APPEARANCES:

ROBERT SCHEFFEL WRIGHT and

JOHN T. LaVIA, III, Landers & Parsons, 310 West
College Avenue, Tallahassee, Florida 32302, appearing
on behalf of Duke Energy New Smyrna Beach Power
Company Ltd., L.L.P.

JAMES A. MCGEE, Florida Power Corporation,

P. O. Box 14042, St. Petersburg, Florida 33733-4042, and

GARY L. SASSO, Carlton, Fields, Ward, Emmanuel, Smith &

Cutler, P.A., Post Office Box 2861, St. Petersburg, Florida

33731, appearing on behalf of Florida Power Corporation.

JAMES D. BEASLEY, Ausley & McMullen, 227 South Calhoun Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32302, appearing on behalf of Tampa Electric Company.

MICHELLE HERSHEL, P. O. Box 590,

Tallahassee, Florida 32302, appearing on behalf of

Florida Electric Cooperatives Association, Inc.

GAIL KAMARAS, 1114 Thomasville Road, Suite E, Tallahassee, Florida 32303, appearing on behalf of Legal Environmental Assistance Foundation, Inc. (LEAF).

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

MATTHEW M. CHILDS, and CHARLES GUYTON, Steel Hector & Davis, 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 601, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of Florida Power & Light Company.

TERRY L. KAMMER, PAC Director, 3944 Florida

Boulevard, Palm Beach Gardens, Florida 33410, appearing on
behalf of System Council U-4 IBEW.

ROBERT J. SNIFFEN, Moyle, Flanigan, Katz, Kolins, Raymond & Sheehan, 210 South Monroe Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of U. S. Generating Company.

LESLIE J. PAUGH and BOB ELIAS, Florida

Public Service Commission, Division of Legal Services,

2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida

32399-0870, appearing on behalf of the Commission

Staff.

2

PROCEEDINGS

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Let it be said that

(Hearing convened at 9:35 a.m.)

3 4

this Cuban started one proceeding on time, so I --

5

(laughter)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

hearing to order.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We'll take

This is a lengthy document so I'm going to try to go point by point in the prehearing and hopefully we can work it out. Staff did have some problems with some of the issues. I want to work with you to try to consolidate some of these things. will make it easier for you all and make it easier for how we address this later on, and hopefully we will break another record and get out of here before Staff's estimated three hours. I'm hoping we'll do much better than that. With that said, call the

Counsel, will you please read the notice.

MS. PAUGH: Pursuant to notice issued on August 31st, 1998, this time and place have been set for the prehearing in Docket No. 981042, joint petition for determination of need for an electrical power plant in Volusia County by Utilities Commission, City of New Smyrna Beach, Florida and Duke Energy New Smyrna Beach Power Company Limited, L.L.P.

appearances.

MR. WRIGHT: Commissioner Garcia, Robert
Scheffel Wright of law firm Landers & Parsons, 310
West College Avenue, Tallahassee, Florida 32301,
appearing on the Utilities Commission, City of
New Smyrna Beach, Florida and Duke Energy New Smyrna
Beach Power Company Limited, L.L.P. I would also
like to enter an appearance for my partner, John T.
LaVia, III, who will be joining us shortly.

MS. HERSHEL: Michelle Hershel representing the Florida Electric Cooperatives Association, 4916

Apalachee Parkway, Tallahassee 32301.

MS. KAMARAS: Gail Kamaras, Legal

Environmental Assistance Foundation, 1114 Thomasville

Road, Suite E, Tallahassee 32303.

MR. SNIFFEN: Robert J. Sniffen, of the firm of Moyle, Flanigan, Katz, Kolins, Raymond & Sheehan on behalf of U. S. Generating Company. We're a proposed intervenor at this point, and we ask that we be allowed to make an appearance notwithstanding that our intervenor status has not been granted at this point. And we be allowed to file positions in writing subject to the granted intervenor status as soon as possible.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We'll deal with that in a second.

1	
1	MR. GUYTON: Charles A. Guyton and Matthew
2	M. Childs of the law firm Steel, Hector and Davis, 215
3	South Monroe Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301,
4	appearing on behalf of Florida Power and Light
5	Company.
6	MR. BEASLEY: James D. Beasley and Lee L.
7	Willis of the law firm of Ausley & McMullen, P. O. Box
8	391, Tallahassee, Florida 32302, appearing on behalf
9	of the intervenor, Tampa Electric Company.
10	MR. SASSO: Gary Sasso, law firm of Carlton
11	Fields, One Progress Plaza, St. Petersburg, Florida
12	33731, appearing on behalf of Florida Power
13	Corporation.
L4	MR. McGEE: James McGee, P. O. Box 14042,
15	St. Petersburg, Florida, also appearing on behalf of
16	Florida Power Corporation.
17	MR. KAMMER: Terry Kammer, representing
18	System Council U-4 IBEW, 3944 Florida Boulevard, Palm
19	Beach Gardens, Florida 33410.
20	MS. PAUGH: Leslie Paugh on behalf of Staff.
21	With me are Robert Elias and Grace Jaye on behalf of
22	Staff.
23	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Counsel, are there any
24	preliminary matters?

