Marguerite McLean

100009-EI

From: Sent: To: Cc:	Costello, Jeanne [jcostello@carltonfields.com] Wednesday, August 18, 2010 3:55 PM Filings@psc.state.fl.us Bryan.Anderson@fpl.com; Lisa Bennett; jbrew@bbrslaw.com; john.burnett@pgnmail.com; jessica.cano@fpl.com; gadavis@enviroattorney.com; alex.glenn@pgnmail.com; vkaufman@kagmlaw.com; paul.lewisjr@pgnmail.com; shayla.mcneill@tyndall.af.mil; jmcwhirter@mac-law.com; RMiller@pcsphosphate.com; jmoyle@kagmlaw.com; Charles Rehwinkel; ataylor@bbrslaw.com; dianne.triplett@pgnmail.com; Jamie Whitlock; Anna Williams; WOODS.MONICA; Keino Young; Walls, J. Michael; Huhta, Blaise N.; Bernier, Matthew R. Filing Docket 100009
Subject:	·
Attachments:	Docket 100009 PEF Notice of Partial Withdrawal of its 17th Req for Conf Class.pdf



<>Docket 100009 PEF Notice of Partial Withdrawal of its 17th Req for Conf Class.pdf>> Docket 100009 In re: Nuclear Cost Recovery Clause

- 1. Attached for filing and service is Progress Energy Florida's Notice of Partial Withdrawal of its Seventeenth Request for Confidential Classification.
- 2. This document is nine (9) pages.
- 3. This document is being filed on behalf of Progress Energy Florida, Inc.
- 4. This document is being filed by

Jeanne Costello on behalf of Blaise N. Huhta Carlton Fields, P.A. 4221 W. Boy Scout Boulevard, Suite 1000 Tampa, Florida 33607-5780 Direct: 813.229.4917 Fax: 813.229.4133 jcostello@carltonfields.com $MPA = \frac{1}{1}$ ECR = $\frac{1}{1}$ GCL = $\frac{1}{1}$

- GCL T RAD T SSC _____ ADM _____ OPC
- CLK Pena

0000MENT SUMPLE CATE

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

IN RE: NUCLEAR POWER PLANT COST RECOVERY CLAUSE Docket No. 100009-EI Submitted for filing: Aug. 18, 2010

PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA'S NOTICE OF PARTIAL WITHDRAWAL OF ITS SEVENTEENTH REQUEST FOR CONFIDENTIAL CLASSIFICATION

Progress Energy Florida, Inc., ("PEF" or the "Company"), files its notice of partial withdrawal of its Seventeenth Request for Confidential Classification (the "Request"), filed with the Commission on July 27, 2010, and states:

Upon further review, and in consideration of the passage of time, PEF agrees to partially withdraw its Request as it pertains to Page 12, Lines 7-15 of the testimony of William R. Jacobs, Jr., Ph.D. (the "Testimony"), and not to seek confidential classification of that portion of the Testimony as originally contemplated by the Request. It is PEF's understanding that this agreement resolves any objections regarding the confidentiality of the information in the Testimony. PEF reiterates its request for confidential classification regarding the remaining information outlined in the Request, i.e., certain portions of the Testimony as represented in the redacted version of that document attached hereto as Exhibit A, and nothing contained in this partial withdrawal should be construed as waiving the Company's right to seek the continued confidentiality of those documents.

> 1021041515216224-0475 06864 AUG182

17282063.1

Respectfully submitted this $\underline{\mathcal{Y}}^{\mathcal{W}}$ day of August, 2010.

R. Alexander Glenn General Counsel John Burnett Associate General Counsel Dianne M. Triplett Associate General Counsel PROGRESS ENERGY SERVICE COMPANY, LLC Post Office Box 14042 St. Petersburg, FL 33733-4042 Telephone: (727) 820-5587 Facsimile: (727) 820-5519 Jantes Michael Walls Florida Bar No. 0706242 Blaise N. Huhta Florida Bar No. 0027942 Matthew R. Bernier Florida Bar No. 0059886 CARLTON FIELDS, P.A. Post Office Box 3239 Tampa, FL 33601-3239 Telephone: (813) 223-7000 Facsimile: (813) 229-4133

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished to counsel and parties of record as indicated below via electronic and U.S. Mail this <u>I</u> day of August, 2010.

