		002	1919
FLO	BEFORE THE RIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		
	DOCKET NO. 1	20015-EI	
In the Matter o	of:		
	ICREASE IN RATES ER & LIGHT COMPANY/	0	12 AU
	VOLUME 15	CI	G 29
	Pages 1919 through 2070	COMMISSION	12 AUG 29 AM 8: 59
PROCEEDINGS:	HEARING		9
COMMISSIONERS			
PARTICIPATING:	CHAIRMAN RONALD A. BRISÉ COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR		
	COMMISSIONER ART GRAHAM COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN		
DATE:	Friday, August 24, 2012		
TIME:	Commenced at 9:02 a.m. Concluded at 12:27 p.m.		
PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148		
	4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida		
REPORTED BY:	LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6734		
APPEARANCES:	(As heretofore noted.)		
FLO	ORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	DOCUMENT	NUMB
		0588	37 A

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

		00192
1	INDEX	
2	WITNESSES	
3	NAME: PAGE NO.	
4	MORAY DEWHURST	
5	Cross Examination by Mr. Moyle 1922	
6	Cross Examination by Mr. Sundback1956Cross Examination by Captain Miller1988	
7	Cross Examination by Mr. McGlothlin1989Cross Examination by Mr. Lavia2003Cross Examination by Mr. Lavia2012	
8	Cross Examination by Mr. Saporito2012Redirect Examination by Mr. Litchfield2039	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	

00)19	21
----	-----	----

							001921
1			EXH	IBITS			
2	NUMBER:				ID.	ADMTD.	
3	113					2067	
4	211					2061	
5	212					2061	
6	555				1940	2063	
7	556				1962	2066	
8	557				1987	2066	
9	558				2008	2066	
10	559				2064		
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
		FLORIDA	PUBLIC	SERVICE	COMMISSION		
	l						

	0019
1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(Transcript follows in sequence from
3	Volume 14.)
4	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Good morning.
5	MR. MOYLE: Good morning.
6	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: We are continuing with Docket
7	Number 120015-EI. We are on cross-examination. At this
8	time we'll continue with Mr. Moyle from FIPUG.
9	MR. MOYLE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr.
10	Chairman.
11	CROSS EXAMINATION
12	BY MR. MOYLE:
13	Q Good morning, Mr. Dewhurst.
14	A Good morning.
15	Q You're wearing a couple of hats today; is that
16	right?
17	A I don't think I'm wearing a hat actually.
18	Q You're the Vice Chairman and Chief Financial
19	Officer for NextEra Energy.
20	A That's correct.
21	${f Q}$ And you're also the Chief Financial Officer
22	for Florida Power & Light.
23	A That's correct.
24	Q And do you serve in any role there's been
25	some pension questions, and I think some of those have
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

been placed to you, but do you serve in a role with respect to FPL's pension?

A Yes. Inasmuch as it contains financial elements and all financial elements ultimately report up to me, I know something about pension. I'd be happy to try and help you.

Q Okay. Are you, are you a trustee of the pension fund or involved in the management of the pension fund?

A Yes on the second. I'm not a trustee. I do have a fiduciary role with respect to the pension plan.

Q And, and what is that?

MR. LITCHFIELD: Mr. Chairman, I hate to start out with an objection so early, but I don't believe that Mr. Dewhurst is testifying as to the pension plan at FPL. I don't recall any pension plan questions being referred to him. If I'm mistaken, I'm happy to have counsel correct me.

MR. MOYLE: I think there was some pension discussion. There was an interrogatory that I think I asked another witness about that had a billion-dollar overfunding of the pension, and they said Mr. Dewhurst is the best person to ask that question of.

> MR. LITCHFIELD: Well, now he's testifying. MR. MOYLE: And the record, the record will,

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

will bear out whether I'm right. I think I am.

I guess I'm just trying to understand his role vis-a-vis the pension, and I have a couple of pension questions for him. He just testified he's involved in the management of it. I think part of the rate request that FPL is seeking is related to funding their pension program, so I think I should be allowed to ask the questions.

MR. LITCHFIELD: Mr. Chairman, I'm just trying to move things along. If you'd like to allow him to ask a question or two, I guess we have no objection. I really am just trying to move things along.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Go ahead, Mr. Moyle. BY MR. MOYLE:

Q I think, I think the pending question was you said you had fiduciary responsibilities vis-a-vis the pension fund, and I was trying to understand what those were from your perspective.

A Well, I'm not a lawyer, so I'm just going to give you a commonsense view. But as a fiduciary, I have to act as a reasonable person would in the best interests of the beneficiaries of the plan.

Q Okay. And you'd also agree -- and sometimes lawyers have common sense, a lot of times they don't. But with respect to the fiduciary, that's a legal term

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that's often used; correct?

A That's correct. That's why I prefaced my previous answer by saying I'm not a lawyer.

Q All right. So, so with respect to the various roles that you play, you would agree with me, would you not, that the, the interests of those entities are not always aligned?

A I'm not sure I understand the question. The interests of which entities?

Q Okay. Well, let's just, let's put the pension off to the side and just talk about NextEra Energy, Inc. That's the company that's publicly traded; is that right?

A That's correct.

Q And Florida Power & Light. The interest of NextEra Energy as the publicly traded company, its interests are not necessarily always aligned with the, with, with Florida Power & Light Company; correct?

A I don't know what you mean by the interests of a corporation. Could you help me out a bit?

Q Sure. I mean, the interests of NextEra Energy, the publicly traded company, if I understand it, is to provide a return to people who buy stock in that company. I mean, somebody today could go contact a stockbroker and say, please, I'd like to buy a thousand

1	shares of NextEra Energy, Inc. And the objective of
2	NextEra Energy, Inc., vis-a-vis, you know, the
3	stockholders, is to maximize profits; is that fair?
4	A No. I don't agree with that.
5	${f Q}$ The, the, to the investment community, are the
6	profits of NextEra Energy, the publicly traded company,
7	important?
8	A I would agree they're important.
9	Q Okay. And you've, you've been here, I think,
10	throughout this proceeding; correct?
11	A No, that's not correct.
12	${f Q}$ Have you, have you watched the proceedings or
13	been made aware of the proceedings that have taken
14	place?
15	A I've been here for some of the proceedings. I
16	haven't been here for all of the proceedings.
17	${f Q}$ Okay. You've heard are you aware that
18	Dr. Avera, Avera essentially provided testimony that
19	with respect to equity capital, that equity capital
20	looks to go where it can find the highest return for the
21	least risk in general terms? Would you agree with that
22	as a matter of economic principle?
23	A I think there were two questions in there. To
24	the first, I'm not sure that that's a correct
25	characterization of Dr. Avera's testimony. I'm not

saying it's not, I'm just not sure it's accurate. So I'd have to review the transcript to be sure.

On the second, could you repeat the standard that you set out in your question?

Q Sure. Just as a matter of economic principle, that -- to the extent there is competition for capital dollars, you would agree that you have to compete for capital dollars; correct?

A I would agree with that.

Q Okay. That investors, consistent with economic theory, all other things being equal, would like to try to earn as high a return as they could with as least risk as they could; correct?

A No. I don't think that's quite precise, because I don't think it's possible to get maximum return and minimum risk in the real world. There's a tradeoff typically between risk and return, and I do believe every investor considers both risk and return. But, no, I don't believe that they try get the maximum return and the lowest risk, nor do I believe that's possible.

Q Okay. So what -- if the returns are the same between two investment choices, investors would choose the one with the lowest risk; isn't that right?

A All other things being equal, typically, yes.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

If the return potential is viewed as equal and the risk differential -- and there's a risk differential, then they would opt for the lower risk option. I would agree with that.

MR. MOYLE: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I, I used an exhibit last night, and I have copies of it that may be helpful just to repass out. This was the Moody's corporate rating, so I can redistribute that.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure.

MR. MOYLE: There's a lot of paper flying around, and sometimes it may be easier just to redistribute it.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: And if you could give us a number of the exhibit that was assigned to it yesterday, that would be helpful as well.

MR. MOYLE: Okay. It was --

MR. LITCHFIELD: I believe it was 544. It's the Moody's rating symbols.

MR. MOYLE: 544.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you.

BY MR. MOYLE:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Q So this, this exhibit is already in evidence as 544, but I just wanted to ask you to confirm that these are the Moody's rating symbols that are used for long-term corporate obligations.

1 Α 2 3 income securities. 4 5 Q 6 7 Is that right? 8 9 Α 10 11 Q 12 what? 13 14 Α 15 16 0 17 Α 18 19 That's correct. 2.0 21 Q 22 23 24 Α 25

A I believe they are. I cannot attest to where this came from, but it appears to me to be the standard Moody's definitions of how it rates specific fixed income securities.

Q And in your testimony you state, on page 7, at line 8, you talk about the results of the last rate case and say that there was a downgrading that took place. Is that right?

A That's correct. We were downgraded both byMoody's and S&P in the spring of 2010.

Q Okay. And, and so the downgrade, the downgrade that took place by Moody's was from what to what?

A I would need to check my memory. It's within the single A category.

Q So there was not a downgrade that went from the categories that are shown on this document; correct?

 A Correct. We're not in the B double A group that contains certain speculative characteristics.
 That's correct.

Q And are you aware that so within, let's just look at the A category, that the further subgradients within A are A1, A2, and A3?

A That's correct. In the Moody's terminology, within the A is A1, that's the highest

25

subcategorization, then A2 and A3.

Q And what are you currently ranked?

A I would have to check, but I believe we are at A2 today, for Florida Power & Light. I assume we're talking Florida Power & Light here.

Q Yes. Yes, sir. And if I understand your testimony, one of the reasons you're asking for a return on equity of 11.5 is to help you get access to, to capital; is that right?

A Yes. I would actually say more maintain very competitive access to capital at attractive rates. I think that would be more precise.

Q Okay. And I appreciate that. But I guess if, if the Commission were to make a decision that was perceived as not helpful to the financial aspects but may be helpful to the ratepayers, you would potentially have a risk of a further downgrade; is that fair?

A Well, I'm not sure I appreciate the premise of your question, but I will agree that it's certainly possible that outcomes from this, these proceedings could cause us to further downgrade. Absolutely, yes.

Q Okay. And, and typically if a downgrade occurs, it is a one-notch downgrade, correct, typically? And when I say notch, it would be if you're currently A2, then you might go to A3. That would be a one-notch

downgrade; is that right?

A I don't know. I haven't studied the statistics of Moody's downgrades, so I can't say the proportions that are single notch, two notch, or more.

Q But you've been in the financial industry for a long time; correct? You don't have information with respect to when a downgrade occurs is it typically a --I mean, don't the, Moody's, don't they typically put you on watch or warning and then follow that with a downgrade that's typically one notch?

A Again, typically to me implies that I have to know something about the relative proportions. I don't have that information. And, no, it is not always true that they give you advanced warning by putting you on negative outlook. Sometimes they do, sometimes they don't.

Q Okay. And you don't, you don't have that information with respect to how the Moody's has dealt with utility companies. I'm not asking with respect to, you know, general corporate ratings, but just with respect to utility companies and their ratings, you likewise don't have information with respect to how Moody's would, would treat those entities typically?

A No, I don't have those historical statistics.I suspect they're available from Moody's, but I don't

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

have them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Q Okay. And were you here last night when we asked Mr. Avera questions about the spread differentials between various ratings with respect to debt, bond ratings?

```
A Yes, I was.
```

Q Okay. So with respect to the difference, and, again, referenced in this chart, between A and going up one, double A, he said he thought there was a difference of approximately 44 basis points; is that your recollection?

A No, that's not.

Q What do you recall the difference between -or do you know? Let me -- I don't need to ask what you remember of Mr. Avera.

What's currently, if you know, the difference between the bond, the spread between A and double A?

A There is no single number.

Q So, so you can't -- the investment community would not be able to look, or there's no place that compiles information that says the average spread between single A and double A is this, or the spread between single A and BAA is that?

A Yes. That's -- you just changed gears. You're now speaking about averages. Averages obviously

encompass a whole array. There are individual spreads for individual instruments as they trade in the market, so not every A1 security will trade at the same spread. So it is -- I would certainly agree that you can compute an average of those, all those spreads. But obviously you'd need to be careful what you were going to try and use it for.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Q Okay. That's fair, because sometimes there's individual pieces of paper that are out there, bond issuances that may have different variability as compared to an average; correct?

A Yes. But every market point with interest rate refers to a specific security. So I believe you're now talking about averaging all of those within a particular category.

Q All right. Well, let's talk about averages within a 90, 90% confidence level, if you would. If you assumed a 90% confidence level, would you be able to tell me and this Commission what the average spread is between an A and a double A?

MR. McGLOTHLIN: I need to ask for some clarification to see if I have an objection or not. I believe the witness answered a few minutes ago that FPL is rated within the single A category within which there's A1, 2, and 3, and now I'm not clear as to

whether Mr. Moyle's question relates to a spread between the category which is shown on this paper as capital A, small A, and capital A, or whether he's referring again to the witness's earlier testimony, which was all contained within the single A category, A1, 2, and 3, because there's a difference in spreads in both directions.

MR. MOYLE: And my question was to ask for the larger spread between the single A and then the capital A, little A, not the, not the spread within A1, 2, 3.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Well, if the question is designed to relate to the particular downgrading that the witness describes, I object because it's not consistent with the, with the evidence. If it's for some other reason, I may not object.

MR. LITCHFIELD: Well, I'll object, I'll object to Mr. McGlothlin's objection as argumentative and testimony.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Mr. Moyle, you may pose your question.

MR. MOYLE: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Maybe restate it, considering
23 some of the factors.

MR. MOYLE: Sure.

BY MR. MOYLE:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

Q As we sit here today, with respect to an average, can you tell this Commission the average spread between A, capital A, as depicted on the exhibit I've provided to you that's been previously marked and entered into the record, and capital A, small a, which is the next general credit rating, long-term corporate obligation, as reflected by Moody's?

Α

Α

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

22

23

24

25

No. I don't have those data with me.

Q Is it your understanding that with respect to these ratings, that when they are measured as a general matter within the industry, that they are, they are measured within the gradients as set forth on this exhibit, so that, that typically single A is compared to capital A, small a, and single A is compared to, you know, going down, Baa?

A I'm sorry. I'm completely lost on the question. Repeat it.

Q Okay. Sure. You're aware that sometimes debt spreads are, are looked at on the average between various corporate ratings; correct?

21

Yes. I think average spreads have some uses.

Q Okay. And when average spreads are looked at, aren't they looked at between the gradients as set forth on this exhibit with respect to Moody's?

A Not necessarily. Obviously it depends who's

doing the looking and what they're looking for. So, no, I can't agree with that as a general statement.

Q Who typically -- I'm sorry. Who typically looks at, who typically does the spreads? Who looks at the spreads and publishes information? Is that Value Line?

A You've got several things in there. Who does the spreads, the market sets the spreads.

Q Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

A We have individual instruments that are priced in the market that create a spread relative to some underlying baseline index. So that's where the spreads come from. That's just the capital markets.

Who looks at those numbers or their averages would be anyone who's interested in that, so clearly investors would be interested in that kind of information generally.

Q Are there services that look at those spreads and publish information relative to them?

A There are a number of services that publish historical data on average spreads, yes.

Q Okay. And those companies that do that, when they look at Moody's, isn't it true that they do it in a way that reflects the rankings set forth on this exhibit?

A Yes and no. It wouldn't be inconsistent with the rankings set forth on this exhibit, but they wouldn't necessarily be restricted to these specific rankings.

Q Right. But you, you just testified about the market setting the spreads, but you don't have information with respect to the spreads currently between the gradients set forth in here?

A That's correct. I believe I already answered that.

Q Okay. And isn't it true that at the end of the day the spreads between, say, an A1 and an A2 are such that that information is not collected and reported by entities that, that set forth the market spreads; that instead, the entities report it with respect to the rankings that are set forth on this exhibit?

A No.

Q In all cases you're saying no, that, that, that nobody, the rating agencies, the people that compile the information, that none of them report it just on, on these gradients, that they all go in and say -- they use the 1, 2, and 3?

