## FILED JUL 10, 2015 **DOCUMENT NO. 04333-15**

000001

**FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK** 1 BEFORE THE 2 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 3 In the Matter of: 4 DOCKET NO. 150075-EI PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF 5 ARRANGEMENT TO MITIGATE IMPACT 6 OF UNFAVORABLE CEDAR BAY POWER PURCHASE OBLIGATION, BY 7 FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY. 8 9 PROCEEDINGS: PREHEARING CONFERENCE 10 COMMISSIONER PARTICIPATING: JIMMY PATRONIS 11 PREHEARING OFFICER 12 Monday, July 6, 2015 DATE: 13 Commenced at 1:30 p.m. TIME: Concluded at 2:05 p.m. 14 PLACE: Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148 15 4075 Esplanade Way 16 Tallahassee, Florida 17 REPORTED BY: LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6734 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

## **APPEARANCES:**

JOHN T. BUTLER, KEVIN I.C. DONALDSON and MARIA MONCADA, ESQUIRES, 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, Florida 33408-0420, on behalf of Florida Power & Light Company.

ANNA H. UPTON, ESQUIRE, 9005 Eagles Ridge
Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32312, on behalf of Florida
Audubon Society.

JON C. MOYLE, JR. and VICKI GORDON KAUFMAN, ESQUIRES, Moyle Law Firm, P.A., 118 North Gadsden Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of Florida Industrial Power Users Group.

ROBERT SCHEFFEL WRIGHT and JOHN T. LAVIA, III, ESQUIRES, Gardner, Bist, Bowden, Bush, Dee, LaVia & Wright, P.A., 1300 Thomaswood Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32308, appearing on behalf of Cedar Bay Generating Company, LP.

CHARLES REHWINKEL, DEPUTY PUBLIC COUNSEL, and JOHN J. TRUITT, ESQUIRE, Office of Public Counsel, c/o the Florida Legislature, 111 W. Madison Street, Room 812, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400, appearing on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida.

MARTHA BARRERA and JOHN VILLAFRATE, ESQUIRES, FPSC General Counsel's Office, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, appearing on

behalf of the Florida Public Service Commission Staff. MARY ANNE HELTON, DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL, Advisor to the Commission, Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850. 

## PROCEEDINGS

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Good afternoon.

_	

Welcome to this prehearing. I'm Jimmy Patronis, and welcome to my first prehearing as a Commissioner at the Florida Public Service Commission.

At this time I'll ask staff to please read the notice.

MS. BARRERA: This prehearing -- a prehearing has been scheduled for July 6th, 2015, to discuss the issues that will be dealt with at the case -- at the hearing in this matter. Sorry.

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay. Thank you.

Let's go ahead and take appearances. If we could have those introductions, please.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Commissioner Patronis.

John Butler appearing on behalf of Florida Power & Light

Company. Also enter an appearance for Kevin Donaldson

and Maria Moncada for FPL.

**COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Okay. Thank you.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Commissioner. Robert Scheffel Wright, Gardner, Bist law firm. I'm appearing subject to a notice of limited appearance to protect the interests of Cedar Bay Generating Company and its confidential information. I'd also like to enter an

1	appearance for my law partner John T. LaVia, III.
2	COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay.
3	MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.
4	MS. UPTON: Hi. My name is Anna Upton. I'm
5	here on behalf of Florida Audubon Society, who's seeking
6	to intervene in the matter.
7	MS. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Commissioner.
8	Vicki Gordon Kaufman. I am here on behalf of the
9	Florida Industrial Power Users Group, and I would like
10	to enter an appearance for Jon Moyle.
11	COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay.
12	MR. TRUITT: John Truitt with the Office of
13	Public Counsel. I'd also like to enter an appearance
14	for Charles Rehwinkel.
15	COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay.
16	MS. BARRERA: Martha Barrera on behalf of
17	Commission staff. And I would also like to enter an
18	appearance for John Villafrate.
19	COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay.
20	MS. HELTON: And Mary Anne Helton, advisor to
21	the Commission.
22	COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay. Thank you.
23	Well, welcome. We actually have some
24	preliminary matters we need to address first. We've got
25	two motions. Let's go ahead and take up the first

motion.

And, FP&L, if you'll present your concerns.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Commissioner.

