



**Jessica A. Cano**  
**Senior Attorney**  
**Florida Power & Light Company**  
**700 Universe Boulevard**  
**Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420**  
**(561) 304-5226**  
**(561) 691-7135 (Facsimile)**

July 5, 2017

**-VIA ELECTRONIC FILING-**

Carlotta Stauffer, Director  
Division of Commission Clerk  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

**Re: Docket No. 20170009-EI; Nuclear Cost Recovery Clause**

Dear Ms. Stauffer:

Please find enclosed for filing in the above referenced docket the rebuttal testimony and exhibits of Steven Scroggs and John Reed, on behalf of Florida Power & Light Company.

If there are any questions regarding this filing, please contact me at 561-304-5226.

Sincerely,

s/ Jessica A. Cano  
Jessica A. Cano  
Fla. Bar No. 0037372

Enclosures  
cc: Counsel for Parties of Record (w/encl.)

**BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**DOCKET NO. 20170009-EI  
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY**

**IN RE: NUCLEAR POWER PLANT COST RECOVERY AMOUNT  
FOR THE YEAR 2018**

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF:**

**STEVEN D. SCROGGS**

1                   **BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

2                   **FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY**

3                   **REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF STEVEN D. SCROGGS**

4                   **DOCKET NO. 20170009-EI**

5                   **JULY 5, 2017**

6

7   **Q.    Please state your name and business address.**

8    A.    My name is Steven D. Scroggs. My business address is 700 Universe  
9        Boulevard, Juno Beach, Florida 33408.

10 **Q.    By whom are you employed and what is your position?**

11 A.    I am employed by Florida Power & Light Company (“FPL” or the  
12        “Company”) as Senior Director, Project Development. In this position I have  
13        responsibility for the development of power generation projects to meet the  
14        needs of FPL’s customers.

15 **Q.    Have you previously provided testimony in this docket?**

16 A.    Yes.

17 **Q.    Are you sponsoring or co-sponsoring any exhibits to this testimony?**

18 A.    No.

19 **Q.    What is the purpose of your testimony?**

20 A.    The purpose of my testimony is to respond to the testimony provided by  
21        Eugene Meehan on behalf of the City of Miami (COM).

22 **Q.    Please summarize your testimony.**

1 A. Mr. Meehan misrepresents the request made by FPL in its petition, and in so  
2 doing, incorrectly assesses the decision to be made by the Florida Public  
3 Service Commission (Commission) in this docket. Much of his testimony is  
4 focused on the alleged need for a long-term feasibility analysis, where no such  
5 need exists. Mr. Meehan also draws incorrect conclusions and makes  
6 inaccurate assumptions about FPL's intent, decision-making process, and  
7 factors affecting any feasibility analysis.

8 **Q. For clarity, what is FPL's request and how does Mr. Meehan**  
9 **misrepresent that request?**

10 A. FPL's request is comprised of three elements: (1) approval to include a \$7.3  
11 million over recovery in the capacity clause next year; (2) a determination that  
12 FPL's decision to finish the Licensing phase is reasonable and appropriate;  
13 and (3) deferral of the costs associated with closing out the licensing phase of  
14 this process and maintaining approvals, once obtained.

15  
16 Mr. Meehan does not take issue with including the proposed over-recovery of  
17 2015 and 2016 costs in the capacity clause. However, he (at page 4 and page  
18 11) mistakenly represents that the decision before the Commission is whether  
19 to continue *funding* the project. The funding of construction, or even pre-  
20 construction for that matter is not at issue. Here, the issue is much simpler.  
21 The issue is: "Is the *decision* by FPL to complete the licensing phase for  
22 Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 an appropriate and reasonable decision?" As  
23 outlined in FPL's petition, the limited set of activities required to complete the

1           licensing phase of this process would be funded by FPL (as it is each year)  
2           and cost recovery would be deferred.

3   **Q.   Why is it important for the Commission to reject this misrepresentation**  
4   **when considering FPL’s petition?**

5   A.   Mr. Meehan’s insistence that a full feasibility analysis is required to move  
6       forward in this limited manner is both technically incorrect, and practically  
7       unsound. In effect, he is asking this Commission to rush to judgment on the  
8       larger question of whether Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 should be constructed,  
9       and to reach that decision without a full and proper set of facts. Accepting his  
10      recommendations could lead to a poorly informed, premature decision that  
11      would be irreversible.

12  
13      From a regulatory perspective, Rule 25-6.0423 describes the filing  
14      requirements for applicants seeking cost recovery through the Nuclear Cost  
15      Recovery Clause. Part (6)(c)5 describes that a long-term feasibility analysis is  
16      a part of the annual filing for those seeking *cost recovery* under section (6).  
17      As of last year, FPL planned to file a feasibility analysis because it planned to  
18      seek cost recovery. Because FPL is not seeking cost recovery at this time,  
19      there is no regulatory need for the filing of a long-term feasibility analysis.

20  
21      From a more practical perspective, such an analysis at this time would provide  
22      no value to inform FPL’s decision to fund the remaining steps to obtain the  
23      COL, or a Commission determination that FPL’s decision is reasonable.

1 FPL's approach has been consistent from inception: to learn from the  
2 collective lessons learned and experience gained during the first wave of U.S.  
3 AP1000 projects as an important input into decisions on the Turkey Point  
4 Units 6 & 7 project. Those projects have experienced delays and disruptions  
5 that have yet to be resolved, preventing FPL from being able to apply that  
6 experience to an estimate of Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 cost and schedule – a  
7 key input into the long term feasibility analysis.

8  
9 Additionally, Mr. Meehan spends a great deal of time discussing the potential  
10 effect on a feasibility analysis of recent changes in natural gas price forecasts,  
11 load growth forecasts, and emission compliance cost forecasts. I acknowledge  
12 those parameters change, although I don't necessarily agree with Mr.  
13 Meehan's estimates. These factors are annually discussed in FPL's Ten Year  
14 Power Plant Site Plan (TYSP). However, the uncertainty that is presented as a  
15 result of year-to-year shifts in these components is less critical in comparison  
16 to bringing a higher level of accuracy to the construction cost of the project. It  
17 is that deficit of information that renders a current analysis uninformative for  
18 completing licensing or for any other purpose.

19 **Q. What would be the expected result of a decision to halt pursuit of the**  
20 **COL prior to issuance?**

21 **A.** FPL's customers may be permanently prevented from being able to attain any  
22 potential value from the licensing investment made thus far. Significant,  
23 additional work would be required to recover the progress FPL has made, if it

1 could be recovered at all. Completion of the licensing process would be  
2 deferred to a different set of NRC Staff and Commissioners that may not have  
3 been involved in AP1000 COLs to date. These are the bases for the  
4 conclusion that it is reasonable to complete the final licensing steps.

5  
6 In short, if Mr. Meehan and the City of Miami seek to impede any opportunity  
7 to construct Turkey Point Units 6 & 7, and to prevent such a proposal from  
8 even reaching the Commission for its consideration, the position advocated by  
9 Mr. Meehan supports that perspective. Otherwise, the answer should be  
10 straightforward: complete the licensing phase.

