by close of business tomorrow, which would be Tuesday at 5:00 p.m. And any changes to those positions will be accommodated and incorporated through the submittal time deadline.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you. Moving on to Issue 5, I know that there were previous comments by the parties in terms of changing their positions, which will be subsumed. But any additional comments as to Issue 5? Hearing none from the parties, staff?

MS. FLEMING: No comments.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Show Issue 5 adopted as written, reflecting the changes in position

Ш

expressed by the parties.

Issue 6. Hearing none from the parties --

MR. REHWINKEL: Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Mr. Rehwinkel.

MR. REHWINKEL: This is the last time I think I'm going to have to step in in this regard, but this issue presents us a bit of a difficulty in taking a position by tomorrow because there is one additional customer testimony hearing opportunity on the morning of the hearing on the 21st. It is a noticed public testimony position — opportunity. So the Office of Public Counsel would ask for leave for good cause to maintain our position as shown here through the hearing or at least through the beginning of the hearing pending receipt of additional customer testimony.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Thank you.

Ms. Bradley.

MS. BRADLEY: Yes. Based upon the customer testimony that we've had so far, while there was some compliments about the service, there were some other people that indicated they were having problems with reliability of service. And so we would change our position to: "No." As reflected by the customer testimony.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Staff

recommendation.

MS. FLEMING: The order establishing procedures does state that if a party is unable through diligence or good faith efforts to take a position at this time, which I think Mr. Rehwinkel has shown because we do still have a service hearing, the parties can maintain those positions until a further date.

commissioner skop: Thank you. My ruling as to the request by OPC and the AG's office is essentially that they've not taken a position at this time based upon the incomplete record as to the customer comment, and they will be granted leave to amend their positions accordingly.

MR. REHWINKEL: Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Okay. Any additional comments on Issue 6? Staff?

MS. FLEMING: No comments.

commissioner skop: Okay. Show Issue 6 adopted, with the understanding that both Public Counsel and the AG's Office will be granted leave to amend their position based upon the customer comment provided at the beginning of the rate case hearing.

Issue 7. Hearing no comment from the parties, staff?

MS. FLEMING: No comments.

	1
1	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 7
2	adopted as written.
3	Issue 8. Hearing no comments from the
4	parties, staff?
5	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
6	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Show Issue 8
7	adopted as written.
8	Issue 9. Hearing no comments from staff I
9	mean from the parties, staff?
10	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
11	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Show Issue 9 adopted as
12	written.
13	Issue 10. Hearing no comments from the
14	parties, staff?
15	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
16	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Show Issue 10
17	adopted as written.
18	That brings us to Issue 11. Mr. Rehwinkel,
19	this is an OPC issue, proposed issue, so do you have
20	some, some comments as to this?
21	MR. REHWINKEL: No, Commissioner.
22	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Any other comments
23	on Issue 11? Staff?
24	MS. FLEMING: Yes. Thank you. Staff has
25	concerns with Issue 11, and this will also segue into

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Issue 12. We believe that the positions that have been taken by OPC under Issue 11 really can be subsumed under Issue 10. Looking at Issues 11 and 12, they're very similar to Issue 10, and we feel that the issues are duplicative and there's really, it's not necessary to have Issues 11 and 12 when those positions can be subsumed under Issue 10.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Rehwinkel, could you briefly respond to staff's concern. And also to the extent that if those lifespans are respectfully included in Issue 10, could you also speak to the additional staff effort that would be needed to address those issues separately as opposed to trying to consolidate them within an issue to which they would be subsumed?

MR. REHWINKEL: Yes, Commissioner. Public Counsel's position is that these issues are issues that have been identified by our office and by our expert for special attention in the sense of highlighting issues for the Commissioners.

We believe that the, the way issues can be presented before the Commission for ratemaking determinations is, is a matter of judgment and it should be looked at on an continuum. You could have an issue that says what should be the change, if any, to

may.

customers' bills or you could have an issue that goes through each and every account and asks for approval of them.

We think the appropriate standard is what is, what is the best way to present the issues for the Commission's decision-making? These, these issues that we have raised with respect to the, to the lifespans for these plants we feel should be given special attention.

I, I have no way of knowing about the workload issue with respect to staff. We think the appropriate standard is what's the best way for the Commissioners to understand the issues and to break them out appropriately. So we, we would urge that these issues be left in as, as discrete issues.

**COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Okay.

MS. KAUFMAN: Commissioner Skop, might I be heard on that?

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Yes, Ms. Kaufman. You

MS. KAUFMAN: I would just echo

Mr. Rehwinkel's views of these issues, and I would note
that for FIPUG's part we have filed specific testimony
that directly goes to this lifespan issue. It's a very
important component of the depreciation issue. And we
also agree that these two issues should remain broken

out for separate consideration. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you.

Mr. Melson.

MR. MELSON: Commissioner, we agree with staff that they could be subsumed within Issue 10. However, we previously told Public Counsel that we would not oppose their inclusion of separate issues, so we're essentially taking no position.

upon the discussion that I've heard, what I would like to do, and based upon no objection from the company, I'm going to allow both issues. I'm going to allow Issue 11 and also Issue 12, which we've not gotten to, because I think that the subject matter is the same. But I think what we need to do is reorder the issues because essentially Issue 10 is the follow-on issue to Issues 11 and 12, which would be the predicate issue. So we'll show Issue 11 as Issue 10, Issue 12 as Issue 11 and Issue 10 as Issue 12. Does that sound correct, staff?

MS. FLEMING: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Are the parties comfortable with that? Any additional comments?

Okay. So just to reiterate, Issue 11 will be included, but it will be renumbered as Issue 10. Issue 12 will be included, but it will be renumbered as Issue

1	11. And Issue 10, which I've already ruled upon, will
2	be renumbered to be Issue 12. And that should
3	accommodate all the parties and the concerns that I've
4	heard before me.
5	Okay. Moving on to Issue 13, any comments
6	from the parties? Hearing none, staff?
7	MS. FLEMING: No comments.
8	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Show Issue 13
9	incorporated as written.
10	Issue 14. Hearing no comments from the
11	parties, staff?
12	MS. FLEMING: No comments.
13	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Show Issue 14 incorporated
14	as written.
15	Issue 15. Hearing no comments from the
16	parties, staff?
17	MS. FLEMING: No comments.
18	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Issue 15, show
19	incorporated as written.
20	Issue 16. Hearing no comments from the
21	parties, staff?
22	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
23	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 16
24	incorporated as written.
25	Issue 17. Hearing no comments from the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 parties, staff? 2 MS. FLEMING: No comment. 3 **COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Show Issue 17 incorporated 4 as written. Issue 18. 5 6 MR. MELSON: Commissioner, if I might. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Mr. Melson, you're 8 recognized. 9 MR. MELSON: I actually have a question for OPC and the Retail Federation. It seemed to me that 10 11 their position on this issue was more appropriate under Issue 19. And if not, I could use an explanation of the 12 13 position. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. We'll start 14 15 with Mr. Rehwinkel. MR. REHWINKEL: Commissioner, I believe that 16 17 Mr. Melson is correct. I think this is something that we are going to talk about as a possible stipulation 18 19 area. 20 MR. MELSON: Okay. 21 MR. REHWINKEL: And I, I can double-check, but 22 I believe that he is correct that that's where our 23 position should go. 24 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Ms. Bradley. 25 MS. BRADLEY: We would support OPC.

