

Eric Fryson

From: Costello, Jeanne <jcostello@carltonfields.com>
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2013 2:47 PM
To: Filings@psc.state.fl.us
Cc: Gamba, Blaise N.; Diane Triplett (dianne.triplett@pgnmail.com); Erik L. Saylor (saylor.erik@leg.state.fl.us); F. Alvin Taylor (ataylor@bbrslaw.com); George Cavros (george@cavros-law.com); jbrew@bbrslaw.com; john.burnett@pgnmail.com; Jon C. Moyle Jr. (jmoyle@moylelaw.com); Karin S. Torain (KSTorain@potashcorp.com); Keino Young; Lee Eng Tan; Bernier, Matthew R.; Walls, J. Michael; Michael Lawson; Paul Lewis Jr. (paul.lewisjr@pgnmail.com); Randy B. Miller (RMiller@pcsphosphate.com); rehwinkel.charles@leg.state.fl.us; Robert Scheffel Wright (schef@gbwlegal.com); 'Woods, Monica'
Subject: Filing Docket 100437-EI
Attachments: Docket 100437-EI PEF Objections to White Springs Revised 2nd Req for Production.pdf; Docket 100437-EI PEF Objections to White Springs Revised 2nd Interrogatories.pdf

Docket No. 100437-EI

In re: Examination of the outage and replacement Fuel/power costs associated with the CR3 steam Generator replacement project, by Progress Energy Florida, Inc.

Attached for filing are the following documents:

1. Progress Energy Florida, Inc.'s Objections to White Springs' Revised Second Set of Requests for Production of Documents (Nos. 3-12) [11 pages]; and
2. Progress Energy Florida, Inc.'s Objections to White Springs' Revised Second Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 3-6) [5 pages].

These documents are being filed on behalf of Progress Energy Florida, Inc. by

Jeanne Costello on behalf of Blaise N. Gamba Legal Admin Assist/Florida Registered Paralegal Florida Bar No. 256251
4221 W. Boy Scout Blvd., Ste. 1000
Tampa, Florida 33607-5780
Direct: 813.229.4917 | Fax: 813.229.4133 jcostello@carltonfields.com | www.carltonfields.com

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

01460 MAR 25 13

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Examination of the outage and replacement
fuel/power costs associated with the CR3 steam generator
replacement project, by Progress Energy Florida, Inc.

Docket No. 100437-EI

Filed: March 25, 2013

**PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA, INC.'S OBJECTIONS TO
WHITE SPRINGS' REVISED SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION
OF DOCUMENTS (NOS. 3-12)**

Pursuant to Fla. Admin. Code R. 28-106.206, Rules 1.280 and 1.350 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, and the Second Revised Order Establishing Procedure, Order No. PSC-13-0084-PCO-EI, issued February 13, 2013, as amended by Order No. PSC-13-0107-PCO-EI, issued March 1, 2013 (the "Order"), in this matter, Progress Energy Florida, Inc. ("PEF" or the "Company") hereby makes its objections to White Springs Agricultural Chemicals, d/b/a PCS Phosphate's ("White Springs") Second Set of Requests for Production of Documents (Nos. 3-12) and states as follows:

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

PEF generally objects to the time and place of production requirement in White Springs' Second Set of Requests for Production of Documents and will make all responsive documents available for inspection and copying at the offices of Progress Energy Florida, Inc., 106 E. College Ave., Tallahassee, Florida, 32301 at a mutually-convenient time, or will produce the documents in some other manner or at some other place that is mutually convenient to both PEF and White Springs for purposes of inspection, copying, or handling of the responsive documents.

With respect to the "Definitions" and "Instructions" in White Springs' Second Set of Requests for Production of Documents:

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

01460 MAR 25 2013

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

PEF generally objects to White Springs' requests to the extent that they call for documents protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the accountant-client privilege, the trade secret privilege, or any other applicable privilege or protection afforded by law. PEF will provide a privilege log within a reasonable time or as may be agreed to by the parties to the extent that a document request calls for the production of privileged or protected documents.

Further, in certain circumstances, PEF may determine upon investigation and analysis that documents responsive to certain requests to which objections are not otherwise asserted are confidential and proprietary and should be produced only under an appropriate confidentiality agreement and protective order, if at all. By agreeing to provide such information in response to such a request, PEF is not waiving its right to insist upon appropriate protection of confidentiality by means of a confidentiality agreement, protective order, or the procedures otherwise provided by law. PEF hereby asserts its right to require such protection of any and all information that may qualify for protection under the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, and all other applicable statutes, rules, and legal principles.