Charles Rehwinkel

Anna Williams Lisa Bennett Keino Young Staff Attorney Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd Tallahassee 32399 Phone: (850) 413-6218 Facsimile: (850) 413-6184 Email: anwillia@psc.state.fl.us lbennett@psc.state.fl.us kyoung@psc.state.fl.us

Associate Counsel Office of Public Counsel c/o The Florida Legislature 111 West Madison Street Room 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400 Phone: (850) 488-9330 Email: rehwinkel.charles@leg.state.fl.us

Vicki G. Kaufman Jon C. Moyle, Jr. Keefe Law Firm 118 North Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301 Phone: (850) 681-3828 Fax: (850) 681-8788 Email: vkaufman@kagmlaw.com jmoyle@kagmlaw.com

John W. McWhirter McWhirter Law Firm 400 North Tampa Street, Ste. 2450 Tampa, FL 33602 Phone: (813) 224-0866 Facsimile: (813) 221-1854 Email: jmcwhirter@mac-law.com

Bryan S. Anderson Jessica Cano Florida Power & Light 700 Universe Boulevard Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420 Phone: (561) 691-7101 Facsimile: (561) 691-7135 Email: bryan.anderson@fpl.com Jessica.cano@fpl.com

James W. Brew Brickfield Burchette Ritts & Stone, PC 1025 Thomas Jefferson St NW 8th FL West Tower Washington, DC 20007-5201 Phone: (202) 342-0800 Fax: (202) 342-0807 Email: jbrew@bbrslaw.com

Mr. Paul Lewis, Jr.

Randy B. Miller

17282063.1

Progress Energy Florida, Inc. 106 East College Avenue, Ste. 800 Tallahassee, FL 32301-7740 Phone: (850) 222-8738 Facsimile: (850) 222-9768 Email: paul.lewisjr@pgnmail.com

Captain Shayla L. McNeill Air Force Legal Operations Agency (AFLOA) Utility Litigation Field Support Center (ULFSC) 139 Barnes Drive, Ste. 1 Tyndall AFB, FL 32403-5319 Phone: (850) 283-6663 Facsimile: (850) 283-6219 Email: shayla.mcneill@tyndall.af.mil White Springs Agricultural Chemicals, Inc. PO Box 300 White Springs, FL 32096 Email: <u>RMiller@pscphosphate.com</u>

Gary A. Davis James S. Whitlock Gary A. Davis & Associates 61 North Andrews Avenue P.O. Box 649 Hot Springs, NC 28743 Phone: (828) 622-0044 Facsimile: (828) 622-7619 Email: <u>gdavis@enviroattorney.com</u> jwhitlock@enviroattorney.com

.

17282063.1

PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA In re: Nuclear Cost Recovery Clause Docket 100009-EI

•

PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA'S NOTICE OF PARTIAL WITHDRAWAL OF ITS SEVENTEENTH REQUEST FOR CONFIDENTIAL CLASSIFICATION

EXHIBIT A

· · · .

DOCUMENT AR MERIE DAME 06864 AUG 18 2 PPSC-COMMISSING OLIVIN

Redacted

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

)

)

)

In Re: Nuclear Cost Recovery Clause Docket No. 100009-EI

FILED: July 8, 2010

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

WILLIAM R. JACOBS, JR., Ph.D.

ON BEHALF OF THE CITIZENS OF

THE STATE OF FLORIDA

REVIEW OF PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA'S

NUCLEAR COST RECOVERY RULE FILING

J.R. Kelly Public Counsel

Office of Public Counsel c/o The Florida Legislature 111 W. Madison Street Room 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400