1 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Very well. 2 Show it done. Any other comments as to Issue 18? 3 Staff? 4 MS. FLEMING: No comment. 5 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Show Issue 18 6 adopted as written with the changes in position as is 7 noted by the parties. 8 Issue 19. Hearing no comments from the 9 parties, staff? 10 MS. FLEMING: No comment. 11 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Show Issue 19 adopted as 12 written. 13 Issue 20. Hearing no comments from the 14 parties, staff? 15 MS. FLEMING: No comment. 16 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Show Issue 20 adopted as 17 written. 18 Issue 21. 19 MR. MELSON: Commissioner. 20 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Mr. Melson, you're 21 recognized. 22 MR. MELSON: Issue -- Progress objects to the 23 inclusion of Issue 21. First, this relates to the 24 procedure for future dismantlement studies. That would 25 have no impact on the rates requested in this

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 proceeding.

And, second, it's Progress's belief that if the direction of future dismantlement studies is going to change, that would require an amendment to Rule 25-6.04364, and that the appropriate vehicle, if, if the OPC wants to suggest a change, is to initiate a rulemaking to address that rule.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you. I guess this is an OPC proposed issue, so I'd like to hear from Mr. Rehwinkel.

MR. REHWINKEL: Yes. Commissioner, we have included this as an issue because -- well, first of all, I've -- the company proposed, filed a dismantlement study that was based on a dismantlement study that was addressed in a stipulation based on a prior dismantlement study, I think, from, from an earlier period in the 2000s. We feel like that the Commission might want to hear testimony on, on how that process had occurred and whether Progress was, was doing this in an appropriate manner.

We have no problem with this issue being put into a generic proceeding. I think there may be some tendency toward that starting from the FPL case. We think the issue is teed up if the Commissioners want to hear evidence about this and want to give some direction

1 as to how they would like things done. We don't 2 disagree with Mr. Melson as far as this being done in a 3 separate proceeding. However, we believe that, that because the company has filed a, a study in this docket, 4 5 that they have raised the issue. We addressed the issue 6 by suggesting that they're doing it in improperly. And it's just there for the Commission if they want to consider it. 8 9 Thank you. From the other COMMISSIONER SKOP: 10 Intervenors? 11 MR. WRIGHT: Commissioner, however you want to 12 handle this is fine. I think it's an appropriate issue 13 in the case. 14 And with regard to the rulemaking, a 15 suggestion that may or may not be appropriate. I don't understand OPC's position to be recommending a uniform 16 17 procedure for fossil dismantlement for all future cases, 18 which is what would, which is what would trigger the 19 requirement that rulemaking be initiated. 20 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you. Any other 21 comments from the parties? 22 MR. MELSON: Commissioner, may I respond

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

MR. MELSON: To the extent there is a

COMMISSIONER SKOP: You may, Mr. Melson.

23

24

25

briefly?

criticism of the demolition approach that the company has used in this case, I believe Mr. Rehwinkel and the Intervenors can address that under Issue 20, are the assumptions reasonable. Issue 21 seems to me to be solely forward-looking and that's the reason we object to it.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Very well.

Mr. Rehwinkel, how would you respond to the concern about the forward-looking and prospective ratemaking comments that have arisen with respect to inclusion of this issue?

MR. REHWINKEL: Commissioner Skop, it's my experience before the Commission that often guidance is given to the company about things that the Commission would like to see before another rate case is filed.

And it — there is testimony in the record today from the company and the parties about the appropriate assumptions about, for instance, restoration methodologies and the standard to which restoration should be done. So, again, we've, we do agree that it is a forward-looking issue. But to the extent that the Commission wants the opportunity to give guidance to the company about future filings, this case is an appropriate vehicle for that to be done. It's really in the Commission's discretion as to whether they want to

hear this. We're, we're prepared to offer an opinion about it and we're prepared to address it in another way, if that's, if that's your pleasure.

2.0

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you. I'd like to turn to staff for a staff recommendation on the issue.

MS. FLEMING: And I'm thinking these through.

I mean, I understand where OPC is coming from and I
understand where the utility is coming from. I do agree
that with respect to how the utility has addressed
demolition approaches, I think that could be addressed
under Issue 20 as far as whether the utility has done
something improperly or correctly or incorrectly.

With respect to this, the issue is worded "in future dismantlement studies," so it is looking to the future. Staff believes that this is not really specific to Progress, it's more appropriate for maybe a generic proceeding, and we don't feel that it's appropriate in this ratemaking proceeding.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Very well. Having heard from the parties, my holding is to exclude this issue from the -- excuse me. Having heard from the parties, my holding is to exclude this issue from the list of issues in this proceeding. Should the parties feel strongly, again, I think I've heard OPC mention there's an additional separate docket that could be used

1	to address this concern, but also to not preclude a
2	motion for reconsideration as a preliminary matter,
3	should OPC feel that's necessary. But I just think in
4	the interest of fairness to the parties, listening to
5	the concerns that have been expressed, that the issue
6	can be appropriately addressed in Issue 20 as well as a
7	separate docket, if necessary.
8	MR. REHWINKEL: Commissioner Skop, we're
9	satisfied with your ruling.
10	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. Thank you.
11	Issue so show Issue 21 excluded.
12	Let's move to Issue 22. Hearing no comments
13	from the parties, staff?
14	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
15	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue
16	22 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
17	Issue 23. Hearing no comments from the
18	parties, staff?
19	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
20	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Show Issue 23 adopted as
21	written and renumbered as appropriate.
22	Issue 24. No comment from the parties. So,
23	staff?
24	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
25	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 24

1	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
2	Issue 25. Hearing no comment from the
3	parties, staff?
4	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
5	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 25
6	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
7	Issue 26. No comment from the parties.
8	Staff?
9	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
10	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Show Issue 26
11	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
12	Issue 27. Hearing no comment from the
13	parties, staff?
14	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
15	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 27
16	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
17	Issue 28. Hearing no comment from the
18	parties, staff?
L 9	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
20	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 28
21	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
22	Issue 29. Hearing no comment from the
23	parties, staff?
24	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
:5	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 29

1	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
2	Issue 30. Hearing no comment from the
3	parties, staff?
4	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
5	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 30
6	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
7	Issue 31. Hearing no comment from the
8	parties, staff?
9	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
10	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue
11	31 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
12	Issue 32. Hearing no comment from the
13	parties, staff?
14	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
15	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue
16	32 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
17	Issue 33. Hearing no comment from the
17 18	Issue 33. Hearing no comment from the parties, staff?
18	parties, staff?
18 19	parties, staff?  MS. FLEMING: No comment.
18 19 20	parties, staff?  MS. FLEMING: No comment.  COMMISSIONER SKOP: Show Issue 33 adopted as
18 19 20 21	parties, staff?  MS. FLEMING: No comment.  COMMISSIONER SKOP: Show Issue 33 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
18 19 20 21 22	parties, staff?  MS. FLEMING: No comment.  COMMISSIONER SKOP: Show Issue 33 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.  Issue 34. Hearing no comment from the
18 19 20 21 22 23	parties, staff?  MS. FLEMING: No comment.  COMMISSIONER SKOP: Show Issue 33 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.  Issue 34. Hearing no comment from the parties, staff?

1	written and renumbered accordingly.
2	Issue 35. Hearing no comment from the
3	parties, staff?
4	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
5	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Show Issue 35 adopted as
6	written and renumbered accordingly.
7	Issue 36. Hearing no comment from the
8	parties, staff?
9	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
10	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Show Issue 36 adopted as
11	written and renumbered accordingly.
12	Issue 37. Hearing no comment from the
13	parties, staff?
14	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
15	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Show Issue 37 adopted as
16	written and renumbered accordingly.
17	Issue 38.
18	MR. MELSON: Commissioner.
19	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Mr. Melson.
20	MR. MELSON: I would just inquire of OPC.
21	They appear to have omitted three zeros after the number
22	in their position, I hope.
23	MR. REHWINKEL: Why do you say that?
24	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Scrivener's error.
25	(Laughter.)