Yes. FPL has filed a motion to include some counter designations to the deposition transcript of Witness Stephen Mark Rudolph in this proceeding. And basically a deposition was taken roughly a month ago of several of the Cogentrix/Cedar Bay personnel,

Mr. Rudolph being one of them. There was an agreement that parties, if they wanted to designate portions of that deposition transcript for inclusion in the record, would be given an opportunity to do so, rather than including the entire deposition transcript in the record.

transcript that they would like to designate into the record. We don't have any objection to that. But consistent with the usual rules of procedure and of evidence for counter designating portions that we feel need to be included for fairness, we have identified portions of Mr. Rudolph's deposition that we would counter designate. And, essentially, I conducted a brief cross-examination of Mr. Rudolph at the conclusion of FIPUG's examination. It was clarifying points that were raised in the testimony he gave in response to

FIPUG's questions, and that's the sole portion of the
deposition that we're seeking to counter designate.

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay. Do you have a
response?

MS. KAUFMAN: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner.
Unfortunately, I'm pinch-hitting for Mr. Moyle. I'm no
aware of, nor have I received, nor should I have

Unfortunately, I'm pinch-hitting for Mr. Moyle. I'm not aware of, nor have I received, nor should I have received FPL's motion, so I don't know whether we object or not. And if we do, we will file an objection within the appropriate period.

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay. And we'll give you until Wednesday, July 8th, for a written, a written response. Okay. So we'll take that under consideration.

We have a second motion also with the attorney on behalf of Audubon, who set their motion with argument.

MS. UPTON: Thank you. Florida Audubon

Society and it member -- and its members have a

substantial interest in the outcome of this proceeding,

and we are seeking intervention in this matter.

Florida Power & Light is seeking approval of a transaction that will result in the early retirement of a coal power plant. Coal power plants have known environmental impacts like air and water pollution that

degrade surrounding areas -- in this case, the St.

John's River, the Broward River that our members use and enjoy the resources around. Continued operation of the plant will cause further environmental degradation, and, conversely, early retirement of the plant, which is what Florida Power & Light seeks to do, would be a great benefit to our members who utilize the surrounding resources. So Florida Audubon Society and its members pass the injury prong of the standing test.

Additionally, a great number of Florida

Audubon Society's members utilize FPL as a power

provider and are ratepayers themselves. For instance,

Nassau County, we have 169 members. Nassau County is

solely supplied by FPL, so all of our members in Nassau

County are also ratepayers. And it's similar throughout

the state; in the 32 counties that Florida Power & Light

provide service, we have members. And so our members

not only have an environmental interest, but

environmental interest as ratepayers as well.

So we are interested in proceeding -- or intervening in these proceedings to protect Florida

Audubon Society members' interests, and we'd like to highlight the environmental benefits that would come from the early retirement of the power plant.

We realize that the normal perspective that's

taken in a Public Service Commission hearing is from the ratepayers' point of view, but we'd like to point out that it is -- the guiding principle is what is in the public interest as a whole. And in Florida Power & Light's petition, they raise environmental impacts and benefits that we believe warrant consideration like the 7 reduction of water use that would take place by taking this power plant out of commission and the reduction of CO2 emissions, which are huge benefits to the state as a 9 whole.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Just a point of information. How many members do y'all have in Nassau County?

MS. UPTON: In Nassau County it's 169 members. We have approximately 28,000 members throughout the state.

When it comes to CO2 emissions, they are not confined to the area where the plant is located. As you know, air pollution goes up into the air and it can affect the state as a whole, so.

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay. FPL, do y'all have a response?

MR. BUTLER: We don't object to their intervention. The representation about having members who are FPL customers satisfies many concerns we might

otherwise have. 1 2 **COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Okay. MS. KAUFMAN: Commissioner? I'm sorry. 3 **COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Yes, ma'am. 4 MS. KAUFMAN: I didn't know if you were ready 5 for my response. I didn't want you to --6 7 COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Please do, yes, because y'all have standing on this also. I'm sorry. 8 9 MS. KAUFMAN: I'm sorry. I didn't mean to 10 interrupt you. COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Again, this is my 11 12 first rodeo. 13 MS. KAUFMAN: And I'm a little rusty, so, 14 yeah. 15 I was going to say that FIPUG does object to the Audubon Society's intervention. We will file a 16 17 written response to the motion. But our objection is 18 based on the Audubon Society's articulation of their 19 environmental concerns, which are not within the purview of this Commission. And we will elucidate that further 2.0 21 in a written response, but we do object on that basis. 22 COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Noted. Thank you. I 23 appreciate your response. 24 I'll just be honest, I want to take all this 25 into consideration, so I'll get back to you and you'll