PEF also generally objects to White Springs' Second Set of Requests for Production of Documents to the extent that it calls for the production of "all" documents of any nature, including, every copy of every document responsive to the requests. PEF will make a good faith, reasonably diligent attempt to identify and obtain responsive documents when no objection has been asserted to the production of such documents, but it is not practicable or even possible to identify, obtain, and produce "all" documents. In addition, PEF reserves the right to supplement any of its responses to White Springs' requests for production if PEF cannot produce documents

immediately due to their magnitude and the work required aggregating them, or if PEF later discovers additional responsive documents in the course of this proceeding.

In addition, PEF objects to White Springs' Instructions and Definitions, in particular White Springs' Definitions Numbers 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 to the extent they seek to encompass documents or information from persons or entities other than PEF who are not parties to this Docket, who are not otherwise subject to discovery under the applicable rules and law, and to the extent these definitions request documents outside of PEF's possession, custody, or control. Furthermore, PEF objects to any request that calls for PEF to create documents that it otherwise does not have because there is no such requirement under applicable law.

PEF further objects to White Springs' Instructions and Definitions to the extent that they seek to impose requirements beyond the requirements of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. PEF will respond to all White Springs requests consistent with the requirements of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, and not some inconsistent and additional requirement under White Springs' Instructions and Definitions.

By making these general objections at this time, PEF does not waive or relinquish its right to assert additional general and specific objections to White Springs' discovery at the time PEF's response is due under the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS

White Springs' Request Number 3:

SPECIFIC OBJECTION: PEF objects to this request to the extent it seeks information that is irrelevant to the issues in phases 2 and 3 of this docket under the Settlement and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. PEF further objects to this request to the extent it seeks information conveyed or created during the course of,

or in furtherance of, mediation of the issue of insurance coverage related to the NEIL Policies. Such information is protected from discovery and rendered inadmissible by the mediation privilege created by section 44.401, Florida Statutes, *et seq.*, and inadmissible under the Florida evidence code, section 90.408, Florida Statutes, and New York law, which governed the construction and interpretation of the NEIL Policies. *See* N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 4547. These statutes indicate the applicable public policy protecting the content of mediation and settlement communications made in furtherance of settling claims, consistent with the Commission's policy preference for settlement. *See, e.g., In re: Allied Universal Corp.*, Order No. PSC-04-1115-FOF-EI (Nov. 9, 2004) (noting the "Commission's longstanding commitment to the support and encouragement of negotiated settlements.").

White Springs' Request Number 4:

SPECIFIC OBJECTION: PEF objects to this request to the extent it seeks information that is irrelevant to the issues in phases 2 and 3 of this docket under the Settlement and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. PEF further objects to this request to the extent it seeks information conveyed or created during the course of, or in furtherance of, mediation of the issue of insurance coverage related to the NEIL Policies. Such information is protected from discovery and rendered inadmissible by the mediation privilege created by section 44.401, Florida Statutes, *et seq.*, and inadmissible under the Florida evidence code, section 90.408, Florida Statutes, and New York law, which governed the construction and interpretation of the NEIL Policies. *See* N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 4547. These statutes indicate the applicable public policy protecting the content of mediation and settlement communications made in furtherance of settling claims, consistent with the Commission's policy preference for settlement. *See, e.g., In re: Allied Universal Corp.*, Order No. PSC-04-1115-FOF-

EI (Nov. 9, 2004) (noting the “Commission’s longstanding commitment to the support and encouragement of negotiated settlements.”).

White Springs’ Request Number 5:

SPECIFIC OBJECTION: PEF objects to this request to the extent it seeks information that is irrelevant to the issues in phases 2 and 3 of this docket under the Settlement and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. PEF further objects to this request to the extent it seeks information conveyed or created during the course of, or in furtherance of, mediation of the issue of insurance coverage related to the NEIL Policies. Such information is protected from discovery and rendered inadmissible by the mediation privilege created by section 44.401, Florida Statutes, *et seq.*, and inadmissible under the Florida evidence code, section 90.408, Florida Statutes, and New York law, which governed the construction and interpretation of the NEIL Policies. *See* N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 4547. These statutes indicate the applicable public policy protecting the content of mediation and settlement communications made in furtherance of settling claims, consistent with the Commission’s policy preference for settlement. *See, e.g., In re: Allied Universal Corp.*, Order No. PSC-04-1115-FOF-EI (Nov. 9, 2004) (noting the “Commission’s longstanding commitment to the support and encouragement of negotiated settlements.”).