Under

MS. PAUGH: Yes, Commissioner.

Section 6 of the draft Prehearing Order we would like 2 to bring to your attention, and counsels', that prior 3 to the issuance of the Prehearing Order, the parties will need to reflect which issues their witnesses are addressing. We only have those statements from 5 Florida Power Corporation at this time. 6 7 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: So we're looking for 8 FP&L and Duke to tell us which issues they are going to address. 9 That's correct, Commissioner. 10 MS. PAUGH: NR. GUYTON: FP&L will get that to Staff. 11 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. You have only 12 one witness here, pretty much spread him out. 13 MR. GUYTON: Yes, Commissioner. 14 MR. WRIGHT: We will too. 15 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Do you want to 16 just proceed and go through the issues, that way we 17 can take -- we don't have to post the nonissues that 18 19 we may not be considering. 20 We're going to go through the -- let me try to do this real quick on the front side. There is an 21 outstanding motion by Mr. Kammer --22 23 MR. KAMMER: Kammer. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Forgive me. 24 Kammer.

About intervention. I'm going to go ahead and grant

it so he can participate on this.

And then the other issue is we haven't finished because Mr. Wright has yet to respond, if I'm not mistaken, correct?

MR. WRIGHT: Commissioner Garcia, it's my understanding that this petition was filed either yesterday or the day before, we haven't responded.

Based --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Making any decision -MR. WRIGHT: -- based on what I know at this
time I don't think we will respond, but I will advise
Staff as soon as that decision is final.

take any new issues from you today. If you want to make some comment -- I don't have a problem with you participating in a limited way, but I'm not going to take any new issues. Any new issues you can address to Staff. When we handle your motion and we can look at that and check with the parties that are already here.

Okay. Let's go through the case background. We don't have anything yet -- at least I don't have it.

MS. PAUGH: The case background has been written and it's available in the draft Prehearing

Order that was issued yesterday. It was after our 2 meeting yesterday. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Does anyone 3 have a problem with it? I know I don't because I 5 obviously haven't seen it. So we'll move one then. Corrections or changes to the order of the 6 7 witness list. We will, before we finish today, get positions from each of -- which each of these witnesses we'll be dealing with. Basic position, any changes or corrections? All right. 10 MR. GUYTON: On Page 9 of the Prehearing 11 Order, the last line on the first paragraph should 12 read "Commission's minimum pleading" rather than 13 "plant requirements." And then the two paragraphs 14 15 down the last line should read "Court's Nassau 16 decisions," plural. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: All right. 17 Issues and positions. Let's go through them issue by issue. 18 you have any questions, problems, we'll deal with them 19 20 as we get to them. Issue No. 1. Issue No. 2. Issue No. 3. 21 MS. PAUGH: Commissioner -- I'm sorry, go 22 23 ahead. 24 MR. GUYTON: Go ahead.

MS. PAUGH:

Staff's position on Issue No. 3

1	is that it is subsumed by Issue No. 1.
2	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Whose issue is this?
3	MR. GUYTON: I believe that it's a Florida
4	Power and Light Company issue.
5	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay.
6	MR. GUYTON: Commissioner, this issue is
7	preparatory not only to Issue 1 but also to the other
8	statutory criteria issues. It's not limited to a
9	question of reliability. It's a question as to
10	whether or not you have enough information to pass on
11	reliability, the reasonable cost that are
12	reasonable electricity adequate electricity at a
13	reasonable cost, cost-effectiveness or conservation
14	measures.
15	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Schef, do you have a
16	problem with this?
17	MR. WRIGHT: Commissioner Garcia, we do not
18	have a problem with this issue being included.
19	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We're going to go
20	ahead unless someone else has a problem with it,
21	we're going to go forward and leave it in for now.
22	No. 4.
23	MS. PAUGH: Staff's position is that this
24	issue is also subsumed by Issue No. 1.
25	COMMISSIONED CARCIA: Whose issue is this?

Florida Power and Light. We're MR. GUYTON: trying very hard to pin down Duke's theory of the case here. Duke has offered testimony on this issue that it, itself, has a need for this power plant. Yet they also take the position that it's the need of the Peninsular Florida that they are trying -- we're trying to make sure that we understand what the theory of the case is. And to the extent that they are trying to prove that they have a need, that that is an appropriate issue. Now, if they're going to take the position

1

3

5

6

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that no, it's not their need, and they don't have a need -- their own need for the power plant, and they'll stipulate to that, then we have no difficulty with dropping the issue. But because of the uncertainty about the theory of the case, at least in its present position, we think this is an appropriate issue.

> COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Schef?