11 **Q. What would be the expected result of FPL's decision to complete and**  
12 **maintain the COL?**

13 A. Proceeding to the point where the COL has been obtained achieves an  
14 important plateau in the process from which FPL can collect and assess  
15 information, and manage the timing of future decisions. The opportunity to  
16 move forward will be preserved for at least twenty years - a period during  
17 which significant changes to all feasibility analysis inputs can occur. The  
18 decision to complete and maintain the COL is the only path that will retain  
19 value for FPL's customers.

20 **Q. Doesn't Witness Meehan claim that you are relying on the 2015 feasibility**  
21 **analysis to justify "continued investment" in the project?**

22 A. He does for his own purposes, but he is incorrect. Witness Meehan attributes  
23 a number of arguments or assumptions to me that I have not made regarding

1 the 2015 feasibility analysis (page 4), future economic benefits (page 11), or  
2 qualitative benefits (pages 4 and 8), and then attempts to discredit those  
3 arguments and assumptions. In fact, the bulk of his testimony follows that  
4 formula. These are three examples. Additionally, it is disingenuous to  
5 portray FPL's plans as reflecting unlimited or unrestricted "continued  
6 investment" as he often does. FPL has made clear that its activities will be  
7 limited to completing the remaining licensing steps at this time, and  
8 maintaining the approvals received.

9 **Q. What is FPL's view of how the future sequence of events would likely  
10 unfold, and how does that differ from that suggested by Mr. Meehan?**

11 A. Mr. Meehan (at page 3, line 22) claims that FPL has "no intent to conduct or  
12 provide such a study until and unless it decides to seek Commission approval  
13 to move forward with construction of Turkey Point 6 and 7." This is  
14 incorrect. As discussed in my May 1, 2017 testimony (page 28, lines 11-15),  
15 FPL anticipates pausing upon receipt of the COL to allow for material events  
16 in the first wave projects to develop to a point where conclusions can be  
17 drawn about first wave cost and schedule. This information would inform the  
18 next step in the process, consistent with Section 3(c) of the NCR statute  
19 (Section 366.93) – an indicative feasibility analysis that would accompany a  
20 petition to move to *preconstruction*. Only once in the preconstruction phase,  
21 where the detailed Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 specific cost estimate can be  
22 developed (supported by a contract with negotiated terms, conditions and



1 project schedule), would FPL be able to provide a feasibility analysis that  
2 would be sufficient to support a request to move to *construction*.

3 **Q. Are there other illustrative examples of where Mr. Meehan draws**  
4 **incorrect conclusions or misrepresents FPL's intent?**

5 A. Yes. An illustrative example is the mischaracterization of FPL's load  
6 forecasts in 2015 and 2017. On page 6, lines 18 through 23, and page 7, lines  
7 1 and 2, Mr. Meehan confuses the reader by portraying a reduction in load  
8 growth rate as a reduction in load. The fact that there is still strong positive  
9 growth in load is obfuscated by this written sleight of hand. Despite a lower  
10 *rate* of growth in the recent 2017 load forecast as compared to the 2015 load  
11 forecast, the incremental load need itself grows over 2,200 MW by 2025 and  
12 over 5,000 MW by the 2031/2032 timeframe currently being estimated as in-  
13 service dates for the 2,200 MW Turkey Point Units 6 & 7 project. A similar  
14 statement can be made for annual energy growth projections.

15 **Q. Do Mr. Meehan's arguments on fuel diversity hold water?**

16 A. No. While Mr. Meehan consulted FPL's TYSP for selected information on  
17 the forward load and energy forecasts, he did not appear to do the same when  
18 he discusses fuel diversity. Had he reviewed 2015, 2016 and 2017 plans, he  
19 would note that FPL's projection for 2024 fuel diversity is remarkably  
20 unaffected by the factors cited, including FPL's significant planned solar  
21 investment, resulting in a projection for natural gas as a percentage of FPL's  
22 fuel mix that ranges from 72.5% (projected in 2015) to 69.9% and 70.3%  
23 (projected in 2016 and 2017, respectively). These are minor changes in a fuel

1 mix that remains strongly gas dependent. While there is truth in the fact that  
2 future developments will impact fuel diversity, the important question is “by  
3 how much?” Florida and FPL remain significantly exposed to dependence on  
4 natural gas – reinforcing the fact that emission free, baseload nuclear energy  
5 remains a generation choice that could considerably move the needle in this  
6 regard.

7 **Q. Are there other illustrative examples of flawed approaches that should be**  
8 **noted within Mr. Meehan’s testimony?**

9 A. Yes. His attempt to create a natural gas price forecast to compare to FPL’s  
10 2015 forecast is inadequate to the task on two counts. First, Mr. Meehan uses  
11 a different forecast (EIA vs. FPL’s PIRA based forward curve forecast,  
12 previously accepted by the Commission) with different forecasting  
13 methodologies. Second, he uses a Henry Hub price forecast, not accounting  
14 for the transmission basis cost of delivering the natural gas by pipeline from  
15 Henry Hub (or other locations) to FPL facilities – a factor accounted for in  
16 FPL’s forecast. Such oversights render his comparisons unreliable.

17 **Q. Mr. Meehan spends some time discussing qualitative benefits of Turkey**  
18 **Point 6 & 7. Do you agree with his stated assumptions and conclusions?**

19 A. No. Mr. Meehan misrepresents the purpose of addressing the qualitative  
20 factors to complement quantitative analysis. He specifically misrepresents my  
21 testimony (page 10, line 21) by asserting that “Mr. Scroggs instead assumes  
22 that the long-term economic feasibility is at least break even”... and that I go  
23 on to rely solely on qualitative factors. That is incorrect, and no such

1 statement can be found anywhere in my testimony. It is his erroneous  
2 conclusion alone, put forth as a factual observation.

3

4 Mr. Meehan may not be aware that the Nuclear Cost Recovery Clause was  
5 authorized by the legislature in the wake of significant natural gas supply  
6 disruptions in 2004 and 2005. Its purpose was to enable solutions to the  
7 qualitative factors of fuel diversity and reliability in the State of Florida. He  
8 may also be unaware that in recognition of this important founding tenet of  
9 the effort to bring new nuclear generation to the state, Commission staff has in  
10 the past requested that applicants continue to address qualitative factors in its  
11 filings. My continued discussion of qualitative factors is a straight forward  
12 acknowledgment of these important factors, but does not seek to replace a  
13 properly informed and conducted quantitative analysis.

14 **Q. Are these types of qualitative benefits considered by FPL to be qualitative**  
15 **feasibility factors?**

16 A. No. As the Nuclear Cost Recovery docket has evolved over the last 9 years,  
17 parties and Commission staff have typically considered qualitative feasibility  
18 factors to include the feasibility of obtaining all necessary approvals, the  
19 feasibility of obtaining financing at a reasonable cost, the feasibility of  
20 constructing the project, and supportive state and federal energy policy. I  
21 testified that the project remains feasible from these perspectives in my May  
22 1, 2017 testimony.