1	MR. REHWINKEL: We've revised our position on
2	87. Yes, that's correct. We will, we will correct this
3	error.
4	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. Any other
5	comments as to Issue 38? Hearing none, staff?
6	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
7	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Show Issue 38
8	adopted as written, renumbered accordingly, with the
9	understanding that OPC will correct the scrivener's
10	error in their position.
11	Issue 39. Hearing no comments from the
12	parties, staff?
13	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
	CONNICCIONED CHOR. Char. Issue 20 adopted as
14	<b>COMMISSIONER SKOP:</b> Show Issue 39 adopted as
14 15	written and renumbered accordingly.
15	written and renumbered accordingly.
15 16	written and renumbered accordingly.  Issue 40. Hearing no comments from the
15 16 17	written and renumbered accordingly.  Issue 40. Hearing no comments from the parties, staff?
15 16 17 18	written and renumbered accordingly.  Issue 40. Hearing no comments from the parties, staff?  MS. FLEMING: No comment.
15 16 17 18 19	written and renumbered accordingly.  Issue 40. Hearing no comments from the parties, staff?  MS. FLEMING: No comment.  COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 40
15 16 17 18 19 20	written and renumbered accordingly.  Issue 40. Hearing no comments from the parties, staff?  MS. FLEMING: No comment.  COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 40 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	written and renumbered accordingly.  Issue 40. Hearing no comments from the parties, staff?  MS. FLEMING: No comment.  COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 40 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.  That brings us to Issue 41. Hearing no
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	written and renumbered accordingly.  Issue 40. Hearing no comments from the parties, staff?  MS. FLEMING: No comment.  COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 40 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.  That brings us to Issue 41. Hearing no comments from the parties, staff?

1	Issue 42. Hearing no comments from the
2	parties, staff?
3	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
4	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue
5	42 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
6	Issue 43. Hearing no comments from the
7	parties, staff?
8	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
9	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 43
10	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
11	That brings us to Issue 44. Hearing no
12	comments from the parties, staff?
13	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
14	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 44
15	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
16	Issue 45. Hearing no comments from the
17	parties, staff?
18	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
19	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 45
20	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
21	Issue 46. Hearing no comments from the
22	parties, staff?
23	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
24	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 46
25	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.

1	That brings us to Issue 47. Hearing no
2	comments from the parties, staff?
3	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
4	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 47
5	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
6	Issue 48. Hearing no comments from the
7	parties, staff?
8	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
9	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 48
10	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
11	Issue 49. Hearing no comments from the
12	parties, staff?
13	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
14	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 49
15	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
16	Issue 50. Hearing no comments from the
17	parties, staff?
18	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
19	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 50
20	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
21	That brings us to Issue 51. Hearing no
22	comments from the parties, staff?
23	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
24	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue
25	51 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.

1	Issue 52. Hearing no comments from the
2	parties, staff?
3	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
4	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue
5	52 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
6	Issue 53. Hearing no comments from the
7	parties, staff?
8	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
9	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 53
10	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
11	Issue 54. Hearing no comments from the
12	parties, staff?
13	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
14	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 54
15	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
16	Issue 55? Hearing no comments from the
17	parties, staff?
18	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
19	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 55
20	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
21	Issue 56. Hearing no comments from the
22	parties, staff?
23	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
24	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 56
25	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.

1	Issue 57. Hearing no comments from the
2	parties, staff?
3	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
4	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 57
5	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
6	Issue 58. Hearing no comments from the
7	parties, staff?
8	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
9	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 58
10	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
11	That brings us to Issue 59. Hearing no
12	comments from the parties, staff?
13	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
14	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 59
15	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
16	Issue 60. Hearing no comment from the
17	parties, staff?
18	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
19	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue
20	60 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
21	Issue 61. Hearing no comment from the
22	parties, staff?
23	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
24	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue
25	61 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.

1	Issue 62. Hearing no comment from the
2	parties, staff?
3	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
4	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue
5	62 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
6	Issue 63. Hearing no comment from the
7	parties, staff?
8	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
9	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 63
10	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
11	That brings us to Issue 64. Hearing no
12	comment from the parties, staff?
13	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
14	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 64
15	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
16	Issue 65. Hearing no comment from the
L7	parties, staff?
18	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
L9	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 65
20	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
21	Issue 66. Hearing no comments from the
22	parties, staff?
23	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
2.4	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 66
5	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.

1	Issue 67. Hearing no comments from the
2	parties, staff?
3	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
4	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 67
5	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
6	Issue 68. Hearing no comments from the
7	parties, staff?
8	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
9	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 68
10	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
11	Issue 69. Hearing no comments from the
12	parties, staff?
13	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
14	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 69
15	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
16	Issue 70. Hearing no comments from the
17	parties, staff?
18	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
19	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue
20	70 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
21	Issue 71. Hearing no comment from the
22	parties, staff?
23	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
24	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue
25	71 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.

1	Issue 72 has been dropped. Is that the
2	understanding of the parties and staff? Okay.
3	MS. FLEMING: That's correct.
4	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Thank you.
5	MR. WRIGHT: Commissioner?
6	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Mr. Wright.
7	MR. WRIGHT: Does that mean that what is now
8	73 will become 71?
9	COMMISSIONER SKOP: It will. I'll have it
10	renumbered accordingly. That's the catch phrase I've
11	been using, so.
12	MR. WRIGHT: Yes, sir. I just wanted to make
13	sure I was keeping up with the renumbering.
14	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. And, like I say,
15	I'll look to our dedicated staff to take care of those
16	renumbering issues.
17	So we'd move to Issue 73. Hearing no comments
18	from the parties, staff?
19	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
20	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 73
21	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
22	Issue 74. Hearing no comments from the
23	parties, staff?
24	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
25	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 74

1	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
2	Issue 75. Hearing no comments from the
3	parties, staff?
4	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
5	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 75
6	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
7	Issue 76. Hearing no comments from the
8	parties, staff?
9	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
10	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 76
11	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
12	Issue 77. Hearing no comments from the
13	parties, staff?
14	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
15	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 77
16	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
17	Issue 78. Hearing no comment from the
18	parties, staff?
19	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
20	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 78
21	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
22	That brings us to Issue 79. Hearing no
23	comment from the parties, staff?
24	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
25	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. Show Issue 79

1	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
2	Issue 80. Hearing no comment from the
3	parties, staff?
4	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
5	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue
6	80 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
7	Issue 81. Hearing no comment from the
8	parties, staff?
9	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
10	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue
11	81 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
12	Issue 82. Hearing no comment from the
13	parties, staff?
14	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
15	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue
16	82 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
17	Issue 83. Hearing no comment from the
18	parties, staff?
19	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
20	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 83
21	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
22	Issue 84. Hearing no comment from the
23	parties, staff?
24	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
25	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 84

1	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
2	That brings us to Issue 85.
3	MR. MELSON: Commissioner, we'd like to add
4	Witness Slusser in the parenthetical after our position
5	on this issue.
6	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. Any other
7	comments as to Issue 85? Staff?
8	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
9	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 85
10	adopted as written, renumbered accordingly, with the
11	correction to the witness as indicated by PEF.
12	That brings us to Issue 86. Hearing no
13	comments from the parties, staff?
14	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
15	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Issue 86 is
16	adopted as written, renumbered accordingly.
17	Issue 87. Hearing no comments from the
18	parties, staff?
19	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
20	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. Show Issue 87
21	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
22	Issue 88. Hearing no comments from the
23	parties, staff?
24	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
25	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. Show Issue 88