I'm not sure what question I'm MR. WRIGHT: supposed to address. We don't --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Guyton, we'll leave it in.

If I may, we do question the

relevance of this issue. We don't disagree with Staff. Mr. Guyton and I and our clients have agreed that rather than fight over the inclusion of issues as between ourselves, we would take a position statement reflecting our concern regarding the issues, and then provide a position in the statement.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We'll leave it in then.

Issue No. 5. It was my own analysis that this was also subsumed by Issue No. 1. Is this yours again, Mr. Guyton?

MR. GUYTON: No, Commissioner. I believe Florida Power Corporation raised this issue.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay.

MS. PAUGH: Staff has some suggested wording changes to Issue No. 5 that would make the issue more acceptable to Staff. Otherwise their position is it is subsumed under Issue No. 1. That change would be after the word "the, "calculating the," adds the words "short-term operating and long-term planning reserve" -- "margins" is then plural. We believe that this more fully addresses what the issue is attempting to explore.

MR. SASSO: We would agree to that change.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: No. 5.

1	1
1	MR. GUYTON: If I may go back and make a
2	correction to a position is that appropriate as to
3	5?
4	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Sure.
5	MR. GUYTON: On Page 6, 16, the next to the
6	last line.
7	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Page 16
8	MR. GUYTON: Am I jumping ahead?
9	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: 16.
10	MR. GUYTON: Next to the last line should
11	read
12	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I'm sorry, next to the
13	last line.
14	MR. GUYTON: Of FP&L's position.
15	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Issue 6.
16	MR. GUYTON: On Issue 5, Page 16.
17	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. FP&L. Go
18	ahead.
19	MR. GUYTON: "Reliability benefits and with
20	possible," insert "with" before "possible." My
21	apologizes.
22	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: And "with."
23	MR. GUYTON: Correct.
24	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. All right.
25	Issue No. 6.
J	000928

1	MS. PAUGH: Staff believes this is subsumed
2	by Issue No. 1.
3	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I'd like to ask you
4	about that. Whose is this one?
5	MR. GUYTON: I believe it's Florida Power
6	Corporation's issue originally.
7	MR. WRIGHT: Commissioner Garcia, if you're
8	interested we agree with Staff that it's duplicative
9	of Issue 1 but
10	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Thank you.
11	MR. SASSO: We'd be happy to recede on this
12	one.
13	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We're dropping Issue
14	No. 6. Issue No. 7. Okay. We're going to leave 7
15	in. Issue 8. That's fine also. Issue 9. Issue 10.
16	Issue 11.
17	MR. BEASLEY: Tampa Electric has a revised
18	position on No. 1. I'll hand it out.
19	MS. PAUGH: Staff's position on Issue 11 is
20	it is subsumed by Issue 9 Commissioner.
21	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay.
22	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Let's do this,
23	Mr. Beasley. We're going to TP this one so that
24	everyone can see it and see if they have an objection,
25	as well as Staff. Staff has not had an opportunity to 000929

read it. It's not going to fly on that one. So we'll pass on Issue 11. Staff, remind me to get back to that before we leave here, okay? And that way everyone can look at Mr. Beasley and TECO's position. Issue 11.

Issue 12.

MS. PAUGH: Staff's position is that this issue is subsumed by Issue 9.

MR. GUYTON: Commissioner Garcia, that was a Florida Power and Light Company issue. If you'll note that Issue 9 goes to the question of cost-effectiveness. One of the specific criteria under 403.519. This issue goes to the Commission's authority under Chapter 366, the Grid Bill and other provisions, as to whether or not the proposed project will result in an uneconomic duplication of facilities. They are different issues, different factual issues, and certainly this is not subsumed within the cost-effectiveness issue.

And if you'll note under 403.519 it's not limited to the consideration of just the four criteria but other matters within the Commission's jurisdiction.

MR. WRIGHT: Commissioner Garcia, I'm honoring my agreement with Mr. Guyton. If it's your

1	pleasure to leave the issue in, we're not going to
2	fight with it.
3	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: All right. We're
4	going to leave this one in. 13.
5	MS. PAUGH: Staff believes this issue is
6	also subsumed by Issue 9.
7	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: It almost seems
8	broader than Issue 9, too, the scope of this question.
9	MR. WRIGHT: Commissioner Garcia, this is
10	actually an issue that we initially proposed. It is
11	specifically an issue that has been included in just
12	about every need determination case that I know of for
13	the last ten years plus. If the Staff believes that
14	it is subsumed in Issue 9, we would not have any
15	objections to it.
16	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We'll drop 13 also.
17	14.
18	MS. PAUGH: Staff believes this issue is
19	subsumed by Issue 9.
20	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Do you want to try to
21	defend your issue or
22	MR. GUYTON: It was a Staff issue so
23	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Even better. 14.
24	Thank you, Mr. Guyton. 15.
25	MS. PAUGH: Staff believes this issue is
l	000931

speculative and should be dropped.

