	I	000001 FILED JUL 12, 2013
		DOCUMENT NO. 03946-13
1	FLORIDA	BEFORE THE FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2	In the Matter of:	
3	In the Matter o	DOCKET NO. 130170-EI
4	PETITION FOR APPROVAL FOR EXTENSION OF COMMISSION'S APPROVAL OF SPECIAL CONTRACT, BY TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY.	
5		
6		/
7		
8		
9	PROCEEDINGS:	COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA ITEM NO. 3
10	COMMISSIONERS	
11		CHAIRMAN RONALD A. BRISÉ COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR
12		COMMISSIONER ART GRAHAM COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS
13		COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN
14	DATE:	Tuesday, July 9, 2013
15	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148
16		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida
17	REPORTED BY:	JANE FAUROT, RPR Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6732
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
		FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Moving on to Item Number 3. MS. DRAPER: Good morning. Elizabeth Draper with staff. Item 3 is a petition by Tampa Electric Company for approval of extension of time for a special contract between Tampa Electric and a potential new customer that is considering locating in the Tampa area.

The Commission originally approved the contract in Docket Number 130037 with a provision that the contract would be rendered null and void if the contract was not executed within 19 days of the Commission order approving the contract. The order was made final on April 5th, 2013. Thus, the contract expired on July 4th, 2013.

Tampa Electric indicated that the customer requires additional time to complete the site selection process. Staff recommends approval of the extension of the contract to allow Tampa Electric to remain a viable candidate to attract this large customer. Attracting a large customer will create jobs and should provide economic benefits.

Staff is here for any questions you may have, and the representatives of the company are also present for any questions.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: All right. Thank you.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

24 25

23

24

25

Commissioner Graham.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Thank you.

This question is for TECO. Is the site selected already for where this customer may want to go?

MR. BEASLEY: I'm sorry?

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Is the site selected? MR. BEASLEY: The site, to our knowledge, is not selected yet. They just indicated to us their need for some additional due diligence to get the project right. And we want them to get it right, and we want to stay in the running for potentially having that facility located in Tampa Electric's service area.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Now, do they have to, I guess, get the site selected and get the land use and zoning and all of that in order before they come to you and accept the deal?

MR. BEASLEY: I think the contract is subject to them getting all of the permitting, so they would ink the contract, is my understanding, and then get the permitting, but those would be contingent parts of the agreement.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Because my only concern was that you may not be able to get all of that done before November 4th.

MR. BEASLEY: Right.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: And I was looking to see if we want to extend that or give the staff the ability to extend that rather than having to come back before us. But if it sounds like all you have to do is get a nod from them yes or no, and you don't have to go through all that land use and zoning process, then I'll know if that's necessary.

MR. BEASLEY: Right. Well, this request included allowing the staff the discretion to administratively approve two months beyond November 4th. That's part of what we asked for just to have a little leeway there in case we are bumping up against that deadline and we need some extra time.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Yeah, but you'll need more time than that if you had to do all of those zoning parts.

MR. BEASLEY: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: So you don't think that you need more time?

MR. BEASLEY: I don't believe we do.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. That's all I had.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you, Commissioner

Graham.

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

Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,

25

and my question was along a similar line.

And just for my benefit and maybe others, procedurally, the docket by which we approved this similar item a number of months ago was closed after the order was issued due to there being no appeal, is that correct?

MS. BROWN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And so to consider this petition for an extension, again, administratively we have opened a new docket for this consideration?

MS. BROWN: I'm not sure whether that would be necessary or not. We could perhaps reopen up this one.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Did we? My question is did we?

MS. BROWN: Yes, we did.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Thank you. MS. BROWN: Sorry.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: That's okay. Thank you. And obviously I'm losing my voice, so I apologize if I was not clear.

Recognizing -- and I certainly heard Mr. Beasley's response to Commissioner Graham about the four months being the time that you think covers the need for what needs to occur, but recognizing that December often can be kind of a lost month for many factors, what is

25

the four months based upon, and would it make sense for us to consider, should the Commission be interested in approving this item for six months, taking us into January, just to avoid, perhaps, some additional procedural steps, if there is no detriment?