see it in my final order. Are there -- does any other 1 party have anything on this preliminary matter? 2 3 Okay. Let's go ahead and proceed through the draft Prehearing Order. I'll identify sections as we go 4 through it. The parties, if you'll -- we'll kind of go 5 through it quickly. If there's any corrections to be 6 7 made, please, please make itself known. So Section I, case background. 8 9 MR. BUTLER: Commissioner? **COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Yes. 10 MR. BUTLER: Actually before we even get to 11 there, I noticed in reading it through this morning that 12 13 Mr. Donaldson, whose name I mentioned earlier, does not appear in the list of appearances here, and we'd ask 14 that Kevin I.C. Donaldson be added as counsel for FPL. 15 16 COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay. That can be 17 noted; right? Thanks. 18 All right. Great. 19 MR. WRIGHT: Commissioner? 2.0 COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Oh, there you go. 21 MR. WRIGHT: I do think it would be 22 appropriate for us to be recognized as appearing for the 23 limited purpose for which we filed our notice in the 24 final Prehearing Order. 25 COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Sure. It's written

down on mine, but I guess we need to --1 MR. WRIGHT: Oh, good deal. Thank you very 2 3 much. COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Sure. Sure. Thank 4 5 you. Okay. Going through the Prehearing Order, 6 7 Section I, case background. Section II. 8 9 Section III. Section IV. 10 MS. KAUFMAN: Commissioner, we do have a 11 12 question, I guess, on Section IV. 13 **COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Okay. 14 MS. KAUFMAN: And our question is that it's my 15 understanding that in the past it has been the practice that when confidential information has already been 16 17 filed, which I believe is the case here, that the staff 18 will be responsible for making copies of that 19 information and distributing it as opposed to someone 20 who's using a confidential cross-examination exhibit 21 that the party would have to provide the copies. 22 MS. BARRERA: Commissioner? 23 COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Yes, ma'am. 24 MS. BARRERA: That is correct. At this point 25 there are no changes to the procedure. The hearing will

involve a large number of confidential exhibits. 1 Pursuant to the section in the Prehearing Officer (sic), 2 3 it's the parties' responsibility to have copies for the Commissioners, necessary staff, and the court reporter 4 in red envelopes clearly marked with the nature of the 5 contents and with the confidential information 6 7 highlighted. Staff recommends that each party bring at 8 9 least 15 copies to the hearing, but staff will provide the copies of the confidential portions of the prefiled 10 testimony and exhibits. 11 12 **COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Okay. 13 MS. KAUFMAN: Thank you. I just wanted that 14 to be clear so there's no confusion at the hearing. COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Sure. 15 MS. KAUFMAN: Thank you. 16 17 COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: No. Thank you for 18 bringing that to our attention. 19 Section V. MS. BARRERA: Commissioner, staff will suggest 2.0 21 that witness summary testimony be no longer than 22 three minutes. 23 COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay. Yes, sir. 24 MR. BUTLER: We would like to leave it at 25 five. I mean, certainly we'll do our best to have our

witnesses be brief, but some of it's relatively complex information, and I would prefer not to be limited to only three minutes of oral summary.

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Well, I guess my concern is, is there's 36 witnesses that I've counted. Now, some of them are repeats that come back, back and forth, but I was trying to be sensitive. I won't be chairing that panel when it takes place.

MR. BUTLER: Well, I know that there is a desire to move this along. We share the desire to move it along. And I think probably, for example, if you wanted to have a limit where witnesses could have, say, a total of, like, eight minutes for direct and rebuttal and we can use it as we see fit, we might be able to work within that framework. But three minutes is pretty short from my experience. And, as I say, we've got some relatively complex matters to be -- to be covered and would prefer not to be limited to three minutes for those reasons.