1 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly. 2 Issue 89. Hearing no comment from the 3 parties, staff? 4 MS. FLEMING: No comment. 5 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Hearing no 6 comment from the parties, staff? 7 MS. FLEMING: No comment. MR. REHWINKEL: Commissioner? 8 9 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Who, who is speaking? MR. REHWINKEL: Mr. Rehwinkel. 10 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Mr. Rehwinkel. 11 MR. REHWINKEL: The Public Counsel's Office 12 13 traditionally does not take positions on the cost of 14 service and rate design issues. When we talk to staff 15 after and the parties afterwards, I may have some sort of a generic issue to address the separations issue 16 17 that's back in 4 and 5 that we discussed very early. 18 Although we don't have, we don't generally get involved for conflict reasons in that, for consistency's sake we 19 20 may take a position just solely related to the filing of 21 the updated forecast. 22 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Very well. Are you 23 speaking to this as to Issue 89? MR. REHWINKEL: Well, all of these. If you 2.4

look at 88, they refer to the May 2009 sales forecast.

25

1 Any, any issues -- and there were some even in the rate 2 base section that deal with updates to the separations 3 factors. And so what we may need to do is to take some 4 sort of a placeholder umbrella issue that flows through 5 everything rather than cluttering up the order with the 6 same old thing. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Very well. Any other comments as to Issue 89? 8 MS. KAUFMAN: Commissioner, FIPUG will be 9 10 changing its position on Issue 89 as well. 11 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. Any other 12 comments on Issue 89 from the parties? Staff? 13 MS. FLEMING: No comment. COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. 14 15 MR. MELSON: Commissioner, could we have an 16 idea of how FIPUG is going to change their position, if 17 they know? COMMISSIONER SKOP: Ms. Kaufman. 18 19 MS. KAUFMAN: I haven't -- I don't -- I can't 20 give you the formulation, but it's, it's going to relate 21 to the revised separation study. 22 MR. MELSON: Okay. 23 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. And that will be 24 submitted by 5:00 p.m. tomorrow; correct? Okay. You'll 25 know by 5:00 p.m. tomorrow.

1	MR. MELSON: Thank you, Commissioner.
2	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Any other comments
3	on Issue 89? Staff, no, no comments?
4	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
5	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Show Issue 89
6	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly, with the,
7	noting the comments made by OPC and the revision to the
8	position statement by FIPUG.
9	That brings us to Issue 90.
10	MS. VAN DYKE: The Navy would just like to add
11	for our issue position at the end of it the
12	parenthetical with Mr. Selecky's name.
13	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. And that's to Issue
14	90; correct?
15	MS. VAN DYKE: Correct.
16	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Any other comments
17	as to Issue 90? Hearing none, staff?
18	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
19	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Show Issue
20	90 adopted as written, renumbered accordingly, with the
21	change in position to add the witness at the end of the
22	Navy's position statement.
23	Issue 91.
24	MS. VAN DYKE: Same thing for the Navy,
25	please, add Mr. Selecky's name.

1	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Very well. Any
2	other comments as to Issue 91? Staff?
3	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
4	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue
5	91 adopted as written, renumbered accordingly, with the
6	noted correction to the Navy's position statement.
7	Issue 92.
8	MS. VAN DYKE: The same correction for the
9	Navy here, please.
10	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. Any other
11	comments as to Issue 92? Staff?
12	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
13	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Show Issue
14	92 adopted as written, renumbered accordingly, with the
15	noted correction to the Navy's position statement.
16	Issue 93. Hearing no comments from the
17	parties, staff?
18	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
19	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 93
20	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
21	Issue 94. Hearing no comments from the
22	parties, staff?
23	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
24	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 94
25	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.

1	That brings us to Issue 95. Hearing no
2	comments from the parties, staff?
3	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
4	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 95
5	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
6	Issue 96. Hearing no comments from the
7	parties, staff?
8	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
9	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 96
10	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
11	Issue 97. Hearing no comment from the
12	parties, staff?
13	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
14	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 97
15	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
16	Issue 98. Hearing no comments from the
17	parties, staff?
18	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
19	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 98
20	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
21	Issue 99. Hearing no comments from the
22	parties, staff?
23	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
24	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 99
25	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.

1	That brings us to Issue 100. Hearing no
2	comments from the parties, staff?
3	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
4	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue
5	100 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
6	Issue 101. Hearing no comments from the
7	parties, staff?
8	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
9	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue
10	101 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
11	It's my understanding that Issue 102 has been
12	dropped. Is that the understanding of the parties?
13	MS. FLEMING: That's correct.
14	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Thank you.
15	Let's move to Issue 103. Hearing no comments from the
16	parties, staff?
17	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
18	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 103
19	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
20	That brings us to Issue 104. Hearing no
21	comments from the parties, staff?
22	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
23	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 104
24	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
25	Issue 105. Okay. Hearing no comments from

1	the parties, staff?
2	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
3	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 105
4	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
5	Issue 106. Hearing no comments from the
6	parties, staff?
7	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
8	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 106
9	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
10	Issue 107. Hearing no comments from the
11	parties, staff?
12	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
13	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 107
14	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
15	Issue 108. Hearing no comments from the
16	parties, staff?
17	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
18	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show 108,
19	Issue 108 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
20	Issue 109.
21	MR. MELSON: Commissioner?
22	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Mr. Melson.
23	MR. MELSON: Issue 109 and 110 are two
24	objections that Progress objects to their inclusion.
25	They relate to the interruptible credit and whether the

interruptible credit should be load factor adjusted. The interruptible credit has been treated as a demand-side management program, and that, the amount of that credit is ordinarily addressed either in a goals docket or in the conservation docket. We don't believe it's an appropriate item to be dealt with in the rate case and should be set in one of those two other dockets.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. And, Ms.

Kaufman, I guess FIPUG is the proponent of this issue,
so if you could please speak to it.

MS. KAUFMAN: We are. Thank you, Commissioner.

Several points on this. Number one, we're in a general rate case here in which all the costs, expenses of the rate case are reviewed. It's perfectly appropriate to review the level of the interruptible credit here and how the company proposes to adjust it.

A similar issue to this was included in the Tampa Electric rate case and was included in the Florida, Florida Power & Light case. We have extensive testimony on this issue, and we think it's something that the Commission should hear and consider in this case.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Thank you. Any

other comments from the intervening parties?

MR. TAYLOR: For PCS, we would agree with FIPUG. This is a key issue in the overall rate proceeding and does belong -- or should be addressed here.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you. Mr. Melson, rebuttal.

MR. MELSON: Ms. Kaufman said that, if I understood her, the company was attempting to change the credit. In this case that's not the case. We are proposing to leave the credit as is.

The, the way it works for the conservation cost recovery docket is the amount of the credit is recovered essentially from other customers through the clause, and that requires a showing that the demand-side, the DSM program, of which the interruptible credit is a part, is cost-effective. That's not something that the company has addressed in this proceeding, it does not affect the base rates, and we believe, as I said, it's more appropriate to handle either in the goals docket or the DSM, the conservation docket.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Thank you.

I'd like to hear from Ms. Kaufman briefly.

MS. KAUFMAN: I was just going to say --

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Briefly.

MS. KAUFMAN: Yes. I'm sorry. I was just going to say that I didn't mean to imply that the company was suggesting a change. I don't recall saying that. If I did, that's not what I meant.

