## FILED OCT 12, 2016 DOCUMENT NO. 08183-16 FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

000001

1 BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 2 In the Matter of: 3 DOCKET NO. 160007-EI 4 ENVIRONMENTAL COST RECOVERY 5 CLAUSE. 6 7 8 9 PROCEEDINGS: PREHEARING CONFERENCE 10 11 COMMISSIONER PARTICIPATING: COMMISSIONER ART GRAHAM 12 PREHEARING OFFICER 13 Tuesday, October 11, 2016 DATE: 14 TIME: Commenced at 1:16 p.m. Concluded at 1:47 p.m. 15 PLACE: Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148 16 4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida 17 18 REPORTED BY: LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR Official FPSC Reporter 19 (850) 413-6734 20 21 22 23 24 25

**APPEARANCES:** 

Company.

Tampa Electric Company.

Florida 33408-0420, on behalf of Florida Power & Light

R. WADE LITCHFIELD, JOHN T. BUTLER, and MARIA

Florida 33408-0420, on benalf of Florida Power & Light

MONCADA, ESQUIRES, 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach,

JAMES D. BEASLEY, J. JEFFRY WAHLEN, and ASHLEY M. DANIELS, ESQUIRES, Ausley & McMullen, Post Office Box 391, Tallahassee, Florida 32302, appearing on behalf of

JEFFREY A. STONE, RUSSELL A. BADDERS and STEVEN R. GRIFFIN, ESQUIRES, Beggs & Lane, P.O. Box 12950, Pensacola, Florida 32591-2950, appearing on behalf of Gulf Power Company.

MATTHEW R. BERNIER, ESQUIRE, 106 East College Avenue, Suite 800, Tallahassee, Florida 32301-7740; and DIANNE TRIPLETT, ESQUIRE, 299 First Avenue North, St. Petersburg, Florida 33701, appearing on behalf of Duke Energy Florida, Inc.

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

**APPEARANCES:** 

appearing on behalf of White Springs Agricultural

Xenopoulos & Brew, P.C., 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street,

JAMES W. BREW, ESQUIRE, Stone Mattheis

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

NW, Eight Floor, West Tower, Washington, DC 20007,

J.R. KELLY, PUBLIC COUNSEL; CHARLES REHWINKEL, ERIK SAYLER, PATRICIA A. CHRISTENSEN, and STEPHANIE, MORRIS, ESQUIRES, 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.

CHARLIE MURPHY and BIANCA LHERISSON, ESQUIRES, FPSC General Counsel's Office, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, appearing on behalf of the Florida Public Service Commission Staff.

KEITH HETRICK, GENERAL COUNSEL, and MARY ANNE HELTON, DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL, Advisor to the Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850.

## PROCEEDINGS

MS. TAN: By notice issued September 27th,
2016, this time and place was set for a prehearing in
the following dockets: 160001-EI, 160002-EG, 160003-GU,
160004-GU, and 160007-EI. The purpose of the prehearing
is set out in the notice.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Thank you. Staff.

We're going to take appearances, and if I could have you, when you give your names or give your company, you don't have to do it each individual, but when you give the company and the names, also give the dockets that you're being a part of all at one time. And I guess we can start right up here with Florida Power & Light.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Commissioner Graham. For the 01 docket I have R. Wade Litchfield, John Butler, and Maria Moncada. We also would be making appearances in Docket 160007, the ECRC. And then for the 02 docket, R. Wade Litchfield, John Butler, and Kenneth Rubin. Thank you.

MR. BADDERS: Good afternoon. Russell Badders on behalf of Gulf Power. I'll be appearing in 01 and 02 and 07 dockets along with Steven R. Griffin and Jeffrey A. Stone.

**COMMISSIONER GRAHAM:** Okay.

MR. BEASLEY: Good afternoon. James D.