Attorney for the Citizens Of the State of Florida

5864 NUG 189 3864 NUG 189 By SU-ON MURSENCE CLERK

1		a schedule shift of at least 20 months for the Levy project (See Exhibit WRJ(PEF)-3,
2		pages1-2). The Company issued a letter to the Consortium requesting the Consortium
3		to conduct six schedule and cash flow analyses for the project (See 10NC-OPCPOD1-
4		3-000005). The results of these analyses formed the basis for the Company's
5		announced plan going forward for the Levy Nuclear Project.
6		
7	Q.	WHAT WERE THE COMPANY'S STATED STRATEGIC INTENT AND
8		OBJECTIVES IN DEVELOPING THE GOING FORWARD PATH FOR THE
9		PROJECT?
10	A.	As stated in the March 8, 2010, Senior Management Committee presentation, the
11		strategic intent and objectives were to:
12		"minimize near term cash flow requirements while maintaining long term
13		flexibility to continue or pursue nuclear development projects." (See 10NC-
14		OPCPOD1-1-000097.)
15		
16	Q.	BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE SCENARIOS ANALYZED BY THE COMPANY.
17	А.	In the Senior Management Committee presentation dated February 15, 2010 (see
18		10NC-OPCPOD101-000057) the Company identified three possible options for the
19		project:
20		• Option 1 - Full Speed Project Continuation: This option would lead to Unit 1
21		Commercial Operation Date (COD) in late-2019. Estimated total cost for this
22		option excluding AFUDC is Expenditures in $2010 - 2012$ to
23		support this option would be
24		• Option 2 - Project Cancellation - This option would result in cancellation of
25		the project and the second sec

Redacted

1		other payments as required by contractual obligations. Expenditures in $2010 -$
2		2012 for this option are estimated to be for the second of the total
3		cost of the LNP that customers would be expected to bear would be
4		through 2012 with possible additional costs pending the outcome of
5		negotiations with the Consortium.
6		Option 3 - Project Continuation with EPC Amendment – This option involves
7		continuation of work needed to support COL issuance in late 2012. It
8		assumes that a Notice to Proceed would be issued in 2013 with Unit 1 COD in
9		2021. The estimated total cost for this option excluding AFUDC is
10		Expenditures in 2010 - 2012 for this option are estimated to be
11		
12		
13	Q.	WHICH OPTION HAS THE COMPANY SELECTED?
14	A.	The Company decided to proceed with Option 3 as described above.
15		
16	Q.	DID THE COMPANY ANALYZE ALL OF THE LIKELY SCENARIOS IN
17		DECIDING THE PATH FORWARD FOR THE LEVY PROJECT?
18	A.	No, they did not. I believe that another reasonably possible outcome scenario is for
19		the project to be cancelled after receipt of the COL in late 2012.
20		
21	Q.	DID YOU ASK THE COMPANY FOR THIS SCENARIO ANALYSIS?
22	A.	Yes, I did. In Interrogatory Question 46 I asked the Company if they had estimated
23		the cost for the chosen alternative (continuation with COL and minimum continuation
24		of the EPC contract) followed by cancellation after receipt of the COL. The
25		Company responded:

• • • •

7

Redacted

Yes, I do. I believe that it was unreasonable to sign the EPC contract without

THE KNOWN UNCERTAINTIES DISCUSSED ABOVE RESULTED IN 1 2 ADDITIONAL COSTS?

. . .

Α.

24

3 knowing the LWA schedule and that signing the EPC contract would result in extra 4 costs. The additional costs incurred by PEF can be seen by comparing the costs spent 5 6 to date between Levy and Florida Power and Light's Turkey Point 6 and 7 project. Both of the projects are in essentially the same place from a schedule perspective with 7 LNP Unit 1 scheduled COD in late 2021 and Turkey Point Unit 6 COD scheduled for 8 2022. FPL has not signed an EPC contract for the new Turkey Point units but is 9 continuing to pursue a COL for these units. The primary difference in the status of 10 these projects is that PEF has committed to the procurement of long lead material and 11 is now trying to determine the best way to dispose of this material. The difference in 12 dollars spent between the two projects is striking. Through 2011, PEF will have spent 13 (PEF Exhibit JL-6, page 22) on LNP while FPL will have spent 14 \$170.1 million on the Turkey Point project. PEF will have spent 15 due primarily to their unreasonable decision to sign the 16 EPC contract in December 2008. If the projects are cancelled, 17 18 19 MS. GALLOWAY TESTIFIES EXTENSIVELY TO THE BENEFITS THAT 20 Q. PEF GAINED BY HAVING SIGNED THE EPC CONTRACT. DO YOU 21 BELIEVE THAT THE COMPANY COULD HAVE ACHIEVED THE SAME 22 SIGN THE EPC CONTRACTUAL BENEFITS BY WAITING TO 23

14

CONTRACT UNTIL THE SCHEDULE FOR THE LWA WAS KNOWN?