A No. I'm sorry. We may be missing each other. I'm not saying that nobody produces indices of averages expressed at the tranche level, let me call it. What I

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

1

thought you were asking was that, was that the only 1 level at which they're reported. And the answer to that 2 is no, which is what I tried to answer. 3 So what's the tranche level? That's the 4 0 gradients that are on this sheet? 5 Yes. If we can agree on terminology. To me, 6 Α 7 A double A is a tranche. It may have gradations within. But isn't it true in your business, when 8 Q 9 ratings are being referred to, you typically refer to the tranche level? 10 No, that's not correct. 11 Α How about with -- same question with respect 12 0 13 to how averages are reported. I think we've just been over that. 14 Some Α 15 averages are reported at this level. You can also get data on averages for the tranche -- for the gradations 16 within the tranches. 17 18 Q Okay. 19 MR. LITCHFIELD: Mr. Chairman, we're spending a lot of time on what seems like discovery as opposed to 2.0 cross-examination. It's been a long time since we've 21 22 been referred back to Mr. Dewhurst's testimony. In fact, I think in 25 minutes we've been referred to his 23 24 testimony once. 25 MR. MOYLE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I mean, he's

25

1

the ROE witness for the company. He's the Chief Financial Officer. This issue is worth \$240 million out of a, you know, rate case of nearly 700 million, so I think it warrants some exploration of, of, of this difference.

I mean, part of the reason that they're saying they need this money is to maintain their credit ratings, and I want to explore the difference between the credit ratings with this witness.

I

I'll try to move it along.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: If we could move along, because, I mean, we have spent considerable time on that and we have not been back to the testimony, so.

MR. MOYLE: Okay.

BY MR. MOYLE:

Q Back to your testimony, you said that there was a downgrade following the last rate case; correct?

A That's correct.

Q Okay. So with respect to the downgrade that occurred, if you assume that it was from A, this broad Category A1, to A2, okay, do you have any idea how much that represented in terms of the additional basis points that, that you would have to pay when you issue debt?

A No, there is no single value to that because that will have an impact on every subsequent debt

issuance that we do, and every subsequent debt issuance will go out at a different spread, which presumably will reflect the new rating. But how that gets priced will be dependent upon market conditions at the time.

So there's both a short-term effect and then there's a longer term effect, and I don't have data with me on either.

Q How about with respect to market conditions when the Commission's decision that's the subject of your testimony, when that was issued, do you have information about the spread at that point in time?

A Not with me, no.

Q And no recollection in your mind?

A It's difficult because we were coming out of the, we were out of the worst part of the crisis. But,I -- no.

Q And not to hold you to specifics, but do you have any idea with respect to range? Was it, you know, 30 basis points, 50 basis points; you just don't know?

Α

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

I wouldn't want to speculate.

MR. MOYLE: I have another exhibit I'd like to have passed out, if I could.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure. We are now on 555. (Exhibit 555 marked for identification.) MR. LITCHFIELD: Mr. Chairman, we're looking

at the document, and I think we would agree with regard to the characterizations or the attributions in the first two lines. We do not agree that, that, with the attribution of the third element to Witness Avera.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Mr. Moyle?

MR. MOYLE: Yeah. This is a variation on an exhibit you've seen before that I'm trying to get in, and --

MR. LITCHFIELD: I would agree it's a variation.

MR. MOYLE: This is the witness that people have asked me to ask of. So if, if it's wrong with respect to what I thought I understood Mr. Avera, you know, say last night, then he can correct me and tell me if it's wrong. I mean, I appreciate Mr. Litchfield previewing that, but probably it's more appropriately coming from the witness.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Any further objections to this, to this exhibit?

Okay. You may pose your question.

BY MR. MOYLE:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Mr. Dewhurst, do you have a, a sense with respect to the proposition or the contention that Florida Power & Light, as I understand it, is making that they need a higher ROE of 11.5 because it will help

them access capital markets, make their debt less expensive, that if you do a comparison between the increased revenue requirements that ratepayers would pay of 240 million, look at your capital expend and apply the interest rate differential, that you can do a mathematical calculation that, that might suggest that ratepayers would be better off paying a little more in debt costs than paying a lot more in return on equity?

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Mr. Moyle. Mr. Moyle, if you could find a question in there.

MR. MOYLE: All right.

BY MR. MOYLE:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Q Do you agree with, with the first item on this chart that the ROE increase is 240 million, as requested from 10%, your current midpoint of 10% to your requested midpoint of 11.5?

A I agree that the, the first order, the revenue requirement differential for a 150 basis point differential in ROE is approximately 240 million.

Q Okay. And would you agree that your capital expend in the test year is 2.4 billion?

A I agree that that's what we expect to spend next year.

Q Okay. And would you agree that the interest rate difference between the current credit rating of

Moody's A and the next highest rating of Moody's AA is, is 44 basis points, less than half a percentage point? No.

Α

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Do you know what the current interest rate 0 differential is between Moody's A and the next highest credit rating of AA?

No, nor even if I did, would it be meaningful Α to multiply one number by the other on this page.

When you build a new power plant, like Cape Q Canaveral, do you fund it with a combination of debt and equity? How do you finance it?

When we are in the construction phase we will Α be funding it essentially through our regular ongoing liquidity program. So we will be pushing cash out the door in response to invoices from vendors, and that will come from our general sources of liquidity. So at the margin the short-term debt may fluctuate up and down.

Periodically we finance the entire enterprise through a mixture of common equity and debt, which for a long time has been about 60% equity, 40% debt. The timing of when we go to market for what are typically first mortgage bonds for the long-term debt will obviously depend upon market circumstances, but in particular the volume of the capital amount that we're seeking.

So it would not make sense for us to go to the market every week for \$50 million issuances. So clearly we have to aggregate.

So my answer is in the short-term we're financing a new power plant the same way we finance the entire enterprise, on a short-term basis. By the time the asset has come into service, essentially it is being financed at that long-term mix of 60/40.

Q So, in sum, you -- long-term you try to finance it with a 60/40 mix, 40% debt, 60% equity?

A Yes. Assuming that the 60/40 is what we consider to be the appropriate capital structure, which, as I said, it has been for a long time, and that would be the long-term effect, yes.

Q Okay. And you're aware that the test year in this case is 2013?

A Yes, sir.

Α

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Q Okay. And do you have any plans in the test year to go into the market to, to get debt?

Yes. Those are listed in the MFRs.

Q How much debt do you plan to ask for in the test year?

A In the test year there's 700 -- 750 million issuance. There's also a 250 million issuance scheduled for December of this year. Obviously when we actually

do those will depend upon market circumstances at the time. And then do you have plans to likewise go into 0 the markets to seek additional equity capital in the test year? We might or we might not. The funding of Α FPL's equity is a little different than the funding of the debt. And that's because all of the equity comes 0 from the parent; correct? No, that's not correct. Α So FPL, the operating company, doesn't have 0 all of its equity from NextEra, the parent? It generates its own incremental equity Α No. through retained earnings. And are those retained earnings sufficient to 0 capitalize the equity of the operating company? Almost. For the last four years FPL has paid Α no net dividends. So effectively over the last four years it's just been able to support its own equity needs by retaining everything that it's generated. So that hasn't resulted -- I mean, I can't 0 invest equity in Florida Power & Light, the operating company; correct? I have to, I have to buy NextEra Energy stock, the holding company stock; correct? FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

That's correct.

Α

Q And then the only entity, as I understand it, that can invest equity in the operating company is the parent; isn't that the practice?

A Yes, that's correct. We maintain that 60/40 ratio by periodically, by dividending up to the parent or reinjecting capital back down from the parent so that the net effect is that we maintain that 60/40 consistently.

Q Isn't this case really at the end of the day -- I mean, you just said that FPL's earning enough money in retained earnings that there's no need for additional equity from the parent. I mean --

MR. LITCHFIELD: I'll object. I don't believe that was his testimony at all. Object, object to the form of the question.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Mr. Moyle?

MR. MOYLE: I thought he had testified that there had not been any equity coming in from the parent to the subsidiary in four years.

BY MR. MOYLE:

Q Is that not your testimony?
A That is not my testimony.
Q Okay. Well, would you clarify that?
A What my, in response to the earlier question,

I was doing a mental computation that said over the four-year period since 2007 the net of the dividends up from FPL to the parent and the injections of new equity capital down from the parent have washed out. In individual years there's been a net injection of capital, in individual years there may be a net dividend up, but roughly over that four-year period it's netted out to zero.

Q So Mr. Silagy, when he was on the stand, he said that there hadn't been a payment, a dividend payment from the operating company to the parent in, in four years. That, that's not correct, I guess. Based on your testimony you're saying there have been dividend payments but there have been equity infusions so they net out.

MR. LITCHFIELD: I'm going to object to the mischaracterization of Mr. Silagy's testimony now.

BY MR. MOYLE:

Α

Q Were you here for Mr. Silagy's testimony?A Yes, I was.

Q Did you hear him say that there hadn't been a dividend payment from the operating company up to the parent company in, I think he said five years, but did you hear his testimony?

I don't recall the exact details of what he

said.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

All right. Well, the record will speak to Q that. But, but just so I understand your testimony, your testimony is in effect that equity coming down from the parent to the subsidiary nets out with respect to the dividends going up from the subsidiary to the parent; is that right? MR. LITCHFIELD: Asked and answered. CHAIRMAN BRISE: You asked that. MR. MOYLE: Okay. This is a confusion area. It's technical. I, I'm a history major, not a finance person, so. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Understood. Understood. But you've asked and it was answered. MR. MOYLE: Okay. BY MR. MOYLE: And I guess the equity, the way the equity Q

works, Mr. Dewhurst, is, is that's the opportunity for the parent to put equity in and, and to earn, earn the money; is that right? That the, the equity going into the operating company all comes from NextEra Energy, and that's the opportunity to -- all the testimony from the experts relates to the equity. That's all equity that is provided by NextEra; is that right?

MR. LITCHFIELD: Asked and answered.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Maybe if --

MR. MOYLE: I'm not sure it was answered. I think it was asked, but I'm not sure it was answered.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. For clarity of the record I'll allow you to ask it.

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I understood your question. It was so compound.

BY MR. MOYLE:

Q Okay. The only entity that can earn a return on, on equity invested in Florida Power & Light, the operating company, is NextEra, the parent; correct?

A No. FPL, the corporate entity, has an opportunity to earn a return on the capital that it deploys that's productive and for the customer's benefit. Because FPL is a subsidiary of NextEra Energy, it's also true that NextEra Energy, or more specifically its shareholders, have the opportunity to earn on capital that's productively employed at FPL.

Q Talk a little bit about the pension. What is the long-term projected return for the FPL pension?

A It's in our SEC filings. I believe at the moment it's 7.75. We can check.

Q And do you, are you aware that the pension fund assets are invested in things like international investments and large cap funds?

A Yes. Like most pension funds, there is a wide array of asset classes that it's invested in.

Q And as -- with your fiduciary duties vis-a-vis the pension fund that you talked about earlier, do you believe that a 7.75 return is a reasonable return long-term?

A Yes. For the specific asset mix that we have in the pension fund and the specific subcomponents of that, I believe 7.75 is a very reasonable long-term return expectation for accounting purposes. What the actual return turns out to be obviously is going to be what it turns out to be.

Q Have you done any comparison to view the relative risk of your investments via the pension fund in things like large cap funds and international investments, as compared to the risk associated with the Florida Power & Light operating company?

A No, I haven't. There would be no relevance to that.

Q Okay. And I guess, would it be, would it be fair to say that the view with respect to a reasonable return -- I mean, you have, you have a different view when you're testifying on behalf of a reasonable return for Florida Power & Light, the operating company, as compared to the reasonable return expected for the

pension fund; correct?

MR. LITCHFIELD: Object to the form of the question. Sounds like testimony, not a question.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: I think it's a fair question. THE WITNESS: It's a question that I don't understand.

BY MR. MOYLE:

Q

Q Okay. When, when you're exercising your fiduciary duties with respect to the pension fund, you would agree that long-term a reasonable return is 7.75%; correct?

A I believe when I answered the previous question I said that I believe that 7.75% is a reasonable return expectation for accounting purposes for the plan that we have today with its specific asset mix, yes.

Q Okay. But when you're testifying as the Chief Financial Officer on behalf of Florida Power & Light, the regulated utility, your testimony is that the reasonable return in that context is 11.5% return on equity; is that right?

A In this particular case, yes, my testimony is that 11.5% is a reasonable allowed return for Florida Power & Light.

Have you ever heard of the saying where you

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

sit -- I'm sorry -- where you stand depends on where you sit?

A Yes, I have.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Q And you made a filing with the SEC, you're the person who signs filings with the SEC under the federal Sarbanes-Oxley Act; is that right?

A I'm one of the people who signs our financial statements, yes.

Q Okay. And, and isn't it true that last week you made a filing with the SEC which informed the investment community that, that you could live with, operate with an ROE that was less than 11.5?

A Could you show me that filing?

MR. LITCHFIELD: And I'll object to the form of the question. I think it's a mischaracterization of our SEC filing and an attempt by Mr. Moyle to introduce evidence into this record that I think we had agreed to exclude.

MR. LAVIA: I would, I would join the objection. I believe he is now straying into the issue concerning the settlement agreement, and I think we've done a good job of keeping it out of this record.

Thank you, Your Honor.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Mr. Moyle? **MR. MOYLE:** If I could speak, if I could speak

to that. They made, they made an SEC filing last week, and the SEC filing had a 10.7 return on equity number in it. You know, it's out there for the investment community. It is something that is, you know, they're telling the investment community that this is an acceptable number. It seems that that filing in that ROE is material and probative with respect to the ROE issue in this case. And I'm not trying to get into what's behind the settlement. I'm just trying to use that filing as an admission against interest about the ROE and --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Mr. Moyle?

MR. MOYLE: -- a statement against interest.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: If we could move on from that question.

MR. MOYLE: Okay. Well, I -- Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate this, we've been spent two or three days and we haven't had any discussion about the settlement agreement. But I said in my opening statement that FIPUG supports the settlement agreement as a fair resolution of the issues, and I am not clear as we sit here today whether I am supposed to be putting in evidence with respect to fairness, because, because that issue -- you know, there was a motion in limine that was made, and I, I thought maybe that some of this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

proceeding would, would touch on that.

So I -- if we're going to have a second, second, you know, kind of continue along proceeding on that where I'll have a chance to ask some questions about fairness, then, then I'm good. But if not, I don't want to be disadvantaged by some people saying, well, you put the settlement in play and then you didn't put any evidence in to support it.

So I just need some direction with respect to procedurally where we are, and I can tailor and adjust my questions accordingly.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Well, right now you can move on from that question. With respect to the, the larger question, we were intending to address, address that on yesterday afternoon, but we were trying to take into consideration some of the factors that were, were sort of natural factors that were out. And now that we have a better sense of where those things will probably be, then we'll be in a better position to talk about the procedure with that.

So if you can move on with your question, and then we'll address the procedure by late this afternoon.

MR. MOYLE: Okay. That's fine.

MR. LITCHFIELD: Mr. Chairman, just, just to clarify though. I think from our perspective at this
end of the table, one of the reasons that we would object to him exploring -- I just want to make this clear for the record -- is that he was attempting to explore just one element of a total package, and that is what would be reflective in and of any filing at the SEC.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Understood.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: So that it's clear, OPC joins in the objections for different reasons, one of which is the provision of the evidence code relating to compromise and offers to compromise being inadmissible for any purpose.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Understood.

So, Mr. Moyle, if you could move on.

MR. MOYLE: Okay. Thank you. I have no further, further questions, given that. But thank you, thank you for letting me raise the issue. I think I understand where we are, and you overruled the request to get into fairness, and we'll deal with that, it sounds like, down the road.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure.

MR. MOYLE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRISE: Mr. Sundback with South Florida Hospital Association.

MR. SUNDBACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

	001956
1	CROSS EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. SUNDBACK:
3	Q Good morning, Mr. Dewhurst.
4	A Good morning.
5	${f Q}$ You testify today in part because you are the
6	CFO of relevant organizations; is that right?
7	A Correct.
8	Q Part of your job duties includes providing
9	information about FPL and NextEra Energy, Inc., to the
10	public and the SEC; is that correct?
11	A Yes.
12	Q And part of your job responsibilities are to
13	make sure that those disclosures are accurate and
14	thorough.
15	A Yes. We work very hard on that.
16	Q Thank you. Your job duties include
17	interrelating with the credit rating agencies; is that
18	not correct?
19	A Yes.
20	${f Q}$ And do you have regular discussions with the
21	credit rating agencies?
22	A Could you tell me what you mean by regular?
23	${f Q}$ Do you speak with the credit rating agencies
24	before the credit rating agencies issue reports or
25	analyses of FPL or NextEra Energy, Inc., on a regular
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

basis? 1 Usually, not always. Sometimes agencies will 2 Α put out reports without consulting the issuer. 3 But, but in more cases than not, you have a 4 0 discussion with the rating agency before the issuance of 5 the report; is that correct? 6 7 Yes. In more cases than not, and we would Α certainly try to. 8 9 And they solicit your input and response in 0 part to what they have as, for instance, a draft 10 document; is that correct? 11 No, that's not correct. 12 Α Do you have a discussion with them about the 13 Q contents of what they propose to issue? 14 15 Α Yes and no. What they typically allow us to do is check their material or their draft report for 16 errors of fact. 17 18 Okay. You are familiar with the methodologies Q employed by the credit rating agency, the primary credit 19 rating agencies, and for our discussion today can we 2.0 accept that the primary credit rating agencies would be 21 22 S&P, Moody's, and Fitch? I will accept that, yes. 23 Α 24 Okay. And are you familiar with their 0 25 methodologies generally?