1	Beasley with the Ausley McMullen law firm. Appearing
2	with me are J. Jeffry Wahlen and Ashley M. Daniels of
3	the same firm in the 01, 02, and 07 dockets.
4	MR. WATSON: Ansley Watson, Jr., Macfarlane,
5	Ferguson & McMullen in the 03 and 04 dockets.
6	MS. KEATING: Good afternoon, Commissioner.
7	Beth Keating with the Gunster law firm. I'm here today
8	for FPUC in the 01, 02, 03, and 04 dockets; FPU-Fort
9	Meade in the 03 docket; and Fort Meade, the Indiantown
10	Division, and Chesapeake in the 04 docket.
11	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.
12	MR. MUNSON: Good afternoon, Commissioner. My
13	name is Greg Munson also with the Gunster law firm on
14	behalf of Florida City Gas in dockets 03 and 04.
15	MR. BREW: Good afternoon, Commissioner.
16	James Brew with the firm of Stone, Mattheis, Xenopoulos
17	& Brew appearing in the 01, 02, and 07 dockets for White
18	Springs Agricultural Chemicals/PCS Phosphate.
19	MR. WRIGHT: Good afternoon, Commissioner.
20	Robert Scheffel Wright and John T. Lavia, III, of the
21	Gardner law firm appearing on behalf of the Florida
22	Retail Federation in Docket 160001, the fuel docket.
23	Thank you.
24	MR. MOYLE: Good afternoon. Jon Moyle with
25	the Moyle Law Firm appearing on behalf of the Florida

	d
1	Industrial Power Users Group in the 01, 02, and
2	07 dockets. And Karen Putnal with the firm should also
3	be noted as entering an appearance. Thank you.
4	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Patricia Christensen with
5	the Office of Public Counsel. And I'd also like to put
6	in an appearance for J. R. Kelly, Public Counsel;
7	Charles Rehwinkel; and Erik Sayler with the Office of
8	Public Counsel in the 01, 02, 03, 04, and 07 dockets.
9	MS. LEITMAN: Melanie Leitman appearing on
10	behalf of my co-counsel, Paula Sparkman, out of Messer,
11	Caparello representing Sebring Gas of the 04 docket.
12	MR. BERNIER: Good afternoon, Commissioner.
13	Matt Bernier with Duke Energy and entering an appearance
14	in the 01, 02, and 07 dockets. And I'd like to enter an
15	appearance for Dianne Triplett in those same dockets and
16	for John Burnett in the 01 docket. Thank you.
17	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Anybody else before I go
18	to staff for appearances?
19	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Can I also add this is
20	Patty Christensen with the Office of Public Counsel
21	an appearance for Stephanie Morris in all of the dockets
22	as well.
23	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Anybody else before I go
24	to staff?
25	Staff.

MS. TAN: Lee Eng Tan on behalf of the 02 docket, and making an appearance for Stephanie Cuello in the 02 and 04 docket, and Margo Leathers and Wesley Taylor in the 03 docket, Kelley Corbari in the 04 docket, Bianca Lherisson and Charlie Murphy in the 07 docket, and Danijela Janjic and Suzanne Brownless in the 01 docket.

MS. HELTON: And finally, Mary Anne Helton.

I'm here as your advisor. I'd also like to make an appearance for your General Counsel, Keith Hetrick.

\* \* \* \* \*

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. 07 docket, staff.
MS. LHERISSON: Yes, Commissioner.

Preliminary matters. Staff is hopeful that all issues can be stipulated and witnesses excused in this docket. Staff will continue to work towards this end. If an agreement can be reached in the next few days, the prehearing order will need to be modified to reflect such an agreement. If an agreement is reached, staff -- if an agreement is reached, staff proposes to circulate an amended draft before an order is issued.

When we get to the issues, we will need to address the possible spinout of issues related to FPL's Turkey Point project and Gulf's Plant Scherer Unit 3. There appears to be an agreement on doing this. There

also appears to be an agreement regarding DEF's Issue

11 and Gulf's Issues 9B and 9C. I am not seeing

disputes on any of the generic issues or the tariff

issue.

2.0

**COMMISSIONER GRAHAM:** Do we have any other preliminary matters for the O7 docket?

Okay. Let's click on through the prehearing order as before. Section I, Section II, Section III, Section IV, Section V. Staff.

MS. LHERISSON: Staff will prepare a

Comprehensive Exhibit List, which will include all

prefiled exhibits and also include those exhibits staff

wishes to include in the record. Staff hopes that an

eventual stipulation will extend to the exhibits in this

docket.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I just love staff is just so hopeful.

Anything else for Section V? Section VI. Staff.

MS. LHERISSON: If an agreement can be reached to excuse any witnesses, staff will confirm with each Commissioner that the witnesses can be excused. If no Commissioner has a question of these witnesses, the witnesses may be excused from the hearing and his or her testimony and exhibits entered into the record at the

hearing as though read.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Yes, sir.

,

MR. BUTLER: I have a question at this point.