White Springs’ Request Number 6:

SPECIFIC OBJECTION: PEF objects to this request to the extent it seeks information that is irrelevant to the issues in phases 2 and 3 of this docket under the Settlement and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. PEF further objects to this request to the extent it seeks information conveyed or created during the course of, or in furtherance of, mediation of the issue of insurance coverage related to the NEIL Policies.

Such information is protected from discovery and rendered inadmissible by the mediation privilege created by section 44.401, Florida Statutes, *et seq.*, and inadmissible under the Florida evidence code, section 90.408, Florida Statutes, and New York law, which governed the construction and interpretation of the NEIL Policies. *See* N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 4547. These statutes indicate the applicable public policy protecting the content of mediation and settlement communications made in furtherance of settling claims, consistent with the Commission's policy preference for settlement. *See, e.g., In re: Allied Universal Corp.*, Order No. PSC-04-1115-FOF-EI (Nov. 9, 2004) (noting the "Commission's longstanding commitment to the support and encouragement of negotiated settlements.").

White Springs' Request Number 7:

SPECIFIC OBJECTION: PEF objects to this request to the extent it seeks information that is irrelevant to the issues in phases 2 and 3 of this docket under the Settlement and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. PEF further objects to this request to the extent it seeks information conveyed or created during the course of, or in furtherance of, mediation of the issue of insurance coverage related to the NEIL Policies. Such information is protected from discovery and rendered inadmissible by the mediation privilege created by section 44.401, Florida Statutes, *et seq.*, and inadmissible under the Florida evidence code, section 90.408, Florida Statutes, and New York law, which governed the construction and interpretation of the NEIL Policies. *See* N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 4547. These statutes indicate the applicable public policy protecting the content of mediation and settlement communications made in furtherance of settling claims, consistent with the Commission's policy preference for settlement. *See, e.g., In re: Allied Universal Corp.*, Order No. PSC-04-1115-FOF-

EI (Nov. 9, 2004) (noting the “Commission’s longstanding commitment to the support and encouragement of negotiated settlements.”).

White Springs’ Request Number 8:

SPECIFIC OBJECTION: PEF objects to this request to the extent it seeks information that is irrelevant to the issues in phases 2 and 3 of this docket under the Settlement and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. PEF further objects to this request to the extent it seeks information conveyed or created during the course of, or in furtherance of, mediation of the issue of insurance coverage related to the NEIL Policies. Such information is protected from discovery and rendered inadmissible by the mediation privilege created by section 44.401, Florida Statutes, *et seq.*, and inadmissible under the Florida evidence code, section 90.408, Florida Statutes, and New York law, which governed the construction and interpretation of the NEIL Policies. *See* N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 4547. These statutes indicate the applicable public policy protecting the content of mediation and settlement communications made in furtherance of settling claims, consistent with the Commission’s policy preference for settlement. *See, e.g., In re: Allied Universal Corp.*, Order No. PSC-04-1115-FOF-EI (Nov. 9, 2004) (noting the “Commission’s longstanding commitment to the support and encouragement of negotiated settlements.”).

White Springs’ Request Number 9:

SPECIFIC OBJECTION: PEF objects to this request to the extent it seeks information that is irrelevant to the issues in phases 2 and 3 of this docket under the Settlement and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. PEF further objects to this request to the extent it seeks information conveyed or created during the course of, or in furtherance of, mediation of the issue of insurance coverage related to the NEIL Policies.

Such information is protected from discovery and rendered inadmissible by the mediation privilege created by section 44.401, Florida Statutes, *et seq.*, and inadmissible under the Florida evidence code, section 90.408, Florida Statutes, and New York law, which governed the construction and interpretation of the NEIL Policies. *See* N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 4547. These statutes indicate the applicable public policy protecting the content of mediation and settlement communications made in furtherance of settling claims, consistent with the Commission's policy preference for settlement. *See, e.g., In re: Allied Universal Corp.*, Order No. PSC-04-1115-FOF-EI (Nov. 9, 2004) (noting the "Commission's longstanding commitment to the support and encouragement of negotiated settlements.").

