1		BEFORE THE
2	FLORIDA	PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
3	In the Matter of:	
4		DOCKET NO. 110001-EI
5	FUEL AND PURCHASE RECOVERY CLAUSE W	ITH GENERATING
6	PERFORMANCE INCEN	TIVE FACTOR.
7		
8	PROCEEDINGS:	AGENDA CONFERENCE
9		ITEM NO. 11
10	COMMISSIONERS	
11	PARTICIPATING:	CHAIRMAN ART GRAHAM COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISÉ
12		COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISE COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN
13		
14	DATE:	Tuesday, June 14, 2011
15	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148
16		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida
17	REPORTED BY:	LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR Official FPSC Reporter
18		(850) 413-6734
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		DOOLMENT NUMBER -PATE

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
04169 JUN 17 =

PROCEEDINGS

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Item Number 11.

MR. LEE: Thank you, Chairman. Commissioners, I'm Daniel Lee with Staff.

Item 11 is the request by Florida Public Utilities Companies for a midcourse adjustment of its fuel factors. The company's request includes two options. Both options will reduce fuel factors for customers of its northwest division starting next month. Staff recommends the second option or Option B.

Staff notes since filing its request the company reported under-recoveries in March and April which substantially offset the savings. With that Staff believes Option B gives customers some level of rate stability as well as rate relief.

Representatives of the company and the City of Marianna are here. They and Staff -- and OPC are also here. They are -- they and Staff are available to answer questions.

> CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: OPC.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: We just wanted to support Staff's recommendation to approve the midcourse correction. We're supportive of anything that gets the most money back to the customers and is in the

customers' best interest in the long run.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: We support the Staff's specific recommendation that you approve Option B. This is consistent with our position that the PPA amendment that was the subject of Item 10, Docket 110041, is not in the best interest of customers. If you do ultimately approve it after hearing, then you can, as the Staff correctly pointed out in their recommendation, you can flow back whatever additional funds are through the true-up in next year's fuel charge. We support Staff's recommendation to approve Option B. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Ms. Keating.

expeditious handling of this item and we're generally supportive of the recommendation. We would like to see Scenario A approved. We think that gets the most amount of money back to consumers. And we think at the end of the day any over or under-recovery that may, may result in other proceedings will get trued up through the regular clause process. And there's enough uncertainty either way that approving Scenario A is not any more or less a sure thing as opposed to approving Scenario B. But either way we're happy to be able to get money back to customers. And we've got Mr. Geoffrey and

Mr. Camfield here on behalf of the company as well to answer any questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: A question for OPC,

Ms. Christensen. You didn't state which one, which

direction you want to go. And I guess the question I

have, because you said whatever is going to get the

money back, it appears to me that Option A will give you

greater savings today and may, may not make things

smoother as you move forward. But if you're looking for

the immediate bang for your buck, Option A is going to

do that, and I didn't hear a recommendation one way or

the other from you.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Well, and that, that's certainly true. And I think we're supportive of whatever gives the customers the most monetary relief at the present. You know, if -- long-term, you know, and we want to ensure that they're not going to be paying a high price later on in the long-term.

As the company pointed out, there is the true-up provision, and we think that that -- there is the ability to true-up later on and that it may not be any more or less risky than Option B, although we do suspect that the City is going to protest the underlying agreement. I think the City is currently operating under the agreement and they're already having the

benefit of that agreement coming in. So, you know, given that, the customers should at least be able to participate in that.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I wasn't quite sure what side of the fence you stepped down on.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: I'm sure in the Commission's infinite wisdom you can weigh those options.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I agree with your comments in that, you know, having a 10 percent reduction or almost a \$15 reduction in a current residential bill, you know, I would tend to believe that the customers would want that immediately rather than later on.

And I'm just curious, a question for Mr. Wright, if you can kind of explain why you would, you would rather see Option B, if you can just elaborate on that a little bit, because I was surprised to hear that.

MR. WRIGHT: Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

Commissioner Balbis, thank you for the opportunity.

We oppose the PPA amendment. We believe that it is a bad deal for customers. We believe that the long-term cost, the costs in the eighth and ninth year

of the amendment are going to be so great that they will vastly outweigh by several times the benefits that would be realized through the modifications in the first seven years. It's pay me now, pay me later. The price tag later is way too high.

There are extensive risks, and we'll bring this out in the, in the case, the hearing on the PPA amendment itself, which we will protest. You know, there are serious risks that, that may make, may make the risk and the long-term costs even greater. Because we believe it is a bad deal, we think it would be inconsistent and inappropriate to start refunding money now when we are going to be litigating in very good faith our protest that this is a bad deal for customers. So it's, it's specifically consistent with our position on the PPA amendment. It's a bad deal. You shouldn't have -- you should not approve it. The PAA order will be protested, and, accordingly, it doesn't make good sense to flow through that reduction to customers now.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: A follow-up question.

Then regardless of Option A or Option B, you would still think that the PPA is a, quote, bad deal for the customers; correct?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, sir. That's, that's Item

10, another docket. But, yes, sir, that's correct.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

agree with the comments you made. I would think that, you know, refunding or lowering the customers' bill as much as possible now, I just personally think that would be better than, you know, doing it 7 percent instead of 10 percent and correcting it if needed. But I'll leave the other comments up to the other Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Brown.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I'd like to ask a question for Staff to address the recommendation for Option B or, or the analysis. What are the pros and cons of Option B versus Option A and the reason for Option B?

MR. LESTER: Pete Lester with Staff.

We chose Option B because the company since its filing has two more months, two more months of actual data have come in, and the company underrecovered significantly during those months. And as Mr. Lee mentioned, they -- that substantially offsets the savings, anticipated savings from the amendment.

Secondly, as you know, the amendment has uncertainty surrounding it.

You know, one good -- the Commission could go with either option, but we felt like Option B was probably a little more, leaned more toward the stability

2 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Uh-huh. But given the fact that the Commission already approved the amendment 3 4 under Item 10, Option A is definitely a viable option, even though we know it's going to be protested. 6 MR. LESTER: Yes, ma'am. 7 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Uh-huh. I would recommend -- I would move that we approve Option A. 8 9 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: It's been moved and seconded Option A. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all in 10 11 favor, say aye. 12 (Affirmative vote.) 13 Any opposed? By your action for Issue Number 14 1 you've approved Option A. 15 Issue Number 2, should this docket be closed? COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Move Staff. 16 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: It's been moved and seconded 17 Staff recommendation on Issue Number 2. Any further 18 19 discussion? Seeing none, all in favor, say aye. 20 (Affirmative vote.) 21 Any opposed? By your action you've approved 22 Staff recommendation on Issue 2 under Item Number 11. 23 (Agenda item concluded.) 24 25

of the rates this year and next.

1

1	STATE OF FLORIDA)		
2	: CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON)		
3			
4	I, LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR, Official Commission		
5	Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein		
6	stated.		
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		
9	transcription of my notes of said proceedings.		
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor		
11	<pre>am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorneys or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.</pre>		
12			
13	DATED THIS 17th day of June, 2011.		
14	Lite Bolan		
15	LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR		
16	FPSC Official Commission Reporter (850) 413-6734		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			