I have a general familiarity. The detailed 1 Α familiarity rests with people within my staff. 2 Okay. In your Exhibit MD-6, you discuss some 3 0 of the criteria that are utilized by the credit rating 4 agencies; is that correct? 5 MR. LITCHFIELD: I believe MD-6 is in 6 7 Mr. Dewhurst's rebuttal testimony. BY MR. SUNDBACK: 8 9 My apologies. Would you agree that you have Q at least a general -- well, I'll strike that. 10 Would you agree that S&P, Moody's, and Fitch 11 look to measurements such as the relationship of debt to 12 cash flows, whether it's free cash or a different 13 measure of cash? 14 15 Α Yes. I believe the cash flow is an important part of their analysis. 16 17 And they also look at the relationship of debt 0 to total capital; is that right? 18 19 Typically, yes. Α And sometimes S&P, at least, includes the 2.0 Q results of their analyses in their reports; is that 21 22 correct? Yes, that's correct. More recently they have 23 Α 24 been doing that. And sometimes they in fact include their 25 Q FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

computations, although that's not always the case. 1 That's a fair characterization. 2 Α Okay. Would you agree that one of the, the 3 0 credit rating agencies like S&P wouldn't include a 4 calculation in their analyses if they didn't consider it 5 material and important? 6 7 Yes. I would certainly hope so. Α Okay. Let's look at page 47 of your direct 8 Q 9 testimony, if we could, please. Yes, sir. 10 Α Starting at line 10, you're discussing the ROE 11 Q 12 adder; right? That's correct. This section deals with the 13 Α ROE adder. 14 Thank you. And one of the justifications is 15 0 that you believe it will incent, among others, FPL to 16 pursue excellent management; right? 17 That's the fundamental logic behind the 18 Α Yes. 19 adder, is to provide a positive incentive for extra 2.0 performance. You're not suggesting that FPL will not 21 Q 22 maintain its current level of performance going forward if it's not given the 25-basis-point adder, are you? 23 24 I can't categorically state what level of Α 25 performance FPL will be able to deliver in the future,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

so I don't think I can answer that question.

Thank you. It's true that the 25-basis-point 0 adder is not the only benefit that would accrue, for instance, to shareholders as a result of excellent management of an enterprise such as FPL; isn't that right?

I'm not sure I'm following you. Could -- I Α may have missed the distinction here.

It's not your testimony that the 0 25-basis-point adder is the only benefit that would accrue to shareholders in FPL as a result of excellent management of FPL, is it? If you have no opinion, that's a fair answer.

Well, my answer is it depends. I would agree Α it wouldn't necessarily be. It would depend upon the facts and circumstances. If FPL was significantly underearning hypothetically, then shareholders wouldn't be gaining appropriate benefits. I think I need to understand the specific circumstances.

Well, for instance, to the extent that Q excellent management produces lower rates, lower rates, all other things being equal, may increase demand for the output of FPL's generation plants; is that correct?

24 25

Q

I agree that could be one outcome. Α Okay. And to the extent --

But that may not be a benefit to shareholders. 1 Α To the extent that excellent management 2 0 results in reducing costs while maintaining revenue, 3 that might increase the margin from time to time; is 4 that not correct? 5 It might. 6 Α 7 To the extent that FPL is making more sales at Q a base rate that's fixed at a lower level of billing 8 9 determinants, does not that, at least between rate cases, provide a higher cash flow for FPL? 10 It probably would. 11 Α To the extent that FPL serves industrial 12 0 customers, FPL, if it has lower rates, may induce the 13 industrial customers to maintain or increase their 14 15 production within FPL's service territory; is that not correct? 16 17 Α It's possible. It would depend. Uh-huh. You haven't done a study of that 18 Q 19 issue, I gather, from your answer. 2.0 I personally have not. Obviously it would Α depend upon how important electricity was as a component 21 22 of their costs and a whole variety of other things, but certainly in principle it could. 23 24 But just to make sure I understand your 0 25 answer, you have not particularly investigated this

issue before, for instance, filing your testimony before 1 this Commission. 2 Correct. I personally have not. 3 Α Thank you. 4 Q MR. SUNDBACK: Mr. Chairman, at this time we'd 5 ask to have assigned the next appropriate exhibit number 6 7 to a document that we'd like to have distributed. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure. That would be 556. 8 9 MR. SUNDBACK: 556? CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Yes. 10 MR. SUNDBACK: Thank you, sir. 11 (Exhibit 556 marked for identification.) 12 CHAIRMAN BRISE: Are there any objections to 13 this document? 14 15 MR. LITCHFIELD: Yes, Mr. Chairman. It again appears to be yet another -- it's less than a subset, 16 isn't it? Just two pages, excluding the cover page, of 17 a much larger document. 18 MR. SUNDBACK: Mr. Chairman, we'd inquire 19 through the bench if that's the entirety of FPL's 2.0 objection. We're happy to address their objections, we 21 22 just don't want to interrupt their --CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure. 23 24 MR. LITCHFIELD: No. I'm -- well, and I 25 presume that Mr. Sundback will attempt to authenticate

it through this witness, but for now that's, that is my objection.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SUNDBACK: Mr. Chairman, we have a copy of the full presentation for that company. And for that matter, it's on the company's website, so the company certainly is able to access this readily.

MR. LITCHFIELD: Thank you. We'd appreciate a full copy. That would be helpful.

MR. SUNDBACK: Mr. Chairman, if we could at this time, we'll provide a full copy to FPL.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure.

MR. LITCHFIELD: Do you have full copies for the witness and for the rest of the counsel?

MR. SUNDBACK: Mr. Chairman, we don't have a full copy for everybody in the room. If that's the request of FPL, I'm sure we can make copies and distribute it at lunch. But we want to ask questions about these pages. We're happy to give the witness a full copy. And if he wants to refer to other pages, presumably he can do so, if it's appropriate.

MR. LITCHFIELD: Well, I think it's more than appropriate then when we are talking about a document and -- that we have the full document before us, not just for the witness but for everybody here this

morning. That's typically the practice if you want to 1 cross-examine on a document. You have it available if 2 someone would like to have a full copy. 3 MR. SUNDBACK: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Litchfield is 4 objecting in the first instance, as I understand it, 5 that he's not sure this document is authenticated. We 6 7 don't want to get into --MR. LITCHFIELD: No, no, no, no, no --8 9 MR. SUNDBACK: I'm sorry. Could I be allowed to finish my --10 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Gentlemen? Gentlemen? 11 Thank 12 you. What we're going to do is we're going to allow 13 questions to be made, to be posed on the document. 14 If 15 you can make the document available to our staff, our staff will make copies and the copies will be 16 distributed. 17 MR. SUNDBACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 18 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. 19 2.0 MR. LITCHFIELD: The -- excuse me, Mr. Chairman. The copies will be made before questions 21 22 are asked or after questions are asked? That's my confusion, I suppose. 23 24 CHAIRMAN BRISE: As questions are being asked. 25 MR. LITCHFIELD: I'd like then, I'd like the

witness to be given my copy. I'll give up my copy so that the witness can have it. I believe for staff to make --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: I believe they have a copy available for the --

MR. LITCHFIELD: I don't believe the copy has even been offered to the witness yet.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. All right. So then we need to make sure that the witness has a full copy.

MR. SUNDBACK: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I apologize. We had two full copies, of which Mr. Litchfield has one and staff has one. So we're not --

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Make one available to the witness, a full copy.

MR. MOYLE: Mr. Chairman, I mean, in these rate cases there's lots and lots of paper that is out there, and I think the practice has been historically to take excerpts and use them. I surely don't feel like I need a full copy. That's going to kill a lot of, you know, trees to do it that way. But if that's how we're going to do it, then it's -- you know, I don't think it's going to make the proceeding go any, any faster.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Understood.

MR. SAPORITO: Mr. Chairman, I just want to

	00196
1	put on the record that the other day I put an excerpt
2	from FPL's annual report. The only objection from FPL's
3	counsel was he wanted to see the full copy. I showed it
4	to him, he returned it, and we proceeded.
5	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Understood.
6	You may proceed.
7	MR. SUNDBACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
8	BY MR. SUNDBACK:
9	Q All right. Just as a general matter,
10	Mr. Dewhurst, in your role as CFO, do you regularly
11	undertake to make sure that disclosures made to, for
12	instance, investors are accurate?
13	A Yes, I do.
14	${f Q}$ Okay. And would it be correct that it's
15	important to FPL to make accurate and careful statements
16	of its conditions to investors?
17	A Yes. We certainly try and do that.
18	Q Sanford Bernstein & Company, could you
19	describe for us who that is generally, if you have any
20	knowledge of them?
21	A Sanford Bernstein is a brokerage and coverage
22	firm, so they would be one of the firms that would trade
23	our stock and would probably have a coverage analyst who
24	would follow our performance and issue reports on it.
25	${f Q}$ And this strategic decisions conference, this

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

involves other invitees aside from Sanford Bernstein employees and, and officers?

A I wasn't present at the June 2nd, 2010,presentation, but I would assume that was the case.That would typically be the case.

Q You were the Vice Chairman at the time, were you not?

A I, at that time I was Vice Chairman and Chiefof Staff. I was not the Chief Financial Officer.

Q Okay. And to the extent that you were Vice Chairman, were you aware of the nature of the presentations that are made to investors?

A At that -- yes and no. At that time, because of my role, I would have a general knowledge of the kinds of materials that we would present, but I wasn't involved, for example, in this specific presentation. So this is actually the first time I've ever seen this particular document.

Q Well, but isn't it true that this presentation is in large part simply a recitation of other materials that are presented periodically, were presented periodically by the company?

A No, that's not correct. Because this is the visual part of the presentation. The more important part is obviously the oral presentation that accompanies

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

that, which is obviously not available to us at this point. So these are typically slides that we will use to illustrate points that we wish to make. But without the, without direct knowledge of the oral presentation, it's difficult going back in time to interpret much from it.

Q All right. But I think, as I understand your statement, these are typically slides that are provided in multiple presentations. In other words, you don't just do a one-off presentation for, in this instance, the strategic decisions conference that contains unique information that's not, on a periodic basis, provided to customers. Haven't you -- I'll strike that.

Haven't you seen information of this nature repeatedly contained in FPL presentations to investors?

MR. LITCHFIELD: I'll object to the question. It's incredibly vague. This information meaning what, and other presentations meaning which?

BY MR. SUNDBACK:

Q Let's look at page 4 of the slides, if you would, under Mr. Hay's presentation.

A I'm there.

Q Would you agree that information that's contained on this slide is typically provided to investors in presentations by FPL?

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Α

Yes. It changes each time.

Q Would you agree that FPL on more than one occasion has asserted that Next Energy -- I'm sorry --NextEra Energy is a premier U.S. power company comprised of two great businesses?

A Yes. To the extent the information remains valid, it would obviously be repeated. To the extent that it changes, we would update the information. The purpose is to try and give a comprehensive view to investors of where we are at any point in time, consistent with Mr. Sundback's point about full disclosure.

Q Thank you. And one of the two great businesses is FP&L, is it not?

A It is now and it has been certainly as long as I've been associated with it.

Q And, for instance, in June 2010?

A I believe it was a great business then, yes.Q Thank you. Let's look at the slide numbered

18, please.

Α

I'm there.

Q On the right-hand side there is a caption, drivers of growth. Do you see that?

A Yes, sir.

Q Florida had nice weather before FPL ever

existed; right?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

A I believe so.

Q And FPL is not responsible for the baby boom generation reaching retirement age or moving to Florida; is that right?

A Correct.

Q Okay. FPL is not responsible for the fact that there's no state income tax; right?

A Certainly not solely responsible. I don't know if we ever played any role in that.

Q By the way, the -- okay.

The third bullet point, that represents a statement by FPL that in fact lower housing prices may be a source of attraction to individuals moving into FPL's service territory; is that correct?

A Yes. At the time that this presentation was made, I believe the, the view would have been that because of the improvement in affordability, that would be long-term a positive driver of growth.

Q Okay. And you're familiar with these types of, the assertions we've just gone through from your exposure to FPL presentations to investors from time to time; is that correct?

A No. I believe I'm familiar with the assertions through reviewing analyses that our staff

have done. The results of those analyses would then be reflected in the presentations we make to the outside world.

Q And your review with your staff would be consistent with the conclusions articulated in this document at that time; is that correct?

A Well, as I said earlier, I wasn't responsible for this at the time, so I didn't review the material. I would think it highly likely. I would have confidence that Mr. Hay satisfied himself that these were valid statements at the time.

Q You didn't discuss with Mr. Hay while you were Vice President -- I'm sorry -- Vice Chairman, for instance, the elements contained in the two pages we just looked at?

A Oh, certainly. I discussed them in general terms. I'm just saying I didn't do that at this specific point in time, which is important because we have to make sure that when we disclose things to investors, we have a reasonable basis for all the forward-looking statements that we are making.

Q Thank you.

Α

Let's look at Page 6, lines 13 through 17 of your direct testimony, if we could, please.

I'm sorry. Page 6?

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1	Q Yes, sir.
2	A And the lines?
3	Q 13 through 17.
4	A Thank you. Yes, sir.
5	${f Q}$ And there you're discussing the ROE adder and
6	you're, you're summarizing your arguments in favor of
7	it; right?
8	A No, I don't believe I'm summarizing it. I
9	believe this is an additional statement, I believe. My
10	testimony further explains. That implies there has been
11	some other things beforehand.
12	${f Q}$ Okay. Would you agree that, in order to
13	provide a proper incentive, the ROE adder has to be
14	based on metrics that can be objectively evaluated?
15	A No, I don't believe so.
16	Q Okay.
17	A I think that was desirable, but ultimately my
18	testimony is the adder, the decision to add the adder is
19	a matter of judgment.
20	${f Q}$ You wouldn't want the criteria on which the
21	adder is evaluated, the opportunity to take advantage of
22	the adder is evaluated, to be based on circumstances
23	that are beyond the utility's control, would you?
24	A No. I disagree with that. I believe the
25	basis for the performance adder should be ultimately the

total value delivery for customers. I believe that's the way free markets work. And as I say in my testimony, one of the values of this is it's a way of mimicking what free markets do. Free markets reward outcomes regardless of how they are obtained. But by doing so, they encourage the inputs that over time are likely to lead to better outputs. So we are --

Q I'm sorry. Would you agree then, or is it your position that to the extent a positive outcome is the result of fortuitous circumstances not within the utility's control, it should be entitled to the ROE adder? Is that your --

A No, that's not what I said. What I'm saying is that I believe the Commission should evaluate the totality of the results and make a judgment, including incorporating into its thinking which portions may be attributable to management actions, which portions may not. But the totality of the results is the ultimate delivery of values that customers that I think you want to incent.

Q All right. Mr. Dewhurst, I'd like an answer to my question. I understand you have provided some information in your last answer, but you have not answered my question.

Could you repeat your question?

Α

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

Q If the beneficial results were purely the result of fortuitous circumstances, is it your position that the 25-basis-point adder should be awarded to the utility?

MR. LITCHFIELD: I have no objection to this question. I do have an objection to arguing with the witness.

MR. SUNDBACK: Mr. Chairman, I could have moved to strike the answer, because the question clearly contemplated -- the prior question clearly contemplated a circumstance in which the only reason the result was obtained was fortuitous circumstances. The witness said that's not what I'm saying, and then went off to a different topic.

He didn't say, no, that's not correct or, yes, that is correct. He deflected it and then moved to a different topic.

I'd just like an answer to the question if I could.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure. If you could restate the question -- I mean, if you could repose your question and then give him an opportunity --

23 MR. SUNDBACK: You're setting a high hurdle,
24 Mr. Chairman, but we'll try.

BY MR. SUNDBACK:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

25

Q It's not your position that if the positive result was obtained purely through fortuitous circumstances, that the utility should be awarded the 25-basis-point adder, is it?

A No. In a counterfactual situation I would say no award.

Q I'm sorry. Could you repeat the answer? I'm not sure I caught that entirely.

A No. In that counterfactual situation I don't think it should be awarded.

Q

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. Thank you.