MR. GUYTON: Commissioner, I'm torn. I have agreed with Mr. Wright that I won't argue with him about the proprietary of the issues, but I'm finding that I have somebody else that I disagree with and I'm torn as to whether or not I should respond.

MR. WRIGHT: Commissioner Garcia, for what it's worth, our agreement is between ourselves. I don't think it binds you in any way. I don't think it binds Mr. Guyton in any way with respect to arguing other parties' issues.

MR. GUYTON: In that regard, this was an issue that Florida Power and Light Company raised. The point of this issue is that it's speculative. The point of this issue is to raise the matter that clearly this information is not available to you. It's critical information which should be available to you. The point is to get that in front of the Commission to have you pass on it.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: This issue struck me, like Staff, as an issue that would be good for an engineering philosophy course rather than what we're going to be conducting here. I think it is speculative. I don't think it adds anything to us moving forward, so we're going to go ahead and drop

- 1	
1	15. Issue 16.
2	MS. PAUGH: Staff believes this issue is
3	addressed by Issue 9.
4	MR. GUYTON: Once again, it's a Florida
5	Power and Light Company issue. Issue 9 is a
6	cost-effectiveness issue. This issue goes to need.
7	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Guyton, isn't this
8	subsumed by 9 and the ones we have allowed after that?
9	How do you distinguish this issue from 9? 9 is a
10	little bit more specific. This is perhaps a little
11	bit more broader.
12	MR. GUYTON: 9 goes to cost-effectiveness.
13	This goes to the you may want to open the matter as
14	to whether it goes to some of the other issues
15	identified as a need, but it's clearly not a
16	cost-effectiveness issue.
17	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I mean it struck me as
18	I read it that we had touched upon it somewhat earlier
19	in this. We'll leave it in for now. Issue 17.
20	MR. BEASLEY: We had taken no position for
21	Tampa Electric at this time. And I have a position
22	I'll distribute.
23	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. That seems
24	simple enough. I'm not going to drop 17, so we'll

25

move on.

MR. SASSO: May I just point out a 1 typographical error in the statement of FPC's position 2 3 there, "engages" should be "engaged." COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Thank you, sir. 4 5 19. 20. MS. PAUGH: The parties may be able to 6 7 stipulate to Issue 20. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I don't see anyone 8 9 stepping up. We'll go on and leave it in for now. Issue 20 is in. 10 MR. GUYTON: We might revisit that. 11 12 read it, it looks like we're all in agreement --13 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: That would be fine. I'll give you an opportunity to think about it. 14 Issue -- let's be reminded to return to Issue 20. 15 MS. PAUGH: 21. 16 17 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: 21. It strikes me this is very similar to Issue 18. MR. GUYTON: This is Florida Power and Light 19 20 Company issue, Commissioner. This goes not to the Commission's authority but to the Petitioner's status 21 as to whether there is appropriate need as envisioned 22 within the statute. 23 FP&L would agree that within the context of 24

a broad, essentially ultimate legal issue can raise a

host of legal issues, we think the Commission is much better served if it focuses on some of the subordinate legal issues that it needs to address. This, we think, is a pretty critical issue in terms of the legal issues this Commission need to address specifically, rather than running the risk of getting lost in the broad issue and in the text of the Staff recommendation when it comes back to the Commission.

commissioner GARCIA: It strikes me in terms of efficiency we're going to have to deal with it any way, so I'm going to drop 21. 22.

MS. PAUGH: Staff's position is that this issue is subsumed by Issue 18. It is also the subject of a motion to dismiss.

MR. GUYTON: Commissioner, I'm in a position I don't have a ruling on the motion to dismiss. I have to raise this issue to make sure it's not waived under your rules. Once again, this goes to the Petitioner's statute, not to the broad brush Commission authority. This isn't even the most narrow issue that can be drafted. There are issues subsumed at this point. Issues we're concerned that if we don't break the issues down they won't get addressed.

This issue goes to whether an entity is an electric utility. Subordinate to that, are the issues

of whether Duke New Smyrna is a regulated electric company or a joint operating agency within the meaning of the Siting Act. We haven't identified those subordinate issues but we have to identify them here to make sure that this is an issue that everybody --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I got scared. I thought you were going to pull some more issues. So when you're saying this is in a broader context, you feel that this subsumes some of the smaller issues that have to be dealt with anyway.

MR. GUYTON: That should be, but we're concerned --

commissioner GARCIA: I guess the other issues, touching on the -- I mean it's a progression; you end up at the same place. You've got to build your case to get there anyway, but we'll go ahead and leave it. Issue 23.

MS. PAUGH: Staff's position is that this issue is also subject to the motion to dismiss and that it is argumentative and should be dropped.