23 **Q. Would you like to discuss any other errors in his testimony?**

1 A. I would like to correct two other errors. The first is his claim that  
2 Westinghouse “is the entity that FPL was planning to rely on as the EPC  
3 contractor.” I have testified in pre-filed testimony each year since 2009 that  
4 FPL has not yet determined whether to employ an EPC contracting approach  
5 or an EP and C contracting approach (where an Engineering and Procurement  
6 vendor is not also the Construction vendor), much less determined which  
7 contractors would fulfill the Construction vendor role. For example, in 2009 I  
8 stated “FPL has chosen to pursue an approach wherein the Engineering and  
9 Procurement (EP) portion of the scope is separated from the Construction (c)  
10 scope... The option of choosing an EPC contract is not abandoned, merely  
11 deferred.” (Docket 090009-EI, transcript p. 64)

12  
13 The second is his claimed “agreement” at page 18 that “absent the statute  
14 constructing a nuclear plant would not be financially feasible.” My quoted  
15 statement, with which he claims to agree, makes no such conclusion.

16 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

17 A. Yes.

**BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**DOCKET NO. 20170009-EI  
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY**

**IN RE: NUCLEAR POWER PLANT COST RECOVERY AMOUNT  
FOR THE YEAR 2018**

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF:**

**JOHN J. REED**

1                   **BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

2                   **FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY**

3                   **REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF JOHN J. REED**

4                   **DOCKET NO. 20170009**

5                   **July 5, 2017**

6

7                   **Section I: Introduction**

8                   **Q.     Please state your name and business address.**

9                   A.     My name is John J. Reed. My business address is 293 Boston Post Road West,  
10                   Marlborough, Massachusetts 01752.

11                  **Q.     By whom are you employed and what is your position?**

12                  A.     I am the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Concentric Energy Advisors,  
13                   Inc. (“Concentric”).

14                  **Q.     Please describe Concentric.**

15                  A.     Concentric is an economic advisory and management consulting firm  
16                   headquartered in Marlborough, Massachusetts. Concentric provides consulting  
17                   services related to energy industry transactions, energy market analysis, litigation,  
18                   and regulatory support.

19                  **Q.     Please describe your educational background and professional experience.**

20                  A.     I have more than 40 years of experience in the energy industry, having served as  
21                   an executive in energy consulting firms, including the position of Co-Chief  
22                   Executive Officer of the largest publicly-traded management consulting firm in  
23                   the United States and as Chief Economist for the largest gas utility in the United  
24                   States. I have provided expert testimony on a wide variety of economic and

1 financial issues related to the energy and utility industry on numerous occasions  
2 before administrative agencies, utility commissions, courts, arbitration panels and  
3 elected bodies across North America. I have provided testimony on behalf of  
4 FPL in its Nuclear Cost Recovery Clause (“NCRC”) proceedings since 2008. A  
5 summary of my educational background can be found on Exhibit JJR-1.

6 **Q. Please describe your experience with nuclear power plants, and**  
7 **specifically your experience with major construction programs at these**  
8 **plants.**

9 A. My consulting experience with nuclear power plants spans more than 30 years.  
10 My clients have retained me for assignments relating to the construction of  
11 nuclear plants, the purchase, sale and valuation of nuclear plants, power uprates  
12 and major capital improvement projects at nuclear plants, and the  
13 decommissioning of nuclear plants. In addition to my work at FPL’s plants, I  
14 have had significant experience with those activities at the following plants:

- |    |                   |                  |
|----|-------------------|------------------|
| 15 | • Big Rock Point  | • Oyster Creek   |
| 16 | • Bruce Power     | • Palisades      |
| 17 | • Callaway        | • Palo Verde     |
| 18 | • Darlington      | • Peach Bottom   |
| 19 | • Duane Arnold    | • Pilgrim        |
| 20 | • Fermi           | • Point Beach    |
| 21 | • Ginna           | • Prairie Island |
| 22 | • Hope Creek      | • Salem          |
| 23 | • Indian Point    | • San Onofre     |
| 24 | • Limerick        | • Seabrook       |
| 25 | • Millstone       | • Vermont Yankee |
| 26 | • Monticello      | • Wolf Creek     |
| 27 | • Nine Mile Point | • Vogtle         |

28 I have been active on behalf of a number of clients in pre-construction activities  
29 for new nuclear plants across the United States and in Canada. In addition, I

1 have provided nuclear industry clients with detailed reviews of contracting  
2 strategies, cost estimation practices, and construction project management.

3 **Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits in this case?**

4 A. Yes. I am sponsoring Exhibits JJR-1 and JJR-2, which is attached to my direct  
5 testimony.

6 Exhibit JJR-1 Résumé of John J. Reed

7 Exhibit JJR-2 Recent Expert Testimony of John J. Reed

8 **Q. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony in this proceeding?**

9 A. My rebuttal testimony responds to the direct testimony that Eugene T. Meehan  
10 filed on behalf of the City of Miami. Specifically, I am responding to Mr.  
11 Meehan's conclusions that the Florida Public Service Commission (the "FPSC"  
12 or the "Commission") should require a "full blown quantitative feasibility  
13 analysis" in order to determine the reasonableness of FPL's continued pursuit of  
14 a Nuclear Regulatory Commission ("NRC") Combined Operating License  
15 ("COL") as the Company continues to create the opportunity to construct two  
16 new nuclear generating units at FPL's existing Turkey Point ("PTN") site. The  
17 project to develop two new nuclear units is referred to herein as "PTN 6 & 7" or  
18 the "Project." I also respond to Mr. Meehan's assertion that the FPSC's  
19 credibility would be damaged if it were to find that FPL's actions were  
20 reasonable without a quantitative feasibility analysis.

21 **Q. Please summarize your testimony**

22 A. I disagree with Mr. Meehan on both issues. An extensive and detailed economic  
23 analysis is not required to see the wisdom of completing the licensing phase of  
24 the Project when it is this close to the finish line. FPL's decision to complete



1 licensing activities is clearly reasonable and consistent with the actions of others  
2 in the industry. The Commission’s credibility would not be tarnished in any way  
3 by approving the Company’s plans to continue to develop this option for the  
4 benefit of customers.

5 **Q. What did Mr. Meehan conclude regarding the reasonableness of FPL’s**  
6 **decision to continue to pursue a COL for PTN 6 & 7?**

7 A. Mr. Meehan states that a combination of quantitative approaches to test the  
8 economic viability of the Project must be undertaken now to reach a decision on  
9 whether to continue developing the option to construct PTN 6 & 7 at a later  
10 date. These approaches include a “full blown quantitative feasibility analysis,”  
11 quantification of claimed qualitative benefits, and a “real option” value analysis.  
12 According to Mr. Meehan, “[g]iven that no such analysis has been provided it  
13 cannot be determined if FP&L’s continued investment in Turkey Point Units 6  
14 and 7, albeit at relatively low levels, is reasonable and prudent.”

15 **Q. Do you agree that these analyses are necessary at this time?**

16 A. I do not. It is completely unnecessary at this time to apply the level of rigorous  
17 analytical review that Mr. Meehan describes. These approaches would be  
18 appropriate once the Company is in a position to determine whether it is in the  
19 best interest of its customers to transition from a licensing or license-  
20 maintenance project to the execution phase of PTN 6 & 7.