Let me understand a little better how you would like to apply the, the criteria. Let's presume we have two utilities, A and B, and they each own one natural gas-fired generator, and it's the same model of generator, it's the same year. Utility A had 100 customers and they consumed 1,000 megawatts of energy every month. Utility B had 1,000 customers and they demanded 1,000 megawatts of energy every month. The production non-fuel O&M associated with those units would be the same; right?

A I don't know. Can you show me in my testimony where this is? I speak to our request for an adder based on our performance.

Q

That's, that's correct. And I want to

understand how you would apply these criteria so that the Commission can know, for instance, what their, the product they're buying, if you will. If you are not comfortable or don't feel yourself competent to address the issues about how the Commission would apply the criteria, that's a, that's a perfectly acceptable answer.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

A As my testimony shows, and also this is also a question that Witness Deaton explains, she explains the specific application, but mechanically what we have proposed is that this Commission would grant us the adder based on the totality of our performance. It would be contingent on us maintaining the lowest typical residential bill in the state going forward. If we were not able to maintain that position, it would be stripped away. If we subsequently recovered that position, it would be reinstated until such time as the Commission saw fit to next review our performance.

Q Okay. Mr. Dewhurst, now, could we address my question? We have those two utilities A and B with the fact pattern I gave you. Would you agree that the non-fuel production O&M associated with each of those units would be the same; right?

A I'm sorry. I lost all the hypothetical assumptions.

Q Okay. I'd really appreciate if you'd focus on, on the question I'm asking you, sir.

MR. LITCHFIELD: I'll object.

BY MR. SUNDBACK:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Q We have two utilities, A and B. Each owns the same model of natural gas-fired generator that was installed in the same year. Utility A has 100 customers. They each demand 1,000 megawatts of hour -- 1,000 megawatt hours of energy every month. Utility B is the same, except it has 1,000 customers instead of 100 who also demand 1,000 megawatt hours of energy every month. In that case, the production non-fuel O&M associated with each of those units is the same; right?

A I'm -- I really am trying to focus on your question, sir, but I'm really having a hard time. Are we saying that we've got two hypothetical utilities that are equal in every other respect, meaning all their other generating units are the same?

Q I'm sorry, sir. There are really only two utilities and each has only one generating unit. It's exactly the same. It's a, it's a 2000 GE combustion turbine.

A Okay.

Q Same model.

1	A Yes. Okay.
2	Q Can you answer my question, sir?
3	A Are they operating exactly the same way?
4	Q They are operating in a way that allows
5	utility A to sell 1,000 megawatt hours of energy every
6	month to its 100 customers, and utility B is able to
7	sell 1,000 megawatt hours every month to 1,000
8	customers.
9	A If I'm understanding your hypothetical, the
10	only difference that you've given me the total
11	delivery of megawatt hours is the same. The only
12	difference is one is going to 100 customers and one is
13	going to 1,000 customers. Is that what you're saying?
14	Q That's correct.
15	A Okay. And the specific measure that you wish
16	me to look to is what?
17	Q Production non-fuel O&M.
18	A Total dollars would be the same.
19	MR. LITCHFIELD: May I ask for a clarification
20	with regard to the assumption? This may be part of the
21	struggle here. What is the assumption with respect to
22	the amount of capacity necessary to meet 100 customers
23	versus 1,000 customers? That, frankly, is unclear to
24	me.
25	MR. SUNDBACK: Mr. Chairman, we've posited

1	that it's the same generating unit. There's no
2	difference in capacity. I'm surprised by the confusion
3	that this engenders.
4	MR. LITCHFIELD: But so we're assuming
5	identical units to serve one load that is one-tenth of
6	the other load? I'm
7	MR. SUNDBACK: Yes, that's what we're
8	assuming.
9	THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm sorry. I did not
10	understand that. You told me 1,000 megawatt hours were
11	coming out of each unit. Is that not the case?
12	BY MR. SUNDBACK:
13	Q 1,000 megawatt hours of energy every month.
14	A From each unit?
15	Q Uh-huh.
16	A And they're operated the same?
17	Q Uh-huh.
18	A Then their costs are going to be the same.
19	${f Q}$ Okay. Would you agree that the number of
20	customers that are within a utility's service territory
21	is at least in part beyond the utility's control?
22	A Yes.
23	${f Q}$ Okay. Now with regard to the ROE adder, we've
24	established earlier in the proceeding, I think, that it
25	on a revenue requirement basis is more or less
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

	00198
1	\$40 million. Is that a number you'd be comfortable
2	working with?
3	A Yes, sir.
4	${f Q}$ All right. Now if FPL were awarded the
5	\$40 million and it received it in a year, a number of
6	different things could happen with that cash once it's
7	in FPL's hands; right?
8	A Yes.
9	Q So, for instance, you discussed retained
10	earnings earlier today with Mr. Moyle; right?
11	A Correct.
12	Q Alternatively, it could pay its employees'
13	bonuses with that money; right?
14	A Correct.
15	Q It could pay it as dividends up to the parent;
16	right?
17	A Correct.
18	${f Q}$ And if it moves up the chain as dividends, it
19	could be used to offset losses from other businesses
20	operated by NextEra Energy; is that right?
21	A No.
22	${f Q}$ So it's your opinion that once it gets to the
23	NextEra Energy, Inc., level, it couldn't be consolidated
24	with the results of other affiliates' and subsidiaries'
25	operations for the purposes of, for instance,
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

determining dividends to NextEra Energy, Inc., shareholders?

A No, that's not what I'm saying. You asked could it offset losses. The losses, whatever this hypothetical thing is, would be the same. The transfer of cash doesn't change the accounting, the income statement.

Q All right. But to the extent, for instance, that we're determining the level of dividends that are available to NextEra Energy, Inc.'s, shareholders, that \$40 million may or may not be available to shareholders because of the results of operations of, for instance, NextEra Energy Resources; is that not correct?

A If I'm understanding your question correctly -- well, maybe I can answer it this way. It would go into the general cash pool. So from a cash perspective, it would be, at this point, if it's been dividended up to the parent, it's available for any corporate purposes, which would certainly include the potential to pay a dividend to NextEra Energy shareholders. Is that what you're trying to establish?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Q Not entirely. No, sir.

Another use that might be -- another fate that might befall the \$40 million, instead of being dividended out to the shareholders of NextEra Energy,

Inc., might be that it was consumed in effect by losses 1 2 that were incurred at NextEra Energy Resources and therefore not available to be paid as dividends to 3 investors in NextEra Energy, Inc.; correct? 4 Yes, if Energy Resources were losing money, 5 Α but it's not. 6 7 Okay. Let's look at your direct testimony, Q please, page 32, 9 through 11. There you assert that 8 9 FPL competes for capital with other enterprises; right? Yes, sir. 10 Α Investors would, among other things, compare 11 0 FPL's risk to other utilities. For instance, those in 12 and outside of Florida; right? 13 14 Α Typically, yes. 15 Q Okay. Let's look at page 16 of your direct, lines 17 through 20, if we could, please. 16 Yes, sir. 17 Α There you're comparing FPL's reliance on 18 Q nuclear -- or making some observations about FPL's 19 2.0 reliance on nuclear generation; right? Yes, that's correct. Specifically relative to 21 Α 22 others in the state. You didn't, though, compare FPL's reliance on 23 Q nuclear to national utilities, aside from those located 24 25 in Florida; correct?

A No, that's not correct. That's not what this specific sentence refers to. But in the broader assessment of the risk profile, I certainly included that.

Q And where, where in your direct testimony can we find the proportions of nuclear generation that are enjoyed by utilities outside of Florida?

A That specific, those specific numbers are not in my direct testimony, if that's what you mean.

Q Okay. And in fact there are some utilities now in the United States that are dependent on nuclear generation for more than 50% of their generation; is that not correct?

A I'm not sure if there's anyone over 50%.There may be.

Q Okay. But you, you couldn't tell us sitting here today whether that was the case.

A No. I would have to go and review my papers back home.

Q Okay. Now, you, you wouldn't want to ask this Commission to impose a double standard when evaluating a utility's management decisions, would you?

MR. LITCHFIELD: Object. The question is argumentative.

MR. SUNDBACK: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. Do we

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

understand the objection as asked and answered?

MR. LITCHFIELD: Argumentative.

MR. SUNDBACK: Oh, I'm sorry.

Could we rephrase, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure. You may rephrase the question.

BY MR. SUNDBACK:

Q Mr. Dewhurst, you wouldn't want the Commission to ignore, for instance, the negative aspects of a management decision and only look at the positive aspects of a management decision, would you?

A No. And on page 19 in my testimony I specifically note that at the top of there with respect to the nuclear risk that we're talking about.

Q Okay. And so you wouldn't want to, for instance, give credit to management for a good result but ignore the detrimental attributes of the decision that contributed to the good result; right?

A Could you please explain what you mean by giving as credit? Within what context?

Q The 25-basis-point adder, for instance.

A No, sir. I am proposing that you review the totality of our performance, good and bad.

Q Okay. Thank you. Now, on page 17 you discuss some more about nuclear power and nuclear generation of

FPL, right, down towards the bottom of the page, lines 14 through 23?

A Specific detail on why investors perceive nuclear power as more risky than other types of generation.

Q Right. You wouldn't want to not hold FPL responsible, particularly its management, for added risks associated with its choice to use nuclear generation, would you?

A I'm sorry. Could you repeat that? I want to make sure I'm precise in my answer.

Q We appreciate your care, interest in care and precision.

You wouldn't not -- well, let's avoid the double negative, if we can.

You would agree it's appropriate to hold FPL's management responsible for added risks associated with, for instance, its choice of nuclear generation; right?

A Yes and no. The yes part is I believe that the assessment of whatever this hypothetical decision is that we're making has to include the risk aspect, and that may include increased risk.

But the no part is that doesn't automatically mean it's bad.

Would you agree that there are some additional

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

23

24

25

Q

1

	0019
1	costs and risks associated with nuclear generation?
2	A Yes. That's in my testimony.
3	${f Q}$ Okay. Generally we understand your testimony
4	to be that of the company's witness describing risk
5	factors facing FPL; right?
6	A That's one of the subjects of my testimony.
7	Q That's fair enough. And you'd certainly want
8	the Commission to engage in a thorough and balanced
9	examination of FPL's risks and opportunities; right?
10	A Yes, sir.
11	Q You wouldn't advocate a decision based on a
12	truncated analysis, would you?
13	A No, sir. I'm looking to the whole record.
14	Q And the whole company; right?
15	A All of Florida Power & Light, yes.
16	Q Yes. Thank you for that.
17	In your summary last night, do you recall
18	stating that, quote, FPL is exposed to greater risk than
19	most other utilities, unquote?
20	A Yes, sir. And that refers, is a summarization
21	of that whole risk section, pages 12 through 31 in my
22	testimony.
23	Q And that includes not only national utilities
24	but Florida utilities; right?
25	A Yes, sir.
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

001987

Okay. You didn't compare the financial 1 Q strength of FPL to that of other U.S. electric utilities 2 when preparing your direct testimony, did you? 3 Α Can you explain to me what you're meaning by 4 financial risk? Again, I want to be precise in my 5 answer. 6 7 MR. SUNDBACK: Let's look at a response to discovery, if we could, Mr. Chairman. I apologize. I 8 9 don't remember the exhibit number. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: We are at 557. 10 (Exhibit 557 marked for identification.) 11 MR. SUNDBACK: And, Mr. Chairman, this 12 13 consists of three discovery responses, the response to OPC request 43 and 45 for the production of documents, 14 and the response to SFHHA's first set of 15 interrogatories, number 167. 16 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. 17 MR. SUNDBACK: Thank you, sir. 18 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you. 19 Any objections to these? 2.0 MR. LITCHFIELD: No, sir. 21 22 CHAIRMAN BRISE: Seeing no objections, you may proceed. 23 MR. SUNDBACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 24 BY MR. SUNDBACK: 25 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

	100
1	Q Mr. Dewhurst, could you let us know once
2	you've had an opportunity to look at these?
3	A I will do that.
4	(Reviewing documents.)
5	Okay.
6	Q Thank you, sir. These were true and correct
7	responses when you made them; is that right?
8	A Yes, sir.
9	Q Thank you.
10	MR. SUNDBACK: Mr. Chairman, no further
11	questions.
12	Thank you, Mr. Dewhurst.
13	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you.
14	Ms FEA.
15	CAPTAIN MILLER: Just one brief question.
16	CROSS EXAMINATION
17	BY CAPTAIN MILLER:
18	${f Q}$ Mr. Dewhurst, in responding to a question from
19	Mr. Sundback, you said that the rating agencies permit
20	you to fact-check the reports before they're issued?
21	A In general, yes.
22	Q Do they actually hand you the physical
23	reports?
24	A Yes and no. Sometimes they give us the draft
25	of what they're proposing to say. More commonly it
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

would be for us to be able to review the numbers to make 1 sure that the numbers are actually accurate, or reflect 2 the information that we've provided them. 3 CAPTAIN MILLER: Thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Office of Public 5 Counsel. 6 7 CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. McGLOTHLIN: 8 9 Hello, Mr. Dewhurst. Q 10 Α Good morning. I'm Joe McGlothlin with the Office of Public 11 Q Counsel. 12 13 Mr. Dewhurst, near the end of the day yesterday, were you in the room at the time when 14 Dr. Avera was on the stand? 15 I believe I was here for all of Dr. Avera's 16 Α 17 testimony. During his testimony, Mr. Lavia asked him to 18 Q 19 agree that NextEra Energy's stock price increased between March 2010 and July 2010 by approximately \$10 2.0 per share, notwithstanding the initial reaction and 21 22 downgrades that occurred after the Commission's order Do you recall that question and answer? 23 was issued. 24 That was comparing apples and oranges. Α Yes. 25 And in his answer Dr. Avera first suggested Q

that it could be explained by the fact that the investment community was aware of settlement negotiations going on between FPL and parties, and read something into the possibility that could lead them to have more confidence in the stock. Do you remember that statement by Dr. Avera?

Ά

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

I do remember that portion, yes, sir.

Q Now, at the time he said that was conjecture on his part, but it appears to me that you might be the person in a position to say whether there was any basis for that explanation or not.

A Yes, sir. I don't believe there was any basis in the external world at that point in time.

Q Certainly FPL did not tell the investment community at large that it was involved in settlement negotiations; correct?

A Yes and no. Yes, we would not talk to specifics of negotiations, but, no, to the extent that it, it is common, and I think we did at the time indicate that we had hopes that we might be able to resolve some of the outstanding negotiations through settlement. There would be nothing specific about a negotiation.

Q Then it's clear that in this instance the NextEra Energy stock increased \$10 per share in that
time frame, notwithstanding the initial reaction of the credit agencies?

MR. LITCHFIELD: I'm sorry. Could counsel repeat the question? He trailed off and I lost completely the last phrase.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Yeah, if you could -- I lost some of it too, so if you could repeat the question.

BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

Q The question is simply this. It's true, is it not, that this increase in the share, price of the share between March 2010 and July 2010 occurred, notwithstanding what has been described as the initial reaction of the credit agencies?

A No.

MR. LITCHFIELD: I'm sorry. Could the witness repeat the answer louder?

THE WITNESS: No. No.

MR. LITCHFIELD: Okay.

BY MR. McGLOTHLIN:

Q I wonder if we're talking past each other.

A We may be. I'm sorry.

Q Why do you say no?

A Because the share prices are inherently
forward-looking, so they're based on, you know,
expectations at the time. So the change in the time

period we're talking about has to include new information of all kinds, including changes in how the rating agencies were viewing things.

So I'm not sure. Again, I may not be understanding the question precisely, but --

Well, let's get the sequence in terms of the 0 time frame understood.

March 2010, the Commission issues its order, sometimes called the presettlement order. The credit agencies react with criticism about the nature of the decision, and then between that period of time and July, the, the price of the stock increases by about \$10 per share. Are we, are we on the same page with respect to the downgrade?

Α No, that's completely incorrect, because the information, obviously information was available to the market long before January, but the out, the negative outlooks occurred in January, by which point the damage was done. We lost 20% of our market cap. So, no, I don't -- that's not the time frame.

Okay. Let's use January as a starting period Q and July as the ending period.

That would be the wrong starting period, but Α I'll go with you.

Q

But in that time frame, the shares, the stock

price increased to the level that was discussed yesterday.

A Yes. We began to claw our way back during that period.

Q So doesn't that suggest to you that the rating agencies can issue their reports and the investors make up their own minds as to what they think the stock is worth?

A Certainly I agree with that. By the time the reports came out they were stale information. Everybody knew what was happening.

Q If you would turn to page 5 of your prefiled testimony.

A Yes, sir.

Q And that's the introductory portion of your testimony. At line 20 you inform the readers of the recommendations you're going to make; correct?