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: How about we split the difference at four, and that way we won't have to keep any math.

MR. BUTLER: Everybody just gets four minutes for their direct and then four minutes for rebuttal?

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Right.

MR. BUTLER: We can live with that.

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 PATRONIS:** Okay. All right. we'll make that note to be four minutes. Is that fine? Okay.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Section VI, order of the witness. Staff, will any witnesses be taken out of order?

MS. BARRERA: At this time, Commissioner, staff is not aware of any witnesses to be taken out of order, but other -- but witnesses may be suggested by the parties.

MR. BUTLER: Nothing for us. The order reflects what we intend to do.

**COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Okay.

MS. KAUFMAN: Commissioner? Sorry. I don't know that -- how this will fall out at the hearing, but -- and in the past we've worked with the parties as the hearing has progressed, but FIPUG's witness Mr. Pollock has a conflict. He has to be in Austin, Texas. And so he needs to testify after 12:00 on the first day -- sometime in this window -- after 12:00 on the first day and he has to be able to depart by noon on day two. So I'm hoping we'll just be able to work that out as we proceed through.

**COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Is that something we can specify now, or is there any problems with that?

MS. HELTON: Commissioner, it's always been the Commission's desire to work with the parties with respect to the timing of witnesses.

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Do the best we can.

MS. HELTON: But, you know, that's to the extent that everybody can make it work out and that the schedule works out. So hopefully that's something that Ms. Kaufman and Mr. Moyle can work out with the parties so that that can happen and that the presiding officer at the -- at the hearing will agree to.

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Be sensitive to.

MS. KAUFMAN: Absolutely. I just wanted to make the parties aware. We've always, I think, been able to work around various witnesses' availability.

In a -- since it's still my turn, I guess, I have two other things on the order of witnesses.

**COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Okay.

MS. KAUFMAN: The first is, again, just sort of in the nature of a heads-up. I don't think it's anything that has to be in the Prehearing Order, but it would be FIPUG's intention to object to witnesses that offer expert opinions unless they are qualified as an expert in that area. And I guess that's something that

will be taken up as each witness takes the stand, but I just wanted to let the parties know that and put it on the record.

And then the other thing really relates to Mr. Pollock's availability as well, which is that in discussion with FPL, I guess, and staff, we would be willing to stipulate Mr. Pollock and Mr. Lane without them having to appear. So if that's something that the parties are interested in, I guess they can contact FIPUG and let us know.

MS. HELTON: Commissioner, may I ask

Ms. Kaufman a question with respect to the expert
qualifications? As I --

**COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Please do.

MS. HELTON: As I understand the requirement in the Order Establishing Procedure -- and I'm looking at Page 5 where it says you are to list in your prehearing statement any objections to a witness's qualifications as an expert. So are there particular experts that you have in mind, or are you saying all experts?

MS. KAUFMAN: I will admit to you, Ms. Helton, that I am not intimately familiar with the testimony in this case. It's my understanding though that in order for an expert to offer an opinion, he has to be

qualified in a particular area. So it would be our intent at the hearing if an ex -- if a witness begins to offer what's an expert opinion and we believe he's not qualified, then we would intend to object.

If you're asking me now to give you specifics on which witness and which areas, that I cannot do.

**COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Ms. Barrera.

MS. BARRERA: Commissioner, the witnesses are -- in their direct testimony all have -- list their qualifications and experience and such.

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Right. I saw that.

MS. BARRERA: My feeling is that possibly
FIPUG should object. You know, if they want to object,
they should list which witnesses after they have read
the, you know, the testimony and the -- that part of the
testimony that sets out the witness qualifications and
designate which witnesses they plan to attack should
there be testimony that they submit as experts, you
know. And I think that would be notice to the parties
to know which witnesses they need to defend or which
witnesses they need to, you know, to provide the
information to.

**COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** I understand.

MS. BARRERA: So that, I think, is just the basis of proper notice.

**COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Okay.

MR. BUTLER: Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Yes, sir.

MR. BUTLER: I would also note that with the exception of the deposition of Mr. Patterson, which is to occur tomorrow, FIPUG has participated in depositions of all of FPL's witnesses. So any questions, confusion they might have had from reading the prehearing testimony about the extent of expertise they've had an opportunity to explore. So we don't see why they wouldn't be in a position to identify that now.

**COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Noted. Okay.

MS. KAUFMAN: Commissioner, I wasn't intending to make this into a big issue. I was simply putting the parties on notice. It's the parties' responsibility, I think, to designate their witness's area of expertise. But I'm not suggesting that you need to rule or anything. It was really just to let the parties know for the record.

**COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Okay. Are there any -- are there any witnesses that may be excused?

MR. BUTLER: Commissioner, one thing that I have as a question here to FIPUG, two of their witnesses are actually, as I understand it, the desire to enter in portions of deposition transcripts. And I don't think

1	that there's a plan to have those witnesses appear, but
2	that's, I guess, a question to Ms. Kaufman. That would
3	be Mr. Evans and Mr. Rudolph.
4	MS. KAUFMAN: That's my understanding,
5	Mr. Butler, that their depositions would be entered into
6	the record in lieu of their appearances. They are more
7	than 100 miles away and they would be adverse witnesses
8	to FIPUG.
9	COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Anything else? All
10	right.
11	MS. BARRERA: Commissioner?
12	COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Yes, ma'am.
13	MS. BARRERA: We are also wondering if the
14	parties plan to take any witnesses out of order or if
15	they would like to or if FP&L will present their
16	witnesses' direct and rebuttal at the same time or wait
17	till after Intervenor testimony.
18	MR. BUTLER: At this point, it's our intent to
19	present them separately on rebuttal.
20	COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay. All right. Any
21	other issues with order of witnesses?
22	Okay. Section VII, basic positions. I assume
23	the parties have no changes in their basic positions.
24	Are there any changes? Okay.
25	If there's any changes any changes to the

basic positions need to be submitted in writing no later than noon tomorrow to staff.

Section VIII, issues and positions. Do the parties have any changes to their positions?

MS. KAUFMAN: We do. And we'll be happy to read it or submit it or both, whichever the Commissioner prefers.

**COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** If you want to go ahead and present it now.

MS. KAUFMAN: Okay.

MS. BARRERA: Excuse me. If we can identify the issue in which you have the change.

MS. KAUFMAN: It's -- it's actually an addition, and it's on Issue 7, which is on page 15. I think I'm looking at the prior draft, but I think it's the same page, toward the bottom.

So we just want to add a sentence after the position that's reflected there. And it would say, "Additionally, because the railcars will not be used to deliver coal to the Cedar Bay facility for the vast majority of the remaining contract term but will be subleased to third parties, the railcar lease payments should be recovered through base rates."

MS. BARRERA: And we will request that the position be submitted in writing by tomorrow. That way

we can put exactly what FIPUG wants. 1 2 MS. KAUFMAN: I'll be happy to do that. COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay. All right. 3 Section IX, exhibit list. 4 MS. BARRERA: Excuse me, Commissioner. 5 **COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Yes, ma'am. 6 7 MS. BARRERA: We have a contested issue. COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Oh, I'm sorry. We do. 8 We do have a contested issue. 9 MS. BARRERA: The issue is not numbered. It's 10 on page 17 of the Prehearing Order. And the parties may 11 want to address this issue. It is OPC's issue, so I 12 recommend that OPC go first. 13 COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay. All right. On 14 behalf of Office of Public Counsel. 15 MR. TRUITT: Thank you, Commissioner. 16 17 As noted, this -- there's multiple issues 18 presented in this position, but arguably the key issue 19 that sparked this proposed transaction is the fact that 20 Cedar Bay's PPA's fixed price O&M and capacity payments, 21 the critical economic drivers, are far above market 22 prices in current avoided costs. 23 FPL argues in its petition and direct 24 testimony that the avoided cost is \$27 per megawatt hour 25 and an all-in price of \$178 per megawatt hour under the

PPA. Now we don't dispute that the PPA is economically unfavorable for FPL's customers; however, the issues in this case revolve around the prudence of the method chosen by FPL to eliminate the PPA. As part of that prudence review, FPL's chosen method to eliminate the current PPA, it's only logical the Commission compare other available options, one of which is a regulatory

out clause in the PPA.

2.0

Now in the prehearing statements, FPL referenced regulatory out clause and stated that it altered the doctrine of administrative finality, referencing Order No. 25668, which was issued February 3rd, 1992.