What I meant to say and what I hope I did say is that this is a component of the company's rates and that it's something that the Commission should look at and review in this case, just as it's looking at it in the, looked at it in TECO and it's looking at it in Florida Power & Light.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Thank you. I'd like to hear briefly from our staff as to their recommendation based upon the discussion, specifically in light of the reference to other cases and how that may impact those if they were common issues.

MS. FLEMING: If I can have a moment to confer with staff with respect to the other dockets.

**COMMISSIONER SKOP:** You may.

(Pause.)

Ms. Fleming.

MS. FLEMING: Commissioner, it's my understanding that with respect to these issues in the FPL and TECO cases, there really is no distinction in this proceeding. However, staff still maintains the

position here as it does in the FPL rate case that this is a load management program. The credits are usually addressed during a DSM proceeding, and those credits are recovered through an ECCR factor. It's not appropriate to modify the credit for one load management program in isolation without adequate review of the cost-effectiveness of those programs.

Staff doesn't believe it has the necessary information in this proceeding. However, those were issues that remained in the FPL and the TECO rate case proceeding, but staff's position will still remain that it's not an appropriate issue in this docket.

**COMMISSIONER SKOP:** All right. So staff's recommendation should be that this issue should not be included?

MS. FLEMING: That's correct.

MS. KAUFMAN: Commissioner, Commissioner Skop, could I just be heard for one moment before you rule?

**COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Ms. Kaufman, you're recognized.

MS. KAUFMAN: And I would simply say that I believe that Ms. Fleming has appropriately stated the way the issues are framed in the other proceedings. And what she has provided to you I think is her position on it, as Mr. Melson has provided you with his position.

1 2 3 4 rate cases. 5 6 to, to that point specifically. 7 MS. FLEMING: I think Ms. Kaufman is correct. 8 9 10 11 12 interruptible credit within this proceeding. 13 14 15 included? 16 17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I think it would be appropriate to leave the issue in and the parties will take whatever position they deem appropriate. That's how it was handled in the other two

COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Ms. Fleming

We still believe that this, these two issues are not appropriate for this proceeding. However, if the issues were to remain, staff's position would be that it is not appropriate to determine a load management or

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. And with respect to Ms. Kaufman's assertion that the issues are included in the other proceedings, are they, are they in fact

MS. FLEMING: It is my understanding that these issues are included in the FPL rate case proceeding.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. All right. Very well. I think I'm going to defer ruling on Issue 109 until the end of the proceeding.

That brings us to Issue 110. And, Ms. Kaufman, you're the proponent of that issue. Could you briefly speak to it? I'm sure it'll be probably the

1 same argument. 2 MS. KAUFMAN: It is, Commissioner. You know, 3 it's part and parcel of how the interruptible credit is dealt with and it is essentially the same argument. 4 5 have testimony filed on it and it's being considered in the other rate cases, specifically the load adjustment 6 7 proposal. COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Very well. 8 9 Mr. Melson. MR. MELSON: Same response on 109 and 110. 10 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. To staff, same 11 12 recommendation? 13 MS. FLEMING: Same recommendation, yes. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Based on the 14 15 discussion I'm going to take that issue under advisement I'll rule at the end of this proceeding. 16 That takes us to Issue 111. 17 MS. VAN DYKE: The Navy would just like to add 18 19 Mr. Selecky's name to our issue response. 20 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. Any other 21 comments as to Issue 111? Hearing none, staff? 22 MS. FLEMING: No comments. 23 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 111 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly. 24 That brings us to Issue 112. 25

1	MS. VAN DYKE: Once again if we could add
2	Mr. Selecky's name.
3	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. Any other
4	comments as to Issue 112?
5	Hearing none from the parties, staff?
6	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
7	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 112
8	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly, with the
9	correction not only to Issue 111 but 112 as to the
10	Navy's comment.
11	Issue 113. Hearing no comments from the
12	parties, staff?
13	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
14	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 113
15	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
16	Issue 114. Hearing no comments from the
17	parties, staff?
18	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
19	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 114
20	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.
21	Issue 115. Hearing no comments from the
22	parties, staff?
23	MS. FLEMING: No comment.
24	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 115
25	adopted as written and renumbered accordingly.

That brings us to Issue 116. Hearing no 1 comments from the parties, staff? 2 MS. FLEMING: No comment. 3 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 116 4 5 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly. Issue 117. Hearing no comments from the 6 parties, staff? 7 MS. FLEMING: No comment. 8 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 117 9 10 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly. 11 That brings us to Issue 118. MR. MELSON: Commissioner Skop. 12 13 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Mr. Melson, you're recognized. 14 MR. MELSON: Issue 118 is another issue that 15 Progress objects to. You may remember Progress filed a 16 17 separate petition to deal with the creation of a pension fund regulatory asset. The Commission issued a proposed 18 19 agency action order allowing the creation of that asset 2.0 and setting out the guidelines for how the asset was to 21 be treated. There was a protest to that order, but the 22 23 protest raised essentially the three issues that follow, 119, 120 and 121, which were issues as to whether it 24 constituted retroactive ratemaking, whether it was 25

2.4

inconsistent with the stipulation and so forth. There was no protest to the portion of the order that established the guidelines for the treatment of the regulatory asset if it's allowed. Under Section 120.80(13), Florida Statutes, and your Rule 25-22.029(3), Florida Administrative Code, when an order is protested, issues that are not raised in the protest are waived and deemed stipulated. So we don't believe at this point there is any appropriate live issue regarding the, the guidelines for the handling of that asset.

**COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Okay. Very well.

Ms. Kaufman, this is a FIPUG issue. If you --

MS. KAUFMAN: It is, Commissioner. Thank you. As Mr. Melson pointed out, there were three issues that were raised in the protest, and those issues are all tied up with the pension asset and how it's going to be treated on a going-forward basis. We think that the treatment of that asset, if it is ultimately approved, is part and parcel of the protest and that this is an appropriate issue for the Commission to look at once it makes a final determination one way or the other. Of course if it doesn't allow it, you wouldn't need to reach that issue. But if you do, it's part and parcel of what the Intervenors have protested in their, in

1 their protest that we filed in this matter.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. I'd like to hear from staff.

MS. FLEMING: Commissioner, Mr. Melson is correct, there was a PAA order that was issued with respect to this pension issue. But that order was protested but only three specific issues were raised with respect to that protest.

And pursuant to the statute that Mr., Progress had raised, 120.80(13), it states that it may only address -- excuse me. I'll read it. And it's (b), it says, "A hearing and an objection to a proposed agency action of the Florida Public Service Commission may only address the issues in dispute. Issues in the proposed agency action which are not in dispute are deemed stipulated."

So I'm having trouble understanding -- in that same order the Commission set forth conditions if there was, if the utility was allowed to set forth a regulatory asset with respect to this pension. What -- if Ms. Kaufman is stating that those are still going to be at issue, that portion of the order, the conditions, were not protested as part of the protest. Thus, staff believes that the only issues in dispute are the three issues raised in the protest. Those conditions would

still remain. And whatever the Commission ultimately decides in Issues 119, 120 and 121, the conditions would still remain in place.

## COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you.

Ms. Kaufman, a brief response as to the issue preclusion associated with not identifying the issues that are previously in dispute, whereas the guidelines were not specifically disputed.

## MS. KAUFMAN: Thank you, Commissioner.

My position is that each one of these issues talks about creating regulatory asset and deferring that asset. Part and parcel of that is how is the asset treated? We think that our issue in regard to what should be done with the asset is clearly encompassed by the three issues that were protested.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Very well. After hearing from the parties and staff recommendation, my holding is to exclude this issue from the list of issues in the proceeding. Should, Ms. Kaufman, you have reservation with that, certainly you can bring a motion for reconsideration as a preliminary matter at the proceeding.