A That's correct.

Q And the first thing that you recommend is that the Commission maintain FPL's current capital structure; correct?

A That's correct.

Q And by that you were referring to the 59.62% equity ratio?

A Yes, sir.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

2.0

And then on the next page -- excuse me. 1 Q And then in terms of the way you've organized your 2 testimony, relating back again to the capital structure 3 and equity ratio, you treat that subject in what is 4 called Roman numeral V portion of your testimony; 5 correct? 6 7 Α Roman numeral V refers to the capital 8 structure, yes. 9 Your second recommendation is that the 0 Commission authorize the, quote, base return on equity 10 of 11.25%; correct? 11 That's correct. 12 Α And you address that in Roman numeral VI --13 Q That's correct. 14 Α -- of your testimony. 15 Q Specifically here I was trying to separate the 16 Α discussion of the performance adder, which conceptually 17 to me is a different thing. 18 19 Refer to page 12 of your testimony. Q 2.0 Yes, sir. Α And under Roman numeral III, which is 21 Q 22 captioned risk profile, you discuss those risks that you say are pertinent to the Commission's consideration? 23 Well, I think the entire section of Roman 24 Α 25 numeral III speaks to risk factors that I think are

pertinent. They're not necessarily the only ones, but they are the principle ones that I'm thinking about. And within that section, that broad section, there are five subcategories, and subcategory three refers to risks around climate, weather, et cetera, impacts on daily operations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Α

Q And you define risk profile as the unique collection of risks that it, being the company, faces both in normal operations and in unusual circumstances; correct?

A Yes. That's my kind of working definition, how I think about the risk profile.

Q And then you divide those risks into five categories, do you not?

Yes, sir. That's correct.

Q The first is financial measures, and I understand that by financial measures you are talking in terms of increased costs or changes in revenues to the company?

A Yes, generally speaking. Variability around the typical financial metrics of the organization, so whether revenues are up or down, costs are up or down, Capex is higher or lower than expected, et cetera.

Q The second category is infrastructure, and the examples you give there have to do with geographical



So there will be others, which I would expect 1 the Commission to take into account, but these to me are 2 the principal ones. 3 Q I want to ask you some questions about one of 4 5 them, on page 14. Yes, sir. 6 Α 7 At line 6, this question is posed: How does Q uncertainty in customer growth affect FPL? 8 9 Would you read lines 7 through 11, please. From an investor perspective, uncertainty in 10 Α customer growth is seen as increasing risk. On balance, 11 a rapid increase in customer growth, which in the 12 13 long-term is a good thing, places more stress on a utility's short-term financial position and acts to 14 depress earned returns. From an investor perspective, 15 this is a risk for FPL. 16 17 Now, please read the rest of that answer, 0 beginning at 13, which discusses a decline in customer 18 19 growth. 2.0 Conversely, a drop in customer growth, or even Α a decline in the overall customer base, as FPL 21 22 experienced in 2009, has obvious negative impacts on revenues and financial performance. While our base 23

there is uncertainty around these expectations, which

expectations are for an increase in customer growth,

24

25

increases the risk profile modestly from an investor perspective.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

So I'm trying to express that it's the uncertainty around these measures that's important from an investor risk assessment perspective.

Q But to summarize, based upon this answer, you are telling the Commissioners that an increase in customer growth is a risk and a decrease in growth is a risk. It appears that you've pretty much blanketed all possibilities except the scenario where things remain the same. Is that a risk too?

A No. That's a mischaracterization of my testimony. Inherent in the concept of risk is it's a concept of deviation from an expected value, and it's a deviation from either side. So being high or being low is what creates the risk. People like certainty, and they're willing to pay for a little more certainty. They're willing to pay to narrow the band.

Just as it's a good thing to narrow fuel volatility, if we can, people -- that's an attribute that customers, individuals clearly value. From an investor perspective, it's the, sort of the spread around some central expectation that is the fundamental concept of risk.

So I'm not saying that it's the high growth or

the low growth per se that is the risk. It's the 1 2 relative variability around customer growth and its impact on the specific business, and it's my testimony 3 that we have more of that than most others. 4 So investors see risk in uncertainty, 5 Q including uncertainty with respect to customer growth; 6 7 correct? Yes. As a general characterization I would 8 Α 9 agree. Risk and uncertainty are slightly different concepts, at least in my mind, but that's fair. 10 Would that be true of other utilities as well? 11 Q 12 Α Yes, sir. 13 And other companies as well? Q Generally speaking, yes. 14 Α 15 Q Going back to your definition, you say that the risk profile is the unique collection of risks that 16 it faces, both in normal operations and in unusual 17 circumstances. When you use the terms "normal 18 19 operations," you are referring to what we would categorize as business risks; correct? 2.0 As what, sir? 21 Α 22 Business risks. 0 The point of this was just to say we 23 Α No. can't just consider risks in when everything is going as 24 25 normal within the typical band. We have to include in

our risk assessment the possibility of extreme events that we might only see once every ten years, once every 50 years. That's the concept I was trying to get in there.

Q Yes. But those extreme events would be cat -would fall in that category of business risks, would they not?

A Well, they represent risk to the business, if that's what you're asking me. Yes.

Q Yes. And I think you said earlier that these risks and this profile, as you've defined them, are the risks that you think the Commission should weigh when setting the company's return on equity; correct?

A Yes. They're also fundamental drivers of the balance sheet strength that you need to maintain, and hence they are also drivers of the capital structure recommendation.

Q Yes, sir. But you did not include that in your discussion of the risk profile, did you?

A I'm sorry?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Q Well, you have Roman numeral III, risk profile; correct?

A Yes, sir.

Q And you discussed the risks that you believe fall within your definition of the risk profile;

correct?

Α

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

Yes, sir.

Q And you treat capital structure under Roman numeral V; correct?

A Well, no. If you read line 8, why is risk profile important? It's important because it heavily influences the degree of financial strength and flexibility that the company requires, and is therefore an important determinant of the appropriate capital structure to employ and the level of ROE required to provide adequate financial strength in favor of its investors (phonetic). So it supports both pieces.

Q Would you agree with me that, for general purposes, an investor distinguishes between business risk and financial risk?

A No. I cannot agree with that as a categorical statement. I will agree that that's a common distinction used in some contexts, in particular academic concepts, but I cannot agree with you as a categorical statement that that's how investors think about it. I think investors are much more sophisticated than that.

Q Would you agree with me that -- well, let's first talk about the definition of financial risk. Would you agree with me that, or can we agree that

financial risk relates to the ability of a concern to 1 meet its debt obligations and avoid default? 2 No, not entirely. I will agree that that's 3 Α one aspect of financial risk. But financial risk covers 4 a whole variety of factors affecting the financial 5 structure of the firm. 6 7 Would you agree with me that the investor Q reviews the entire panoply of risks, including what we 8 identified as business risk and financial risk? 9 We have identified -- I'm not sure what you 10 Α mean by "we have identified." 11 All right. Would you agree with me that the 12 0 investor assesses the entire risk profile of the 13 company? 14 I believe most smart investors look at 15 Α Yes. the totality of the company's risk profile. 16 Including risk, financial risk as you would 17 0 define it? 18 Including financial risk as I would define it, 19 Α 2.0 yes. And would you agree with me that in terms of 21 Q 22 identifying the appropriate return on equity, the Commission should take that entire panoply of risks into 23 24 account? 25 Α Yes, that's my testimony.

	00200
1	MR. McGLOTHLIN: No further questions.
2	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Mr. Lavia.
3	MR. LAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
4	CROSS EXAMINATION
5	BY MR. LAVIA:
6	Q Good morning, Mr. Dewhurst.
7	A Good morning.
8	Q My name is J. Lavia. I represent the Florida
9	Retail Federation.
10	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Actually, Mr. Lavia, before
11	we go on, we're right at that two-hour mark for the
12	court reporter. So before you get into your questions,
13	and I want to sort of stop you at the beginning, and
14	we'll take a five-minute break to give her a little bit
15	of a rest.
16	MR. LAVIA: That's fine. Thank you.
17	(Recess taken.)
18	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: I want to give everybody
19	about 30 or 45 seconds to, to find their places so we
20	can get going again.
21	All right. We're going to reconvene at this
22	time.
23	Mr. Lavia.
24	MR. LAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
25	BY MR. LAVIA:
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Hello again. 1 Q 2 Α Good morning. I believe you testified earlier today that you 3 Q were here, present for Mr. Silagy's testimony earlier 4 this week? 5 Yes, sir, I was. 6 Α 7 Is that correct? And then Mr. Silagy deferred Q a few questions to you. Specifically when Mr. Wright 8 9 asked him about how FPL had performed on a cash basis since the 2009 rate case, he deferred that question to 10 you. Do you recall that? 11 I don't. 12 Α 13 Okay. Would you be prepared to answer Q questions about that? 14 I will do my best. 15 Α Okay. What is FPL's ROE as reported on FPL's 16 0 17 earnings surveillance reports to the PSC for the past 12 months, say? 18 It should be approximately 11%. 19 Α 2.0 Okay. Thank you. And what is FPL's Q 21 corresponding cash basis ROE for the past 12 months, 22 same period, estimated? It doesn't have to be precise. It's probably 100, maybe 150 basis points 23 Α 24 below. The big effect is this year, because we've got 500 of surplus depreciation in this year. So it's this 25

002005



1	bit of a challenge for the court reporter. So I'd just
2	ask Mr. Lavia to fully let Mr. Dewhurst finish his
3	answer before he begins his question.
4	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right.
5	You may proceed, Mr. Lavia.
6	MR. LAVIA: Thank you.
7	BY MR. LAVIA:
8	Q And this net operating income figure of
9	\$1.156 billion, is that after FPL covers all costs,
10	including depreciation and amortization; is that
11	correct?
12	A No.
13	${f Q}$ Okay. What does that number reflect then?
14	A It doesn't include the cost, the full cost of
15	capital. This number would lead to a deficiency
16	relative to the totality of the cost, and that
17	deficiency is worked through and that's the 516. So
18	when you take in the total cost, including cost of
19	capital, you get to the 516.
20	${f Q}$ Okay. What ROE on a non-cash basis would this
21	net operating income correspond to for FPL, if you can
22	tell me?
23	A If it's line 8, the 2013 number would
24	correspond to about 775. After Canaveral would come in
25	it would be 675 without rate relief.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Q And what ROE on a cash basis would this net operating income correspond to?

A Excuse me. About the same. I should, I should have been more precise earlier when I was responding to questions about cash ROE. I'm really thinking of adjusting the book ROE for the principal non -- big non-cash item, which is the surplus depreciation. So there might be some other smaller differences. But with that factored out, you then, in 2013 you have the 191 million left, so that's roughly 100 basis points. So the cash return would be, you know, 100 basis points below that.

Q Okay. Thank you. Could you -- that's all I have on that schedule. Thank you.

Please turn to page 19, line 7 of your testimony.

Q I'm sorry. This question asks about the risks associated with FPL's fossil fuel supply; is that correct?

Α

Α

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

That's correct.

Q On lines 13 through 14 of page 19 you state that FPL's the largest utility user of natural gas in the country. Is that accurate?

That's correct. That's my belief.

A Yes. Yes, sir.

Approximately how much natural gas does FPL 1 Q 2 use per year? In MMBtu? 3 Α 0 Yeah. 4 I don't know that off the top of my head. 5 Α MR. LAVIA: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to offer an 6 7 exhibit into evidence. I need a number. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure. We are at 558. 8 9 (Exhibit 558 marked for identification.) MR. LAVIA: Mr. Chairman, while it's being 10 passed out, heeding prior objections and in the spirit 11 of completeness, I have provided a complete copy of, of 12 what this is excerpted from to both the witness and to 13 Mr. Litchfield. 14 15 It is a, described as FPL's 2012 TYSP, which stands for Ten-Year Site Plan, schedule 5, fuel 16 17 requirements. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Any objections? 18 MR. LITCHFIELD: No, sir. 19 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Seeing none, you may 2.0 proceed. 21 22 BY MR. LAVIA: Mr. Dewhurst, please look, turn to the last 23 Q 24 page of that exhibit. 25 Α I'm there. FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

	0020
1	${f Q}$ And if you need it for any reason, the full
2	Ten-Year Site Plan is that large 250-page document to
3	your right.
4	A Thank you.
5	Q Do you see line 9?
6	A Yes, sir.
7	${f Q}$ What is the figure in column, in the column
8	labeled 2012? I'm sorry for the small print.
9	A I'm sorry for my eyes. 565962 units of
10	thousand MCF or MMBtus, so that's about, yeah, 585 BCF,
11	yes. That's about, that seems about right.
12	Q That's what it looks like to me. Thank you.
13	Can we, can we agree that do you understand the
14	difference between MCF and MMBtu and how they basically
15	correlate?
16	A No.
17	Q You do not?
18	A I have to refresh myself on the details of
19	that.
20	${f Q}$ Would it be fair for me to represent to you
21	that they're about a one-to-one correlation in terms of
22	how the industry deals with them?
23	A Yes, that's the way I think of them. That's
24	not technically accurate.
25	Q Okay. And can we
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

A That's not technically accurate, but that's the way I think of it.

MR. LITCHFIELD: Yeah. Mr. Lavia is speaking over the top of the witness, and it's very difficult to follow the conversation.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Really, if we can get both Mr. Lavia and Mr. Dewhurst to speak a little bit louder, because I'm having trouble hearing you, Mr. Dewhurst, if you could speak a little bit louder.

And, Mr. Lavia, if you could give some time for the response before you move into the next question. BY MR. LAVIA:

Q Is it, would it be fair to say that that column, that number that you just recited is equivalent to approximately 500 million MMBtu?

Α

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Yes, sir. I believe that's about right.

Q Okay. Thank you.

In the context, context of potential risks to FPL's customers, what would happen to FPL's rates, and I would include fuel charges in rates, for a year if the price of natural gas increased by \$3 per MMBtu?

A I can't answer that question. You'd have to go through a lot of calculations. Obviously it would depend upon what happened to the generation mix, what other actions we took to offset that increase. So

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

without knowing that I can't answer that.

Q Well, let's assume hypothetically that they used about the same amount of natural gas in the year, in my hypothetical year as they did in, as FPL does in 2012.

Α

I think that's very unlikely.

Q But for my hypothetical, could we assume that?
A I don't know what your hypothetical is doing.
Your hypothetical was to, hypothetically the price of natural gas goes up by 3 bucks, and you're asking me to

assume that we sit there and do nothing?

Q I, I'm assuming that you have the same power plants that you have, I'm assuming that you use the same amount of natural gas that you have used in the prior year, and gas goes up by \$3 per MMBtu. Would it be fair to assume that that would correspond to an increase in fuel charges of about \$1.5 billion?

A No, I don't think that would be --

Q Why is that?

A For the reasons I stated earlier.

Q Could you restate them?

A That those other factors wouldn't stay the same. Clearly the generation mix would change. We would dispatch the fleet differently. It also depends upon what's happened to other fuel prices. So I can't

	002
1	say.
2	MR. LAVIA: Thank you. I have no further
3	questions.
4	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right.
5	Mr. Saporito.
6	MR. SAPORITO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
7	CROSS EXAMINATION
8	BY MR. SAPORITO:
9	${f Q}$ Good afternoon, Mr. Dewhurst. My name is
10	Thomas Saporito. I'm here in a pro se capacity, just
11	representing myself, and I'll be very brief.
12	You were asked some questions by several
13	counsels here representing different parties with
14	respect to risk. Do you recall?
15	A Yes, sir.
16	${f Q}$ Okay. And I'm sorry if this might be a
17	little bit duplicative, but just for clarification, it's
18	my understanding that Florida Power & Light is a
19	subsidiary of a parent, NextEra Energy, Inc.; is that
20	correct?
21	A That's correct.
22	${f Q}$ And so if you wanted to become a shareholder
23	of FP&L, you would actually have to buy NextEra Energy
24	stock; is that true?
25	A If you wanted to become an indirect owner of

FPL, you would have to buy NextEra Energy stock, yes. You can't actually, you couldn't actually buy FPL stock. It's not traded.

Q So the only way you could own, be a part of FPL, you have to be a NextEra Energy shareholder; correct?

A No, that's not actually quite accurate from an economic perspective. It is possible to come very close to having an economic interest in FPL without having an economic interest in the rest of the organization. You would need to be a pretty sophisticated investor to do it, because it requires shorting some other things that have a risk profile that's comparable to the other sides of the organization, so you end up net economically kind of owning FPL. There are a few hedge funds who do that, but that's pretty sophisticated stuff.