We'd like to note there's two critical exceptions to the doctrine of administrative finality, a significant change of circumstances, and demonstrated public interest.

Notwithstanding that there is a regulatory out clause in this PPA, one of the last ones in the State of Florida, finding a demonstrated public interest would allow the Commission to limit recovery of costs under the PPA should the Commission find the PPA is so economically unfavorable as to not be in the public interest.

Second, FPL specifically appealed the topics

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 PATRONIS: FIPUG.

of regulatory out clauses in FPL v. Beard, 626 So.2d 660, which was decided by the Florida Supreme Court in 1993, a year after the order cited in the prehearing statement.

In that case, FPL argued the regulatory out clause was needed. And to quote from the decision, the court stated, "FPL asserts circumstances could arise under which the Commission, acting in the public interest or pursuant to a legislative mandate, would preclude the recovery of payments made to a QF."

The Supreme Court went on to find the Commission made a decision to remove regulatory out clauses later in an endeavor to make its orders as final as the law permits.

Now, based on the statements of the court and the argument in that case and the court's interpretation of the arguments, the present exercise of regulatory out clause do not alter the doctrine of administrative finality. So we believe it's only appropriate for the Commission in this case, while conducting a prudence review of the proposed transaction, that the Commission consider all the options that are available besides simply the one that FPL presented. Thank you, Commissioner.

2

4

5 6

7

8

10 11

12

1314

15

16

1718

19

20

21

22

2324

25

MS. KAUFMAN: Regardless of your decision on this issue, we're going to remain with the position as we reflected it in the Prehearing Order.

**COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Okay. FPL.

MR. BUTLER: Commissioner, we reiterate our position that the doctrine of administrative finality, you know, does and should apply here. I mean, yes, the contract has a regulatory out provision, but, you know, the change of circumstances is simply a matter of economics having become less favorable, the contract, over time. If the Commission were to treat that as a change of circumstances that justified departing from the doctrine of administrative finality, it would give basically no parties to contracts any certainty about the exercise of those contracts ever. Basically the reason people want to change the terms of contracts are because of some change of circumstances that, you know, makes the economics more favorable for one side or the other. And if one is going to allow parties to have confidence that contracts will be enforced, that simply can't be a valid change of circumstances.

I think that what the doctrine has in mind, administrative finality in creating that exception, is where there has been some just different legislation, different circumstances that make the whole nature of

the relationship different than it had been at the time of contracting. And there's nothing about the relationship that's any different today than it was when this contract was entered into. It's simply that the prices of fuel and other conditions have changed to the point where a contract that was favorable one way initially maybe is unfavorable in that direction and more favorable in the other direction now. But that's not the sort of thing that ever could or should result in a departure from administrative finality.

2.0

And as to the public interest, I mean, again, it's sort of tautological. Of course, if a contract is now unfavorable, then it would be good in that particular instance for customers if the Commission were to force the parties to abandon that contract. But I think the long-term implications of that would be drastically opposed to the public interest. I mean, parties in, you know, proceedings where very long-term commitments are being made and are being approved by the Commission need to know that that approval is going to remain without being revisited simply because the economics change.

So for all of those reasons, we think that the doctrine of administrative finality is applicable here.

That it would be improper and very much a matter of poor

public policy for the Commission to take Public

Counsel's suggestion that the easy way out here is

simply to trash the contract rather than dealing

properly with a legitimate way for the parties to end it

on terms that are mutually agreeable. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Thanks. I'm inclined not to allow it.

All right. We'll move to exhibition (sic) list, IX.

MS. BARRERA: Staff notes that it will prepare a draft Comprehensive Exhibit List which will list all prefiled exhibits and those exhibits staff wishes to include in the record. Staff will circulate the draft and will check with the parties prior to the hearing to determine if there are any objections to the exhibit list or any of staff's exhibits being entered into the record.

**COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Okay. Section X.

MS. BARRERA: Staff will note that there are no stipulations at this time. Should there be stipulations, we will -- after the Prehearing Order is issued, we will be -- provide it to the Commissioners prior to the hearing.