21 FPL has stated that it is pausing at this time to gather more information  
22 that would better inform its decision regarding a transition to preconstruction or  
23 construction work. A quantitative assessment based on current conditions in the  
24 market would, therefore, be of no value to the Company in making this decision

1 some years from now. It would, however, be a costly and time-consuming  
2 distraction from obtaining the COL, which FPL expects to happen by the end of  
3 this year or early in 2018.

4 **Q. Is it reasonable for the Company to continue with the Project as described**  
5 **in its direct testimony, knowing that there is uncertainty regarding**  
6 **whether the construction of the Project will ultimately move forward?**

7 A. Yes, it is. As described by FPL witness Scroggs in his May 1 testimony, the  
8 Company's plan is to complete the licensing phase of the Project and to maintain  
9 the COL for the benefit of its customers in the future if and when conditions  
10 indicate that moving to construction is a reasonable and prudent path forward.

11 Resource planning, including any decision to move beyond the licensing  
12 phase of the PTN 6 & 7 Project in the future, is a long-range process that entails  
13 making informed decisions and assumptions despite significant uncertainty with  
14 regard to market conditions, fuel prices, and public policy at the state and federal  
15 level. This uncertainty has increased in the last several years, particularly in the  
16 context of load growth and environmental policies. All other things being equal,  
17 greater uncertainty leads to a higher value on having the option to pursue  
18 different baseload options, including additional nuclear capacity.

19 **Q. Is it reasonable for FPL to complete the initial licensing phase in the**  
20 **absence of a "full blown" quantitative analysis?**

21 A. Yes, it certainly is.

22 As described in the testimony of witness Scroggs, FPL is now just a few  
23 months from reaching its next major milestone, the issuance of the COL, which  
24 is the culmination of a process that began eleven years ago. Approximately \$308

1 million dollars have already been approved as reasonable in past Nuclear Cost  
2 Recovery Clause (“NCRC”) proceedings. FPL has estimated it would incur  
3 approximately \$25 million for the entirety of 2017, including carrying costs and a  
4 return on its deferred tax asset. About \$18 million of this reflects actual Project  
5 spending. By the time the Commission issues its order in this proceeding, there  
6 may be only \$3 million of further spending to get to the issuance of the COL.

7 The total Project cost expected to be incurred through 2017 is  
8 approximately \$333 million, or approximately 1.5% of the upper end of the  
9 current capital cost range for the Project. By November 1, 2017 FPL may have  
10 only 1% of that total left, which would be 1% of 1.5% of the high end of the  
11 range of total projected costs for the Project. The COL is a valuable asset itself,  
12 and should provide approximately 20 years of optionality in terms of proceeding  
13 with the actual construction of the Project. Continuing to pursue the license at  
14 this point is not only reasonable and prudent, it would be unreasonable and  
15 imprudent for the Commission to require that the Company abandon the Project  
16 at this late stage.

17 **Q. Have other companies continued to pursue NRC licenses for AP1000**  
18 **projects despite similarly uncertain plans to construct new nuclear units?**

19 A. Yes. For example, the NRC granted a license to Duke Energy for the W.S. Lee  
20 plant in South Carolina in December 2016.

21 Duke continued to pursue this license notwithstanding challenging  
22 circumstances that have arisen with respect to AP100 development projects.  
23 Duke stated in July 2016 that it had spent approximately \$495 million to that date  
24 on development of the option to construct two new AP1000 reactors at the W.S.

1 Lee facility, which was approximately six months before it received its COL.<sup>1</sup>  
2 Duke recognized the potential future value of obtaining a COL for its customers,  
3 even at a cost that significantly exceeded what FPL expects to have spent by the  
4 time the PTN 6 & 7 license is granted. FPL's decision to continue to pursue the  
5 COL clearly is consistent with the decisions of others in the industry and is  
6 reasonable.

7 **Q. What effect did Mr. Meehan suggest approval of FPL's plans would have**  
8 **on the Commission's credibility?**

9 A. Mr. Meehan states that finding it is reasonable for FPL to acquire and maintain a  
10 COL would compromise the Commission's credibility as a regulatory body, and  
11 would place the Nuclear Cost Recovery statute at risk.

12 **Q. Do you agree with Mr. Meehan on this point?**

13 A. Absolutely not. Continuing to secure and maintain PTN 6 & 7's COL is clearly  
14 the right course of action right now. The Commission, and FPL will need much  
15 more information before any plans to proceed with significant preconstruction  
16 or construction activities are executed, and FPL agrees with that approach.

17 The Commission's credibility will not be harmed by supporting the  
18 reasonableness of FPL's decision to secure the COL for PTN 6 & 7. It is the  
19 right decision at this time.

20 **Q. Would you please summarize your perspective with regard to the**  
21 **prudence and reasonableness of FPL's plans to continue to develop the**  
22 **option to construct PTN 6 & 7?**

23 A. There are no conceivable results from an update of FPL's feasibility study for  
24 PTN 6 & 7 that would cause me to conclude that its pursuit of the COL should

1 be abandoned before the license is received at the end of this year or in the first  
2 quarter of 2018. FPL's decision to continue with the pursuit of the COL,  
3 without undertaking the extensive analysis Mr. Meehan seeks, is clearly  
4 reasonable at this stage of the Project's development.

5 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

6 A. Yes, it does.

7

1 Endnotes:

—

2 <sup>1</sup> Duke Energy. “Report of Lee Nuclear Station Activities and Expenditures  
3 Pursuant to Section II, Paragraph 4 of the Settlement Agreement.” PSCSC  
4 Docket No. 2011-20-E: Amended Project Development Application of Duke  
5 Energy Carolinas, LLC for Approval of Decision to Incur Nuclear Generation  
6 Pre-Construction Costs, July 27, 2016.

**John J. Reed**  
**Chairman and Chief Executive Officer**

---

John J. Reed is a financial and economic consultant with more than 35 years of experience in the energy industry. Mr. Reed has also been the CEO of an NASD member securities firm, and Co-CEO of the nation's largest publicly traded management consulting firm (NYSE: NCI). He has provided advisory services in the areas of mergers and acquisitions, asset divestitures and purchases, strategic planning, project finance, corporate valuation, energy market analysis, rate and regulatory matters and energy contract negotiations to clients across North and Central America. Mr. Reed's comprehensive experience includes the development and implementation of nuclear, fossil, and hydroelectric generation divestiture programs with an aggregate valuation in excess of \$20 billion. Mr. Reed has also provided expert testimony on financial and economic matters on more than 150 occasions before the FERC, Canadian regulatory agencies, state utility regulatory agencies, various state and federal courts, and before arbitration panels in the United States and Canada. After graduation from the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, Mr. Reed joined Southern California Gas Company, where he worked in the regulatory and financial groups, leaving the firm as Chief Economist in 1981. He served as executive and consultant with Stone & Webster Management Consulting and R.J. Rudden Associates prior to forming REED Consulting Group (RCG) in 1988. RCG was acquired by Navigant Consulting in 1997, where Mr. Reed served as an executive until leaving Navigant to join Concentric as Chairman and Chief Executive Officer.