Q Mr. Dewhurst, I would 100% agree with you, because I didn't understand any of that you just said. But a person like myself who wants to invest in, in Florida Power & Light, I would just go and look at the price of NextEra Energy's stock price and that's what I would consider buying; is that not true?

A Yes. That's typical for most utilities. There'll be a utility holding company, which is what you have to own.

Q And you talked at length about investors and how they analyze risk, and I'm not going to go over all those variables, but is it your understanding that an investor tries to mitigate risk by having a diverse portfolio of stocks? They would have a little bit of NextEra Energy, maybe own some GE, maybe Alcoa, that type of investment?

A Yes and no. Many investors do seek to diversify. I think most individual investors seek to diversify. But clearly there are institutional investors that deliberately do not diversify, because they believe they have some specific information about a sector and they want to be concentrated in that sector.

So it varies. Obviously if we talk about investors, we've got retail investors, we've got institutional investors. There's a lot of varieties there, so it's tough to generalize it.

Q Well, let's just talk about the retail investor, someone like myself. Would it be -- would I be able to have less, less risk with my assets if I bought a little bit of FP&L, a little bit of GE, a little bit of IBM, diversify in that manner?

A In general, yes.

Q Okay. And NextEra Energy, Inc., is a diversified company, are they not? Don't they invest in

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

25

24

renewable energies like wind energy and solar energy and nuclear energy, et cetera?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

A Yes. Obviously diversified is a, it's sort of a continuous variable, but we are diverse in some of our activities, yes.

Q So because NextEra Energy has, has a diversified energy portfolio, it makes them less risky of an investment as far as the retail investor is concerned; is that not true?

A Not necessarily. In general, I think having a diverse generation portfolio is a good thing and reduces risk. That's one of the reasons why we seek diversity in the FPL generation fleet. So in general, yeah, but not necessarily so.

Q Okay. And because Florida Power & Light Company is a subsidiary of its parent, NextEra Energy, an investor looks not primarily at FPL's risk assessment in the overall risk of investing in FPL, but the investor, the retail investor like myself would look at the diversification of the entire portfolio of NextEra Energy along with FP&L in assessing how much risk their capital would be under; is that not true?

A Not necessarily. If you were a retail investor in FPL's first mortgage bonds, you really wouldn't care about the risk profile of other parts of

the enterprise. If you're an equity investor in NextEra 1 Energy, then, yes, clearly you would be concerned about 2 the totality of the risks. 3 MR. SAPORITO: Okay. I have no further 4 questions. Thank you. 5 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you, Mr. Saporito. 6 7 Mr. Hendricks. MR. HENDRICKS: No questions for this witness. 8 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Staff? 9 MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, in lieu of staff's 10 questions, the parties have graciously agreed that staff 11 can enter Mr. Dewhurst's deposition transcript along 12 with his errata sheet and any attachments to it. And I 13 think we have one, one late-filed exhibit that was --14 15 and it's just a one-pager. It's a clarification from, I think, Mr. McGlothlin. 16 MR. MOYLE: What is it? 17 MR. YOUNG: It's just a one-pager late-filed 18 exhibit that was asked during the course of the 19 deposition. 2.0 MR. MOYLE: I'd just like to see it. 21 22 MR. LITCHFIELD: It was, it was served on all parties Sunday, but it's being distributed. 23 MR. YOUNG: And this would all be, this would 24 25 all fall under what is marked in the Comprehensive

002017

Exhibit List number 113.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. You all can take a look at it, and when we will deal with exhibits, we'll deal with entering and any objections at that time. Commissioners? Commissioner Brown. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. And thank you, Mr. Dewhurst. THE WITNESS: Good morning. **COMMISSIONER BROWN:** You were here yesterday and today. On page 13 of your direct, lines 11 through 12, you indicate that FPL's risk profile is greater than other utilities, as was addressed by some of the Intervenors here. I just want to be clear, is it just because of FPL's position in the southern point of Florida? THE WITNESS: No. That's my overall assessment of the totality of the risk factors. But clearly where we are has a great deal to do with it. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Can you expand a little bit? THE WITNESS: Yeah. Sure. I mean, we're at the bottom, the extreme end of everything, both electrically and from a fuel system perspective, so there is less support for us. So, for example, our neighbors to the north, Progress Energy, if they get

into trouble, they can draw both from Georgia and from us, and they frequently do. We always, everybody helps each other out.

We look behind us and all we've got is Cuba and the Bahamas, and I'm very fond of the Bahamians, but they can't support us either with fuel or electricity. So there's that aspect.

And then at the same time, because the exposure to tropical storm is such a big one and one that we can't ensure in the commercial markets, in contrast to ice storm damage, we are both on the front line when you look at statistically at where and when and with what frequency tropical storms hit, and at the wrong end of the country for getting support.

So a very good example is what we've been going through the last couple of days. All utilities, when they see a storm coming, get on the phone and they start making requests for resources. Well, not unnaturally, people who are a little bit to the north of us want to make sure that if it affects them, they've got enough resources to deal with that. But we're down on the bottom; statistically we're going to get hit first. We've got to get our share of the resources and they've also got to travel further.

So it's a whole combination of operational

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

things like that. So, yes, where we are in Florida has a great deal to do with it. But it's not, to be fair, the totality. And as my testimony says, there are some things where my judgment is that we actually have a lower risk profile than others. I've tried to take all of that into account in thinking about what kind of balance sheet we need to maintain and what I think a fair and reasonable ROE is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you for clarifying that. Also on the same page, lines 17 through 19, you provide that FPL is currently in the midst of the largest capital expansion program in its history, and of course that adds to its risk profile.

Under whose directive is FPL operating under? Is it FPL, is it the federal regulations, PSC, NextEra?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. With respect to the capital program? Fundamentally that's our initiative. Depending upon what the capital is being deployed against, it may well and, in fact, has required us to come before this Commission to seek specific approval.

So the principal reason why the Capex is so large at this stage is because of the big generation projects, which have obviously been previously approved based on a need determination here. What I think of as the ongoing infrastructure capital is the annual set of,

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

you know, the annual planning process, annual set of decisions that we make as to what's the appropriate ongoing level that we need.

So I view those as fundamentally our accountability to you is to come in periodically through these proceedings, or any time you want to have us come in, when you review the totality. But in between those periods it's up to us to figure out what we should be spending and how it's going to benefit customers.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay. Thank you. And with regard to the adder, the 25-basis-points adder, is it just based on maintaining the lowest customer bill, or is it also factors like reliability also factored into that, your proposal?

THE WITNESS: Let me be very clear on this, because I know there's been some confusion about it. My testimony before you is that you should decide whether to award an adder on your assessment of the totality of our performance. So that -- seen through customers' eyes; right? How well are we doing in delivering value to our customers?

To me, that means the combination of bills, because we know customers care about bills, reliability, because we know they care about reliability, and customer service. When they call us, they want whatever

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

their issue is taken care of efficiently and promptly.

I think there are a few other things that are also important. I do think our emission profile is important from a consumer perspective, but personally I would weight that one a little bit lower.

But to be clear, my testimony is that you should decide on that basis, and that you should include warts and all, the good stuff along with the bad, and then decide.

However, for the purposes of these proceedings, and to try and give people some reassurance and some conservatism, we have proposed that that adder would only be maintained as long as we continue to have that lowest bill. So to me that's just a win-win.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: That's good. Thank you for explaining that a little bit more thoroughly. I got a little confused with the testimonies.

Since the last rate case, and this may be a little duplicative, but I just want, again, for clarification purposes, while it's been acknowledged that S&P and Moody's downgraded the credit ratings of FPL, I mean, how did this actually, actually impact FPL's ability to get access to credit?

THE WITNESS: That's a hard question to answer because of the existence of the settlement agreement.

So if you go through in time, we have the, what I call the presettlement order as the culmination of the last rate case. That led to a downgrade in credit. We weren't in the capital markets much at that time. Then we entered into the settlement agreement. That provided some reassurance to investors that there was going to be time for us to get things back on track.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Right. Like the Fitch.

THE WITNESS: So the net is I think today, to this point in time, our true cost structure hasn't been hurt that much through all of this. It's more a question of what might have been and do, frankly, do we want to risk going further down that path.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. I appreciate that. With -- and last question. With regard to the storm cost recovery that FPL wants to continue from the 2010 rate case settlement, can you explain in more detail from what you've provided in your direct testimony the reasoning behind keeping the framework in place? I understand it's on a temporary basis, and so I want to know the reasoning behind that and whether, when you plan on converting it back to the traditional framework.

THE WITNESS: Let me take the last question first, because it's the easiest one. I don't know.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

21 22 23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

25

24

Fundamentally there's a history here. Parties have disagreed on what's the best way to recover prudently incurred storm costs. Each time we disagree, there is a significant debate that goes on, and that chews up administrative resources.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

While we -- I continue to believe that the traditional method is fundamentally superior, we've been satisfied with the current, current framework, which, to be very clear, was just one part of a broader set of negotiations for the settlement agreement, but we're essentially saying if we want, if we can lift that out and use that for the moment, that's a reasonable compromise. That's really what it boils down to.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: That may be not satisfactory, I understand, but --

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I understand. Thank you. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Commissioner Balbis. COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I eliminated two of my questions because Commissioner Brown already asked those. But I want to focus a little bit with you, Mr. Dewhurst, on the accelerated amortization of surplus depreciation. And I asked Witness Barrett a few questions on that, and I want to expand a little further, more about the

25

accounting treatment of that surplus depreciation. If you're able to answer that, I'd appreciate it.

THE WITNESS: I'll try. Accounting is not my forte.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Well, that makes two of us.

But, in essence, the use of the surplus depreciation, as far as impact on, on perceived revenues or income, would it be correct to say that the use of the surplus depreciation from a surveillance standpoint made it look as if FPL was receiving additional income than it was, or, or its expenses were less than they were?

THE WITNESS: The latter is I think the more, they're both the same functionally. Yes. And that's really when we had this conversation about the difference between regulatory return and the cash return, that's really the difference.

So the, to be clear, what happened last time was coming out of the depreciation study there was a surplus. The traditional, what I would characterize as the traditional method would have been to flow that back over the remaining life of the asset. So in this case, let's say hypothetically there was 800 million, and the average asset life was, I'm going to do it 20 because I

need the math, that would have meant 40 million a year of future credit to expenses. So lower rates, other things equal, in all future years.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Instead what the Commission chose to do was require the 800 to be amortized over four years. So think of it as 200 a year on average. So that allowed the rates to be kept lower in the short-term. But once you've used up the accounting credit, you've got to go back to the underlying cost structure. And, as I think Witness Barrett testified, in the meantime your rate base has grown to be a little bit bigger than it otherwise would have been.

So it effectively accelerated rate relief at the expense of creating a cliff later on, which is what we're now dealing with.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Right. And I want to expand on that and on the one point you made on, in essence, a \$200 million credit. But that credit didn't exist, it wasn't a surplus account that had cash that FPL accessed in order to either increase the income or decrease the expenses.

THE WITNESS: No, sir. No, sir. And that's why Mr. Silagy made the comment at one point that he's yet to be able to get suppliers to take surplus depreciation in payment. It's an accounting treatment.

It's perfectly valid from an accounting perspective, but it doesn't give us any cash.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: So would it have been better for this Commission in 2009 to have allowed FPL to recover the revenues associated with its expenses to -- and once you take the expenses out, be allowed to actually earn that rate of return of 10%?

THE WITNESS: Commissioner, you're putting me in a very awkward position.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Well, let me, let me try to help you then, because I understand the position you're in and I don't want to make it awkward. I'm just trying to make sure I understand.

From a cash flow standpoint, it would have been better for FPL to actually receive the revenues it needed to offset the expenses and still earn the allowed rate of return.

THE WITNESS: Correct. I agree with that.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. I want to shift gears a little bit on, on FPL's ability to manage the ROE.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: And you indicated over the past year that in the earnings surveillance reports FPL has consistently earned 11%.
5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

1

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: With the surplus depreciation reserve amount being exhausted after 190 million that's left, what will FPL's ability be to manage their ROE? Will you still be at the high end of the range, or do you expect you'd be back towards the fluctuation where you were before?

THE WITNESS: Based on everything that we see today, if you were to hypothetically accept, you know, our entire petition, then for the test year we would be at the proposed midpoint, plus or minus whatever, we would have no flexibility, it would be whatever the business does, and then presumably in the subsequent year, in '14, we would have a loss of the 190 -remaining 191 million credit. So our starting point would be 191 million pretax lower.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. And that really hits on my concern, is that you indicate in your testimony that the appropriate ROE, and you referenced other witnesses, was 11.25%. And if FPL has consistently earned, albeit perhaps because of the surplus depreciation, at the high end that 11.25, the highest authorized rate of return would really be 12.25. Is that correct? If we, if the Commission allows that 100 basis point spread.

THE WITNESS: Theoretically we would be able to earn up to 12.25, but as a practical matter it would be fundamentally different from the situation we're in right now where the settlement agreement gives us the flexibility so that we know -- it's not guaranteed by any means, but, you know, with reasonable certainty that we can get to a level that's closer to investor expectations.

And that was part of what got investors comfortable with the settlement agreement as an interim step.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. I mean, I hope you understand the position we're in. At some point the increase of the allowed ROE results in revenue requirements that really are in excess of what the company would need in order to access capital, so that's really the decision point that we have.

And the last line of questioning is on, on capital structure. You indicate that the ratio has been in effect for several years and that it has served the customers well.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: My question, and really the other point you made was that there was no good reason to change it.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 1 2 **COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Would there be any detrimental effects for the customer if you did change 3 it? 4 THE WITNESS: Oh, I think over time, if we 5 weaken the capital structure, yes, it will eventually 6 7 hinder our ability to continue delivering the kind of customer value proposition we do. That absolutely is my 8 9 testimony. 10 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Thank you. That's all I had. 11 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Commissioner Graham. 12 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Thank, Mr. Chairman. 13 Mr. Dewhurst, how are you today? 14 15 THE WITNESS: Good morning, sir. COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Several of the 16 Intervenors and some of the Commissioners have talked 17 about the, the downgrading in your, by the rating 18 agencies after the last rate increase. Was it one or 19 two or three of the major rating, rating agencies that 2.0 downgraded you? 21 22 THE WITNESS: In the end only two actually downgraded us. The third, Fitch, started out with a 23 negative outlook. And then when the settlement 24 25 agreement came into force, they took the negative off.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Did you meet with the two rating agencies that downgraded you after the last rate increase to get more details on why they downgraded you?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, we did.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: And can you tell me what some of those, some of the reasoning was on the, the downgrade?

THE WITNESS: Well, I can do better than that. I mean, we have the -- I don't have them here, but their explicit reasoning is in the, in the credit report.

Specifically they were concerned about increased regulatory risk in the State of Florida from an investor perspective. There was a widely shared perception that what had been one of the best, most constructive is typically the term used, regulatory environments had significantly changed. And that obviously was a function of a number of different things, but it included the 10% ROE award, which was, you know, in the context at the time very low. It included the order to accelerate the amortization of surplus depreciation. But even more important, it was investor perceptions of the overall climate within Florida, not strictly limited to regulatory, but also encompassing the political environment within which

regulators have to operate.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

And to paraphrase my friend, Dr. Avera, that's not me saying it. That's, you know, I'm not the one that counts. It's investors.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Now did they tell you, did they place any of that blame -- and don't get me wrong, I appreciate what you said about the changes in the regulatory environment here in the State of Florida. Of course I think that's why most of us are here now, because of that. Did they say any of the things that maybe Florida Power & Light was at fault on why the rating went down?

THE WITNESS: I don't know if there's specifically anything at fault. Obviously all the other credit factors come in there. To the extent that we are perceived by investors of having contributed to the decline in the regulatory environment, I suppose, you know, that's there. But I don't, I don't think so.

19 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. That's all the 20 questions I have.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. I have a couple of questions for you, Mr. Dewhurst.

23 On page 14 you talk about uncertainty in 24 customer growth as, as a risk. Are you aware of any 25 utility anywhere that doesn't have that risk?

THE WITNESS: No, sir. Everybody has that risk. My testimony is that it's relatively greater for us in Florida.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. We talked to you a little bit about -- you have an exhibit, let me make sure I have the right one -- MD-2, where you talk about, where it sort of lays out a trend in ROE or an historical view of ROE for electric companies and other utilities here in the State of Florida.

And so in the '70s range was 12%, '80s, 16%, and if I look at the trend lately, and even before the area that, that the time period that might be considered a questionable time frame, the trend is downward. What would suggest to you that the trend now begins to move upward?