I just want to be sure I understand what the direction is with respect to the potential deferral of FPL's issues on the Turkey Point cooling canals. If that is approved and, you know, I guess when that's approved, one of the witnesses here and then several of the exhibits listed in the prehearing order I think would be removed. It's not stipulated into the record they be removed and it wouldn't be appropriate for Mr. Labauve, who is our witness on the cooling canals, to be a witness if we don't have an issue on that topic. So I'm just, I guess, looking to staff to understand how that process will play out on -- between now and the hearing.

**COMMISSIONER GRAHAM:** Staff.

MR. MURPHY: How would you like it?

MR. BUTLER: I would like to -- I would like to learn that we have agreement for the issue to be deferred today, in which case I think we would just be withdrawing Mr. Labauve's testimony and exhibits.

MR. MURPHY: When we get to the issues, I think we may get there.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

MR. MURPHY: And if that's the case, then you

1	can just
2	MR. BUTLER: Come back to it?
3	MR. MURPHY: Yes.
4	MR. BUTLER: Okay. Thank you.
5	MR. BADDERS: Commissioner Graham, I do have
6	one change in Section VI.
7	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Sure.
8	MR. BADDERS: Actually it's two changes. We
9	need to add witness or Issue 9C to Witness Boyett and
10	Issue 9B to Witness Deason. And I'll provide that to
11	Mr. Murphy so he'll have a written record of that.
12	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: One more time. Which
13	one to Boyett?
14	MR. BADDERS: Mr. Boyett, add Issue 9C, as in
15	Charlie.
16	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.
17	MR. BADDERS: And on Deason, add Issue 9B, as
18	in Bravo.
19	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Are those the
20	only two changes?
21	MR. BADDERS: Yes, sir.
22	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Any other changes to
23	Section VI?
24	Okay. Let's move on to Section VII, Section
25	VIII. Staff.

Procedure requires that a party take a position at the prehearing conference unless good cause is shown as to why that party cannot take a position at this time.

Accordingly, if a party's position in the draft prehearing order is currently "No position at this time," or something similar, that party must change its -- must change it at today's prehearing conference or show good cause why it cannot take a position.

Otherwise, the prehearing order will reflect "No position" for that party on that issue. If a party wishes to change a position, please submit your position in writing no later than noon tomorrow, October 12th.

**COMMISSIONER GRAHAM:** We'll make that end of the day. Continue.

MS. LHERISSON: Commissioner, can we go through the issues one at a time and see if there are any disputes? Some have been stipulated.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Issue 1, is there any dispute? Issue 2. I'm sorry. I see people still turning pages. Issue 1 still. Issue 2, Issue 3.

MR. MOYLE: Can I ask a question of clarification or process with respect to Issue 3?

**COMMISSIONER GRAHAM:** Sure.

MR. MOYLE: And it probably will flow through

to some other issues as well.

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

FPL's position reflects a basis for recovery on cost allocation that, my understanding, appears to be different from some previous filings that they've made. So given your point about being able to change positions till close of business tomorrow, I'm kind of wondering whether FPL anticipates changing its position with respect to the 12CP and 25 percent cost allocation to set forth a position consistent with a filing, I think, that was made last week. I'm just not sure what the plan is and how that's going to proceed, and I'd like to be informed on that point.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: I assume Mr. Moyle is referring to the settlement agreement or proposed settlement agreement we filed in the rate case docket and the consolidated dockets there. That would end up changing our position on the allocation basis for production plant from the 12CP and 25 percent that we are proposing here consistent with our position in the rate case to the 12CP and 1/13th that would be consistent with the proposed settlement agreement. At this point we are presenting them as alternatives because we obviously don't know yet whether the proposed settlement agreement would be approved. And unless and until it is, our

position remains that the 12CP and 25 percent methodology would be appropriate. If the settlement is approved, then, as stated in our position here, we would sort of resort to or default to the position of using the sort of current or past practice of the 12CP and 1/13th.

MR. MOYLE: And just on a -- from a timing perspective, it's anticipated that that information and decision will be known before this decision?

MR. BUTLER: I think that's still up in the air and it's dependent on what the Commission ends up scheduling. But I think there is a fair chance it will not be decided. That's one of the reasons that we had presented them as alternatives, Jon. It may be that we reach the hearing date for this docket with not yet a decision on whether or not to approve the settlement agreement. And in anticipation of that possibility and not knowing one way or the other how it'll play out, that's why we're sort of keeping both positions open as options.

## COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Staff.

MR. MURPHY: Just while we're at a break, if we could roll back. We don't have -- however you work that out is good with us. But what we'd like to do is there's some variation in there being no dispute. Are

the parties -- is it acceptable if we reflect these things as "No position" where we've got, for example, someone agreeing with OPC or someone saying you've got a burden of proof? Is that --

MR. MOYLE: Well, for my position, I mean, I'm going to have to take issue with the 12CP and 25 percent because we took issue with it in the rate case. So to be consistent, I would need to say, no, 12CP and 1/13th is the better way to go, you know, on issues like that. But in terms of a stipulation with respect to the Turkey Point cooling canals and the Scherer issue, I mean, my understanding is those are going to be hopefully punted down the road, and that's fine by us. We want to have our chance to have the day in court and are not feeling that it has to be in the clause proceeding, so we're not going to be in the way of anything related to punting.

MR. MURPHY: Sure. But for the other generics, you're okay with -- just get with me.

MR. MOYLE: Okay. Let's follow up offline, if we can, on that.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, sir.

MR. MOYLE: So I guess, Mr. Chairman, the only thing is, like, who knows how this all plays out, but for the changes, I mean, obviously if this doesn't go the way -- one way, I mean, we'd like to amend the

exhibit list to have the filing from last week be 1 available as an exhibit in this case that shows the 12CP 2 and 1/13th approach as the one FPL is proposing. 3 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: So you propose that we 4 use the proposed settlement as one of the exhibits? 5 MR. MOYLE: Their filing, yes. 6 7 MR. BUTLER: I don't have an objection to that, but I think you could probably just take official 8 9 recognition of it. But if it's the will of the parties to include it as an exhibit, that's okay with me. 10 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: And, staff, we're fine 11 12 with that? Mary Anne? 13 MS. HELTON: I actually have been doing some reading on official recognition since the rate case 14 15 hearing, and I think it might be appropriate to make it as an exhibit. 16 17 **COMMISSIONER GRAHAM:** Okay. 18 MR. MOYLE: Yeah, that way I can ask the 19 witness questions about it. "Isn't it true that this is 20 the best way to go?" kind of thing, so. 21 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: No. I understand where 22 you're coming from. 23 MR. MOYLE: Yeah. Right. Okay. Thank you.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

So we'll -- by close of business tomorrow, we'll submit

the filing that will list that document as an exhibit.

24

25

1	And I think you've dealt with it today, so thank you.
2	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Anything else on
3	Issue 3? Okay. Let's move on to Issue 4.
4	MR. MOYLE: That's the same point on Issue 4.
5	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Issue 5, Issue 6,
6	Issue 7.
7	MR. MOYLE: Same point. I don't feel the need
8	to point it out every time.
9	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: No, that's fine.
10	MR. MOYLE: Yeah.
11	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Issue 8, Issue 9A. Yes.
12	MR. BADDERS: Commissioner Graham, I believe
13	we have a proposed stipulation on this issue that all of
14	the parties are either in agreement with or will take a
15	Type 2 stipulation. I just want to get confirmation of
16	that from all of the parties.
17	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Does that sync with
18	everybody's knowledge?
19	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Yes. OPC's understanding is
20	we do have some agreed-to language to stipulate this
21	issue and defer it.
22	MR. MOYLE: And we haven't agreed to the
23	stipulation affirmatively but said we're not going to
24	stand in the way and we think it should be deferred, so
25	we're happy with that result.

MR. BADDERS: I believe that would be the 1 2 stip -- Type 2 stipulation that we typically see. 3 **COMMISSIONER GRAHAM:** Yeah. So if anybody is not in agreement with that, speak up. I'll assume you 4 all are. There you go. 5 MR. BADDERS: I believe the same is true for 6 7 9B and 9C. COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Questions, concerns, 8 9 comments on 9B, 9C, Issue 10. MR. BUTLER: Issue 10 is FPL's issue for 10 deferral of the Turkey Point Cooling Canal Monitoring 11 12 Plan project. We believe that there is agreement to 13 defer that. And I have not heard any objection to the 14 language that FPL has proposed as the statement or the 15 basis for deferral, so I would ask whether there's any 16 objection to stipulating to that. 17 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Any comments, concerns, 18 questions on Issue 10 from what FPL just said? 19 MR. MOYLE: FIPUG would take the same position 20 as I just took with Gulf with respect to saying we 21 support the deferral of the matter, don't have an issue 22 with it being deferred, think that's a good idea. 23 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Ms. Christensen, 24 you're reaching for your button. 25 MS. CHRISTENSEN: Yes. And I think we've

stated we're in agreement with deferring it and we didn't have any dispute with the language. We would note that this doesn't create a presumption for next year's proceeding in the correctness of the cost.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Yes. Staff, do you have anything to add before I move to 11? You're good?