---

**REPRESENTATIVE PROJECT EXPERIENCE**

**Executive Management**

As an executive-level consultant, worked with CEOs, CFOs, other senior officers, and Boards of Directors of many of North America's top electric and gas utilities, as well as with senior political leaders of the U.S. and Canada on numerous engagements over the past 25 years. Directed merger, acquisition, divestiture, and project development engagements for utilities, pipelines and electric generation companies, repositioned several electric and gas utilities as pure distributors through a series of regulatory, financial, and legislative initiatives, and helped to develop and execute several "roll-up" or market aggregation strategies for companies seeking to achieve substantial scale in energy distribution, generation, transmission, and marketing.

**Financial and Economic Advisory Services**

Retained by many of the nation's leading energy companies and financial institutions for services relating to the purchase, sale or development of new enterprises. These projects included major new gas pipeline projects, gas storage projects, several non-utility generation projects, the purchase and sale of project development and gas marketing firms, and utility acquisitions. Specific services provided include the development of corporate expansion plans, review of acquisition candidates, establishment of divestiture standards, due diligence on acquisitions or financing, market entry or expansion studies, competitive assessments, project financing studies, and negotiations relating to these transactions.

### **Litigation Support and Expert Testimony**

Provided expert testimony on more than 200 occasions in administrative and civil proceedings on a wide range of energy and economic issues. Clients in these matters have included gas distribution utilities, gas pipelines, gas producers, oil producers, electric utilities, large energy consumers, governmental and regulatory agencies, trade associations, independent energy project developers, engineering firms, and gas and power marketers. Testimony has focused on issues ranging from broad regulatory and economic policy to virtually all elements of the utility ratemaking process. Also frequently testified regarding energy contract interpretation, accepted energy industry practices, horizontal and vertical market power, quantification of damages, and management prudence. Has been active in regulatory contract and litigation matters on virtually all interstate pipeline systems serving the U.S. Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, Midwest, and Pacific regions.

Also served on FERC Commissioner Terzic's Task Force on Competition, which conducted an industry-wide investigation into the levels of and means of encouraging competition in U.S. natural gas markets and served on a "Blue Ribbon" panel established by the Province of New Brunswick regarding the future of natural gas distribution service in that province.

### **Resource Procurement, Contracting and Analysis**

On behalf of gas distributors, gas pipelines, gas producers, electric utilities, and independent energy project developers, personally managed or participated in the negotiation, drafting, and regulatory support of hundreds of energy contracts, including the largest gas contracts in North America, electric contracts representing billions of dollars, pipeline and storage contracts, and facility leases.

These efforts have resulted in bringing large new energy projects to market across North America, the creation of hundreds of millions of dollars in savings through contract renegotiation, and the regulatory approval of a number of highly contested energy contracts.

### **Strategic Planning and Utility Restructuring**

Acted as a leading participant in the restructuring of the natural gas and electric utility industries over the past fifteen years, as an adviser to local distribution companies, pipelines, electric utilities, and independent energy project developers. In the recent past, provided services to most of the top 50 utilities and energy marketers across North America. Managed projects that frequently included the redevelopment of strategic plans, corporate reorganizations, the development of multi-year regulatory and legislative agendas, merger, acquisition and divestiture strategies, and the development of market entry strategies. Developed and supported merchant function exit strategies, marketing affiliate strategies, and detailed plans for the functional business units of many of North America's leading utilities.

---

## **PROFESSIONAL HISTORY**

### **Concentric Energy Advisors, Inc. (2002 – Present)**

Chairman and Chief Executive Officer

### **CE Capital Advisors (2004 – Present)**

Chairman, President, and Chief Executive Officer



**Navigant Consulting, Inc. (1997 – 2002)**

President, Navigant Energy Capital (2000 – 2002)  
Executive Director (2000 – 2002)  
Co-Chief Executive Officer, Vice Chairman (1999 – 2000)  
Executive Managing Director (1998 – 1999)  
President, REED Consulting Group, Inc. (1997 – 1998)

**REED Consulting Group (1988 – 1997)**

Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer

**R.J. Rudden Associates, Inc. (1983 – 1988)**

Vice President

**Stone & Webster Management Consultants, Inc. (1981 – 1983)**

Senior Consultant  
Consultant

**Southern California Gas Company (1976 – 1981)**

Corporate Economist  
Financial Analyst  
Treasury Analyst

---

**EDUCATION AND CERTIFICATION**

B.S., Economics and Finance, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, 1976  
Licensed Securities Professional: NASD Series 7, 63, 24, 79 and 99 Licenses

---

**BOARDS OF DIRECTORS (PAST AND PRESENT)**

Concentric Energy Advisors, Inc.  
Navigant Consulting, Inc.  
Navigant Energy Capital  
Nukem, Inc.  
New England Gas Association  
R. J. Rudden Associates  
REED Consulting Group

---

**AFFILIATIONS**

American Gas Association  
Energy Bar Association  
Guild of Gas Managers  
International Association of Energy Economists  
National Association of Business Economists  
New England Gas Association

Society of Gas Lighters

---

**ARTICLES AND PUBLICATIONS**

“Maximizing U.S. federal loan guarantees for new nuclear energy,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*  
(with John C. Slocum), July 29, 2009

“Smart Decoupling – Dealing with unfunded mandates in performance-based ratemaking,” *Public Utilities Fortnightly*, May 2012



<b>SPONSOR</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>CASE/APPLICANT</b>	<b>DOCKET NO.</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>
<b>Alberta Utilities Commission</b>				
Alberta Utilities (AltaLink, EPCOR, ATCO, ENMAX, FortisAlberta, Alta Gas)	1/13	Alberta Utilities	Application 1566373, Proceeding ID 20	Stranded Costs
<b>Arizona Corporation Commission</b>				
Tucson Electric Power	7/12	Tucson Electric Power	Docket No. E-01933A- 12-0291	Cost of Capital
UNS Energy and Fortis Inc.	1/14	UNS Energy, Fortis Inc.	Docket No. E-04230A- 00011 and Docket No. E- 01933A-14-0011	Merger
<b>CT Dept. of Public Utilities Control</b>				
Southern Connecticut Gas	8/08	Southern Connecticut Gas	Docket No. 06-05-04	Peaking Service Agreement
<b>Federal Energy Regulatory Commission</b>				
Portland Natural Gas Transmission System	6/08	Portland Natural Gas Transmission System	Docket No. RP08-306- 000	Market Assessment, Natural Gas Transportation, Rate Setting
Portland Natural Gas Transmission System	5/10 3/11 4/11	Portland Natural Gas Transmission System	Docket No. RP10-729- 000	Business Risks, Extraordinary and Non- recurring Events Pertaining to Discretionary Revenues
Morris Energy	7/10	Morris Energy	Docket No. RP10-79-000	Affidavit re: Impact of Preferential Rate
Gulf South Pipeline	10/14	Gulf South Pipeline	Docket No. RP15-65-000	Business Risk, Rate Design