White Springs' Request Number 10:

SPECIFIC OBJECTION: PEF objects to this request to the extent it seeks information that is irrelevant to the issues in phases 2 and 3 of this docket under the Settlement and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. PEF further objects to this request to the extent it seeks information conveyed or created during the course of, or in furtherance of, mediation of the issue of insurance coverage related to the NEIL Policies. Such information is protected from discovery and rendered inadmissible by the mediation privilege created by section 44.401, Florida Statutes, *et seq.*, and inadmissible under the Florida evidence code, section 90.408, Florida Statutes, and New York law, which governed the construction and interpretation of the NEIL Policies. *See* N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 4547. These statutes indicate the applicable public policy protecting the content of mediation and settlement communications made in furtherance of settling claims, consistent with the Commission's policy preference for settlement. *See, e.g., In re: Allied Universal Corp.*, Order No. PSC-04-1115-FOF-

EI (Nov. 9, 2004) (noting the “Commission’s longstanding commitment to the support and encouragement of negotiated settlements.”).

White Springs’ Request Number 11:

SPECIFIC OBJECTION: PEF objects to this request to the extent it seeks information that is irrelevant to the issues in phases 2 and 3 of this docket under the Settlement and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. PEF further objects to this request to the extent it seeks information conveyed or created during the course of, or in furtherance of, mediation of the issue of insurance coverage related to the NEIL Policies. Such information is protected from discovery and rendered inadmissible by the mediation privilege created by section 44.401, Florida Statutes, *et seq.*, and inadmissible under the Florida evidence code, section 90.408, Florida Statutes, and New York law, which governed the construction and interpretation of the NEIL Policies. *See* N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 4547. These statutes indicate the applicable public policy protecting the content of mediation and settlement communications made in furtherance of settling claims, consistent with the Commission’s policy preference for settlement. *See, e.g., In re: Allied Universal Corp.*, Order No. PSC-04-1115-FOF-EI (Nov. 9, 2004) (noting the “Commission’s longstanding commitment to the support and encouragement of negotiated settlements.”).

White Springs’ Request Number 12:

SPECIFIC OBJECTION: PEF objects to this request to the extent it seeks information that is irrelevant to the issues in phases 2 and 3 of this docket under the Settlement and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. PEF further objects to this request to the extent it seeks information conveyed or created during the course of, or in furtherance of, mediation of the issue of insurance coverage related to the NEIL Policies.

Such information is protected from discovery and rendered inadmissible by the mediation privilege created by section 44.401, Florida Statutes, *et seq.*, and inadmissible under the Florida evidence code, section 90.408, Florida Statutes, and New York law, which governed the construction and interpretation of the NEIL Policies. *See* N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 4547. These statutes indicate the applicable public policy protecting the content of mediation and settlement communications made in furtherance of settling claims, consistent with the Commission's policy preference for settlement. *See, e.g., In re: Allied Universal Corp.*, Order No. PSC-04-1115-FOF-EI (Nov. 9, 2004) (noting the "Commission's longstanding commitment to the support and encouragement of negotiated settlements.").

Respectfully submitted,

John T. Burnett
Deputy General Counsel
Dianne M. Triplett
Associate General Counsel
PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA, INC.
Post Office Box 14042
St. Petersburg, FL 33733-4042
Telephone: (727) 820-5587
Facsimile: (727) 820-5519

s/ Blaise N. Gamba
James Michael Walls
Florida Bar No. 0706242
Blaise N. Gamba
Florida Bar No. 0027942
Matthew R. Bernier
Florida Bar No. 0059886
CARLTON FIELDS, P.A.
Post Office Box 3239
Tampa, FL 33601-3239
Telephone: (813) 223-7000
Facsimile: (813) 229-4133

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished to counsel and parties of record as indicated below via electronic and U.S. Mail this 25th day of March, 2013.

s/ Blaise N. Gamba

Attorney

Keino Young
Theresa Lee Eng Tan
Michael Lawson
Florida Public Service Commission Staff
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
Phone: (850) 413-6218
Facsimile: (850) 413-6184
Email: kyoung@psc.state.fl.us
ltan@psc.state.fl.us
mlawson@psc.state.fl.us

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

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

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

Robert Scheffel Wright
John T. LaVia
c/o Gardner Law Firm
1300 Thomaswood Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32308
Phone: (850) 385-0070
Fax: (850) 385-5416
Email: schef@gbwlegal.com

George Cavros
120 East Oakland Park Blvd., Ste. 105
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33334
Phone: (954) 563-0074
Fax: (866) 924-2824
Email: George@cavros-law.com

Randy B. Miller
White Springs Agricultural Chemicals, Inc.
PO Box 300
White Springs, FL 32096
Email: RMiller@pscphosphate.com
(via email only)

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