MR. GUYTON: I don't disagree that it's an issue that's been raised by the motion to dismiss. I don't know -- I mean, I'm at a little bit of a loss as how to respond to an issue being argumentative. They are the source of argument and contention within a

1	case. I think it's objectively worded, if you will,
2	and it is an issue on which the Commission has
3	previously passed.
4	MR. WRIGHT: As noted, we think it's vague.
5	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I think that it's an
6	obvious issue. It an obvious part of what is the rest
7	of what we're doing, Mr. Guyton, so I just don't see
8	it being necessary. We'll drop that. 24.
9	MS. PAUGH: Staff's position is that this
10	issue is subsumed by Issue 18.
11	MR. GUYTON: Commissioner, I think the
12	Commission would be well served to visit whether or
13	not it's in compliance with specific language from the
14	specific Supreme Court decision as opposed to running
15	the risk that it get lost in the legal issues.
16	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: It's certainly been
17	pointed out that we may be abrogating our
18	responsibilities, and I hope this agency can keep that
19	part of our responsibility during this case. I don't
20	see a point to this, Mr. Guyton. I'm going to drop
21	Issue 24. 25.
22	MS. PAUGH: Staff's position is that
23	Issue 25 is subsumed by Issues 18, 19 and 9.
24	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Who's defending this
25	one?
	l

1 MR. GUYTON: I am. I need to go back and take a look at the three issues. 2 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: That's all right. 3 Commissioner, this really goes to an issue 4 that is not within the four criteria within the need 5 determination's statute, but in the other matters within the Commission's jurisdiction, as we understand 18 and 19 they go to the need criteria. This goes to 8 the authority under Section -- Chapter 366, to 9 avoiding uneconomic duplication of facilities --10 11 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Didn't we retouch on 12 that --13 MR. GUYTON: On a factual issue. 14 legal issue. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: All right, Mr. Guyton, 15 we'll allow it. 16 26. MS. PAUGH: Staff has no objection to this 17 18 issue. We'll move on then. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: 19 20 27. MS. PAUGH: Staff's position is that 21 22 Issue 27 is subsumed by Issue 18. 23 MR. GUYTON: Commissioner, I have to raise 24 I don't have a ruling on my motion to dismiss. had to raise it to keep from waiving.

1	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: You agree, Mr. Guyton,
2	this is also subsumed in what we're basically looking
3	at. Do you really think we need to break this out as
4	an issue, or do you think this is a bit repetitive?
5	MR. GUYTON: I think the Commission needs to
6	rule on this issue given it's been raised in the
7	motion to dismiss.
8	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We can only refrain
9	from answering it as we move through this, if we deal
10	with it in the motion to dismiss, so I'll leave it in.
11	I think you could all come to an agreement on this
12	one, I would hope.
13	MS. PAUGH: Are you referring to Issue 28?
14	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: 28, yeah.
15	MS. PAUGH: Yes. It appears the parties may
16	be in a position to stipulate to Issue 28.
17	MR. GUYTON: The stipulation being "no"?
18	MS. PAUGH: That's correct.
19	MR. GUYTON: FP&L can stipulate to that.
20	MR. WRIGHT: We've got a problem because we
21	think this is irrelevant and prejudicial to include a
22	stipulation as to "no".
23	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I'm comfortable
24	dropping the issue all together. Does that make you

25 more comfortable?

1	1
1	MR. WRIGHT: Yes, sir.
2	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We're going to drop
3	this issue all together. I don't think it gets us
4	anywhere.
5	29. Staff is fine with 29?
6	MS. PAUGH: That's correct.
7	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Get to policy issues.
8	30 is all right.
9	MS. PAUGH: That's correct, Commissioner.
10	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: 31 is all right.
11	MR. GUYTON: We may have a stipulation on
12	this.
13	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: On 31?
14	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Well, do we have a
15	stipulation? Seems like we do.
16	MR. WRIGHT: According to the stated
17	position, not necessarily. But if the stipulation is
18	no, we're okay on that. If the stipulation is "no,
19	but" extra discussion, maybe not.
20	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Whose issue is this?
21	Is this yours, Mr. Guyton?
22	MR. GUYTON: Yes, Commissioner.
23	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Would that be fine
24	with you?
25	MR. GUYTON: As to "no"?
	0.00

1	
1	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Yes.
2	MR. GUYTON: As long as we're not by
3	stipulating that removing the opportunity to present
4	testimony as to the other matter that's covered in our
5	position here.
6	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I agree on that. 31
7	is stipulated. "No" is the answer.
8	32. I'm fine with this. 33.
9	MS. PAUGH: Staff's position is that
10	Issue 33 is subsumed by Issues 30, 29 and 1.
11	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Mr. Guyton,
12	this is yours.
13	MR. GUYTON: Yes.
14	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Let me save you time.
15	I feel comfortable with this one.
16	MR. GUYTON: Okay.
17	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I think we can leave
18	it in. 34.
١9	MS. PAUGH: Staff's position is that this
20	issue is subsumed by Issues 25, 29, 30 and 1. This
21	issue is also the subject of the motions to dismiss
22	and it is argumentative. Staff suggests that it be
23	dropped.
24	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: 25, 29, 30.
25 25	MS. PAUGH: And 1.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: And 1. Okay.