Don't feel like you have to add anything.

MR. MURPHY: I guess as we go forward, we may need to decide what witnesses can be excused, given this, and what issues are just fallout issues and what witness you might have to have here for Mr. Moyle's concerns, if we get there.

MR. BUTLER: Sure. Do you want to cover that now or wait till the end?

MR. MURPHY: Even after this. Just whenever

MR. BUTLER: I can do it pretty simply, if you want to. I mean, our -- my sense is that unless we reach agreement with Mr. Moyle on the -- or the issue is otherwise resolved by the settlement agreement on the allocation question, Ms. Deaton, the first witness listed in the -- back on page 4 in the order of witnesses, she would need to appear. And with the stipulation that I believe has just been approved for Issue 10, Mr. Labauve, there would be no reason for him

to appear. His testimony solely relates to the cooling 1 2 canal project. COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: So you would strike the 3 testimony of both -- part of Deaton and all of Labauve? 4 MR. BUTLER: That's right. There's a small 5 portion of Ms. Deaton's testimony that relates to the 6 7 cooling canals. We can take that out. But as a witness, she'll still be the person to appear. 8 9 Mr. Labauve would not need to at all because his 10 testimony is exclusively on the cooling canals. COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Staff, does that handle 11 12 your concern, your question? 13 MR. MURPHY: Yes. Thank you. 14 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Anybody else on Issue 10? Okay. Let's move to Issue 11, Issue 12. 15 MR. BREW: Commissioner. 16 17 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Yes. 18 MR. BREW: It's my understanding on Issue 19 11 that there's agreement to do a Type 2 stipulation on that issue. 2.0 21 **COMMISSIONER GRAHAM:** On Issue 11? 22 MR. MURPHY: That is my understanding as well 23 if -- I guess we need to hear from Mr. Moyle. 24 MR. MOYLE: Yeah. We're not going to stand in 25 the way of a Type 2. We just don't want to

affirmatively stipulate, but we're good on moving along. 1 Same with the other positions; we're not going to stand 2 in the way of it, but --3 MR. BERNIER: Yeah, Mr. Commissioner, that's 4 our issue, and we would agree with that as well, so --5 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Issue 12. 6 7 Is that all of our issues? MR. BADDERS: Commissioner Graham, I hesitate 8 9 to go back, but given the Commission's -- yes, but -given the positions of the parties on Issues 9A, B, and 10 C, I believe all the other issues related to Gulf, the 11 generic issues, the parties would probably be in the 12 13 position to either stipulate to our number or take a Type 2 because at this point we have no remaining 14 15 issues. 16 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: You had to go back there, didn't you? 17 18 MR. BADDERS: Sorry. 19 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Comments on Gulf's 20 statement on 9A, B, and C? Ms. Christensen. 21 MS. CHRISTENSEN: Yes. To the extent that 22

we've actually agreed to the deferral issue, we would be able to take a positive stipulation, I believe, on 9A as set forth in the prehearing order. As to the remaining issues, it would be "No position," and we would be in a

23

24

25

position to do a Type 2 stipulation on the remaining 1 2 issues. COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Anybody else have 3 a comment -- anybody else have a comment or concern on 4 Gulf's statement on 9A, B, and C? 5 MR. MOYLE: No. I would just say, "See 6 7 above." We're not going to stand in the way of it, but are not affirmatively stipulating to all the stuff that 8 9 they put in their position. 10 MR. BADDERS: And with that, when we get to issues, excusals, and all of that, that would get all of 11 our issues resolved and each of our witnesses in the 12 13 position to possibly be excused, pending the 14 Commissioners. COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. All right. 15 MR. MURPHY: Commissioner, sorry. 16 17 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Sure. 18 MR. MURPHY: I believe we're at the same place 19 with TECO and Duke, and there are only a couple of issues here that we would have for FPL. So it's 2.0 21 narrowed considerably, and hopefully we could excuse 22 witnesses and stipulate the record for whatever we can. 23 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: All right. So we've 24 gone through the issues. We're on -- have we handled

the FIPUG objections as well?