But, again, at least looking at what's been alleged, that the specific issue was not previously identified as being in dispute in the protest to the

prior order, and is deemed stipulated. 1 2 Let's move to Issue 119. Hearing no comment 3 from the parties, staff? MS. FLEMING: No comment. 4 5 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 119 6 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly. 7 Issue 120. Hearing no comment from the 8 parties, staff? 9 MS. FLEMING: No comment. COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 120 10 11 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly. 12 That brings us to Issue 121. Hearing no 13 comment from the parties, staff? MS. FLEMING: No comment. 14 15 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 16 121 adopted as written and renumbered accordingly. 17 That brings us to Issue 122. Hearing no 18 comment from the parties, staff? MS. FLEMING: No comment. 19 20 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Show Issue 122 21 adopted as written, renumbered accordingly. And at this point I'd like to take a brief 22 23 recess to confer with staff as to the remaining issues that I've not yet ruled upon, and we'll move on from 24 there upon that ruling. So I'd like to take a brief 25

ten-minute recess. Thank you.

2.4

(Recess taken.)

Okay. We're going to go back on the record.

I want to address one issue. It seems I may have
misspoke. I guess it's the engineer in me that tends to
want to reorder things in a logical fashion. But I
recognize that renumbering issues may cause the parties
angst, as well as my staff. So, again, I don't want to
lead the horse off the cliff. So I think perhaps the
more prudent course of action would be to leave the
issues numbered as they exist today. If the issues were
deleted or dropped, they will be so noted. The only
issues that will be renumbered will be the order of
Issues 110, 111 and 112 respectively. They'll be
inverted as we discussed without getting into the whole
narrative. And I think that'll make things a lot easier
for the parties, a lot easier for my staff.

MS. FLEMING: And just to clarify, Commissioner. They're Issues 10, 11 and 12.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Sorry. Issues 10, 11 and 12. So just for the record Issue 11 will be 10, Issue 12 will be 11 and Issue 10 will become 12, and that'll be the only change in renumbering. That should make it orderly for the parties when they're preparing their statements so they don't have to change the world and as

well as my staff. And I guess it's just the engineer in me that likes order in the universe to make things flow. But in retrospect, that probably wasn't the best way to go about it. So even I make mistakes.

All right. Let's get back to the issues that I've not yet ruled upon. Issue 1 with respect to the AG's request, my holding on that issue is to exclude it from the list of issues in this proceeding. I'll give a brief explanation, a two-fold explanation.

First, the issue as currently written does not cite the legal standard. It -- so that's, that's an issue in itself. Secondly, the issue as it is framed in terms of being at the beginning of the proceeding seems to lend itself perhaps better towards being a conclusory statement after all the issues have been identified. So based on the above and the discussion that was held, I'm going to exclude that issue. But I would hold open -- Ms. Bradley, if you wish, feel strongly about it and wish it to be reconsidered, certainly that's your right as a preliminary matter in the proceeding.

MS. BRADLEY: I would be happy to go back and recheck the statute and reword it to appropriately reflect that, if that would be an alternative to that.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: No. I appreciate that. I just think that in terms of the proceeding itself, it's

almost drawing a conclusion before any of the issues have been heard and answered in the affirmative or negative. So that's, that's my concern.

MS. BRADLEY: We would have no objection to moving it to the last one.

commissioner skop: Okay. Well, I guess based on the above and based on the thing, I'm, you know, it's a good argument. I'm going to exclude it from the list of issue. I do think that the statute encompasses the Commission to consider each of those with respect to every issue. But if you feel strongly about it, again, the proper procedural method would be I guess motion for reconsideration as a preliminary matter, which, you know, you have my full leave to do should you desire to do so.

MS. BRADLEY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. As to Issues 109 and 110, both of those issues will come in. So Issue 109 will be incorporated as written and Issue 110 will be incorporated as written. And that's to provide, not only based upon the discussion, but consistency in similarly situated matters before the Commission.

So that brings us --

MR. MELSON: Commissioner Skop.

**COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Mr. Melson, you're recognized.

MR. MELSON: On Issue 109 and 110 then I would ask that the objection that's in, shown in regular type simply be taken out and the italics changed to our regular type and that would be our position on the issues.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Very well.

Show that done, staff, for Issue 109 and 110. Any other matters on the, on the ruling or concerns?

Okay. All right. That takes care of all the issues as proposed.

Let's move on to Section IX, exhibits list.

MS. FLEMING: Staff would note that in the Draft Prehearing Order on Page 107 we did not include the description for Peter Toomey's exhibits for the Bartow proceeding. We intend to include those in the final Prehearing Order.

## **COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Okay.

MS. FLEMING: We would also note for the record that staff is in the process of preparing a Comprehensive Exhibit List consisting of the prefiled exhibits for purposes of numbering and identifying the exhibits at hearing, and we'll provide that exhibit list to the parties as soon as possible.

In addition, based on discussions at the Issue ID on August 20th, I believe, the Intervenors had suggested that if staff could start providing those exhibits that staff would like to include in its stipulated composite exhibit, that they do so so that they would have ample time to review those. Staff provided a list of exhibits consisting of certain discovery responses about three, three and a half weeks ago to the parties in an effort to streamline the hearing process. It's my understanding some of the Intervenors have been able to look at some of the items, but it's, it's time consuming. So we intend to meet with the parties after this prehearing conference to discuss what exhibits of staff's exhibits, if any, can be stipulated.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Very well.

And with respect to that comment, I would encourage the parties to work together in good faith to stipulate when they're able to do so. And if we could expedite that process, I think it would be tremendously helpful to our staff that's been working hard on these issues. So I'd continue to ask the parties to be fully cooperative and see where there's common ground to be had.

MR. MELSON: Commissioner Skop, Progress has got one addition to the witness list. I can either give

that to the staff offline or I can give it to you now.

**COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Okay. If you could state it now for the record.

MR. MELSON: Okay. On Page 114 between Will Garrett WG-6 and Thomas R. Sullivan, we should insert Michael J. Vilbert proffered by PEF. The designation is Appendix A, and the description is qualifications of Michael J. Vilbert.

**COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Very well. Show that done.

Okay. Any other concerns with respect to Section IX on the exhibits list? Hearing none, we'd move to Section X, proposed stipulations. And staff?

MS. FLEMING: Progress has circulated a list of issues that may potentially be stipulated. We have not heard from any of the parties regarding those stipulations. But it's my understanding that the parties, Progress and staff do plan to meet after this prehearing conference to discuss the list of stipulations.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Very well. And to my prior comment again, I'd encourage the parties to find common ground where they're able to do so and stipulate issues and/or witnesses where they're able to reach that agreement and work with our staff to achieve

1 that endeavor.

2.5

Any other concerns as to Section X? Okay.

Hearing none, we're going to move to Section XI, pending motions. Staff?

MS. FLEMING: I would like to note there is one additional pending motion that's not identified here. There is a petition to intervene filed by several employees of Progress. That order will be forthcoming and should be issued sometime prior to the hearing.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. And I believe -- is there another -- I think Ms. Bradley mentioned a pending motion in limine. If you'd like to speak briefly to that.