MR. GUYTON: This is a FP&L issue. 25 and 29 are legal issues, not policy issues. 1 is a factual issue, not a policy issue. Issue 30 is a policy issue. Let me go back and take a look at it briefly.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Sure.

MR. GUYTON: Issue 30 goes to how the Commission would discharge its responsibilities under the Siting Act as to the need criteria, it affects those. Issue 34 goes not go to the four specific need criteria but to the Commission's Grid Bill jurisdiction, all of which are appropriately considered but this matter is not reached under 30 but instead is a separate matter. We think it's appropriately in.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We'll leave it in then. 34 is in.

Ms. Paugh, you had some issue with -- you wanted to offer something?

MS. PAUGH: Yes, Commissioner. The following rewording of Issue 35, Staff would find it acceptable. It would be reworded in its entirety to say as follows: Can Florida's investor-owned electric utilities, or their affiliates, build merchant plants

in their service areas?

The reason we have suggested this rewording is because we believe that it more closely addresses the matters that are attempted to be addressed in the issue as it is presently worded. In other words, we believe it's more on point and reflective.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Whose issue is this? Staff's?

MR. GUYTON: It was a Florida Power and Light Company issue.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay.

MS. HERSHEL: We would have to include the municipals and cooperatives in Staff's rewording also.

MS. PAUGH: That would be acceptable.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Do you want to see this in writing and we'll come back to it? All right, Staff, if you could have someone just type that up so we could pass it out.

MR. WRIGHT: If I could just make one suggestion to the wording while we're here.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Shef, I'm not even looking at it, so I don't even have it before me.

Let's wait until Staff prints it out. We've got to return to a few other issues.

Issue 36.

1	MS. PAUGH: Staff's position on Issue 36 is
2	it is argumentative and should be dropped.
3	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Don't get sympathetic
4	on me. Whose is this? (Laughter)
5	MR. GUYTON: Florida Power and Light.
6	Commissioner, I must express some surprise,
7	through three issue ID meetings Staff has said they
8	agree to this issue and, indeed, here having said
9	that, if the Commission if you, from the
10	Commission, is not concerned about these types of
11	issues, we can proceed from there.
12	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Guyton, I think
13	these are issues I would be concerned with, I'm
14	certain that the Chairman is concerned, I'm certain
15	the executive director is concerned. However, I don't
16	think the issues in this docket don't bring the
17	concern necessary, so we're going to drop 36. 37.
18	MS. PAUGH: Staff's position on Issue 37 is
19	that it is subsumed by Issues 9 and 14.
20	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Whose issue is this?
21	MR. GUYTON: Florida Power and Light
22	Company. Issue 14 has been dropped.
23	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Referring back to
24	that, you score. We'll leave 37.
25	MS. KAMARAS: The other conservation

1	measures, No. 7, Staff, the one you meant to refer to.
2	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I think this is fine
3	as a policy issue. I feel comfortable with it.
4	38. I was all right with this one.
5	MS. PAUGH: Staff has no objection to
6	Issue 38 through Issue 40.
7	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Good. If no one else
8	has any objection, Issue 41. So we leave in Issue 38,
9	39, 40 does anyone have any issue with 41,
10	objection to Issue 41? All right. If no one does,
11	then we're finished well, 42 I guess no one can
12	have an objection.
13	MS. PAUGH: Actually, Commissioner, Staff
14	does; has not an objection but a question. Tampa
15	Electric Company has taken a position of "no"
16	regarding the docket closing, and we wonder if that's
17	correct.
18	MR. BEASLEY: It should be "yes". Thank
19	you.
20	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: That was surprising.
21	We're through with that.
22	We'll go through the exhibit list. Any
23	corrections? Is there anything else to be taken up?
24	MS. PAUGH: Yes, Commissioner. LEAF has not
25	taken

5

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: With the exception of the two issues we're going to go back to in a moment.

MS. PAUGH: Yes. LEAF has not taken a position with respect to any of the issues in this docket, and they will need to do that. I was wondering when LEAF proposes to take a position?

MS. KAMARAS: I think we're authorized going into the hearing to be neutral on the issues.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: You're not giving us a witness or anything.

we're reserving our right to cross examine, but we hope to take a position after hearing the evidence at the hearing.

Establishing Procedure states that all parties must take positions by the time of the prehearing. I'm looking for that language for you. I would refer LEAF to Page 5 of the first Order Establishing Procedure, under "Prehearing Procedure and Waiver of Issues." It states that "Any issue not raised by a party prior to the issuance of the Prehearing Order shall be waived by that party except for good cause shown." In addition, this page states that "Unless a matter is not at issue for that party, each party shall

diligently endeavor in good faith to take a position on each issue prior to issuance of the Prehearing Order."