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

MS. LHERISSON: FIPUG has raised objections to the expertise of all witnesses for whom no area of expertise were listed in the prefiled testimony. In light of where we are with the issues, does FIPUG have an objection to the expertise of any witness? If so, to whom?

MR. MOYLE: So that's kind of a standing issue that we have with the Commission with respect to how experts are handled. So we would just maintain, I guess, Ms. Deaton, that, you know, properly she should be identified as an expert in certain areas in her prefiled testimony as compared to it not being identified. But I think things are on a path toward moving forward. So we would maintain our position that we maintain and -- with respect to experts that we've maintained in all the other proceedings. But given the discussions and where things are headed, I'm not sure we're going to have witnesses.

MR. MURPHY: I think we are going to have Deaton as a witness.

MR. MOYLE: My understanding of the conversation is that potentially we may, but it somewhat depends on sequencing and how things play out with respect to the filing that FPL made. I mean, we're going to be prepared to, but, you know, who knows how

it'll all end up.

\_\_\_\_\_

MS. HELTON: Well, I think there's the possibility that the settlement will not be addressed by the Commission until after this hearing the first week in November. So does that change where you're coming from?

MR. MOYLE: Maybe the best thing to do is just to have conversations with FPL and staff and see if we can come up with a way to resolve this without

Ms. Deaton having to come testify on that point. I mean, I want to reserve that right, but, you know, I've talked to her a number of times about the allocation approach, so there's maybe a way we can deal with it without having to have the witness come.

MS. HELTON: And, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I have to ask this question. If Ms. Deaton does come, what we're really trying to get to is do you want to voir dire Ms. Deaton?

MR. MOYLE: No.

MS. HELTON: Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER GRAHAM:** You were taking a big risk on that question.

(Laughter.)

Okay. So does that conclude Section VIII?
All right. Section IX.

MS. LHERISSON: Staff will prepare a

Comprehensive Exhibit List for the purpose of numbering

and identifying the exhibits at hearing. Staff will provide the exhibit list to parties as soon as possible.

MR. BUTLER: Commissioner Graham.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Consistent with the stipulation on Issue 10 to defer the cooling canal issues, I think that the exhibits identified here for Mr. Labauve on pages 20 and 21 would not need to be included in the record.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Duly noted. Anybody else on Section IX? Section X. Staff.

MS. LHERISSON: Proposed stipulations and undisputed issues were discussed before. It is staff's hope that the record and all issues will be stipulated and all witnesses excused.

MR. MOYLE: So can I back up just for a second?

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Yeah, sure.

MR. MOYLE: So with respect to the witness testimonies, it sounds like they're coming out, they're not going in the record, is that right, from Mr. Butler's perspective and FPL's perspective with the exception of Ms. Deaton on the cost allocation approach?

MR. BUTLER: Yeah, we only have two witnesses. 1 And of those two, yes, Mr. Labauve would not be 2 testifying. Ms. Deaton would be. 3 MR. MOYLE: Okay. And is the same -- I assume 4 the same holds true with Gulf, that with respect to 5 their stuff, since it's being deferred, that that's not 6 7 coming in either. MR. BADDERS: No, that is not what the 8 9 stipulation says. It says our witnesses' testimony will go into the record. So we're in a different posture. 10 MR. MOYLE: But we're not having a decision 11 made on the testimony that comes in. It's not like the 12 13 Commission is going to make a ruling and say, "We've 14 considered this substantively and we say X, Y, or Z." So I'm not sure why it has to come in. 15 MR. BADDERS: My understanding is that it will 16 17 come in and it will also be transferred over to the 186 docket. 18 19 MR. MOYLE: Which is the rate case docket? 20 MR. BADDERS: Potential rate case docket, yes. 21 But it will go in in this docket to satisfy everything 22 else that's in this docket, and basically that was part 23 of the stipulation. We wanted that testimony in to be 24 able to defer. 25 MR. MOYLE: Right. And we didn't agree to the stipulation, you know, with respect to that. I just don't want to be in a position of you all at some point saying, "Well, you put this testimony in, and this testimony is, you know, defining him." And we're having our day in court at the rate case, and I just want to make sure we're all on the same page, that that's when we're having our day in court and the admission of this evidence is not impacting that one way or the other.

MR. STONE: Commissioner Graham, Jeff Stone on behalf of Gulf Power Company.