MS. BRADLEY: Thank you. It's similar to the one that we filed in the Florida Power & Light case, which I know y'all are familiar with. But essentially we're just asking that if there are any late-filed exhibits, that a procedure be established that would allow us an opportunity to review any late-filed documents before they are admitted so that we can object, if necessary, and so that we can cross-examine. Hopefully that can be done before the end of the hearing. If not, we would ask for some procedure to be set up so that we are allowed to review it and, if necessary, cross-examine the person preparing it so that

the record is clear and we have an opportunity to defend those late-filed exhibits.

commissioner skop: Okay. Very well. And with respect to that specific motion, probably I am going to, in deference to the importance of that, probably defer that to the entire Commission as a preliminary matter for consideration at the beginning of the hearing. And I think that that's the appropriate thing to do. Should I change my mind, I'll let you know.

MS. BRADLEY: Okay.

**COMMISSIONER SKOP:** But that's my gut feeling as it stands now on that particular motion.

MS. BRADLEY: Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Any other motions, staff?

MR. MELSON: Commissioner Skop, should you change your mind, we'd like a brief opportunity to respond.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Yes. Okay. Will do. But I think that my -- well, you can respond now, should you wish to. But, again, my inclination is to defer that as a preliminary matter for the entire Commission.

MR. MELSON: And, Commissioner, we basically agree with that approach. We think it's premature and in fact may even be premature at the outset of the

1 We believe it's something that's probably best 2 dealt with an on exhibit-by-exhibit basis if and when 3 there's a request and an objection. 4 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Very well. 5 Any other pending motions, staff? 6 MS. FLEMING: I'm not aware of any other 7 pending motions. 8 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Very well. 9 Let's move to Section XII, pending confidentiality 10 motions. 11 MR. MELSON: Commissioner Skop, I can get 12 offline with staff. I believe there are three temporary 13 protective order motions that may not be listed. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Very well. Any 14 15 other motions that staff is aware of as it pertains to confidentiality? 16 17 I would just note that there are MS. FLEMING: several requests for confidential classification. All 18 19 those will be addressed by separate order. 20 With respect to the three temporary protective 21 orders that Mr. Melson was referring to, we have outstanding orders on those and those will be issued 22 23 probably this week. 24 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. As soon as I 25 have an opportunity to rule on those matters, I will.

suspect they'll be consistent with past rulings of the Commission.

MR. MELSON: Commissioner Skop?

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Mr. Melson.

MR. MELSON: There is one of the new requests for confidential classification, and I guess it's Item 10 on the list which deals with the updated compensation information. We were hoping that among this list -- if that one could be ruled on earlier rather than later. I anticipate there's going to be seeking judicial review of the full Commission order, and this is another order that probably ought to travel with that one, if it were possible to have it issued.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. As soon as I'm able to take a look at it through staff providing it,
I'm happy to rule upon that motion.

Okay. Any other issues as it pertains to Section XIII? Excuse me. Section XII. I'm getting ahead of myself.

Okay. Hearing none, let's move to Section

XIII, posthearing procedures. And we need to probably
address the posthearing positions and posthearing

briefs. I'd like to hear from the parties as to what
they might like to see before I make a ruling, and also
hear from our staff.

Mr. Melson.

MR. MELSON: Commissioner, Progress would suggest 75 words for position statements. And we would request 150 pages for the brief, although we would endeavor not to use that much.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well.

Ms. Bradley.

MS. BRADLEY: I would appreciate it if we could do something like we did in the other case that would allow us the option of having a few more words on a couple of issues because, since some of these have been disallowed and we're going to have to try to squeeze them into other issues, I would appreciate some additional words on at least a couple.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. All right. very well.

Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Commissioner. I agree with, with both Mr. Melson and Ms. Bradley. I think 75 words as a general rule is appropriate. 150 pages for briefing is appropriate. And I believe in the FPL case we were granted up to ten issues on which we could have position statements up to 150 words.

And the only other thing I wanted to mention,
I'm sorry I can't find the issue right now, but one of

the, the big depreciation issue has a whole lot of subparts to it, I think -- or maybe not. Maybe that's OPC's position. There -- well, I'm looking for some extra, for some extra words on the depreciation issues.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. All right. I'll take that under advisement.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: How would, just briefly, would you respond to the fact that there are significantly less number of issues in this proceeding than in the one that you drew a comparison to?

MR. WRIGHT: My response might be that that might affect the number of pages. But since Mr. Melson has proposed 150 pages, I had been thinking 150 pages as well.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Very well.

Mr. Rehwinkel.

MR. REHWINKEL: I probably don't have a whole lot to add to this other than to hope that I don't need 150 pages. But I, I'm not briefing all the issues too because there are a significant number that we're not taking a position on.

I would concur with Mr. Wright that, and
Ms. Bradley that there may be a couple of issues in the
depreciation area where the positions may need to exceed

7 the limit. But I would be willing to accept a very 2 limited number of exceptions there, if that would be 3 your will. Thank you. COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. very well. 4 Ms. Van Dike. 5 6 MS. VAN DYKE: We take no particular position. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. 8 Mr. Taylor. MR. TAYLOR: I have nothing further. 9 10 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Ms. Kaufman. MS. KAUFMAN: Commissioner Skop, FIPUG can 11 12 generally support Mr. Melson's position. And we would 13 also support Ms. Bradley and the others who have spoken that it may be appropriate on some issues to give us a 14 15 little more leeway. 16 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Well very. 17 Ms. Alexander. MS. ALEXANDER: We'd be happy to just defer to 18 19 whatever the Commission decides is the best. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. 20 21 Staff, recommendations? 22 MS. FLEMING: I am aware that in the FPL rate 23 case there were, the parties were allowed up to ten 24 issues where their position statements could, I think, 25 be no more than 150 words. And it seems like that's

something that the parties are suggesting here, and it
may be appropriate in this proceeding as well. 75 words
is appropriate; however, I think 150 pages is a bit much
considering the number of issues. And hearing from the
parties, they don't seem to think that they'll need 150

pages, so I would suggest maybe a lower number.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Very well.

All right. Based upon what I've heard, and I'm in a generous mood today, but I don't want to have people get too wordy, so here's, here's what I propose.

With respect to the issues, the standard rule is going to be 80 words. I'll give the parties leave on ten respective issues, up to ten issues to go up to 150 words, but only those ten issues that they deem appropriate. Total pages will be 140 pages. And show that done. And any additional concerns with respect to that ruling? Okay. Hearing none, I assume that the parties feel it's fair, and staff could just please incorporate that into the Prehearing Order.

Okay. Any other issues under Section XIII for, for posthearing procedures?

Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Commissioner, I have spoken with Mr. Melson and with staff and at least with a couple of the other parties. This is really in the nature of an

ore tenus motion for a modification of the procedural order, and particularly the controlling date for the filing of briefs. As all of us know all too well, this is an extremely busy time for the Commission and for pretty much all of us. I would ask for you to consider, and I understand staff wants to consider it and that's fine, but I would ask that you consider a motion to extend the due date for briefs from Friday, October 16th, to Monday, October 19th. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Can you please repeat that? MR. WRIGHT: Certainly. The motion is to

MR. WRIGHT: Certainly. The motion is to extend the date for briefs from its present due date of Friday, October 16, to Monday, October 19, close of business, 5:00.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Very well. Staff, with respect to the request, is that something that can be reasonably accommodated by staff or would that present a substantial hardship?