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Kamaras, it will make it easier for the parties to participate if they know where you stand on this.

limited resources, we have really been unable to do much on this case. And we would like the opportunity to hear the evidence at the hearing in order to better form our positions. If we must take a position on issues, I will endeavor to do that this afternoon and get that to Staff and all of the parties. I would suspect we will only take a position on one or two issues in any case.

commissionER GARCIA: Ms. Paugh, we will be asking this of Mr. Kammer, we'll be asking him to take a position also.

bring to the parties' attention that the Prehearing Order is due on November 18th. That gives the parties, Mr. Kammer and LEAF plenty of time to provide Staff with positions on issues. We do request the positions be provided to us two days in advance of the issuance date so that we have an opportunity to

1	include them in the order.
2	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Let's not give that
3	that much time. Let's give them four days before
4	you just so if there's any problems by the other
5	parties that they can take a look at it.
6	MS. PAUGH: I'm sorry, did you say a date,
7	Commissioner?
8	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I just said four days
9	before that so we can have enough time and they will
10	have enough time, and I think Mr. Kammer what is
11	the date again? You said the 18th.
12	MS. PAUGH: Four days before that is Sunday.
13	I would recommend that we have it be due on the 13th,
14	which is a Friday.
15	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay.
16	MS. PAUGH: I would also request that the
17	positions be submitted on diskette pursuant to our
18	filing requirements.
19	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: It's with the light
20	off. We work different here. (Referring to
21	microphone)
22	MR. SNIFFEN: Would that same opportunity be
23	provided to U. S. Generating?
24	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Once we decide and
25	once we get we decide, then we'll think about that.

But I would imagine you take this as you find it. 2 we do let you in at that stage I think we're pretty much set on the issues that are going to be before us. 3 4 MR. SNIFFEN: With respect to positions. 5 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: With respect to positions, if we do allow you to intervene, I expect 6 you to take positions. You've got enough time to look 7 at it, if I'm not mistaken. That's what, a week and 8 9 something, so we'll be fine. 10 MR. SNIFFEN: All right. Thank you. 11 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We've got to go back to the two issues that we were hoping for -- if I'm 12 not mistaken, we're going to go back to Issue 11. 13 MS. PAUGH: That's correct, Commissioner. 14 15 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Remind me why we're going back to Issue 11. 16 17 MS. PAUGH: Tampa Electric Company provided us with positions. Staff has no objection to the 19 position. Okay. 20 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Good. 21 anyone else? So we move on. Issue 11, then, we add TECO's position. Then we had to go back to --22 23 MS. PAUGH: Issue 17. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: And this is also --24 25 we're not changing the issue, we're putting TECO's

response in also.

MS. PAUGH: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We're putting in TECO's response in on Issue 17. We had another one that Staff was rewriting, if I'm not mistaken, we were going to pass out.

MS. PAUGH: Before we get to that,

Commissioner, we had questions whether we could

stipulate to Issue 20.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Correct. Let's give the parties a chance to look at it. Relatively quickly, and --

MR. WRIGHT: Commissioner Garcia, I apologize, I turned to co-counsel -- are we on Issue 20.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Issue 20.

MR. WRIGHT: Okay. We believe that the issue raises not only the simple fact question that it purports to raise but it implicates timing issues as to when contracts may be required and when they may be entered into. If we stipulate to this issue we're not going to have a chance to address that. And we think it's entirely appropriate for us to address that. So we're not going to stipulate this, unless the stipulation is our statement.

1	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: So much for that. All
2	right. Issue 35 then is the last one.
3	MS. PAUGH: Yes, Commissioner, everyone has
4	been handed Staff's.
5	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Obviously, by the
6	change of the wording of this, some of the positions
7	may change a little bit. So let's see how comfortable
8	we are with Staff's change and then we'll go from
9	there.
10	MR. WRIGHT: Commissioner Garcia, is it your
11	pleasure to entertain discussion on this issue now or
12	do you want us to get together afterwards?
13	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I'm hoping to have
14	discussion now, unless you need some more time, and
15	we'd get your positions later; you can send them to
16	Staff later.
17	MR. WRIGHT: With your permission then, I'd
18	like to offer the suggested wording change
19	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Correct.
20	MR. WRIGHT: and the rationale that I
21	started to do a little while ago.
22	Given the interconnected nature
23	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Paugh, read this
24	into the record.
25	MS. PAUGH: "Can Florida's investor-owned 000951

