# Shawna Senko

From: Sent: To: Cc:	Chris Andersen <chris.andersen@bbrslaw.com> Wednesday, July 02, 2014 4:26 PM Filings@psc.state.fl.us 'mwalls@cfjblaw.com'; 'bgamba@cfjblaw.com'; 'John.burnett@duke-energy.com'; dianne.triplett@duke-energy.com; 'Matthew.bernier@duke-energy.com'; 'paul.lewis@duke-energy.com'; 'jmoyle@moylelaw.com'; 'Jessica.Cano@fpl.com'; 'Ken.Hoffman@fpl.com'; 'Bryan.Anderson@fpl.com'; 'Schef@gbwlegal.com'; ilavia@gbwlegal.com'; 'Bebwinkel Charles@leg.state.fl.us'; kellv.ir@leg.state.fl.us;</chris.andersen@bbrslaw.com>
Subject: Attachments:	jlavia@gbwlegal.com; 'Rehwinkel.Charles@leg.state.fl.us'; kelly.jr@leg.state.fl.us; MCGLOTHLIN.JOSEPH@leg.state.fl.us; 'cmilsted@aarp.org'; 'billn@fcan.org'; 'jeremy@realesg.com'; 'rpjrb@yahoo.com'; Caroline Klancke; Keino Young FPSC Docket No. 140009 - Prehearing Statement of PCS Phosphate p-pcs_prehearing_statement_7032014 F.pdf

a. Person responsible for filing:

James W. Brew Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C. 1025 Thomas Jefferson St, NW Eighth Floor, West Tower Washington, DC 20007 Tel: (202) 342-0800 Fax: (202) 342-0807 jwb@bbrslaw.com

- b. Docket No. 140009-EI, In Re: Nuclear Cost Recover Clause
- c. Filed on behalf of White Springs Agricultural Chemicals, Inc. d/b/a PCS Phosphate White Springs
- d. Total Pages = 8
- e. PCS Phosphate's Prehearing Statement

### BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Nuclear Cost Recovery Clause

) Docket No. 140009-EI
) Filed: July 2, 2014

### PREHEARING STATEMENT OF WHITE SPRINGS AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS, INC. <u>d/b/a PCS PHOSPHATE – WHITE SPRINGS</u>

Pursuant to the Florida Public Service Commission's February 4, 2014, Order

Establishing Procedure, Order No. PSC-14-0082-PCO-EI, ("Procedural Order"), White

Springs Agricultural Chemicals, Inc. d/b/a PCS Phosphate - White Springs ("PCS

Phosphate"), through its undersigned attorney, files its Prehearing Statement.

### A. <u>APPEARANCES</u>

James W. Brew Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C. 1025 Thomas Jefferson St., NW Eighth Floor, West Tower Washington, DC 20007 Tel: (202) 342-0800 Fax: (202) 342-0807 E-mail: <u>ibrew@bbrslaw.com</u>

### B. <u>WITNESSES</u>

PCS Phosphate will sponsor no witnesses.

### C. <u>EXHIBITS</u>

PCS Phosphate may offer exhibits based on responses to discovery requests as well as the testimony offered by Duke Energy Florida ("Duke" or "DEF") and other party witnesses at the hearing.

### D. <u>STATEMENT OF BASIC POSITION</u>

In March 2012, the Commission issued Order No. PSC-12-0104-FOF-EI which approved a stipulation and settlement agreement among DEF, the Office of Public Counsel ("OPC") and other consumer party intervenors, including PCS Phosphate. In November 2013, in Order No. PSC-13-0598-FOF-EI, the Commission approved the Revised and Restated Stipulation and Settlement Agreement ("RRSSA") among Duke and the intervenor settling parties. As a consequence, the primary focus of the 2014 NCRC proceeding for Duke relates to the utility's efforts to wind down its involvement in the aborted Levy Nuclear Project ("LNP"), and comparable efforts to shut down its existing Crystal River Unit No. 3 nuclear station following Duke's determination that the containment building had been irreparably damaged in the course of Duke's attempt to replace the unit's steam generator.