<b>SPONSOR</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>CASE/APPLICANT</b>	<b>DOCKET NO.</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>
BNP Paribas Energy Trading, GP South Jersey Resource Group, LLC	2/15	Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation	Docket No. RP06-569-008 and RP07-376-005	Regulatory Policy, Incremental Rates, Stacked Rate
Tallgrass Interstate Gas Transmission, LLC	10/15 12/15	Tallgrass Interstate Gas Transmission, LLC	Docket No. RP16-137-000	Market Assessment, Rate Design, Rolled-in Rate Treatment
<b>Florida Public Service Commission</b>				
Florida Power and Light Co.	10/07	Florida Power & Light Co.	Docket No. 070650-EI	Need for New Nuclear Plant
Florida Power and Light Co.	5/08	Florida Power & Light Co.	Docket No. 080009-EI	New Nuclear Cost Recovery, Prudence
Florida Power and Light Co.	3/09	Florida Power & Light Co.	Docket No. 080677-EI	Benchmarking in Support of ROE
Florida Power and Light Co.	3/09 5/09 8/09	Florida Power & Light Co.	Docket No. 090009-EI	New Nuclear Cost Recovery, Prudence
Florida Power and Light Co.	3/10 5/10 8/10	Florida Power & Light Co.	Docket No. 100009-EI	New Nuclear Cost Recovery, Prudence
Florida Power and Light Co.	3/11 7/11	Florida Power & Light Co.	Docket No. 110009-EI	New Nuclear Cost Recovery, Prudence
Florida Power and Light Co.	3/12 7/12	Florida Power & Light Co.	Docket No. 120009-EI	New Nuclear Cost Recovery, Prudence
Florida Power and Light Co.	3/12 8/12	Florida Power & Light Co.	Docket No. 120015-EI	Benchmarking in Support of ROE
Florida Power and Light Co.	3/13 7/13	Florida Power & Light Co.	Docket No. 130009	New Nuclear Cost Recovery, Prudence
Florida Power and Light Co.	3/14	Florida Power & Light Co.	Docket No. 140009	New Nuclear Cost Recovery, Prudence



<b>SPONSOR</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>CASE/APPLICANT</b>	<b>DOCKET NO.</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>
Florida Power and Light Co.	3/15 7/15	Florida Power & Light Co.	Docket No. 150009	New Nuclear Cost Recovery, Prudence
Florida Power and Light Co.	10/15	Florida Power and Light Co.	Docket No. 150001	Recovery of Replacement Power Costs
Florida Power and Light Co.	3/16	Florida Power & Light Co.	Docket No. 160021-EI	Benchmarking in Support of ROE
<b>Florida Senate Committee on Communication, Energy and Utilities</b>				
Florida Power and Light Co.	2/09	Florida Power & Light Co.		Securitization
<b>Hawai'i Public Utility Commission</b>				
NextEra Energy, Inc. Hawaiian Electric Companies	4/15 8/15 10/15	Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc.; Hawaii Electric Light Company, Inc., Maui Electric Company, Ltd., NextEra Energy, Inc.	Docket No. 2015-0022	Merger Application
<b>Illinois Commerce Commission</b>				
Renewables Suppliers (Algonquin Power Co., EDP Renewables North America, Invenergy, NextEra Energy Resources)	3/14	Renewables Suppliers	Docket No. 13-0546	Application for Rehearing and Reconsideration, Long-term Purchase Power Agreements
WE Energies Corporation	8/14 12/14 2/15	WE Energies/Integrus	Docket No. 14-0496	Merger Application
<b>Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission</b>				
Northern Indiana Public Service Company	1/08 3/08	Northern Indiana Public Service Company	Cause No. 43396	Asset Valuation



<b>SPONSOR</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>CASE/APPLICANT</b>	<b>DOCKET No.</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>
Northern Indiana Public Service Company	8/08	Northern Indiana Public Service Company	Cause No. 43526	Fair Market Value Assessment
Indianapolis Power & Light Company	12/14	Indianapolis Power & Light Company	Cause No. 44576	Asset Valuation
Indianapolis Power & Light Company	12/16	Indianapolis Power & Light Company	Cause No. 44893	Rate Recovery for New Plant Additions, Valuation of Electric Generating Facilities
<b>Iowa Utilities Board</b>				
Interstate Power and Light	5/07	City of Everly, Iowa	Docket No. SPU-06-5	Municipalization
Interstate Power and Light	5/07	City of Kalona, Iowa	Docket No. SPU-06-6	Municipalization
Interstate Power and Light	5/07	City of Wellman, Iowa	Docket No. SPU-06-10	Municipalization
Interstate Power and Light	5/07	City of Terril, Iowa	Docket No. SPU-06-8	Municipalization
Interstate Power and Light	5/07	City of Rolfe, Iowa	Docket No. SPU-06-7	Municipalization
<b>Kansas Corporation Commission</b>				
Great Plains Energy Kansas City Power and Light Company	1/17	Great Plains Energy, Kansas City Power & Light Company, and Westar Energy	Docket No. 16-KCPE-593-ACQ	Merger Standards, Acquisition Premium, Ring-Fencing, Public Interest Standard
<b>Maryland Public Service Commission</b>				
AltaGas Ltd./WGL Holdings	4/17	AltaGas Ltd./WGL Holdings	Docket No. ____	Merger Standards, Public Interest Standard
<b>Mass. Department of Public Utilities</b>				
NStar	9/07 12/07	NStar, Bay State Gas, Fitchburg G&E, NE Gas, W. MA Electric	DPU 07-50	Decoupling, Risk



<b>SPONSOR</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>CASE/APPLICANT</b>	<b>DOCKET No.</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>
NStar	6/11	NStar, Northeast Utilities	DPU 10-170	Merger Approval
<b>Michigan Public Service Commission</b>				
Consumers Energy Company	1/07	Consumers Energy Company	Case No. U-14992	Sale of Nuclear Plant
WE Energies	12/11	Wisconsin Electric Power Co	Case No. U-16830	Economic Benefits/Prudence
Consumer Energy Company	7/13	Consumers Energy Company	Case No. U-17429	Certificate of Need, Integrated Resource Plan
WE Energies	8/14 3/15	WE Energies/Integrays	Case No. U-17682	Merger Application
<b>Minnesota Public Utilities Commission</b>				
Northern States Power	11/08 05/09	Northern States Power Company	Docket No. E002/GR-08-1065	Return on Equity
Northern States Power	11/09 6/10	Northern States Power Company	Docket No. G002/GR-09-1153	Return on Equity
Northern States Power	11/10 5/11	Northern States Power Company	Docket No. E002/GR-10-971	Return on Equity
Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy	1/16	Northern States Power Company	Docket No. E002/GR-15-826	Industry Perspective
<b>Missouri House Committee on Energy and the Environment</b>				
Ameren Missouri	3/16	Ameren Missouri	HB 2816	Performance Based Ratemaking
<b>Missouri Public Service Commission</b>				
Missouri Gas Energy	11/10 1/11	KCP&L	Case No. ER-2010-0355	Natural Gas DSM