electric utilities, electric cooperatives and 2 municipal electric utilities, or the affiliates of any of these, build merchant plants in their service 3 4 areas?" 5 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Now, remind me, was 6 this an issue -- a Staff issue, an FP&L issue? 7 MS. PAUGH: This is a revision of an FP&L 8 issue revised for the purpose of more closely 9 focussing on the intent of the issue. 10 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Maybe one of those cases where I agreed with Mr. Guyton, but nonetheless 11 this is the issue that is there. 12 MR. WRIGHT: My only comment --13 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Hold on a second. I 14 have to ask Mr. Guyton. It's his issue and clearly 15 there's been substantial changes. 16 17 MR. GUYTON: I don't mean to be contentious. As you might guess, I prefer the issue that we raised. 18 As long as we can get the issue before the Commission 19 I quess I'm largely indifferent to the wording of it. 20 I think we would do well to keep this in the 21 context of this case to have kind of a preparatory 22 sentence or phrase, would granting the determination 23 being sought authorize the remainder of Staff's issue 24

would be fine. The Commission may want to be somewhat

concerned about how broad a policy issue have been 2 identified for this motion. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Schef, how are you 3 going to change this? Just real guick. 4 5 MR. WRIGHT: I was going to say considering the interconnected nature of the transmission system 6 7 in Peninsular Florida, and limiting the connections to the Panhandle and Georgia, I think the relevance of 8 building a merchant plant in a specific utility's service area, i.e., its traditional service area, is 10 not as relevant as whether they could build a plant in 11 Florida. For example, FP&L owns a plant 17 miles 12 north of Macon, Georgia --13 14 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: This is why we're not going to change it. Thank you. We're going to stay 15 with Mr. Guyton's position. And I think that does it. 16 17 MR. WRIGHT: I apologize for prolonging this. 18 19 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: We're still under record time. 20 21 MR. WRIGHT: But with respect to Item 11 on Page 59 of the Prehearing Order, I just. Roman XI on Page 59. 23 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: WRIGHT: Roman Numeral XI on Page 59 of 24 25 the order, "Pending Motions."

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Go ahead.

_

MR. WRIGHT: You dealt with IBEW's motion to intervene and our motion opposition. I wanted to call to your attention that yesterday the joint petitioners, the Utilities Commission and Duke New Smyrna filed motions to strike portions of the prefiled direct testimonies of Florida Power's witnesses Rib and Dolan and Florida Power and Light's witness Steinmeier.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I haven't seen those.

MR. WRIGHT: Just for purposes of letting everybody know.

commissioner GARCIA: Thank you for bringing me back. It just reminded me that FP&L's Motion to Expedite, I think I had to officially deny it here, and so it's denied.

MR. WRIGHT: We had an alternate Motion to Expedite 20 days, and that's how we have been governing ourselves to the extent possible with our resources. We've agreed with Staff to respond in 20 days to their request. I appreciate the affirmative ruling on our motion for alternative expedited discovery schedule, which was 20 days response time, sir.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I don't remember

seeing that.

MS. PAUGH: It would be appropriate to rule on that, Commissioner. It was within their objection.

MR. WRIGHT: We objected to the 14 days and proposed an alternative by a motion for --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Does Staff have any problem with that?

MS. PAUGH: Staff does not.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Then that is granted.

Anything else?

MS. PAUGH: Yes, Commissioner.

First, so the parties know, Staff will issue by the end of business on Monday, the 9th, the renumbered issues to reflect those issues which have been dropped. That will be the basis of the additional positions that may be filed by LEAF and/or IBEW. We also need to discuss the pending motions to dismiss.

commissioner GARCIA: Correct. It's my
belief that this issue would probably clog up agenda
unnecessarily. So what we're going to do is take it
up at the beginning of the hearing, so you should all
be prepared to argue it then. What we're going to do
is limit it to -- I think we had discussed,

Ms. Paugh -- is it half an hour per side?

1 MS. PAUGH: I would recommend each of the two parties that have filed Motions to Dismiss be 2 allowed a half hour for oral argument each, and that 3 Duke New Smyrna be allowed half an hour in response to each of them for a total of a hour for Duke, a total 5 of two hours oral argument. 6 7 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Correct. 8 to encourage you, Mr. Wright, to take that full hour because I think that's -- a lot of these issues will be overlapping so we can deal with it all at once. 10 MS. PAUGH: I believe there are no further 11 12 matters, Commissioner. COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Thank you all for 13 being so cooperative. I just caution you that we're 14 15 working on a tight time clock so try to be early on everything with Staff and let's get this done. Thank 16 17 you. (Thereupon, the hearing concluded at 10:30 18 19 a.m.) 20 21 22 23 Over 1030 a.m. 24

STATE OF FLORIDA) 1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 2 COUNTY OF LEON 3 I, JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR, Chief, Bureau of Reporting, Official Commission Reporter, 4 DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Prehearing 5 Conference in Docket No. 981042-EM was heard by the Prehearing Officer at the time and place herein stated; it is further 6 7 CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript, consisting of 41 pages, constitutes a true 9 transcription of my notes of said proceedings. 10 DATED this 6th day of November, 1998. 11 12 13 14 15 Florida Public Service Commission 16 Chief, Bureau of Reporting 17 (850) 413-6732 18 19 20 21 22 23

24