MS. FLEMING: Commissioner, I'm not prepared to address that at this time. I have spoken to Mr. Wright. I told him that I would confer with staff and see how that extension would impact the posthearing proceeding and the posthearing rec process. As soon as I'm able to speak with the appropriate staff, then we

7 can convey that information to you and maybe take that 2 under advisement. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Is that something 3 that needs to be decided in the proceeding before us 4 5 today or can that be just a ruling made after you confer? 6 MS. FLEMING: It does not need to be decided 7 in the proceeding today. And, of course, these dates 8 that Mr. Wright has set forth is subject to change, and 9 this is just assuming that this hearing would actually 10 11 conclude on October 2nd. COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Very well. 12 1.3 I'll take that under advisement as a reasonable request. If it can be accommodated by our staff without undue 14 15 hardship, again we'll consider it to the best of our 16 ability. 17 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Commissioner. And my thanks to the staff also. Thanks. 18 19 COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Any other 2.0 issues with respect to Section XIII? MR. MELSON: Commissioner Skop, I've got --21 22 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Mr. Melson. 23 MR. MELSON: I'm not sure that's where they fit, but I've got two more issues. The order --24 25 COMMISSIONER SKOP: We were doing good here.

Now --

MR. MELSON: The order that consolidated the pension accounting docket into this one indicated that the case was being consolidated for purposes of hearing. I just wanted to clarify and make sure my understanding is correct that that would include the briefing and so forth. We're expected to brief those three pension accounting issues in this case; is that correct?

COMMISSIONER SKOP: I'll look to staff.

MS. FLEMING: That is correct. The issues are identified I think as 119, 120 and 121. So those would be encompassed as part of the posthearing brief.

MR. MELSON: Okay. And, second, maybe I'm getting ahead of myself, but did you want to address time limits for opening statements?

**COMMISSIONER SKOP:** We're going to do that in the next section.

MR. MELSON: Well, I will keep quiet.

**COMMISSIONER SKOP:** All right. Okay. So no other questions, concerns as to Section XIII?

All right. Very well. We're going to move to Section XIV, rulings. And one of the first orders of business on that is we need to set the time limits for opening statements. And so I'll look to the parties as to what they might like to propose and we'll take it

1	from there.
2	MR. MELSON: Progress has not talked with the
3	other parties. What we would propose is a 20-minute
4	opening statement for Progress, 20 minutes for OPC, and
5	something like ten minutes apiece for the remaining
6	parties.
7	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Ms. Bradley.
8	MS. BRADLEY: I would certainly appreciate ten
9	minutes.
10	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Mr. Wright.
11	MR. WRIGHT: Commissioner Skop, that's
12	agreeable to the Retail Federation. Thank you.
13	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Thank you.
14	Mr. Rehwinkel.
15	MR. REHWINKEL: Commissioner, that's
16	appropriate. I believe we probably could do it in less
17	than 20, but I appreciate that time.
18	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Very well.
19	Ms. Van Dyke.
20	MS. VAN DYKE: We do not need more than ten
21	minutes and most likely will take less.
22	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. That's always a
23	positive.
24	Mr. Taylor.
25	MR. TAYLOR: Ten minutes is fine for PCS.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Ms. Kaufman.
2	MS. KAUFMAN: We're agreeable to that,
3	Mr. Commissioner.
4	COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Thank you.
5	Ms. Alexander.
6	MS. ALEXANDER: We'll also likely take less
7	than our ten minutes. Thank you.
8	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. All right. Let me
9	do some quick math on this because you may have read my
10	mind, but I need to make sure that if I count properly,
11	absent OPC, we have one, two, three, four, five, six
12	intervenors. Is that correct? Okay. And, Mr. Melson,
13	you said that you needed 20 minutes?
14	MR. MELSON: Yes, sir. We'd like that,
15	please.
16	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Do you feel, based upon
17	the discussion that you've heard, that it would be
18	prejudicial to give you 20 minutes and give OPC 20
19	minutes and ten or less for each of the other
20	Intervenors?
21	MR. MELSON: I'm sorry. I didn't understand
22	the question.
23	COMMISSIONER SKOP: You've requested 20
24	minutes.
25	MR. MELSON: Yes, sir.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER SKOP: And some of the other Intervenors have proposed that in addition to you getting 20 minutes, that OPC gets 20 minutes, and then the rest of the Intervenors get ten minutes. Do you feel that's appropriate.

MR. MELSON: Yes, sir. That's fine with us.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. All right. So show that done. What we'll do is that opening statements will be limited to Progress to 20 minutes, OPC will have 20 minutes, and the remaining Intervenors will have ten minutes each. And I think if I do that correctly, you'll have 20 minutes total for Progress and a total of 80 minutes for the other parties. But they will be not shared, they'll be 20 minutes for OPC, ten minutes individually for the remaining Intervenors. All right. Show that done.

Any other -- and it would be appreciated, I know my Chairman would love me for mentioning this, but again if we can keep it brief and keep it short, that's always a good thing to do because we do have a lengthy proceeding to litigate on the merits and we don't want to run behind schedule needlessly. So I'd call upon the parties to keep it tight, make a compelling opening statement and turn it over to the next person.

Okay. Any other comments on Section XIV?

Okay. All right. So that takes care of the preliminary Prehearing Order. Are there any other matters that need to be addressed at the prehearing conference? I'll look to staff and then go to the parties.

MS. FLEMING: Staff would just remind the parties that any changes in positions, if they could provide those to staff by close of business tomorrow. And also just to remind the parties that we intend to meet as soon as this prehearing conference concludes to discuss any stipulations of witnesses, issues or exhibits.

**COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Okay. Very well. Any other matters that the parties need to bring to my attention?

MS. VAN DYKE: I just wanted to make certain that we don't need to be here on Monday; is that correct? Tuesday will be the first day, as we had discussed, or has that changed?

MS. FLEMING: Monday the 21st?

MS. VAN DYKE: Correct.

MS. FLEMING: No. The hearing starts on Monday, September 21st. There is a service hearing portion, if there are any customers here to address the Commission, but the parties should be here Monday

1 morning on September 21st.

2.4

MS. VAN DYKE: Oh, okay. Because we had had a phone conversation with all the parties earlier where I had asked does that mean that we don't need to be here until Tuesday, and I was told that, yes, that is the case, that Monday is going to be all public comment and the parties don't have to be here until Tuesday. But that's changed?

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Let me, let me chime in here just, Ms. Van Dyke, just so you know our process. Typically when we do have a rate case or a major proceeding and there is a customer hearing scheduled at the, at the front end of the hearing, that that basically is conducted. And should that not require a full day, then we'll immediately go into the hearing posture.

MS. VAN DYKE: Okay.

**COMMISSIONER SKOP:** So my understanding would be that the parties would need to be here ready to try the case as of that Monday.

MS. VAN DYKE: Okay.

commissioner skop: Again, if there are a lot of customers, again, it may be very late in the day or not at all that we get into the actual case for opening statements. But, you know, depending upon turnout, that

could happen by noon time or earlier. So it just depends. So you need to be ready to go on Monday with your opening statement. MS. VAN DYKE: Thank you. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Staff, any other concerns? MS. FLEMING: We have no other issues. **COMMISSIONER SKOP:** Okay. Any remaining concerns from the parties? Okay. Hearing none, again, I commend the parties on their, on their willingness to work together. It seems like we've made a lot of good progress. And with that, the meeting is adjourned. (Prehearing Conference adjourned at 11:21 a.m.) 

1	STATE OF FLORIDA ) : CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	COUNTY OF LEON )
3	
4	I, LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR, Official Commission Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing
5	proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.
6	
7	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the
8	same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.
9	
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties'
11	attorneys or counsel connected with the action, nor am I
12	financially interested in the action.  DATED THIS $/5^{49}$ day of September,
13	2009.
14	
15	LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR
16	FPSC Official Commission Reporter (850) 413-6734
17	(830) 413-6734
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	