<b>SPONSOR</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>CASE/APPLICANT</b>	<b>DOCKET No.</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>
Missouri Gas Energy	11/10 1/11	KCP&L GMO	Case No. ER-2010-0356	Natural Gas DSM
Laclede Gas Company	5/11	Laclede Gas Company	Case No. CG-2011-0098	Affiliate Pricing Standards
Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri	2/12 8/12	Union Electric Company	Case No. ER-2012-0166	ROE, Earnings Attrition, Regulatory Lag
Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri	6/14	Noranda Aluminum Inc.	Case No. EC-2014-0223	Ratemaking, Regulatory and Economic Policy
Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri	1/15 2/15	Union Electric Company	Case No. ER-2014-0258	Revenue Requirements, Ratemaking Policies
<b>Missouri Senate Committee on Commerce, Consumer Protection, Energy and the Environment</b>				
Ameren Missouri	3/16	Ameren Missouri	SB 1028	Performance Based Ratemaking
<b>Nat. Energy Board of Canada</b>				
TransCanada Pipelines Ltd.	4/07	TransCanada Pipelines Ltd.: Gros Cacouna Receipt Point Application	RH-1-2007	Toll Design
Repsol Energy Canada Ltd	3/08	Repsol Energy Canada Ltd	GH-1-2008	Market Study
Maritimes & Northeast Pipeline	7/10	Maritimes & Northeast Pipeline	RH-4-2010	Regulatory Policy, Toll Development
TransCanada Pipelines Ltd	9/11 5/12	TransCanada Pipelines Ltd.	RH-3-2011	Business Services and Tolls Application
Trans Mountain Pipeline LLC	6/12 1/13	Trans Mountain Pipeline LLC	RH-1-2012	Toll Design
TransCanada Pipelines Ltd	8/13	TransCanada Pipelines Ltd	RE-001-2013	Toll Design
NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd	11/13	NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd	OF-Fac-Gas-N081-2013-10 01	Toll Design





<b>SPONSOR</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>CASE/APPLICANT</b>	<b>DOCKET No.</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>
Trans Mountain Pipeline LLC	12/13	Trans Mountain Pipeline LLC	OF-Fac-Oil-T260-2013-03 01	Economic and Financial Feasibility and Project Benefits
Energy East Pipeline Ltd.	10/14	Energy East Pipeline	Of-Fac-Oil-E266-2014-01 02	Economic and Financial Feasibility and Project Benefits
NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd	5/16	NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd	GH-003-2015	Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity
<b>New Brunswick Energy and Utilities Board</b>				
Atlantic Wallboard/JD Irving Co	1/08	Enbridge Gas New Brunswick	MCTN #298600	Rate Setting for EGNB
Atlantic Wallboard/Flakeboard	9/09 6/10 7/10	Enbridge Gas New Brunswick	NBEUB 2009-017	Rate Setting for EGNB
Atlantic Wallboard/Flakeboard	1/14	Enbridge Gas New Brunswick	NBEUB Matter 225	Rate Setting for EGNB
<b>NH Public Utilities Commission</b>				
Public Service Co. of New Hampshire	7/14	Public Service Co. of NH	Docket No. DE 11-250	Prudence
Public Service Co. of New Hampshire	7/15 11/15	Public Service Co. of NH	Docket No. 14-238	Restructuring and Rate Stabilization
<b>New Jersey Board of Public Utilities</b>				
Morris Energy Group	11/09	Public Service Electric & Gas	BPU GR 09050422	Discriminatory Rates
New Jersey American Water Co.	4/10	New Jersey American Water Co.	BPU WR 1040260	Tariff Rates and Revisions
Electric Customer Group	1/11	Generic Stakeholder Proceeding	BPU GR10100761 and ER10100762	Natural Gas Ratemaking Standards and pricing



<b>SPONSOR</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>CASE/APPLICANT</b>	<b>DOCKET No.</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>
<b>New Mexico Public Service Commission</b>				
Southwestern Public Service Co., New Mexico	12/12	SPS New Mexico	Case No. 12-00350-UT	Rate Case, Return on Equity
PNM Resources	12/13 10/14 12/14	Public Service Co. of New Mexico	Case No. 13-00390-UT	Nuclear Valuation/In Support of Stipulation
<b>New York State Public Service Commission</b>				
Rochester Gas and Electric and NY State Electric & Gas Corp	2/10	Rochester Gas & Electric NY State Electric & Gas Corp	Case No. 09-E-0715 Case No. 09-E-0716 Case No. 09-E-0717 Case No. 09-E-0718	Depreciation Policy
National Fuel Gas Corporation	9/16 9/16	National Fuel Gas Corporation	Case No. 16-G-0257	Ring-fencing Policy
<b>Nova Scotia Utility and Review Board</b>				
Nova Scotia Power	9/12	Nova Scotia Power	Docket No. P-893	Audit Reply
Nova Scotia Power	8/14	Nova Scotia Power	Docket No. P-887	Audit Reply
Nova Scotia Power	5/16	Nova Scotia Power	2017-2019 Fuel Stability Plan	Used and Useful Ratemaking
NSP Maritime Link ("NSPML")	12/16 2/17 5/17	NSP Maritime Link ("NSPML")	NSPML Interim Cost Assessment Application	Used and Useful Ratemaking
<b>Oklahoma Corporation Commission</b>				
Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company	3/08	Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company	Cause No. PUD 200800086	Acquisition of Redbud Generating Facility
Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company	8/14 1/15	Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company	Cause No. PUD 201400229	Integrated Resource Plan



<b>SPONSOR</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>CASE/APPLICANT</b>	<b>DOCKET NO.</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>
<b>Ontario Energy Board</b>				
Ontario Power Generation	9/13 2/14 5/14	Ontario Power Generation	EB-2013-0321	Prudence Review of Nuclear Project Management Processes
<b>Texas Public Utility Commission</b>				
Oncor Electric Delivery Company	8/07	Oncor Electric Delivery Company	Docket No. 34040	Regulatory Policy, Rate of Return, Return of Capital and Consolidated Tax Adjustment
Oncor Electric Delivery Company	6/08	Oncor Electric Delivery Company	Docket No.35717	Regulatory policy
Oncor Electric Delivery Company	10/08 11/08	Oncor, TCC, TNC, ETT, LCRA TSC, Sharyland, STEC, TNMP	Docket No. 35665	Competitive Renewable Energy Zone
CenterPoint Energy	6/10 10/10	CenterPoint Energy/Houston Electric	Docket No. 38339	Regulatory Policy, Risk, Consolidated Taxes
Oncor Electric Delivery Company	1/11	Oncor Electric Delivery Company	Docket No. 38929	Regulatory Policy, Risk
Cross Texas Transmission	8/12 11/12	Cross Texas Transmission	Docket No. 40604	Return on Equity
Southwestern Public Service	11/12	Southwestern Public Service	Docket No. 40824	Return on Equity
Lone Star Transmission	5/14	Lone Star Transmission	Docket No. 42469	Return on Equity, Debt, Cost of Capital
CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC	6/15	CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC	Docket No. 44572	Distribution Cost Recovery Factor
NextEra Energy, Inc.	10/16 2/17	Oncor Electric Delivery Company LLC, NextEra Energy	Docket No. 46238	Merger Application, Ring-fencing