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay. Section XI.
MS. BARRERA: The pending motions have already

been heard, and staff is not aware of any other motion. COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay. Section XII. MS. BARRERA: Staff will note that there are several confidentiality requests pending. Staff is currently working with the parties to narrow the scope of those confidentiality requests so that orders can be issued. COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay. Section --MS. KAUFMAN: Commissioner? **COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Yes. 

MS. KAUFMAN: In that regard, again, just so the parties are on notice, FIPUG does have and will be filing some written objections to some of the requests for confidentiality regarding some of the documents that are at issue. And perhaps we can work that out without a ruling -- I don't know -- but just so the parties are aware.

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay. Section XIII.
MS. BARRERA: Post-hearing -- excuse me.

**COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Mary Anne.

MS. HELTON: I'm sorry, Commissioner, to keep interrupting. It looks to me like the last filing for request for confidential treatment was on June the 19th, according to the Prehearing Order. Haven't the seven days passed?

MS. KAUFMAN: I think there have been some --1 I think they're up to number seven, if I'm --2 MS. HELTON: Okay. Maybe -- I'm sorry. Maybe 3 I have the wrong draft. But -- so you're just going to 4 object to those that have been filed within the 5 seven-day period to object? 6 7 MS. KAUFMAN: Whatever the appropriate time frame is. 8 9 MS. BARRERA: It is seven days. MS. KAUFMAN: Yeah. A lot of -- it's -- the 10 11 same documents are being filed sort of over and over 12 again. Some were attached to depositions. We will respond -- I believe we have till Wednesday to respond 13 14 to the last request that was filed. 15 COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay. Section XIII, post-hearing procedures. 16 17 MS. BARRERA: Yes. Parties have indicated 18 that they will be filing post-hearing briefs on the 19 issues in this docket. Pursuant to Rule 28-106.215, Florida Administrative Code, a party's proposed findings 2.0 21 of fact and conclusions of law, if any, statement of 22 issues and positions and briefs shall together total no 23 more than 40 pages, and staff recommends post-hearing 24 briefs be no longer than 40 pages. 25 COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Are all parties in

agreement with that? 1 MR. BUTLER: That's fine for FPL. 2 MS. BARRERA: Okay. 3 **COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Okay. 4 MS. BARRERA: Staff will also note that a 5 6 7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

summary of each position of not more than 75 words set off with asterisks could be included in the statement. We're recommending that the summary be limited to 75 words.

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Is that all in agreement? Okay.

MS. BARRERA: Staff finally notes that any briefs will be due on August 11th, 2015, for the September 15th, 2015, Agenda Conference.

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay. Section XIV, rulings.

MS. BARRERA: Staff suggests that the Prehearing Officer make a ruling that opening statements, if any, should not exceed five minutes per side, unless any party chooses to waive its opening statement.

MR. BUTLER: Once again, I'm going to ask for more. Five is pretty short. I certainly appreciate the Commission's interest in not having the proceeding held up unduly by prehearing statements. There aren't a lot

of parties in this docket though, and I think that, you 1 know, ten minutes would be sufficient for us and not an 2 3 extended period that would unduly delay the start of the hearing. 4 5 **COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Is that okay? Any problem with ten minutes? 6 7 MS. KAUFMAN: Is ten minutes okay? COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Is that -- are you --8 9 MS. KAUFMAN: We don't -- we don't object to 10 ten minutes. It's kind of long, but we don't object. COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Well, again, I would, 11 I would encourage you to keep it as close to five as you 12 13 can, but I'll move it to ten minutes. 14 Okay. Other matters? Staff, are there any other matters to address in this Prehearing Conference? 15 MS. BARRERA: There are no other matters that 16 17 we are aware of. 18 COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Okay. All right. 19 Well, seeing no other matters before the counsel today, 20 this concludes our prehearing, and the Prehearing 21 Conference is adjourned. Thank you for your attendance. 22 (Prehearing Conference adjourned at 2:05 p.m.) 23 24 25

1	STATE OF FLORIDA ) : CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	COUNTY OF LEON )
3	
4	I, LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR, Official Commission
5	Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.
6	
7	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the
8	same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true
9	transcription of my notes of said proceedings.
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor
11	am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I
12	financially interested in the action.
13	DATED THIS 10th day of July, 2015.
14	
15	Linda Boles
16	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR
17	FPSC Official Hearings Reporter (850) 413-6734
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	