Mr. Moyle was not present when the negotiations with Public Counsel to resolve the issue were conducted last week. The -- we are in a different posture than FPL. Our issue is not being deferred until next year. Our issue is being rolled into the rate case. As a result, in order to not disadvantage the parties and maintain the status quo, there was one element that had to be stipulated to, and that is the eligibility for ECRC.

I understand Mr. Moyle's position, and he is not being prejudiced in the rate case to take his position on anything other than eligibility of ECRC. If he decides that he is going to object to this stipulation as it's agreed to by Public Counsel and Gulf, then he will have his opportunity to have a

hearing because we will not be deferring the issue. But if he accepts the Type 2 stipulation, which he has previously indicated that he would, he is waiving his right to contest the ECRC eligibility issue. He's retaining all of the rights as deferred into the rate case, and he continues to retain his rights to challenge the dollars themselves in the ongoing proceeding, whether it be in the rate case or in the ECRC proceeding.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Ms. Christensen.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Yes. Our understanding is we are going forward with saying that the equipment that was put onto Scherer 3 was ECRC eligible. The ultimate question of whether or not these should be allowed to be recovered because they're being used for the customers or not is an issue that's being deferred to the rate case, and then that will impact future recovery and future ECRCs and whether or not this amount should be refunded, if that helps clarify the issue. We're not objecting to the fact that these were put on to be compliant with the ECRC requirements.

MR. STONE: Ms. Christensen and I are making consistent statements.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Mr. Moyle.

MR. MOYLE: And I'm just trying to get out of

2

3

4

presented.

MR. MOYLE:

the way without giving up any of my rights, so.

his right to challenge eligibility for ECRC.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Well, it sounds

Right. But if there were costs in

MR. STONE: It's challenge -- it's giving up

continues to retain the right to argue that as a matter

of policy it should be in base rates rather than ECRC,

but he -- if he agrees to the Type 2 stipulation, he is

giving up his right to contest the eligibility for ECRC

because that is an essential part of the stipulation as

there related to, you know, membership in a health club

anything related to, I'm not stipulating that, you know,

that would be part of the recovery, as I understand it.

or something that was like -- had nothing to do with

Or I'm not stipulating to anything, but I'm not

precluded from bringing that up and saying, "Wait a

minute. What's a health club membership, you know,

like then the only thing that you're giving up right now

is the ability to challenge if it should be in the EC --

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Laughter.)

doing in this case?"

out health club memberships and used cars.

Mr. Stone, are you good?

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I'll allow you to take

MR. STONE: I'm good.

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 GRAHAM: So don't come with health club memberships and used cars.

MR. STONE: There will be no health club memberships or used cars.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. All right.

MR. MURPHY: Commissioner, just to be clear, Mr. Moyle, so we are at "No position" on this for your Type 2 stipulation, with the understanding that you can still challenge numbers and things that are outside of -- that these facilities do come under the ECRC, they may be decided to be rolled into base rates, they may be determined to not meet the threshold of being retail, but the facilities are within the parameters of the ECRC, but you can still, any kind of audit, the numbers are still subject to true-up and challenge going forward. Is that --

MR. BADDERS: That's correct.

MR. MOYLE: I mean, the health club membership, I mean, obviously that wouldn't be within the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause, so --

MR. MURPHY: And it would be reflected in an audit, too, and you could challenge it, yes.

MR. MOYLE: Yeah. So all I'm trying is just not to be in a position six months from now where

000030
somebody has taken a transcript and going, "No, you, you
know, you didn't preserve your rights." So I think
we've done it with the conversation, and the record
hopefully will be clear.
MR. MURPHY: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. We finished
Section X; correct?
MS. LHERISSON: Yes.
COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: We're going to Section
XI.
MS. LHERISSON: Yes. There are no pending
motions.
COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Section XII.
MS. LHERISSON: There are two pending
confidentiality motions, and staff is working on them.
COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Section XIII.
MS. LHERISSON: If issues are stipulated, a
bench decision may be possible. If no agreement is
reached, briefs will be due November 16th.
COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Once again, three
minutes, opening statements. Briefs are 40 pages. Any
other matters with this docket before we continue?
Okay. Well, we'll adjourn the 07 docket
and go on to the 01 docket.
(Proceeding adjourned at 1:47 p.m.)

1	STATE OF FLORIDA )
2	: CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 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
6	stated.
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 12th day of October, 2016.
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	