Generally, PCS Phosphate does not contest recovery through the NCRC of CR3 EPU costs that the Commission has addressed in prior dockets, but maintains that a Commission prudence determination with respect to DEF's on-going CR3 asset disposal actions is premature and should be deferred to the 2015 proceeding. Since that process seems to be at a relatively early stage, the Commission will not possess facts sufficient to make such determinations this year.

With respect to LNP, the RRSSA specifies a fixed cost recovery factor that should apply to the 2015 factor for some or all of that year. The suits (and counter-suits) initiated earlier this year between Duke and Westinghouse Electric Company ("WEC"), however, have materially complicated Duke's efforts to extricate itself from the engineering, procurement and construction contract ("EPC") that it signed with the WEC-Shaw Stone & Webster consortium for LNP at the end of 2008. The complications include:

- The disposition of long lead time equipment ordered and fabricated for Levy that DEF customers have already paid for through NCRC factor charges;
- In excess of \$54 million in payments that Duke claims it made to WEC for work that was never actually begun: and
- WEC's claim that it performed approximately \$500 million in engineering, licensing and AP1000 support activities that are properly billed to Duke.

At this date, Duke's asset disposition efforts are on-going, and a prudence determination should be deferred until a more complete picture is available. With respect to the Duke-WEC claims, it is reasonable to expect that final and binding rulings on those suits will take some time. In the meantime, the Commission in this docket should make clear that DEF's consumers are not mere insurers of any outcome, litigated or settled, that may eventually transpire. In particular, the Commission should adopt a rebuttable presumption that any disposition of LNP long lead time equipment to WEC should reflect the original cost of those items charged to Duke consumers. Similarly, the Commission should put Duke on notice that it would be presumptively imprudent to charge Duke customers for work billed by WEC that was not actually performed. PCS Phosphate reminds the Commission that the Commission has not previously reviewed or approved the Levy EPC agreement from which all of the above claims and counter-claims arise. Finally, as stated in the RRSSA, all going forward actions by Duke to pursue a construction and operation license ("COL") from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for Levy are Duke's responsibility. The Commission should not countenance any effort by Duke to fund those activities through settlement of the EPC termination disputes.

### E. <u>STATEMENT ON SPECIFIC ISSUES</u>

With respect to the various issues presented in this proceeding, PCS Phosphate takes no position regarding the resolution of the issues with respect to Florida Power & Light. PCS Phosphate takes the following positions on the specific issues presented below as they pertain to DEF:

### **Duke Energy Florida, Inc., Issues**

### <u> DEF – Levy Project Issues</u>

- **<u>Issue DEF 1</u>**: Should the Commission find that during the years 2012 and 2013, DEF's project management, contracting, accounting and cost oversight controls were reasonable and prudent for the Levy Units 1 & 2 project?
- **<u>PCS Phosphate</u>**: No position.
- **<u>Issue DEF 2</u>**: Has DEF reasonably accounted for COL pursuit costs pursuant to paragraph 12(b) of the 2013 revised and restated stipulation and settlement agreement?
- **<u>PCS Phosphate</u>**: No position at this time.
- **Issue 2A:** What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as DEF's final 2012 and 2013 prudently incurred cost for the Levy Units 1 & 2 project?
- **<u>PCS Phosphate</u>**: No position.
- <u>Issue DEF 3</u>: Should the Commission approve DEF's Levy Project exit and wind down costs and other sunk costs as specifically proposed for recovery or review in this docket?
- **<u>PCS Phosphate</u>**: No position at this time.
- **<u>Issue DEF 4</u>**: What action, if any, should the Commission take in the 2014 hearing cycle with respect to the \$54,127,100 in Long Lead Equipment milestone payments, previously recovered from customers through the NCRC, which were in payment for Turbine

# Generators and Reactor Vessel Internals that were never manufactured?

- **<u>PCS Phosphate</u>**: PCS Phosphate adopts the position of the OPC. Duke customers should be fully credited for amounts paid by Duke and charged to ratepayers for work not actually performed for the LNP project.
- **<u>Issue DEF 5</u>**: What restrictions, if any, should the Commission place at this time on Duke's attempts to dispose of Long Lead Equipment?
- **<u>PCS Phosphate</u>**: PCS Phosphate adopts the position of the OPC.

### **DEF - CR3 Uprate Project Issues**

- **<u>Issue DEF 6</u>**: Should the Commission find that during the years 2012 and 2013, DEF's project management, contracting, accounting and cost oversight controls were reasonable and prudent for the Crystal River Unit 3 Uprate project?
- PCS Phosphate: No position.
- **<u>Issue DEF 7</u>**: What jurisdictional amounts should the Commission approve as DEF's final 2012 and 2013 prudently incurred cost for the Crystal River Unit 3 Uprate project?
- **PCS Phosphate**: No position.
- <u>Issue DEF 8</u>: Should the Commission approve DEF's Crystal River Unit 3 Uprate Project exit and wind down costs and other sunk costs as specifically proposed for recovery or review in this docket?

**<u>PCS Phosphate</u>**: No position.

- **DEF Ultimate Issue**
- <u>Issue DEF 9</u>: What is the total jurisdictional amount to be included in establishing DEF's 2015 Capacity Cost Recovery Clause Factor?

**<u>PCS Phosphate</u>**: PCS Phosphate adopts the position of the OPC.

### F. <u>STIPULATED ISSUES</u>

None.

### G. <u>PENDING MOTIONS</u>

None.

# H. <u>PENDING REQUESTS OR CLAIMS FOR CONFIDENTIALITY</u> None.

## I. <u>OBJECTIONS TO QUALIFICATIONS OF WITNESS AS EXPERT</u>

None at this time.

## J. <u>REQUIREMENTS OF ORDER ESTABLISHING PROCEDURE</u>

There are no requirements of the Procedural Order with which PCS Phosphate

cannot comply.

Respectfully submitted the 2nd day of July, 2014.

# BRICKFIELD, BURCHETTE, RITTS & STONE, P.C.

<u>s/ James W. Brew</u> James W. Brew Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C. 1025 Thomas Jefferson St., NW Eighth Floor, West Tower Washington, DC 20007

Attorney for White Springs Agricultural Chemicals, Inc. d/b/a/ PCS Phosphate – White Springs

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing has been furnished by electronic

mail and/or U.S. Mail this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of July 2014 to the following:

Keino Young Caroline Klancke Florida Public Service Commission Gerald L. Gunter Building 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Matthew R. Bernier Paul Lewis, Jr. Duke Energy Florida, Inc. 106 E. College Ave., Suite 800 Tallahassee, FL 32301

John T. Burnett Dianne M. Triplett Duke Energy Florida, Inc. 299 First Avenue North St. Petersburg, FL 33701

Robert Scheffel Wright John T. LaVia Florida Retail Federation c/o Gardner Law Firm 1300 Thomaswood Drive Tallahassee, FL 32308

Bryan S. Anderson Jessica Cano Florida Power & Light Company 700 Universe Boulevard Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

Charles Milsted AARP 200 West College Avenue Tallahassee, FL 32301 J.R. Kelly C. Rehwinkel J. McGlothlin Office of Public Counsel c/o The Florida Legislature 111 W. Madison Street, Room 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400

Southern Alliance for Clean Energy George Cavros 120 E. Oakland Park Blvd, Ste. 105 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33334

J. Michael Walls Blaise N. Gamba Carlton Fields Law Firm P. O. Box 3239 Tampa, FL 33601-3239

Jon C. Moyle, Jr. Florida Industrial Power Users Group c/o Moyle Law Firm 118 North Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301

Kenneth Hoffman Florida Power & Light Company 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 810 Tallahassee, FL 32301-1858

Bill Newton Florida Consumer Action Network 3006 W Kennedy Blvd. Ste B Tampa, FL 33609 Jeremy L. Susac Real Energy Strategies Group 113 South Monroe Street Tallahassee, FL 32301 Robert H. Smith (14) 11340 Heron Bay Blvd. #2523 Coral Springs, FL 33076

s/ James W. Brew