MR. BEASLEY: We see no detriment in doing that if you would like to. Through discussions with the potential customer, that's how we came to guesstimate that four months would be enough with a little two-month extra room at the end in case we needed it. But if it's the Commission's pleasure, a little extra time would not hurt beyond that time.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And to our staff, is there any reason not to do that, or is there any detriment to any other stakeholder, ratepayer, et cetera?

MS. BROWN: Not that I can think of.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Nor can I, but I did want to ask the question. I would just say, Commissioners, I am amenable to granting the company's request. It seems to me that if we've got four months and the possibility of a two-month extension, recognizing no detriment that we can foresee, that to eliminate perhaps some additional administrative paperwork back and forth that we might want to consider granting a six-month extension

at this time.

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: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have two questions. One, the existing special contract that we approved, it's listed that it expired July 4th, and today is July 9th. Hopefully that was not problematic for the company, that they didn't allow it to expire, or it affected the site selection process.

MR. BEASLEY: It does not. And I think you could retroactively extend that.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. And then hopefully, depending on what extension we approve, that we won't find ourselves in a position where it comes before us after the contract has expired, so hopefully that will not repeat itself.

The other question I had is we approved this previously, and it's listed in the staff analysis because it will only have a minimal impact to the general body of ratepayers. However, we have TECO that's in for a rate case at this time. Was staff's analysis previously based on the existing rates, and would the current schedule of TECO's rate case -- would it warrant another analysis based upon the outcome of

that situation? And should that affect whether we grant a four-month or six-month extension?

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

MS. DRAPER: Commissioner, when TECO and the customer originally negotiated the rates, the negotiated rates were based on TECO's last cost-of-service study. That's correct, TECO is in currently for a rate case. This customer is not scheduled to come on-line, if they select the Tampa Bay area, until 2016. So it's not included in the TECO -- in the current TECO rate case test year.

However, to the extent TECO's base rates will change in this test year, this will not affect the negotiated rates of this customer. I mean, they will stay the same as they have been negotiated and approved in the contract.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. So regardless of the outcome of the TECO rate case, this should not affect the impact to the general body of ratepayers, this special contract's impact? Or should we wait until the outcome, like not extend this special contract, you know, look at the ending of the TECO decision to see if we need to look at it again, or do you not think the cost-of-service study will affect it?

MS. DRAPER: Since the customer is not scheduled to come on-line in the test year, they should

not be a consideration in this current rate case. It might be in the next rate case, the one after this one, and then we might look at impact on revenues. COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Thank you,

Commissioner Balbis.

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

At this time, unless there are any further questions, I think we're ready to entertain a motion. I think there's a couple of ideas here with respect to the time frame for the extension; we can have discussion on that.

Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Chairman, for our consideration, I would move that we approve TECO's petition for a four-month extension, and then amend the staff recommendation to add approximately sixty additional days to that. Looking at the calendar, January 6th is a Monday, so just for clarity, I would say extending that approval to January 6th of next year.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay.

Commissioner Graham.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I just want to make sure, does that six-month extension also include the additional two months that the staff can do on their

own, if need be?

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Commissioner Edgar. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: My thoughts are, and the intent of the motion was that the two months that we would be granting now would be in lieu of additional delegated authority to staff.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. All right. Any discussion on the concept? Okay. If not, I think we might be in the proper posture for a motion.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Then I would move approval of the staff recommendation with the amendment to add approximately sixty days to the approval of the special contract. And for clarity, set that at January 6th of 2014.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Second.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. It has been moved and seconded.

Any further discussion?

All right. Seeing none, all in favor say aye. (Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you very much. And this concludes our agenda conference for today, so we'll will officially adjourn this.

* * * * * * *

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

2 3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

	000011		
1			
2	STATE OF FLORIDA)		
3	: CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER		
4	COUNTY OF LEON)		
5			
6	I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, Hearing Reporter Services Section, FPSC Division of Commission Clerk, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.		
7			
8	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.		
9			
10			
11	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,		
12	employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties'		
13	attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.		
14	DATED THIS 12th day of July, 2013.		
15			
16	JANE FAUROT, RPR Official FPSC Hearings Reporter (850) 413-6732		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		