THE WITNESS: Fundamentally the outlook for interest rates. Obviously -- well, perhaps not obviously, but the single biggest driver of this sort of broad upward and then downward trend is the change in underlying interest rates. So those have been coming down. They are about as low in my judgment as they're likely to get. The forward curve shows them going up. The consensus clearly is they're going to go up. There is a huge disagreement about when and how much. But that's fundamentally looking forward the, the driver

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

that we have to consider.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: The other question that I have is, what was the impact of Fukushima on, what was the impact of Fukushima on FPL's or NextEra's ability to, to go out to the markets? What type of concrete impact did that have, if any?

THE WITNESS: I think very little, surprisingly little actually. I was pleasantly surprised by how well, if you like, the capital markets reacted to that event. Obviously because we have nuclear exposure we're concerned about what the reaction might have been. Clearly there's going to be a cost impact. Witness Stall testified to that.

But in terms of turmoil in the markets or, you know, impact for companies like ours that have that, that piece, the fact that it was outside of the U.S. regulatory regime was reassuring to investors.

So the real, the risk impact, if you like, is indirectly through the changes that then occur via the NRC and affect the cost structure.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. On page 39, looking at lines 8 through 16, you talk about burden, under -- the shareholder's burden under the settlement agreement, and there is mention there of having to draw a \$250 million line of credit to establish reasonable

24

25

assurance that FPL would be able to be liquid and so forth. What was the cost borne by FPL shareholders?

THE WITNESS: I can't give you an exact number on that.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Was there any cost?

THE WITNESS: Oh, there was certainly a cost, yes. There's an ongoing cost because of the change in our commercial paper rating. The recent renewal that we did of the credit facilities, there was probably a \$3 million increase just on the cost of the credit facilities. So all of these things are sort of cumulative, but I can't give you a total number at this point.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. What did shareholders earn in 2010 versus 2011?

THE WITNESS: On a regulatory basis it continued to be the 11%, consistent with the settlement agreement.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Now specific to shareholders, what costs -- or was the cost to shareholders that you mentioned outweighed by their earnings during that period?

THE WITNESS: I would say not so much outweighed as absorbed into the total calculation of earnings. If you're, if you're trying to saying

magnitude --1 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Right. 2 THE WITNESS: -- clearly the, the specific 3 pieces we're talking here are small relative to the 4 totality. 5 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Understood. So to summarize 6 7 that question, I guess I'll restate it in a different way. 8 9 Did shareholders take a loss in essence? THE WITNESS: No, sir. Incurred incremental 10 costs, but certainly didn't take a loss. 11 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Thank you. 12 Commissioner Edgar. 13 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. Thank you, 14 15 Mr. Chairman. Just, probably just one question, unless that engenders a second. 16 17 But in response to Commissioner Brown's question about the storm charge reserve and the, the 18 19 lack of current and requested annual addition to the 2.0 reserve, the mechanism that is laid out from the settlement agreement, so in your response to her 21 22 questions along that line, I believe you said that in the past that decisions as to mechanisms for post storm 23 potential recovery engendered a lot of discussion and a 24 25 lot of administrative resources. When you said that,

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

1

were you referring -- did you mean administrative resources within FPL or broader than that?

THE WITNESS: I was referring broadly to ourselves, Intervenors, staff, yourselves, and, you know, many of the issues are ones that we've talked about on multiple occasions, so we just felt like, given the complexity of the core of the case, that was something that we could pull off the table, if we have in a sense the protection that we currently have that's a consequence of one narrow item in the settlement agreement.

I don't want to be unclear. We are clearly lifting that as a pattern from something. It was agreed to as part of a broader set of negotiations, but we think it makes a reasonable template to use.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And when, and so just to close out that line then, when I think of options for possible recovery of direct storm, post storm impacts, and immediately before a storm, I guess I would include that, I think of a request for surcharge as is prescribed by statute, the securitization option, or, I guess, no end, I guess a third option would be no request for recovery of direct costs. Is there another option beyond what the reserve would provide?

THE WITNESS: Beyond what the reserve would

1

provide, we would have to come back to you in some form or another for either a temporary surcharge on the customer rate, or we'd be back in the securitization process, which, as you recall, was a very lengthy process.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I do recall that.

THE WITNESS: Which in the meantime ties up our balance sheet. So that's, that was, that's part of the core of that. But I don't know that there are any other mechanisms that I could think of.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: All right. Thank you. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Any further questions by Commissioners?

Okay. I'm debating whether I have one more. Actually I will, I do have one more, if you refer to your testimony on page 40.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Between lines 14, moving on to page 41 up to line 3, where you say, I recommend that the test year equity ratio of 59.6% based on investor sources equivalent to 46% on all sources be approved. This is consistent with the ratio approved by the Commission in 2010 and deemed appropriate.

So you refer to the 59.6 equity ratio that was approved in the settlement agreement, and therefore you

25

say that we should continue down that path this go-round. Such a request is consistent with your argument for consistency and predictability you made earlier in your testimony, at least in your written testimony.

My question is if the equity ratio of 59.6 should remain the same, why shouldn't the ROE midpoint remain the same?

THE WITNESS: Okay. First, before I answer your question, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to do something which nobody should do, which is try and correct the Chairman, but I have to.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Look, this Chairman is humble.

MR. LITCHFIELD: I tried to tell him.
(Laughter.)

THE WITNESS: The 59.6, effectively the current capital structure was in the Commission's order, so that was not a creation of the settlement agreement. The settlement agreement then continued that.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure.

THE WITNESS: Okay. So then to the core of your question, my response is, we're now coming back again. The settlement agreement was a temporary bridge which got investors over the shock value that you heard

about. But fundamentally we need to come back to, I would call it normal rate of return regulation. That's what we're asking for.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

My testimony is that 11.25% is a reasonable number as a midpoint, given today's circumstances and the totality of our conditions. Clearly Intervenors have a different perspective on that, and we are ultimately depending upon your judgment as to what the right number should be.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: So, so your testimony is that, what is it, 11.25 would be the appropriate amount. But would you agree that anything within the range, as Dr. Avera suggested, 10.25 to, he went all the way up to 12.25, would be appropriate?

THE WITNESS: Yes. It's a little hard for me to get away from that because I do believe that's right. I think the further away you are from 11.25, either towards the 12.25 or the 10.25, I have more of a problem with that. But clearly it's a judgment call. There's no analytical technique on earth that can produce a perfect number here. It is a judgment call.

> CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you very much. Redirect.

MR. LITCHFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. LITCHFIELD:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Q And on that note, Mr. Dewhurst, let me ask you this, if the Commission adopted the lowest end of Dr. Avera's range of 10.25, isn't it true that typically there's a band or a range of plus or minus 100 basis points on either side of that midpoint?

A Yes. And when I was discussing that, I was in my mind assuming the continuation of that standard practice here in Florida.

Q But the southern end of that band in this hypothetical would be outside or below Dr. Avera's range, would it not?

A That's true.

Q Okay. Okay. I want to refer you back to Mr. Lavia's questions for a moment. Do you recall that -- I think he identified this as Exhibit 558. He showed you an excerpt from FPL's Ten-Year Site Plan and talked to you about gas consumption and the potential rise in gas prices. Do you recall that discussion?

Α

I recall that.

Q What does FPL do to mitigate against natural gas price increases?

A Well, we do several things that have been -obviously we have the fuel hedging program in place, which is a, at least a short-term mitigant. The

fundamental thing though that we do and have been doing for a long time is work on making the efficiency of the system better. If we can burn less fuel per kilowatt hour generated, then when our gas prices are low or high it's a benefit. But particularly if gas prices start to rise, it becomes, you know, proportionately more of a benefit.

Q And now you mentioned FPL's hedging program in part of your answer. What is necessary for FPL to engage in that hedging program?

A There are a variety of things. Obviously we have to have the capability of entering into the required transactions. But the most significant thing we need is a balance sheet, because we can't support the credit obligations and the liquidity obligations on that hedging program without the credit strength and balance sheet. And, you know, frankly, I would love to be able to go out further and hedge further out, but we don't have the, a big enough balance sheet to do that. So we're thinking about some other things, but we need a balance sheet.

Q Now remaining on Mr. Lavia's line of questioning relative to the natural gas consumption by Florida Power & Light Company and the potential for natural gas price increases, have you looked at what

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

FPL's gas costs on a per kilowatt hour basis have done over the last three to five years?

A Yes, I did. And I was pleased to see that we are now not merely the lowest in the state on O&M per kilowatt hour, but now our actual fuel cost per kilowatt hour is the lowest. That's a combination of a number of things; a combination obviously of the fact we have nuclear efficient combined cycle units.

Q Thank you. Mr. Lavia also focused you on Schedule A1 and asked you about FPL's earnings on a non-cash basis. Do you recall those questions?

A Yes, I do.

Q Now is the difference between reporting on a non-cash basis and a cash basis and the difference between the figures that you discussed and others in this case have discussed on a non-cash versus cash basis, is essentially the difference between those two figures the amount of reserve surplus depreciation that is, that is booked?

MR. SUNDBACK: Mr. Chairman, we'll object. This is another textbook example of leading the witness.

MR. LITCHFIELD: I can rephrase the question. I apologize.

MR. SUNDBACK: And, excuse me, Mr. Chairman. Given our experience with prior witnesses, we'd

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

appreciate FPL's counsel attempt to refrain from this going forward. This has been a consistent theme, and we don't want to interrupt the flow of redirect, but it has been a consistent practice, it is troubling, and it's contrary to established practice, especially redirecting an articulate expert witness.

MR. LITCHFIELD: Well, counsel will also note that a number of predicate type questions as leading are permissible that don't go to the ultimate conclusion. And in terms of efficiency, that's what I was attempting to do. I am happy to restate that question though.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Please do.

BY MR. LITCHFIELD:

Q Mr. Dewhurst, what is the essential difference between the reported figures or the figures that have been discussed in this proceeding by you and others as between cash and non-cash?

A I think I actually referred to this earlier. But when I'm talking about the cash return, I was factoring out the impact of surplus depreciation. Other effects would be minor.

Q Okay. Now Commissioner Balbis again asked you about the, the amount of reserve surplus that was available in the test year; correct? Do you recall that question?

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

24

25

23

24

25

Correct. 191.

Α

Q Now we -- again, as a matter of predicate, I think it's been established as a rough order of magnitude that about \$160 million equates to 100 basis points. Would you agree with that?

A Yes. That's the rule of thumb that we've used repeatedly over the last few days.

Q Now can you explain for the Commission what, all other things equal, what the impact on FPL's cash earnings would be in the test year without the rate relief requested, taking into account the \$191 million you discussed with Commissioner Balbis?

MR. MOYLE: Mr. Chairman, to the extent that the witness is referring to a document to get his answer, I think it would be helpful that he just identify the document so we have it for the record.

THE WITNESS: Sure. I was just refreshing my memory on A-1, because I was confused between the test year and 2014.

So for the test year it would be down to about sort of around 7, maybe a little below 7.

BY MR. LITCHFIELD:

Q Okay. Thank you.

Now do you recall Mr. McGlothlin discussing with you the change in share price over a period of time

that I believe in his example commenced with the initial order of the last Commission? This would have been prior to this order approving the settlement agreement. Do you recall that discussion?

A Yes, I do.

Q What in your view would be the relevant time period over which to consider the impact on FPL's share price relative to the outcome of the last rate case?

A In my judgment, because, as I've indicated in my earlier testimony, share prices are inherently forward-looking, they incorporate expectations. The appropriate time is to go back to essentially the beginning of the rate case. And if you look at the, the numbers there, as I think I indicated earlier, we lost about 20% of our market capitalization in that period up to the actual rate order. By the time the rate order came out, it was obviously clear to investors where we were. So the specifics of it were more confirmation of expectations.

Q So did I understand your answer correctly to be -- at the time that the rate case hearing started, FPL's stock price, how did it compare to some of the other major indicators such as the S&P 500 or any other, any other index you'd like to discuss?

MR. MOYLE: I, I object to the extent that the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

question, the original question asked specifically for time frames, and the answer was not really specific with respect to time frames. The question now is posed with respect to a rate case. And it's just unclear as to, as to the time frames, to me anyway, that are being solicited or sought.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

I think if it could be more precise and more clear so that, that we understand. And I'm okay on the answer, but I just, it's not precise with respect to the question on, on time frames.

MR. LITCHFIELD: The witness was asked for a, an impact, an impact in terms of change of stock price during a specific time period that Mr. McGlothlin wanted him to address. And I've just asked the witness what he views as the relevant time period, and I would now simply like to ask him what the impact in stock price has been over what he views as the relevant period.

MR. SUNDBACK: Mr. Chairman, if we could, the witness referenced a 20% decrease in stock price, if the note taking here is correct, but there were no specific dates associated with it and so we don't really have a context. And I think the record would be benefited if we understand sort of the start date from which the snapshot was taken and the 20% decline is measured. That would give us some notion of the period that

Mr. Dewhurst views as relevant for purposes of assessing the impact of the prior rate order.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LITCHFIELD: In the interest of efficiency, I thought I could take the witness through based on his understanding. But I have an exhibit that I'm happy to distribute, if that will aid counsel and the Commission, and then we'll all be looking at the time periods that we're discussing here and seeing the actual impact.

MR. MOYLE: I would object to that. I mean, it's not a hard question. It's what is the relevant time period that you believe? He can say September this to November that.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you.

Mr. Litchfield, if you could re-pose your question, please.

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

Q So, Mr. Dewhurst, the point of departure in terms of, of your assessment as to what the relevant time period would be for looking at the impact on FPL's stock price from the last case, would you restate that for the record, please?

A Yes. I think there are a number of possibilities. They are fundamentally in the summer of

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

2009. The specific date, it doesn't really matter. I don't think you want to focus too much on any date.

In my own mind I go back to roughly the August time frame, because that was when there was a lot of information generally available to investors that began to get them very concerned. So in my mind it's the August of 2009 time frame.

Q And with regard to that time frame then, can you tell me, not in precise price terms but in relative terms, how FPL's stock compared to other major market indices at that time, and then tell us how that changed or didn't change over your relevant time period?

MR. McGLOTHLIN: I object because it goes beyond the scope of cross-examination. The, the questions during cross-examination were geared toward the claim by the company that the reaction of the credit agencies at the time of the decision was one of disappointment. And the limited questions on cross related to what happened during the stock price, from that point forward to July 2010.

And the question that is being put to the witness at this point goes far beyond anything that was mentioned either by the company in his direct statement or by Intervenors on cross-examination.

MR. LITCHFIELD: Mr. Chair? They were

entitled to get the answer to their question relative to their time period, and I'm simply asking now for the answer to, from Mr. Dewhurst relative to his time period.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. McGLOTHLIN: But that's wrong because --

MR. LITCHFIELD: And I understand why they don't want the answer.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: No. Counsel is mistaken, because the witness's first time frame and the company's statements during this case all relate to the reaction of the credit agencies to the decision. That is the appropriate point in time.

Now during his answer, Mr. Dewhurst says, well, you said March, but it actually was in January. And I accepted that as, as a reasonable comment on my question, and he answered accordingly.

But, but now counsel for FPL is trying to change the parameters of, of the company's own direct testimony, and that's why I'm objecting. It's beyond the scope of, not only of cross but of their own statements in the case.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Mary Anne?

MR. LITCHFIELD: Mr. McGlothlin has opened the door. He asked about stock prices in a time period, and I'd like to ask the same question relative to the

witness's time period.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

MR. McGLOTHLIN: The door I opened had to do with the decision.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Gentlemen. Thank you. Thank you. you.

Mary Anne?

MS. HELTON: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if you've ever heard me read from *Florida Civil Practice* by Judge Philip Padovano. He's a judge in the 1st District Court of Appeal here in Tallahassee. If you don't mind, I'd like to.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure.

MS. HELTON: The purpose of the questioning on redirect is to clarify, explain, or limit facts brought out on cross-examination. The right to question a witness on redirect examination cannot be used as an opportunity to bring out facts that were not discussed on cross-examination. To the contrary, the questions on redirect must be within the scope of the cross-examination.

MR. LITCHFIELD: And may I respond to that? MS. HELTON: I'm not sure I'm finished, Mr. Litchfield.

24 MR. LITCHFIELD: I apologize. I apologize,
25 Mary Anne.

MS. HELTON: I agree with Mr. McGlothlin. It seems to me that Mr. Litchfield is going beyond the scope of the cross-examination that Mr. McGlothlin had asked and some of the other parties here had asked, and it seems to me that Mr. Litchfield is trying to bring out on redirect information that should have been put before you on their direct case.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. So then I will sustain the objection.

MR. LITCHFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll move on to my next question.

BY MR. LITCHFIELD:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Q Do you recall, Mr. Dewhurst, the hypothetical that Mr. Sundback offered you in terms of utility A and utility B, as I recall, one had 100 customers, one had 1,000 customers, but the same unit generating electricity for those customers and the same output, as I recall, of 1,000 megawatt hours? Do you recall that hypothetical?