<b>SPONSOR</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>CASE/APPLICANT</b>	<b>DOCKET No.</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>
<b>Texas Railroad Commission</b>				
Atmos Pipeline Texas	9/10 1/11	Atmos Pipeline Texas	GUD 10000	Ratemaking Policy, risk
Atmos Pipeline Texas	1/17 4/17	Atmos Pipeline Texas	GUD 10580	Ratemaking Policy, ROE, Rate Design Policy
<b>Texas State Legislature</b>				
CenterPoint Energy	4/13	Association of Electric Companies of Texas	SB 1364	Consolidated Tax Adjustment Clause Legislation
<b>Utah Public Service Commission</b>				
Questar Gas Company	12/07	Questar Gas Company	Docket No. 07-057-13	Benchmarking in Support of ROE
<b>Wisconsin Public Service Commission</b>				
Wisconsin Electric Power Company	1/07	Wisconsin Electric Power Co.	Docket No. 6630-EI-113	Sale of Nuclear Plant
Wisconsin Electric Power Company	10/09	Wisconsin Electric Power Co.	Docket No. 6630-CE-302	CPCN Application for Wind Project
Northern States Power Wisconsin	10/13	Xcel Energy (dba Northern States Power Wisconsin)	Docket No. 4220-UR-119	Fuel Cost Adjustments
Wisconsin Electric Power Company	11/13	Wisconsin Electric Power Co.	Docket No. 6630-FR-104	Fuel Cost Adjustment
WE Energy	8/14 1/15 3/15	WE Energy/Integrus	Docket No. 9400-YO-100	Merger Approval



<b>American Arbitration Association</b>				
Nevada Power Company	4/08	Nevada Power v. Nevada Cogeneration Assoc. #2		Power Purchase Agreement
Sensata Technologies, Inc./EMS Engineered Materials Solutions, LLC	1/11	Sensata Technologies, Inc./EMS Engineered Materials Solutions, LLC v. Pepco Energy Services	Case No. 11-198-Y-00848-10	Change in Usage Dispute/Damages
<b>Canadian Arbitration Panel</b>				
Hydro-Québec	4/15 5/16 7/16	Hydro-Fraser et al v. Hydro-Québec		Electric Price Arbitration
<b>Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Appellate Tax Board</b>				
NStar Electric Company	8/14	NStar Electric Company		Valuation Methodology
Western Massachusetts Electric Company	2/16	Western Massachusetts Electric Company v. Board of Assessors of The City of Springfield	Docket No. 315550 Docket No. 319349	Valuation Methodology
<b>Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County, Civil Division</b>				
Sunoco Marketing & Terminals L.P.	11/16	Sunoco Marketing & Terminals, L.P. v. South Jersey Resources Group	Case No. 150302520	Damages Quantification
<b>International Court of Arbitration</b>				
Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd., and Mitsubishi Nuclear Energy Systems, Inc.	12/15 2/16	Southern California Edison Company, Edison Material Supply LLC, San Diego Gas & Electric Co., and the City of Riverside vs. Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd., and Mitsubishi Nuclear Energy Systems, Inc.	Case No. 19784/AGF/RD	Damages Arising Under a Nuclear Power Equipment Contract



<b>State of New Jersey, Mercer County Superior Court</b>				
Transamerica Corp., et al.	7/07 10/07	IMO Industries Inc. vs. Transamerica Corp., et al.	Docket No. L-2140-03	Breach-Related Damages, Enterprise Value
<b>State of New York, Nassau County Supreme Court</b>				
Steel Los III, LP	6/08	Steel Los II, LP & Associated Brook, Corp v. Power Authority of State of NY	Index No. 5662/05	Property Seizure
<b>Province of Alberta, Court of Queen's Bench</b>				
Alberta Northeast Gas Limited	5/07	Cargill Gas Marketing Ltd. vs. Alberta Northeast Gas Limited	Action No. 0501-03291	Gas Contracting Practices
<b>State of Utah, Third District Court</b>				
PacifiCorp & Holme, Roberts & Owen, LLP	1/07	USA Power & Spring Canyon Energy vs. PacifiCorp. et al.	Civil No. 050903412	Breach-Related Damages
<b>U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Northern District of Texas</b>				
Consolidated Edison Company	2/08 6/08	Consolidated Edison Company v. United States	No. 04-0033C	SNF Expert Report
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation	6/08	Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation	No. 03-2663C	SNF Expert Report
<b>U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division</b>				
U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission	4/12	U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission v. Thomas Fisher, Kathleen Halloran, and George Behrens	Case No. 07 C 4483	Prudence, PBR
<b>U. S. District Court, Western District of Virginia</b>				



Washington Gas Light Company	8/15 9/15	Washington Gas Light Company v. Mountaineer Gas Company	Civil Action No. 5:14-cv- 41	Nominations and Gas Balancing, Lost and Unaccounted for Gas, Damages
<b>U.S. Tax Court in Illinois</b>				
Exelon Corporation	4/15 6/15	Exelon Corporation, as Successor by Merger to Unicom Corporation and Subsidiaries et al. v. Commission of Internal Revenue	Docket Nos. 29183-13, 29184-13	Valuation of Analysis of Lease Terms and Quantify Plant Values

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**  
**DOCKET NO. 20170009-EI**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the rebuttal testimony and exhibits of Steven Scroggs and John Reed was served electronically this 5th day of July, 2017, to the following:

Kyesha Mapp, Esq.  
Margo Leathers, Esq.  
Division of Legal Services  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850  
kmapp@psc.state.fl.us  
mleather@psc.state.fl.us

Matthew Bernier, Esq., Sr. Counsel  
106 East College Ave., Suite 800  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301-7740  
Matthew.bernier@duke-energy.com  
*Attorney for Duke Energy Florida, Inc.*

Jon C. Moyle, Jr., Esq.  
Moyle Law Firm, P.A.  
118 North Gadsden Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301  
jmoyle@moylelaw.com  
*Attorney for Fla. Industrial Power Users Group*

Patricia A. Christensen, Esq.  
Associate Public Counsel  
Office of Public Counsel  
The Florida Legislature  
111 W. Madison Street, Room 812  
Tallahassee, FL 32399  
Christensen.patty@leg.state.fl.us  
*Attorney for Citizens of the State of Florida*

Dianne M. Triplett, Esq.  
299 First Avenue North  
St. Petersburg, Florida 33701  
dianne.triplett@duke-energy.com  
*Attorney for Duke Energy Florida, Inc.*

Victoria Méndez, City Attorney  
Xavier Albán, Assistant City Attorney  
Christopher A. Green, Senior Assistant  
City Attorney  
Kerri L. McNulty, Assistant City Attorney  
City of Miami  
444 S.W. 2nd Avenue, Suite 945  
Miami, FL 33130-1910  
vmendez@miamigov.com  
xealban@miamigov.com  
cagreen@miamigov.com  
klmcnulty@miamigov.com  
mgriffin@miamigov.com  
*Attorneys for City of Miami*



James W. Brew, Esq.  
Laura A. Wynn, Esq.  
Stone, Mattheis, Xenopoulos & Brew, P.C.  
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.  
Eighth Floor, West Tower  
Washington, D.C. 20007  
jbrew@smxblaw.com  
law@smxblaw.com  
*Attorneys for White Springs Agricultural  
Chemicals, Inc. d/b/a PCS Phosphate – White  
Springs*

George Cavros, Esq.  
120 E. Oakland Park Blvd., Suite 105  
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33334  
George@cavros-law.com  
*Attorney for Southern Alliance for Clean  
Energy*

By: *s/ Jessica A. Cano*  
Jessica A. Cano  
Fla. Bar No. 0037372