A I do recall struggling to understand what was apparently a very simple example.

Q All right. So if the same output is being generated by those two utilities, what does that suggest with respect to the consumption of the utility's customers, customer base of 100 and the utility's

Т



try to locate it, if necessary, during the lunch break, FPL said, we don't, we don't have anything like that. So to now arrive in the 13th hour and attempt to lay into the record in redirect some attempt at quantification strikes us as somewhat problematic.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Mr. Litchfield?

MR. LITCHFIELD: Mr. Chairman, I think it's a fair question. I'm a little surprised at the objections, but I can ask a slightly different question that may not elicit the objection.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. That's fine. BY MR. LITCHFIELD:

Mr. Dewhurst, do you, did you provide Q testimony in this proceeding relative to the negative implications, or the implications -- let me remove the term negative -- the implications of an impairment to the company's financial integrity?

> Generally, yes. Α

And what -- would you please summarize that? Q

Generally speaking, a downgrade would limit Α our financial flexibility. It would over time lead to higher costs, and I believe eventually, I can't tell you exact time frame, would undermine our ability to continue investing, and ultimately lead to poorer quality of service for our customers.

	00203
1	${f Q}$ Thank you. Mr. Moyle asked you a few
2	questions on, on FPL's pension management. Do you
3	recall those questions?
4	A Generally, yes.
5	${f Q}$ Do you recall him asking you about the
6	expected rate of return for that fund?
7	A Yes, I do.
8	Q Can you tell me what types of investments are
9	in that pension fund, in general terms?
10	A As I think I testified earlier, it's a wide
11	range of things. Because of a very well funded
12	situation, it's a very conservative low risk profile, so
13	it's heavily in low risk investments.
14	Q Low risk meaning fixed income securities?
15	A There's a lot of fixed income in there.
16	Q Are those
17	A Other things, too.
18	${f Q}$ Is it, again, as a matter of predicate, fixed
19	income, is that, is that similar to debt, or is it debt
20	in many cases, fixed income securities?
21	A Yes. When I speak of fixed income, these are
22	typically debt securities or debt-like securities.
23	${f Q}$ And you gave the, the remind me again the
24	number that you gave Mr. Moyle as an expected
25	A Expected return for accounting purposes today
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

is 7.75%.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

16

17

19

2.0

23

24

25

Right. And FPL's capital structure has both Q debt and equity in it, does it not? Α Yes, sir. And what's its weighted average cost of Q capital, as proposed in this case? Based on the filing it's 7.0%. Α Okay. My last question, or two or three Q questions perhaps, if it takes that much, Mr. Dewhurst, relates to the two pages of exhibit, marked as Exhibit 556 that Mr. Sundback walked you through. 11 As I recall these, other than the title page of the 12 13 presentation, these were two pages from a much larger document. Do you recall that? 14 Yes, sir. 15 Α Would you please turn to the back of that Q document, you'll see about five pages there, beginning at page 51? 18 Yes, sir. Α It's entitled cautionary statement and risk Q factors that may affect future results? 21 22 Yes, sir. Α There are five pages of these risk factors and Q cautionary statements; agreed? I believe there's more than that. Α FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

	002
1	Q Oh, I apologize. You're right.
2	A They go up through page 60.
3	${f Q}$ The back end of my copy had a page 55. I
4	think that was inadvertent. Somebody else may be
5	missing page 55 from their copy.
6	So ten pages then?
7	A By my count, yes.
8	${f Q}$ Okay. Why does the company include these
9	materials in connection with presentations that are made
10	available to investors?
11	A As part of our effort to ensure that investors
12	have a full context for everything we're disclosing, and
13	these are obviously key risk factors which they need to
14	understand.
15	${f Q}$ Now the two pages that Mr. Sundback focused
16	you on, I think he asked you, among other questions he
17	asked you whether those are typical of the types of
18	pages that are included in these types of presentations.
19	Do you remember that question?
20	A I don't exactly.
21	${f Q}$ Okay. I'd like you to turn to page, pages 21
22	and 22.
23	A Yes, sir.
24	Q And what do these pages contain?
25	MR. SUNDBACK: Mr. Chairman, could we get a
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

point of clarification at this stage from FPL? Is FPL intending to move into the record the entirety of the document? If they are not, then we're, we have a question as to what we're doing with this redirect. We'd like to have clarification of what their intention is with regard to the document.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LITCHFIELD: Mr. Chairman, we don't intend to move the entire document into the record. I don't think it's necessary. As Mr. Sundback examined Mr. Dewhurst on a couple of pages, I think it's within our right to redirect on a couple of pages, but we don't intend to move the whole document into the record.

MR. SUNDBACK: Mr. Chairman, we'd like to understand at that point then whether FPL does not have any objections to our movement of the pages on which we conducted cross-examination. If that's the case, we wouldn't have an objection coming out of the gate on cross-examination of other pages.

However, if it's going to be, let's call it a mismatch in the sense that they want to cross-examine out of a couple of pages and object to the pages we conducted cross-examination on, we would object to this procedure. And that's really what we're trying to understand is what, what's FPL contemplating with regard to our pages and the document in general?

25

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Mr. Litchfield.

MR. LITCHFIELD: Thank you. I think, I think I can clarify and will resolve Mr. Sundback's concern.

I have a couple of questions on a couple of the pages. I don't even propose to move those into the record. We will not object to the two pages that Mr. Sundback will ask to have moved, with one exception, and that is that we would include the last ten pages of the cautionary statements along with it. But beyond that, we're fine.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Mr. Sundback?

MR. SUNDBACK: Mr. Chairman, we appreciate your soliciting that clarification from FPL. For the time being we have no objection just out of the gate to the cross-examination. We'd like to reserve the opportunity, once we've heard the questions and seen the use, to assess those.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure.

MR. SUNDBACK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Mr Litchfield.

BY MR. LITCHFIELD:

Q So, Mr. Dewhurst, on 21 and 22, these pages contain what?

A Pages 21 and 22 show -- 21 shows some history, but they're fundamentally our view as of the date of the

document, which is June 2nd, 2010, of what the projected capital expenditures for FPL would be, and specifically on 22, to give investors a sense for the major projects that we were then pursuing. But am I right that updated information Q relative to these initiatives or current Capex initiatives would be in the current case --MR. MOYLE: Leading. MR. LITCHFIELD: Well, I'm -- this is why, counselor, I don't need to offer these into evidence. I just need him to affirm that these, these materials or this information is already in the record in this case. Is that objectionable? CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Mr. Litchfield, ask your question. MR. LITCHFIELD: Okay. Thank you. BY MR. LITCHFIELD: I'm sorry. Did I get an answer? Q Could you repeat the question? Α This, the information generally reflected on Q slides 21 and 22 would be of the type of information that is included in this case; correct? Yes and no. To the extent that the year, the Α time period overlaps, we would have in the current filing whatever our best estimate of the Capex for those FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

projects is. To the extent that the time periods don't overlap, then obviously that would not be reflected in the filing.

Q Okay. Now Mr. Sundback showed you page 14 from this deck, and I'd like you to just look at page, pages 15 and page 16. Tell me first what these pages relate to.

MR. SUNDBACK: Mr. Chairman, just as a point of clarification, we didn't conduct any cross-examination on page 14. Now I don't know whether that's material as a foundation for Mr. Litchfield's questions, but we didn't ask him about page, what's numbered 14 on the lower left-hand corner. We asked him about, questions about the pages numbered 4 and 18.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: 18.

MR. LITCHFIELD: I apologize if I got the page number incorrect.

BY MR. LITCHFIELD:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Q Mr. Dewhurst, do you, do you have the question pending?

A On pages 15 and 16, it has been a common practice for a long time for us to share with our investors our overall cost performance, reliability performance. So page 15 speaks to our O&M per kilowatt hour, our fossil heat rate history trend, and page 16

speaks to our relative bill comparison. 1 All right. Same concluding question on an 2 Q updated basis. Is this information reflective of 3 information that's been filed in this case? 4 Yes. I believe all these have been included, Α 5 updated for this case. 6 7 **MR. LITCHFIELD:** That's all I have. Thank 8 you. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you very much. Now we 9 will deal with exhibits for Mr. Dewhurst. 10 FPL. 11 MR. LITCHFIELD: FPL would move 211 and 212. 12 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. 211 and 212. Are 13 there any objections to 211, 212 being moved into the 14 record? 15 Okay. Seeing none, we'll move Exhibits 211, 16 212 into the record. 17 (Exhibits 211 and 212 admitted into the 18 19 record.) CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: FIPUG. 20 MR. MOYLE: We'd move Exhibit 555. 21 22 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Exhibit 555. Are there any objections to Exhibit 555 being moved into the 23 24 record? 25 MR. LITCHFIELD: Yes. Yes, there, there are. FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

I did my own score card on the sheet, and of everything on this sheet, the only two items that have been documented, and they were documented previously through Witness Barrett, were the two mathematical conclusions on the top right, 240 million and 2.4. Again, it's a matter of arithmetic based on the assumptions that Mr. Moyle provided during direct, during cross-examination.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

There's nothing else on this page that has been authenticated, and in fact the balance of the figures that would follow in fact would not follow, because mathematically they are contingent upon the adoption of the .44% figure, which is neither attributed to Witness Avera nor confirmed by Mr. Dewhurst here this morning. So we would object.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Mr. Moyle?

MR. MOYLE: When I asked him about that he explained it. I mean, I think to the extent that it helps to have a clear record with respect to it, it probably could come in and give it the weight that it's accorded.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: I think I agree. We'll move this into the record. It's traveling with three or four witnesses already. So we will give it the appropriate weight.

(Exhibit 555 admitted into the record.) **MR. MOYLE:** Okay. And, Mr. Chairman, a lot of paper in this case, and we've all had situations, erratas and different things, and I neglected to provide an exhibit to this witness, and we've already crossed that bridge. All I would like to do was to have the exhibit introduced into the record. It relates to the FPL pension fund that, that he was asked some questions about, and it just, you know, he was talking to a document. The document is the best evidence, and they have an interrogatory that shows how the pension fund's assets are invested.

So what I would ask to do is to be able to have this document marked and also moved in, but I'm not going to ask any questions on it, but just have it as part of the record.

MR. LITCHFIELD: FPL has no objection to having it marked, but would like to see a copy of it and perhaps over lunch hour we could come back and either agree or, or agree to disagree with regard to its introduction at that point, Mr. Chairman.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MOYLE: That's fine.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. So if the document could be distributed and we will deal with that post lunch.

MR. MOYLE: And the number to have it marked 1 would be? 2 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: It would be 559. 3 (Exhibit 559 marked for identification.) 4 MR. MOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 5 CHAIRMAN BRISE: Okay. Is that everything for 6 7 FIPUG in terms of exhibits for now? MR. MOYLE: Yes. 8 9 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. South Florida Hospital Association? 10 MR. SUNDBACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 11 We'd move at this time the admission into the record of SF --12 oh, I'm sorry -- hearing exhibits number 556 and 557. 13 CHAIRMAN BRISE: 556 and 557? 14 15 MR. SUNDBACK: Yes, sir, please. CHAIRMAN BRISE: Are there any objections? 16 MR. LITCHFIELD: Mr. Chairman, no objection 17 with regard to 556, subject to what I understood was our 18 offer and acceptance by counsel to include the ten pages 19 of disclaimers and, excuse me, risk factors and 2.0 cautionary statements that are appended to the back of 21 22 this. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. 23 24 Mr. Sundback? 25 MR. SUNDBACK: It's fabulous nighttime FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

reading, and so we have no objection.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. All right.

Any objections to 557?

MR. MOYLE: We had a discussion about, about the document and we wanted the whole document. And the whole document was in front of us. I'd like for the whole document to come in. Optional completeness.

MR. LITCHFIELD: There were no questions asked on any other portion of the document. I don't think that it needs to be moved. We're not moving it and Mr. Moyle didn't ask questions on it. I don't think he's in a position to move it. And Mr. Sundback had the opportunity to ask questions on the whole document and elected to ask questions on two pages. So I think it would be improper at this point.

CHAIRMAN BRISE: I would tend to agree. So we just move in the, the, what was it, page 20 and 21 and page 4 and 18?

MR. LITCHFIELD: No, sir. It is simply pages 51 through 60.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: 51 through 60, that's the --51 through 60 and 4 and 18. Okay. So that will be Exhibit number 557.

MR. SUNDBACK: Mr. Chairman, just out of a surfeit of caution, we're also including the cover page

	002
1	that shows the
2	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure.
3	MR. SUNDBACK: Thank you.
4	MR. LITCHFIELD: I'm sorry. 556, I believe.
5	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Is that 556? Yes, because
6	557 is an interrogatory. Okay.
7	MR. LITCHFIELD: No objection to 557.
8	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. So we will move 556
9	and 557 into the record at this time.
10	(Exhibits 556 and 557 admitted into the
11	record.)
12	558.
13	MR. LAVIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The
14	Florida Retail Federation would like to move into the
15	record Exhibit 558.
16	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Any objections?
17	MR. LITCHFIELD: No objection.
18	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Seeing none, we
19	will move 558 into the record at this time.
20	(Exhibit 558 admitted into the record.)
21	MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, at this time staff
22	would move what is identified as hearing, on the
23	Comprehensive Exhibit List, number 113, as amended to
24	include the errata sheet and the late-filed Exhibit
25	Number 2 to the deposition.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. So we will move 1 Exhibit 113 with the errata and the interrogatory. 2 MR. YOUNG: Late-filed Exhibit Number 2 to 3 Mr. Dewhurst's deposition. 4 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Are there any 5 objections to that? 6 7 MR. LITCHFIELD: No. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Seeing none, we will 8 9 move Exhibit 113 into the record. (Exhibit 113 admitted into the record.) 10 Okay? I think we are pretty much done with 11 this witness, with the exception of the exhibit issue. 12 Can we handle the exhibit issue without the witness 13 being present? 14 MR. LITCHFIELD: I, well, from my standpoint, 15 I believe the answer is yes, because I don't think it's 16 going to be proper to put the witness back on the stand 17 to come back and be crossed on an exhibit that counsel 18 19 had a chance to use when it, when he was up to bat. **MR. MOYLE:** Yeah. And I think we can work 2.0 through it. But if the objection is authentication and 21 22 we've let the witness go, you know, the only question would be is this an authentic document. I'd hate to put 23 24 myself in that box. 25 MR. LITCHFIELD: Mr. Moyle put himself in that

box when he didn't use it during his turn at cross-examination.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MOYLE: That's fair. I admitted I didn't use it, but, you know, we can, we can go the easy way or go the hard way.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. All right.

MR. YOUNG: Also, too, Mr. Chairman, the witness, the witness has rebuttal testimony. To the extent that the deposition relates to the rebuttal testimony, Mr. Moyle can possibly take it up then too.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Perfect. So we will excuse Mr. Dewhurst from his direct testimony at this time.

Thank you very much. And --

MR. MOYLE: Mr. Chairman, I had one housekeeping matter, if I could. I know everybody is wanting to get to lunch.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Yes, sir.

MR. MOYLE: But last night during Mr. Avera's, Avera's testimony, I had asked him some questions about a document that related to some bond yields, and after my cross I, I left the room. Mr. Saporito kindly said during the further cross when I was not in the room that the South Florida Hospital Association brought up some facts and that he looked at it and affirmed it. And so I was not aware of that. I didn't try to move it.

But given what had been represented in conversations with counsel for South Florida, I would like to, you know, move the Exhibit 545 that was used with Mr. Avera last evening.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LITCHFIELD: FPL objects and actually would take the suggestion of Mr. Young, that if Mr. Moyle wants to use that exhibit again with Mr. Avera when he comes back on rebuttal, that that might be the most efficient way to go here, than relying upon --Mr. Moyle is relying upon Mr. Saporito's recollection of what Dr. Avera said last night.

MR. MOYLE: But we have a record. I mean, it's not, it's not like it's a mystery. You know, he either did it or he didn't. And to the extent he testified from it and confirmed some things, it ought to come in.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: I'll tell you what, when we return from lunch, we will deal with that issue.

Okay. It is 12:27, and we'll see you back here at 1:30.

(Recess taken.)

(Transcript continues in sequence in Volume 16.)

STATE OF FLORIDA 1) CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER : 2 COUNTY OF LEON 3 4 I, LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR, Official Commission Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein 5 stated. 6 IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I 7 stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; 8 and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings. 9 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, 10 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 financially interested in the action. 12 1 day of august DATED THIS 13 14 15 LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR 16 FPSC Official Commission Reporter 17 (850) 413-6734 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION