1	BEFORE THE	
2	FLORIDA	PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
3	In the Matter of:	DOCKET NO. 110138-EI
4		
5	PETITION FOR INCREASE IN RATES BY GULF POWER COMPANY.	
6		/
7 .		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14	PROCEEDINGS:	PREHEARING
15	COMMISSIONER	COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR
16	TACTICITATING.	PREHEARING OFFICER
17	DATE:	Monday, November 21, 2011
18	TIME:	Commenced at 1:30 p.m. Concluded at 4:46 p.m.
19	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center
20		Room 148 4075 Esplanade Way
21		Tallahassee, Florida
22	REPORTED BY:	JANE FAUROT, RPR Official FPSC Reporter
23		(850) 413-6732
24		
25		BOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE
		A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A

ing the second of the second o

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 737 DEC-2=

APPEARANCES:

JEFFREY STONE, ESQUIRE, RUSSELL BADDERS,
ESQUIRE and STEVEN GRIFFIN, ESQUIRE, Beggs & Lane Law
Firm, Post Office Box 12950, Pensacola, Florida
32591-2950, appearing on behalf of Gulf Power Company.

RICHARD D. MELSON, ESQUIRE, 705 Piedmont
Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32312, appearing on behalf
of Gulf Power Company.

CHARLES A. GUYTON, ESQUIRE, Gunster Law Firm, 215 S. Monroe Street, Suite 618, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of Gulf Power Company.

JOSEPH A. MCGLOTHLIN, ESQUIRE, and ERIK
SAYLER, ESQUIRE, Office of Public Counsel, c/o The
Florida Legislature, 111 W. Madison Street, Room 812,
Tallahassee, Florida 32393-1400, appearing on behalf
of the Citizens of the State of Florida.

KAREN S. WHITE, STAFF ATTORNEY AND MAJOR
CHRISTOPHER THOMPSON, ESQUIRE, Federal Executive
Agencies, c/o AFCESA-ULFSC139 Barnes Drive, Suite 1,
Tyndall AFB, Florida 32403-5319, appearing on behalf of
Federal Executive Agencies.

APPEARANCES (Continued):

ROBERT SCHEFFEL WRIGHT, ESQUIRE, and JOHN T.

LaVIA, III, ESQUIRE, Gardner, Bist, Wiener, Wadsworth,

Bowden, Bush, Dee, LaVia & Wright, P.A. 1300 Thomaswood

Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32308, appearing on behalf

of Florida Retail Federation.

VICKI GORDON KAUFMAN, ESQUIRE and JON C.

MOYLE, JR., ESQUIRE, Keefe, Anchors, Gordon & Moyle Law

Firm, 118 North Gadsden Street, Tallahassee, Florida

32301, appearing on behalf of Florida Industrial Power

Users Group.

CAROLINE KLANCKE, ESQUIRE, FPSC General
Counsel's Office, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard,
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, appearing on behalf of
the Florida Public Service Commission Staff.

MARY ANNE HELTON, Deputy General Counsel,
Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak
Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, Advisor to
the Florida Public Service Commission.

PROCEEDINGS

7 8

6

9 10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Good afternoon. It looks like we are all here. I have been designated to serve as prehearing officer in this docket, and so I will call us to order and ask our staff to read the notice.

MS. KLANCKE: By notice issued by the Commission Clerk, this time and place has been set for a prehearing in Docket Number 110138-EI.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. And we'll take appearances.

MR. STONE: Thank you, Commissioner.

I'm Jeffrey A. Stone of the law firm of Beggs and Lane. I would also like to enter an appearance on behalf of my partners Russell A. Badders and Steven R. Also entering appearances on behalf of Gulf Power Company in this proceeding are Charles A. Guyton and Richard D. Melson.

I note from the draft prehearing order that we had omitted Mr. Melson from that draft, and I will be sure and get with staff to add that information. And I also note that I had made a mistake in our prehearing statement about the address for Mr. Guyton, and I will also get that correction to the staff.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Thank you. And our staff will get with you and we will have those

changes made as we work through the next draft of the 1 prehearing order. 2 Mr. Wright. 3 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Madam Chairman. 4 Robert Scheffel Wright appearing on behalf of 5 the Florida Retail Federation. I'd also like to enter 6 an appearance for my law partner, John T. LaVia, III. 7 Thank you. 8 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. 9 10 MR. SAYLER: Erik Sayler on behalf of the Office of Public Counsel. 11 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Joe McGlothlin with OPC. 12 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: 13 Thank you. MS. WHITE: Good afternoon. 14 I'm Karen White on behalf of the Federal 15 16 Executive Agencies, and I'll also enter an appearance 17 for Major Christopher Thompson. 18 MS. KAUFMAN: Good afternoon, Commissioner. Vicki Gordon Kaufman of the law firm Keefe Anchors 19 20 Gordon and Moyle. I'm appearing on behalf of the 21 Florida Industrial Power Users Group, and I would also 22 like to enter an appearances for John Moyle. 23 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. And, 24 Commission staff.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

MS. KLANCKE: Caroline Klancke, Commission

25

legal staff. Also with me is Mary Anne Helton, Advisor to the Commission, and Jennifer Crawford.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you.

Now, it's my understanding that there are a couple of items that we will need to discuss or have raised as we work our way through the draft prehearing order, and that it is also my understanding that we are all working from the same draft that has recently been distributed. So aside from items dealing specifically with the language before us, are there any other matters, or what I would call preliminary matters that it would be good for us to take up at this time?

I am seeing none from the parties. Any from staff?

MS. KLANCKE: Staff is not aware of any preliminary matters at this time.

ask is that as per standard procedure, we will slowly work our way through the draft prehearing order. And if there is a comment, a change, a question, anything like that, just get my attention. I'm hoping some of these will move fast. We will absolutely take the time that we need to to work through any concerns or discussion. And so with that, I note that Sections I, II, III, and IV are all on Page 2 of the draft. Are there any

comments or discussion to be made on Sections I through IV?

All right. I'm seeing none, so we will move on to Section V, which is on Page 3, prefiled testimony and exhibits, witness summaries. The draft reflects, as is usual, five minutes a witness per summary. Is there a desire to make any changes to that? Okay. Then we will leave that as is.

And, Section VI, order of witnesses, which is on Page 4.

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Chairman.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

I had last week circulated a request to all parties that our witness, Mr. Steve W. Chriss, be allowed to be either -- if necessary, taken out of order, or be the first witness amongst the consumer witnesses. He has to be in Utah on Thursday, and we are hoping that he could conclude his cross-examination by 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday, December 14th. A couple of folks said that was probably okay with them, but I just wanted to call that to your attention and renew that request.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Wright.

And this is exactly the time to do that, so I

appreciate that. And, Ms. Kaufman, I understand that you may have a similar request?

MS. KAUFMAN: I do, Commissioner. We would ask that Mr. Pollock, who is FIPUG's only witness, be permitted to follow directly after Mr. Chriss, and hopefully -- I understand Mr. Chriss has to make, I think, a 2:00 o'clock plane. Mr. Pollock would need to get out of -- or leave Tallahassee by the end of the day on Wednesday, so if that would be accommodated we would appreciate it. Whether he moves up in the order, or as Mr. Wright said, whether he is taken out of order, depending on where we are.

MR. WRIGHT: And, Chairman, just to be clear.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Yes, Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Pollock and Mr. Chriss' flight is at 4:55, but we would like to give them out of here around 2:00 o'clock to allow for getting to the airport, and Professor Murphy. Thanks.

practice, and I believe the practice of the Commission to try to accommodate schedules for the parties and for witnesses. That cannot always be done, but we do try to make those accommodations. And also, of course, ask for the cooperation of all parties, and if there is a concern for that to be raised so that nobody feels

disadvantaged. So let me ask the other parties --1 excuse me. Mr. McGlothlin. MR. McGLOTHLIN: I think you were about to ask 3 the question I wanted to answer. 4 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Well, my question 5 was going to be to the other parties, are there any 6 concerns with trying to accommodate the requests regarding these two witnesses? 8 9 MR. McGLOTHLIN: We want to cooperate in that regard. We have four witnesses. Donna Ramas presently 10 is scheduled to be the first intervenor witness. Of the 11 12 four, she is the one that has some limitations on her 13 scheduling and her availability. We would coordinate 14 with the others with the understanding that she will be 15 able to be on and off so as to catch a flight on the 16 15th. She has another commitment the following day. 17 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. So just so I am 18 clear, then this is a third witness that there is a 19 desire for that testimony to be complete by the end of 20 the proceeding on Wednesday, the 14th. 21 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Yes. 22 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Anything else? 23 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Of all of our witnesses, she 24 is the one that has some limitations. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I understand. 25 Then let

me ask Gulf.

MR. STONE: Commissioner Edgar, perhaps I misunderstood. I thought Mr. McGlothlin said that Ms. Ramas had a conflict that required her to be through on the 15th.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Did I misstate?

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Yes. She needs to be traveling on the 15th so as to be in place somewhere else on the 16th.

MR. STONE: So you need to have her finished on the 14th or --

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Or is she available in the morning? Excuse me, I did not mean to speak over you.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: I think she is available in the morning on 15th. And if we crossed wires on that, I apologize. Currently she is scheduled to be the first intervenor, and she is the one who would be displaced by the others going first. That's why I wanted to bring her limitation to your attention.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Thank you for the clarification.

MR. STONE: And my only concern is I know there is also implicit in these requests that they be taken out of turn. It is our hope that they would not

be interrupting our case in chief. We'll obviously have to cross that bridge when we come to it, but it is our preference not to have Gulf's case in chief interrupted by taking intervenor witnesses in between Gulf witnesses, if we could avoid that.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Are you committing to have your witnesses through with their testimony by the morning of the 14th?

MR. STONE: To the extent it is under my power, yes.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I understand. Staff?

MS. KLANCKE: So for going forward with

respect to the draft prehearing order, it is my

understanding that the intervenors FIPUG and FRF had

proposed after the full culmination of all of Gulf's

witnesses then to bring those two respective witnesses

up immediately following Gulf Witness Thompson.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And so if I may, which I think is exactly the same thing that you're saying, but to restate, for purposes of the prehearing order what I would propose for your consideration at this time would be to move Witness Pollock -- excuse me, Witness Chriss and then Pollock up after Witness Thompson, and then continue with Witness Ramas and on down the line.

Having that be the order reflected in the prehearing

order, realizing that then during the course of the hearing working with our staff and with the presiding officer at the time, we can see how timing is going and what more we can or cannot accommodate.

Ms. Kaufman.

MS. KAUFMAN: Yes. I was just going to ask, I know nobody can predict how things are going to run, obviously, but it would also help us if we didn't have to bring Mr. Pollock any earlier. You know, I don't want the client to have to pay for him to sit around here for two days, so that he wouldn't take the stand any earlier than the 15th, and then I guess we will see

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Wright.

where we are. That would be my request.

MR. WRIGHT: Could you ask Ms. Kaufman to clarify the 15th or the 14th on Mr. Pollock.

MS. KAUFMAN: I'm so sorry. Mr. McGlothlin got me off track. The 14th.

MR. WRIGHT: And thank you very much. That's fine. Mr. Chriss, by the way, will be present on the 13th as well as the 14th.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.

MR. WRIGHT: So if we get lucky and Gulf finishes its case in chief on Tuesday afternoon, he'll be ready to go.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Then for our 1 purposes here today, all of those requests are noted for 2. the record, with, again, recognition of the statement I 3 made a few moments ago that the Commission will work 4 with all the parties to accommodate as many of those 5 requests as we can. However, I am not in a position to commit to a time certain either way at this time, nor do 7 I want to get that type of specificity in the prehearing 8 order. But I will ask our staff to make the changes to 9 the order of witnesses as we have discussed, and then as 10 11 we move closer to hearing and at the beginning of the proceedings and seeing how we go, again, work with staff 12 and with our presiding officer. And we will do our best 13 14 to accommodate, realizing that none of us can say for 15 certain.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Thank you.

Anything else with Section VI -- I may have misstated earlier -- Section VI, order of witnesses. Okay. Then we will move on.

That brings us to Section VII, basic positions. Any changes that need to be brought to our attention?

Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

16

17

18

19

20

22

21

23

24

25

In our statement of basic position, as well as in a few of our positions, I have, in reviewing the draft prehearing order, noticed some typographical things that came up. I would rather not burden you and this whole party with -- this whole assembled body with those right now. If it's okay, I'll just get our corrections to Ms. Klancke as soon as I can.

Hopefully -- well, before I leave the office tonight, if that's okay.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. So Mr. Wright's characterization that he has some minor changes to FRF's basic positions that are nonsubstantive and those will be shared with our staff, and those changes will be made. Anybody else with any comments about this section? Okay. Seeing none, then we will move on.

That brings us to Section VIII, issues and positions.

Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Thanks. I apologize if this is redundant or anything, but we will be making some changes. Where we have no position at this time, we will be changing to either no position or to a substantive position. There are a few others that we will be changing our positions. Will it be satisfactory to give those to Ms. Klancke later today or do you want

to hear them as we go through? 1 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I will direct that to the 2 parties. 3 Mr. Guyton. 4 MR. GUYTON: Gulf would like to hear them as 5 we go through so we can discern whether or not we can 6 narrow the issues. 7 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Sure. Mr. Wright, can 8 you accommodate? 9 MR. WRIGHT: Oh, certainly. 10 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: All right. 11 MR. WRIGHT: And thus, with respect to Issue 12 1, we will be adding verbiage to be equivalent to OPC's 13 verbiage. But actually I think we have to talk about 14 the issue statement now, too. But that is up to 15 Mr. McGlothlin. 16 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. McGlothlin, did you 17 want to address concerns, questions, comments about the 18 wording of Issue 1 and/or the positions? 19 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Yes. And it requires a bit 20 of background. It will just take 30 seconds or so. 21 When we read Gulf's Direct Testimony, we were under the 22 impression that Gulf was relying on 366.93, the advance 23 recovery portion of 366 to support its request to place 24

certain property in rate base as plant held for future

25

use, and that was the genesis of the issue that we identified and that staff formulated as Issue 1.

Since that time, primarily through rebuttal testimony, Gulf has clarified as we understand it that Gulf does not rely on 366.93 to support its request to place property in rate base, plant held for future use, but does rely on 366.93 for the proposition that it is authorized to calculate or compute a carrying charge or deferred charge on the property, on the site itself.

With that refined understanding of Gulf's position request, over the weekend I edited Gulf's proposed rewrite of Issue Number 1 and circulated it to the parties. Staff reminded me that Gulf's proposed rewrite has no status in terms of the starting point, and so with that in mind, shortly before this prehearing conference, I edited what now appears as Issue 1 to use current Issue 1 as the point of departure for my desire to reform this to include the point about carrying charges as opposed to plant held for future use, and I have that to distribute now.

commissioner EDGAR: Okay. I understand. And if you would, and if somebody on staff would help so that I can get a copy of that, as well.

MR. STONE: Commissioner Edgar, perhaps this is out of place, but we were prepared to accept Mr.

McGlothlin's proposed changes to our rewording of Issue 1, so I'm not sure -- not having seen what his changes are to the original Issue 1, I'm not sure how much different that's going to be.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I understand. Well, I haven't seen it either, and I wasn't yet prepared to accept any of them, so we'll just all take a look at it and go from there.

MR. STONE: There were several reasons we proposed rewording of the original issue as proposed in the preliminary list of issues and positions. We were trying to get the issue more neutrally stated, and we also were trying to make sure it was broad enough to cover what is actually our position. Mr. McGlothlin's proposal over the weekend accommodates our desires and also his desire to make sure it frames up the particular point of disagreement. We respectively suggest that the proposed rewording circulated over the weekend is preferable to the proposed rewarding that has just been circulated.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Which rewording? Because I now have three, and I don't know that I have the one that you are speaking to, although I might. So which --

MR. STONE: Mr. Melson has some copies, along our revised position.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Ms. Klancke is going to help you, Mr. Melson. Or is that -- give me just a second.

All right. Thank you. I've got it.

Ms. Klancke has clarified for me that the language that our staff had shared with me this morning is what I'm now going to call the weekend language.

When I reviewed this issue and the pieces of the two versions that had been shared with me, and now we have a third that we'll talk about here in a moment, for the what I will call the initial language, I had a concern about the use of the word support. And I realize that we may not -- we may be moving from that language, but that was a concern of mine.

The language that we are now calling the weekend language, I believe, and I will ask them to speak to it in more detail, but that our legal staff, Commission legal staff had a concern about the way the issue proposed language would have shifted some of the burden on the Commission for determining our legal authority, which is not really the posture that we are in.

The third version that Mr. McGlothlin has just distributed, obviously this is the first that I have had the opportunity to take a look at it, and not to speak

20

21

22

23

24

25

for you, Mr. McGlothlin, but I do believe I understand and appreciate the clarification as to 366.93 and its pertinence for this issue. And I do think that that is a clarification, because I was a little confused with the two versions as to pointing to just 366.93 if we were limiting the discussion to a potential nuclear use, and that was not my understanding. And I think that that is what you have touched on. So let me turn to our staff and see if you have any thoughts.

MS. KLANCKE: With respect to the issue -- not the weekend circulated issue, but the issue that was just circulated, staff supports the rewording of this issue as referenced on this single sheet which was just

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: We will come back to you, Mr. Badders. But do any of the other parties have any thoughts on what I'm going to call version three?

MS. WHITE: The FEA supports version three that has just been circulated.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Ms. Kaufman.

MS. KAUFMAN: Yes, Commissioner. I would agree with that, version three.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: I apologize. I'm a little fuzzy.

Is version three the one that includes type-and-strike that Mr. McGlothlin distributed, or is it Gulf's new one?

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: What I'm calling version three, because it is the third iteration that I have seen, is the one that Mr. McGlothlin just passed out a few moments ago that does have the type-and-strike and does insert the language regarding to calculate a deferred carrying charge.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. The question I would have with respect -- and this is for everybody. The question that I would have with respect to that is that it appears to just address the deferred carrying charge issue and not to address the inclusion of the site as plant held for future use. That's okay with me, if we are going to deal with that at Issue 26 or 27 or whatever it is. If you could ask Mr. McGlothlin whether that was his thought.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. McGlothlin.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Yes. This limitation to the deferred carrying charge is dependent on what I understand to be Gulf's position, which is that it is not invoking 366.934, the rate base treatment, but only for the deferred charge. I will ask Gulf to confirm if that is the case. And if that is the case, then I think

Issue 24 takes care of the plant held for future use aspects of it.

MR. WRIGHT: And with that, Madam Chairman, we would support using the version three language for Issue 1. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. Mr. Badders.

I'm back to you, Mr. Melson.

MR. MELSON: Commissioner, I think we would be all right with version three, assuming that none of the intervenors is taking the position that the Commission lacks the legal authority to include the plant in plant held for future use. We read some of the initial positions as indicating maybe they were questioning that broader legal authority. If that issue is off the table, and the only issue is the narrow one of the scope of 366.93, then I think we can live with Mr.

McGlothlin's version three.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you.

Mr. McGlothlin.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: We believe the Commission has the legal authority to allow property as plant held for future use if that property qualifies and meets the criteria for such inclusion. We dispute that position with respect to the North Escambia site, so I think that's why we say we can address that in Issue 24.

MR. MELSON: If I'm understanding Mr.

McGlothlin, he's saying we do not have a dispute about
the Commission's legal authority, only about the factual
question of whether it qualifies for inclusion. And if
so, then I think the legal issue that he has stated here
would focus on the particular legal dispute we have.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Then, Mr. Melson, your restatement of Mr. McGlothlin's response to your question is what I understood Mr. McGlothlin's response to be, so let me put it to Mr. McGlothlin.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: I think we're there.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I think we're there, too.

Okay.

Any other concerns by any of the parties or by our staff with the proposal per this discussion that for the prehearing order and the proceeding to follow that we substitute the language that Mr. McGlothlin distributed as the language to be used for Issue 1?

MS. KLANCKE: Staff believes that that would be prudent.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Then I will ask our staff to do so, recognizing the discussion that we have had about the agreement as to the Commission's legal authority on the point that we have discussed.

Mr. Badders, before we move on, do you have

any other comments on this particular point? 1 MR. STONE: Commissioner Edgar, just for the 2 record, I'm Mr. Stone. Mr. Badders is behind me. 3 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Badders, there you 4 I apologize. And I knew that. I did know that. 5 6 I am so sorry. MR. STONE: No apology necessary. I just 7 wanted to make sure the record is straight. 8 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: If I get a fourth 9 version, I'm going to call somebody else by their 10 11 inappropriate name possibly, potentially. MR. STONE: His parents would be upset if you 12 were referring to me. 13 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: But just wait, because I 14 haven't called you Mr. Wright. 15 16 (Laughter.) MR. STONE: I think we have a clear 17 understanding on what the issue is. We will have a 18 19 revised position to match the new issue and we will provide that to staff. 20 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I would expect that, and 21 I think Mr. Badders maybe even agrees with you. Okay. 22 23 Then my understanding is that we have completed our 24 discussions surrounding the language for Issue 1 and the positions that will be reflected with the understanding 25

that Gulf will submit a revised position. And that brings us then to any other issues.

Mr. Wright, I'm going to look to you. There were some other issues that you wanted to change your position statement.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. On Issue 7 we will change our position to no position.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.

MR. WRIGHT: Issue 14, we would change our position to agree with OPC.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.

MR. WRIGHT: Issue 18. This is typographical. There is a bunch of stuff that is underlined there which is -- because I had left a placeholder before I typed in the number. The underlining need not be there.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: So, Mr. Wright, did I understand you to say that for Issue 18, the FRF position will be as reflected, but without the underlining?

MR. WRIGHT: Our position is as stated by the words; you just don't need the underlining. I said it was just typographical. Issue 19, I understand subject to what Mr. Sayler is about to say that the Public Counsel's Office is changing their position to no position.

1 MR. SAYLER: That would be correct, 2 Mr. Wright. MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. 3 Madam Chairman, in which case we will also 4 change our position to no position. 5 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Okay. 6 MR. WRIGHT: Madam Chairman, if the Public 7 Counsel is intending to take no position on Issue 20, we 8 9 would change our position to that. Otherwise, we'll 10 stick with agree with OPC. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. McGlothlin, do you 11 have a change to Issue 20? 12 MR. McGLOTHLIN: It remains no position. 13 MR. WRIGHT: Is it no position, or no position 14 at this time? 15 MR. McGLOTHLIN: I will say we will take no 16 position on Issue 20. 17 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. In which case we also will 18 take no position on Issue 20. 19 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. So for Issue 20, 20 OPC, there will be a slight change, and it will be 21 22 reflected as no position, period, and FRF will be 23 reflected similarly. MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. Issue 26, we will 24

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

also change our position on this issue to no position.

25

1 Issue 27, there is a typo in our position in the third sentence where it says, "Moreover, Gulf," it 2 should be G-U-L-F-'-S, otherwise it is as stated. 3 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I understand. 4 5 MR. WRIGHT: Issue 29, our position should change from no to agree with OPC. Madam Chairman, I 6 7 apologize that I'm having to have some sidebars here, but it has been kind of a busy time with a lot of 8 9 e-mails flying. I just haven't had an opportunity to touch all the bases before this afternoon. 10 11 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I understand. 12 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you very much. 13 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: So which issue are we 14 looking at now? MR. WRIGHT: I'm looking at Issue 35, Madam 15 Chairman. Thank you. 16 17 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: 35. Okay. And so is the 18 question to OPC if they are going to revise their 19 position at this time? 20 MR. WRIGHT: Yes, ma'am. 21 MR. McGLOTHLIN: We have testimony on this 22 that has not changed, so we will go with what is 23 reflected here. 24 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: So on 35 all will be 25 reflected as is.

MR. WRIGHT: As is, yes, ma'am. Thank you.

2

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

MR. WRIGHT: On Issue 42, I think somewhere along the line there was just an inadvertent transposition of a block-and-copy event. As shown in the -- let's see if that got fixed here. I'm working on the one that was sent out this morning, which I hope is the same as this one. As you will see, our position on Issue 42 is simply a restatement of the question posed by the issue, and our position should be as it was stated in our prehearing statement, "No. Agree with OPC that the appropriate jurisdictional amount of operating revenues is \$484,019,000."

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Period, end of position? MR. WRIGHT: Period, end of position. Yes, ma'am. Thank you.

The next issue that I have anything with respect to is Issue 52, and what appears to have happened is it appears that our position statements on Issue 52 and 53 got transposed. Our position statement on Issue 52 should be, "Yes, agree with OPC that test year expenses should be reduced by \$294,765," instead of the 343,807. And then our position on Issue 53 is, "Yes, agree with OPC that test year expenses should be reduced by 343,807."

1 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: All right. I understand. 2 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. 3 On Issue 65 -- no, nevermind. I don't have anything on Issue 65. I just had a marginal note. 4 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. It took me a while 5 to get there, but I am now. I'm sorry. So for 65 --6 7 MR. WRIGHT: I did not have any change. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Oh. 8 9 MR. WRIGHT: I had a marginal note that made 10 me think I had something to change, but that was not 11 correct. 12 (Phone ringing.) 13 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I think that is Mr. Badder's phone. 14 15 (Laughter.) 16 MR. WRIGHT: I think it might be Mr. Wright's 17 phone. 18 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I think I have seen that 19 happen before. 20 MR. WRIGHT: That what? 21 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I think I have seen that 22 happen before. 23 MR. WRIGHT: On Issue 85, we would change our 24 position to no position. On Issue 87, similarly change 25 our position to no position. On Issue 90, there is a

typo. The appropriate allowable level of -- this really has a zero and M, and it should be capital O&M. To our position on Issue 94, I would like to add the word yes at the beginning, so the position would read, "Yes. Agree with OPC," end of position.

And thank you for your indulgence. Those are the ones that I wanted to change.

commissioner edgar: Thank you. Obviously, I know our staff took notes, as did I, and we will have the transcript to use, as well. And so I'll ask the staff to make those changes. Any concerns or discussion by any of the other parties about the changes that Mr. Wright has requested to his position statements?

Okay. Any other parties with positions or issues that you would like to discuss at this time?

Yes, Ms. Kaufman.

MS. KAUFMAN: We, like Mr. Wright, have a number of changes, and I will do my best to walk through them, if that would be your pleasure.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.

MS. KAUFMAN: On Issue 1, I guess version number three that you have incorporated, our position on that would be to agree with OPC.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.

MS. KAUFMAN: On Issue 2 we would take no

1 position, and on Issue 3 we would take no position, and on Issue 4 we would take no position. Issue 5, no 2 position. Issue 6, no position. Issue 7, no position. 3 On Issue 10, our position would be, "No, see Issues 16 4 and 17." 5 On Issue 14 -- no, Issue 14 is correct. I'm 6 sorry. On Issue 19, we would change our position to no 7 position, and the same on Issue 20. On Issue 26, we 8 9 would take no position. And on Issue 39 our position 10 should be, "No, agree with OPC." And Issue 40 should be, "Yes, agree with OPC." On Issues 43, 44, and 45 we 11 take no position. On Issue 46 also we take no position. 12 On Issue 47 our position should be changed to, "No. 13 Issues 39 through 41, and 48 through 68." 14 MS. KLANCKE: May I have those issue numbers 15 16 one more time, please? MS. KAUFMAN: Yes. It's 39 to 41 and 48 to 17 68. 18 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Which is the same as the 19 OPC position? 20 MS. KAUFMAN: Right. I think my next changes 21 are in the cost of service, but I just wanted to be sure 22 23 I hadn't skipped anything. On Issue 78. Yes. 24 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Ms. Kaufman, what page is 25

that, please?

MS. KAUFMAN: That is on Page 58.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you.

MS. KAUFMAN: I'm sorry, and this is not the version that was handed out, but --

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: That will get me close.

MR. STONE: It is still Page 58.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Thank you.

MS. KAUFMAN: So, our position on Issue 78 on Page 58 is agree with OPC. Issue 81 on Page 60, our position is no position. On Issue 85 our position is no position. Issue 86, FIPUG's position is agree with OPC. Issue 87, no position. Issue 88, agree with OPC. Issue 91, agree with OPC. Issue 94, FIPUG's position is yes, agree with OPC. Issue 95, agree with OPC. On Issue 100 our position is no. Issue 101, we take no position.

I understand there is a wording change to

Issue 102 that I think Gulf proposed. It was the result

of -- I don't know it was a typographical error or a

miswording, but I don't know if you want them to explain
their change before I give my position.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: We can do that now, Mr. Stone, if you would like to.

MR. STONE: Yes. We would like to -- in order to clarify what the intent of the change is, we would

like to change the word minimum to maximum, and we would like to change the rate schedule designation from GSD to GS, so that the corrected issue would read, "Should the maximum kW usage level to qualify for the GS rate be increased from 20 kW to 25 kW."

change that staff brought to my attention earlier today, and it seems to make sense to me. Are there any concerns if that change is made? Okay. Then we will ask our staff to make that change to the language for Issue 102.

Ms. Kaufman, does that then --

MS. KAUFMAN: Yes. With that change we have no position. I just wanted to be sure I had the issue correct.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Yes. Thank you.

MS. KAUFMAN: On Issue 103 our position is yes. Issue 104, our position is yes. Issue 105, our position is yes. Issue 109, we have no position. Issue 110, we have no position. Issue 111, we have no position.

MR. STONE: For 109 that was no position?

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Correct.

MS. KAUFMAN: Yes.

MR. STONE: I'm sorry, I got behind.

1 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** That's okay. Ms. Kaufman, correct me if I get this wrong. 2 3 For 109, 110, and 111, change the FIPUG position to no position, period. 5 MS. KAUFMAN: Yes. 6 MR. STONE: I'm caught up. 7 MS. KAUFMAN: 112, no position. 113, no 8 position. 114, FIPUG's position is the Commission 9 should follow prior policy in setting standby rates. 10 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Hold on. I'm sorry, Ms. 11 Kaufman, I want to make sure -- again, we are now on 12 Issue 114? 13 MS. KAUFMAN: Yes, ma'am. 14 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And the language change 15 that you would like to have added? 16 MS. KAUFMAN: Rather than no position, it 17 should say, "The Commission should follow prior policy 18 in setting standby rates." 19 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Any questions? Okay. 20 Next. 21 MS. KAUFMAN: And then 115 and 116, no 22 position. 117, our position should be yes, agree with 23 OPC. And the last issue, 119, our position would be --24 I guess it would be yes, after Gulf has filed the 25 appropriate tariffs for approval.

1	MS. KLANCKE: May I have that language one		
2	more time?		
3	MS. KAUFMAN: Yes, after Gulf has filed the		
4	appropriate tariffs for approval. And I think that's		
5	it. I hope I have picked up all my changes. Thank you.		
6	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. And the federal		
7	agencies?		
8	MS. WHITE: Yes. Likewise, we have changes.		
9	I'm just going start from the beginning and work		
LO	through, if that works for you.		
L1	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.		
L2	MS. WHITE: For the new Issue 1, our position		
L3	is agree with OPC. Issue 2, no position. Issue 3, no		
L4	position. Issues 4 through 7, no position. Issues 8		
L5	and 9		
L6	MS. KLANCKE: Just a moment. So that was 4		
.7	through 17?		
.8	MS. WHITE: No, 4 through 7.		
.9	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Four through 7.		
20	MS. KLANCKE: Four through 7. Sorry. That		
21	was change it to no position?		
22	MS. WHITE: No position, correct. Issues 8		
13	and 9 I'm sorry, 8 is agree with FIPUG. Issue 9,		
14	agree with OPC. Issue 10, agree with FIPUG. Issue 11,		
:5	no position. Issue 12, agree with OPC. Issue 13, no,		

agree with OPC. 1 MR. STONE: Commissioner Edgar, I believe Mr. 2 McGlothlin circulated a revised position on Issue 13 3 earlier today. 4 5 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. McGlothlin, I don't believe that I have seen that, but this would be a fine 6 7 time to raise it. MR. McGLOTHLIN: We indicated to staff and the 8 9 parties that we are prepared to stipulate to 13 and 15 which relate to the smart grid investments based upon 10 Gulf Power's representation that no grant funds have 11 been included in the plant-in-service for which they 12 want to earn a return. 13 14 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Ms. Klancke. 15 MS. KLANCKE: Staff has no issues with respect 16 to the proposed stipulation to Issues 13 and 15. 17 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And the other parties? 18 Ms. Kaufman. 19 MS. KAUFMAN: Yes. We will just change our 20 position to no position. We don't want to join in the stipulation, but we will take no position on 13 and 15. 21 22 MS. WHITE: Likewise for FEA. 23 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. 24 MR. WRIGHT: And, Madam Chairman, likewise for the Retail Federation. Thank you. 25

1 MR. STONE: We would suggest that if everyone 2 is in agreement that Issue 13 could simply be dropped 3 rather than being shown as a stipulated issue. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Ms. Klancke. 4 MS. KLANCKE: Staff has no issues with merely 5 reflecting Issues 13 and 15 as dropped. 6 I think you still need 15, but 13 MR. STONE: 8 could be dropped. 9 MS. KLANCKE: Okay. Thirteen. And 15 would 10 be stipulated. 11 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Yes. We indicated we were 12 going to either drop or stipulate to 13. I see no 13 reason for it to remain. 15, I think, would be a 14 stipulation because Gulf made a correction to its 15 earlier position. 16 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. So what is before 17 us right now is the proposal that Issue 13 be removed 18 and that Issue 15 be shown as proposed stipulation, or 19 proposed stipulated. Any concerns about that proposal? 20 MS. KAUFMAN: Commissioner, I don't have any 21 concerns about it as long as my client's position is 22 reflected as no position. 23 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: As no position. MS. KAUFMAN: Thank you. 24 25 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Madam Chairman. 1 On Issue 15 our position should be no 2 position, so I quess that will make it a Type 2 or 2A 3 stipulation. Thanks. 4 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: 5 Okav. MS. WHITE: So FEA will change our position 6 then on 14 to no position, as well as on 15. 7 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Okay. 8 9 MS. WHITE: And we do not object to 13 being 10 dropped. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. So, Mr. Stone, are 11 you clear? 12 MR. STONE: Yes, ma'am, I am. And I apologize 13 14 for messing up the flow. 15 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: That's okay. That's 16 okay. 17 MS. WHITE: Issue 16, FEA -- our position is, 18 no, agree with OPC. Likewise on 17, our position is, 19 no, agree with OPC. Issue 18, agree with OPC. Issue 20 19, no position. Issue 21, no, agree with OPC. Issue 21 23, no position. Issue 26, no position. Issue 29, 22 agree with OPC. Issue 33, agree with OPC. Issue 39, 23 our position is no. Issue 40, agree with OPC. 24 41, agree with OPC. Issue 43, no position. Issue 44,

no position. Issue 45, no position. Issue 46, no

25

1 position. Issue 47, agree with OPC. Issues 48 and 49, agree with OPC. Issue 51, yes, agree with OPC. Issue 2 52, agree with OPC. Likewise for Issues 53 and 55, 3 change to agree with OPC. 56, 57, and 58 should all be 4 5 changed to agree with OPC. 59, yes, agree with OPC. As 6 well as 60, yes, agree with OPC. As well as 61 and 62, 7 yes, agree with OPC. 64, yes, agree with OPC. 65, yes, 8 agree with OPC. 66, no, agree with OPC. 67 and 68, no, agree with OPC. 69, agree with OPC. 71, agree with 9 10 FIPUG. 77, yes, agree with OPC. And then 78 should be agree with OPC. Sorry, I need to check on one back. 11 12 Okay. 79, agree with OPC. 80 -- I'm sorry? 13 MR. STONE: I apologize. 14 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: That's okay. This is the 15 time. 16 Mr. Stone. 17 MR. STONE: Apparently I made some bad notes on Issue 78. FIPUG changed its position to agree with 18 19 OPC, is that correct? 20 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: That's what I have 21 written down. 22 MR. STONE: Evidently I had crossed through 23 OPC's position and wrote agree with OPC. So, I 24 apologize. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. That's all right. 25

1 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Well, OPC does agree with OPC. 2 3 (Laughter.) MR. STONE: I'm glad to hear that, Joe. 4 5 MS. WHITE: Okay. So 80 -- did I say 80? 6 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: We are on 80. 7 MS. WHITE: Okay. 8 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Well, you did 81. 9 did not make a change to 80. 10 MS. WHITE: Okay. 80 is agree with OPC. 81 is no position. 84 is agree with OPC. 85 is no 11 position. 86 is agree with OPC. 87 is no position. 12 13 88, I thought we took a position, but it looks like that 14 is not here. May I just have a moment to look at this? 15 88 is agree with OPC. 89, agree with OPC. 91, agree 16 with OPC. 93, agree with OPC. 94, agree with OPC. 98, 17 agree with OPC. 100, no. 101, no position. 102, no position. 104, no position. 105, no position. 109, no 18 19 position. 110, no position. 111, no position. 112 and 20 113, no position. 114, agree with FIPUG. 115, no 21 position. 116, no position. 117, agree with OPC. 118, 22 no position. And 119, agree with FIPUG. 23 Thank you for allowing us to go through that 24 one at a time. 25 MR. STONE: Commissioner Edgar, if I might

inquire of the Public Counsel with regard to Issue 78.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And, Mr. Stone, since you are ahead of me there, what page are you on?

MR. STONE: 58.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you.

MR. STONE: The issue as it's framed refers exclusively to the injuries and damages reserve. OPC's position, which is agreed to by other parties, incorporates positions that do not relate to the injuries and damages reserve, but relate instead to the property insurance reserve. It appears to me that there may be a misunderstanding, and that if we could segregate the issue and only refer to the injuries and damages reserve, we may able to reach a stipulation.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. McGlothlin.

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Chairman.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: I think Mr. Stone may well be on the right track. We will see what my colleague has to say. I think the confusion is I think that injuries and damages is 228.2 is a FERC USOA subaccount, and storm reserve accrual is 228.3, although I might have those backwards. But if we can clarify that that doesn't include any part of the storm accrual, we may be able to get there.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Yes, I agree with that. I think we were operating under the assumption that the storm damage was a subset of the larger account that included injuries and damages. If that's not the case, then we can remove our position statement on 78 and take no position.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Just for clarity, if that's how it goes, then we would also change our position to no position. Thank you.

commissioner EDGAR: Okay. So I'm going to start with you, Mr. Stone. There appears to be either confusion or not confusion as to accounts or subaccounts regarding the injuries and damage reserve. So --

MR. STONE: I hesitate to practice accounting without a license --

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: You and me both.

MR. STONE: However, I believe that staff is in agreement with us that there are two separate accounts and that's the reason for two separate issues.

MR. SLEMKEWICZ: This is John Slemkewicz with the staff. Yes, the injuries and damages reserve and the property reserve, which includes the storm damage reserve, are two separate accounts.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. So where does that

leave us?

MR. STONE: I think we are at the point of a stipulation on Issue 78. The only confusion is that FIPUG said agree with OPC, which is no position.

MS. KAUFMAN: Well, I think I agree with OPC and with Gulf if we are clear that that doesn't include the storm damages, then. If they are two separate accounts, as Mr. Slemkewicz has said, then we are fine with, again, taking no position on that issue.

going to do at this time is ask our staff to note those changes to the changes, and with the understanding that we may be very close to a proposed stipulation on Issue 78. And I will ask our staff to work with all of the parties after this to make sure that we are all clear. And if, indeed, we can have a proposed stipulation, then to so reflect.

Okay. Let's see. We have done Mr. Wright. We have done -- yes. Mr. McGlothlin, did you have any other -- realizing all of the changes that we have discussed, do you have any other changes to issues or positions?

MR. McGLOTHLIN: I believe with the ruling on Issue 1, and the stipulations that were accepted on 13 and 15, and I've checked, it appears that staff has

already picked up and reflected in this version of the draft order some fairly late-arriving changes we made on 63, which has been dropped, and 101, to which we have a position statement now. I believe that covers the things that were on my list. I would note, though, I have noticed that I may need to touch up OPC's statement of basic position to reflect the same distinctions that were made with the rulings on Issues 1 and 24, and I would provide that language to staff in the next little bit.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Mr. Stone.

MR. STONE: Commissioner, in light of all the changes in positions, there are a number of issues that I believe we could show as stipulations, because all the parties have either taken no position or have -- well, I guess they have taken no position, and I think it would be helpful if we went through those. I have a list. I don't have page numbers, but I have issue numbers.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. I thought that that might be the case. And, again, while we are altogether and we can list those, I think that would be a very useful and time-efficient thing to do. So let me make sure everybody is ready.

Let me ask just Mr. Stone to go through his list of issues that with the changes that have been

requested here today may be ripe for stipulation, proposed stipulation. Before he does that, any questions or comments? Yes, Ms. Kaufman.

unfortunately, I was working from an earlier draft, and I see that Issue 63 has been dropped, which is the issue that relates to the corporate leased aircraft on the prior version, and FIPUG does not agree to drop that issue at this point. So I guess we would ask that that issue be included and that our position on it be reflected as it is in the prior draft.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. The draft that I have, Ms. Klancke, does not show 63 being removed. What I have for Issue 63 is should any adjustments be made to expenses related to use of corporate leased aircraft. Is that the issue, Ms. Kaufman, that you are referring to?

MS. KAUFMAN: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And what you are telling me is you thought it may have been removed, but you believe it should remain. And in my draft it does remain.

MS. KAUFMAN: In the draft that was distributed it's out.

MS. KLANCKE: I apologize. The very most

recent draft it is reflected as dropped, but staff will work with FIPUG and the rest of the parties to ensure that even if a stipulation is reached with respect to it, your positions will be accurately reflected thereunder. MS. KAUFMAN: Well, at this point we don't 7

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have a stipulation on that issue.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Right. So at this point, Ms. Klancke, what I would ask is that Issue 63 remain as it was, as it is, and as it will be for the foreseeable future anyway, which is should any adjustments be made to expenses related to use of corporate leased aircraft. And I am showing OPC as no position; FIPUG as, yes, all costs for leased aircraft should be removed. Ms. Kaufman, is that accurate?

MS. KAUFMAN: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: FRF, agree with OPC. FEA, no position at this time. Is that accurate for FEA?

MS. WHITE: No. I was working off of the dropped version, so I would change our position to agree with FIPUG.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Anything else on Issue 63? Okay. Anything else on any other issues before I ask Mr. Stone to go forward?

Okay. You're up. 1 MR. STONE: The first one that I see is Issue 2 2 on Page 12. 3 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Does staff have a comment 4 that they want to make? 5 MR. SLEMKEWICZ: Staff would like to add to 6 that somehow that with appropriate adjustments, that is 7 the appropriate test year. That is on Issue 2. 8 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: As to a position, or as 9 to a rephrasing of the issue itself? 10 MR. SLEMKEWICZ: That would be on the 11 If we are trying to work on a stipulation, 12 that staff would like to, you know, add basically to 13 Gulf's position that with appropriate adjustments that 14 it would reflect the appropriate test year. I would 15 have to work on that language a little bit, but --16 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. So what I think 17 I'm hearing you say is a suggestion from staff would be 18 to slightly change the language in Issue 2, and add the 19 phrase with appropriate adjustments, and go on with the 20 21 issue --MR. SLEMKEWICZ: Yes. 22 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: -- for consideration? 23 MR. STONE: And as I understand staff's 24 position, it's basically saying that we are taking the 25

2012 test year, subject to the adjustments that are on 1 remaining issues in the prehearing order. 2 MR. SLEMKEWICZ: That is correct. 3 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. 4 MR. STONE: We are in agreement with that and 5 we can work with staff to make sure that language is 6 7 clear. Okay. That seems clear COMMISSIONER EDGAR: 8 to me, but we will go down the line. 9 Mr. Wright. 10 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Madam Chairman. 11 I'm just not understanding incorporating 12 accounting adjustments, the decisions into the issue 13 whether the test year period itself is the appropriate 14 test year. If I could either get some enlightenment or 15 16 reserve our right to comment on that before we sign off 17 I mean, I thought we were stipulating that 2012 is the right test year period. 18 19 MR. McGLOTHLIN: For what it's worth, I have 20 the same reaction. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I understand. 21 22 MR. McGLOTHLIN: It's one thing to say we are 23 not at issue with respect to the time frame. But once you introduce appropriate adjustments, that covers a lot 24

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

of territory that I don't think we can say are not at

25

issue. 1 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Broader? 2 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Yes. 3 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Yes. Ms. Kaufman, 4 similar? 5 I had that concern, as MS. KAUFMAN: Yes. 6 well. But I was wondering if for purpose of process if 7 Mr. Stone could tell us the issues that he believes we 8 have all agreed to, and then we might work on the 9 language rather than try and craft it here. 10 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Sure. That's where we 11 were headed, yes. Okay. So I understand that the staff 12 has a potential language suggestion. We will reserve 13 that for further discussion. And at this point Issue 2 14 is as we had discussed previously, which I am showing no 15 position for all parties other than Gulf. So, Mr. 16 Stone, for that reason you were saying that this is an 17 issue that could perhaps be discussed for stipulation. 18 MR. STONE: 19 Yes. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. And then go on, if 20 you would, with others. 21 MR. STONE: I suspect the next one may be 22 easier. Number 3, also on that page. 23 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Go ahead. We'll take it 24 kind of quickly, but as long as we are all together, if

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

there is a question or comment, just get my attention 1 and we will see what we can do with it. Okay. So at 2 this point potentially 2, 3 --3 MR. STONE: Four, 5, 6, 7. 13 we agreed to 4 15. 19, it's on Page 22. 26, found on Page 27. 5 29 found at the bottom of Page 29. I may have 6 overstated on that one. There seems to be a little bit 7 of difference of opinion between OPC and Gulf, so that 8 may need to be worked out between the parties. 9 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. 10 MR. STONE: 34, I think the only difference is 11 rounding. I'm sorry, I didn't pick up on FEA's 12 position, so I guess that's not. 35 also has a problem 13 with -- FEA's position is different than the others, so 14 I'll skip that one. 15 Mr. Melson has reminded me that our proposal 16 is a lower number, and that FEA probably would like to 17 change their position to agree with us in order to 18 stipulate. 19 MS. WHITE: I believe that that's true. 20 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. So 35 looks like 21 it belongs on the list for potential stipulation. 22 MR. STONE: That would be true for 34 and 35. 23 MS. WHITE: That's correct. 24

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

MR. STONE: 43 is the next one I show, and

that is on Page 38, 44, 45, and 46. The next I have is 50 on page -- I'm sorry, 50 was dropped. 53, I believe. Yes, I think we are all in agreement on the number in 53.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: So you have gone from 46 to 53?

MR. STONE: Yes. On Page 46, Issue Number 58.

There is a slight difference in the numbers. I think
the concept is the same. We may need to reconcile the
numbers.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And that's 58?

MR. STONE: On 58. On Issue 59, we are representing to the Commission and to the parties that the expenses on the work orders that are cited on this issue are not a base rate item and have not been included in our test year. Everyone's position -- let's skip 59 for a moment.

Sixty-five. The only thing that is preventing a stipulation on Issue 65 is OPC's position that the number that they have identified in their position on Issue 60 should be taken out of advertising expenses.

We are representing to the Commission and to the parties that it is not part of advertising expenses. I don't know if Public Counsel had a chance to react to my suggestion with regard to the \$17,482.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. McGlothlin. 1 MR. McGLOTHLIN: If there is going to be a 2 break any time soon, I need to confer before we can 3 respond. 4 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. We will mark that 5 for discussion. 6 MR. STONE: I had earlier referred to Issue 7 We need to change our position slightly on Issue 8 That is on Page 46. We need to delete our last 9 sentence in our position, which means the issue is --10 11 there is an issue to be resolved in this proceeding. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. So I'm going to 12 13 remove 59 from my list at this time of potentially ripe 14 for stipulation. 15 MR. STONE: In Issue 68 on Page 51, we are 16 agreeing to take the extra money out that is at issue 17 here, so I think there is agreement between the parties. 18 Issue 73 on Page 55. As I understand the positions of 19 the parties, I think we are in agreement. 20 MS. WHITE: It looks to me like, as I look 21 over 73, that I missed a typo or something. Our 22 position doesn't make any sense. So I would change it 23 to agree with OPC.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Oh. On Issue 73, I see

24

25

what you mean.

MS. WHITE: On 73 it just says yes. 1 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. So the FEA position as we are now will be amended to agree with 3 OPC. And then Mr. Stone has raised the possibility that 4 with that change, and FIPUG and FRF agreeing with OPC 5 that this may be one that would be ripe for potential 6 stipulation. 7 Okay. The next one I have, I think we MR. STONE: 8 may have already discussed, which was Issue 78. And 9 then the next one after that is on Page 59, Issue 81. 10 11 Issue 85 on Page 60, bottom of Page 60, top of Page 61. 12 104 on Page 72. 105. 13 And the only other one is on Issue 118. 14 issue is framed with the number 60 days. What we have 15 asked in our position is if we could agree to 90 days we would be willing to stipulate. The 90 days is 16 17 consistent with the time that was granted Gulf in its 18 last case. I believe staff is in agreement with 90. 19 MR. SLEMKEWICZ: Yes, staff is in agreement 20 with the 90 days. 21 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Ninety days instead of 22 60 is appropriate? 23 MR. SLEMKEWICZ: Yes, ma'am. 24

25

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Stone, anything further at this point?

MR. STONE: That's it on the issues that I saw may be ripe for stipulations at this time.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Then from my notes from what you have suggested, I show 29, 34, 35, 58, 65, 68, 73, and 118. It all looks close, but maybe there need to be some discussions as to a wording or a number, but pretty close. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 15, 19, 26, 43, 44, 45, 46, 53, 78, 81, 85, 87, 104, 105, as from the information that we have before us, appear to be consistent positions.

So what I would like to do at this time is I know we have all taken notes on that. Let's set that aside for the moment, work our way through the rest of the draft prehearing order, see where that leaves us, and then discuss maybe taking a short break. We can confer, and if there are decisions or issues that all parties are comfortable stipulating today we can do that. All others I will ask that you get with our staff. So let's see if we can go from there.

That will bring us then to Section IX, the exhibit list, which is on Page 83. Staff?

MS. KLANCKE: Staff would like to note for the record that we will be preparing a Comprehensive Exhibit List consisting of all prefiled exhibits for the purposes of numbering and identifying the exhibits at

hearing. Staff will be providing the exhibit list to the parties as soon as possible.

Staff also intends to prepare a proposed stipulated exhibit composed of certain discovery responses and deposition transcripts which we will provide to the parties as soon as possible and far enough in advance of the hearing to allow for effective review and consideration. Staff would also request that with respect to that composite exhibit that the parties afford us with notice of any items on that list that they take issue with.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Any comments or concerns?

MR. STONE: None from Gulf.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. I'm seeing none.

Okay. That brings us obviously to Section X, proposed stipulations. We will have that changed, per our further discussion today.

Mr. Sayler.

MR. SAYLER: Commissioner, just to note that there are two pending motions to strike --

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: You're ahead of me.

MR. SAYLER: -- I will mention later, but some of these exhibits under Section VII are subject to those motions to strike. Similarly, portions of testimony at an earlier session. I just wanted to point that out.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Understood. Okay, thank you. Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Chairman, I thought we were still -- you jumped to X quicker than I expected.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Sorry.

MR. WRIGHT: I would ask if -- I think it would be appropriate pursuant to your earlier appropriately qualified directive that Mr. Chriss be shown as the first consumer witness after Mr. Thompson, that his exhibits, and similarly Mr. Pollock's, also be moved up to follow Mr. Thompson's Direct Testimony and exhibits in the order of exhibits.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. I did not mean to race too far ahead. No, I agree with that, and would ask our staff to show the exhibits in the same order as would reflect from our discussion of changing the witness order. Thank you.

Obviously, Section X we will revisit.

Section XI, pending motions. As Mr. Sayler has also mentioned, I am aware of two motions that have been filed. The joint motion to strike portions of the rebuttal testimony of Gulf Power Company Witness Rhonda J. Alexander filed by OPC, and then also earlier today consumer intervenors' motion to strike portions of the Direct Testimony of Gulf Witness Constance J. Erickson

and exhibit. Both of those, it is my understanding, still have time for response -- motions or responses to be filed, so each of those will be considered with the responses and will be addressed by separate order.

Anything else on Section XI?

Okay. I believe that brings us to

Section XII, pending confidentiality motions. I do

understand that there are a number of requests for

confidential classification and for temporary protective

order. Similarly, those will be addressed by separate

order. It is my desire to have all of those issued

prior to the start of the hearing, if at all possible.

And I know that our staff will work with my office and

we will commit to try to do that.

Anything else on Section XII? Okay. That brings us to Section XIII, post-hearing procedures.

MR. STONE: Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Yes.

MR. STONE: The page limits in this section appear to be more appropriate for other proceedings other than a rate case. And, similarly, we would ask that the word limits and page limits for the post-hearing briefs be extended. It is my understanding that in the last two cases, the page limit was 150 pages, and the word limit was at least 75 words, and in

1 some cases as many as 150 words. **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** I admit to not recalling. 2 3 I've blocked it out. However, I understand the point that you are raising, although realize that we may be 5 stipulating a number of issues. But I am open to what I hear as a request for additional words for post-hearing 6 7 positions and additional pages for post-hearing briefs. Is there a specific request? 8 9 MR. McGLOTHLIN: I request 120 words per 10 position. That seems to have worked in other cases in 11 which I have been involved. 12 MR. STONE: I'm sorry, Joe, I didn't hear --COMMISSIONER EDGAR: He said 120 for words for 13 14 post-hearing positions. Correct, Mr. McGlothlin? 15 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Yes. 16 MR. STONE: We have no objection to that. 17 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Anything from staff? 18 MS. KLANCKE: Staff has no objection to that. 19 MR. WRIGHT: We would support the 150 pages 20 and 120 words, Madam Chairman. Thank you. 21 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Up to. 22 MR. WRIGHT: Yes, ma'am. Up to. 23 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. I will ask my

24

25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

120 words, up to 150 pages. Anything else for this

staff to make that change, please. Thank you. So up to

section?

Okay. That brings us to Section XIV dealing with opening statements. Of course, customarily we do up to ten minutes a party. However, realizing that we have one party on one side and four parties basically on the other side, with some, of course, unique differences, is there a request or a proposal?

MR. McGLOTHLIN: I would request that each intervenor be able to use up to ten minutes. I don't object to Gulf having more than ten as compensation for that.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Stone?

MR. STONE: That's fine with us.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. How about this, how about if -- does ten minutes suffice for your client?

MR. STONE: We would like more than ten minutes given that each of the intervenors is going to have ten minutes apiece.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Well, that hasn't been decided yet.

MR. STONE: I mean, if the others are given ten per intervenor, we would like more time. If the limit was ten minutes per side, then we would live within 10 minutes.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I would like to suggest that we meet somewhere in the middle. And let me put this out there for your consideration. I would say 12 minutes for Gulf, 30 minutes for the consumer intervenors combined to be divided per your agreement between you, and the order, as well.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: We can work with that.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Chairman, that is fine with the Retail Federation. If Gulf wanted more than 12 minutes, it would be okay with us, too. Fair is fair.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Stone?

MR. STONE: We would ask for 20 minutes, and we hope not to use all of it.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: How about 15?

MR. STONE: Sold. So, again, I will ask that we reflect 15 minutes for Gulf, 30 minutes for the customer intervenors to work out amongst themselves, and to let the presiding officer know before we start how you are going to divide your time and what order that you are going to go in.

Okay. Now, I am thinking that at this point it may be helpful and worth our time to take about a ten-minute break and see if from the list of issues that we have listed and all of the different position changes

that we have asked to be reflected, if while we are together we can still come to agreement on some of those. If not, there will be the opportunity between now and then. But at this point it is quarter after.

Let's come back at 25 after 3:00. And during that break I'll take a stretch, and if we are in a position to propose some stipulations, then let's do so and see where we are at. So thank you all for your cooperation right now, and I will see you back here in ten minutes.

(Recess.)

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Folks, let's go back on the record.

Can I get a summary? Ms. Klancke, on the record why don't you give us an update as to where we are. And I'm open to suggestions.

MS. KLANCKE: Absolutely. At this time we are up to proposed stipulated Issue Number 45. We have about 15 left to go, but we are making really good progress with respect to hammering out some language that everybody can agree with respect to the stipulations. So if we could possibly have a little bit more time, that would be much appreciated.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Sure. Let me ask this, and I'm going to put it to you, but, of course, for all parties also to provide any input. What will be the

most useful and productive, to go off the record again and give all parties and staff the chance to continue to work together, and then to report back on the record, or to just go ahead and adjourn with the understanding of all of the good work that we have done to now, and ask that all parties work with our staff today and give a deadline for changes to be submitted to our staff so that we can turn them around?

Mr. Stone.

MR. STONE: If I may be so bold, Commissioner, I think it would be beneficial while we are all here physically present today if we could have another ten minutes. I think we would be able to finish the list, and it might be productive.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Then in all candor, to accommodate my schedule, I am going to --will 4:15 work?

MR. STONE: Oh, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. I don't want to keep anybody beyond where they have to be, but we will at this point take a recess. We will come back at 4:15. During that time, I'm going to step away and tend to other business. I'm going to ask all parties to work with our staff. We will come back on the record at 4:15, and see what we have reached agreement on and what

next steps are best so that we have all made good use of our time. And with that, we are on break until 4:15. Thank you.

(Recess.)

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. We are back on the record. And I understand that while we took a break there were discussions amongst the parties and staff.

Ms. Klancke, can you catch me up?

MS. KLANCKE: Certainly. During the break we had a very productive discussion amongst all the parties. On behalf of myself, I sincerely appreciate the Prehearing Officer affording us with the ability and the time to do this, and the flexibility with regard to this prehearing.

If it pleases the Prehearing Officer, at this time I would like to identify the issues which we have reached stipulated language and read the stipulation with respect to this. And then I would like to address just the numerals of those stipulations that we can identify as pending, pending additional information, or some additional language, or something to that effect. And then I would like to identify those issues that have been dropped.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Before I ask

Ms. Klancke to work from her notes as to the discussions

that y'all had together, any comments or issues to be 1 raised prior to that? 2 Mr. McGlothlin? 3 MR. McGLOTHLIN: Just that I agree that it was 4 5 a productive session. 6 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Good. And thank you all 7 for staying and working through while we are all here 8 together. Okay. 9 Ms. Klancke. 10 MS. KLANCKE: Okay. With respect to the 11 proposed stipulations, please let us begin on Page 12 with Issue 2. The proposed stipulation language is --12 13 and all of the ones that I am going to read with the 14 exception of 68 are Category 2 stipulations, meaning 15 that there is at least one party that does not agree with respect to the stipulated language. 16 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I'm sorry, there is at 17 18 least party that does not what? 19 MS. KLANCKE: That does not -- has taken no 20 position. 21 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Has no position. 22 MS. KLANCKE: That's correct. I apologize. 23 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: That's fine. 24 MS. KLANCKE: Okay. Beginning with Issue 2, 25 the proposed language is Gulf's projected test year

period of the 12-months ending December 31st, 2012, is appropriate.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: One more time, please.

MS. KLANCKE: Gulf's projected test year period of the 12-months ending December 31st, 2012, is appropriate.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.

MS. KLANCKE: I'd like to move on to Issue Number 7. Issue Number 7, the proposed stipulation language is the quality and reliability of electric service provided by Gulf is adequate.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.

MS. KLANCKE: Issue Number 15.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.

MS. KLANCKE: Okay. The language of the stipulation is going to be largely the Gulf position in its entirety, thus it shall be reflected as Gulf's requested level of distribution plant-in-service, of 1,029,829,000 (\$1,034,325,000 system) should be reduced by \$803,000 (803,000 system) to reflect an error identified by the company in the course of corresponding to discovery. The corrected amount of distribution plant-in-service, \$1,029,026,000 (\$1,033,522,000 system) is appropriate to be included in rate base.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.

MS. KLANCKE: We will move now to 43, issue

Number 43. With respect to Issue 43, the stipulation

language will be reflected as, "Gulf has made the

appropriate test year adjustments to remove fuel

revenues and fuel expenses recoverable through the fuel

adjustment clause."

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.

MS. KLANCKE: The next issue to be stipulated is Issue 44, and it should be reflected as, "As adjusted, Gulf has made the appropriate test year adjustments to remove conservation revenues and conservation expenses recoverable through the conservation cost-recovery clause. As shown on Mr. McMillan's Direct Testimony Exhibit RJM-1, Schedule 6, Gulf's ECCR depreciation and property tax adjustments were \$325,000 and \$146,000, respectively. The ECCR depreciation expense adjustment should be increased to \$375,000 and the ECCR property tax expenses should be increased to \$156,000."

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Let me ask you a question. I think we may have transposed a number, but I want to make sure. With the sentence that begin as shown on Mr. McMillan's Direct Testimony, coming down to the property tax adjustments, in the Gulf position previously it was 352,000, and I think I heard you say

325,000.

MS. KLANCKE: I meant 352,000.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. And is that -okay. I am seeing no disagreement. That was Issue 44?

MS. KLANCKE: That was Issue 44.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Yes.

MS. KLANCKE: The next -- if we are all in agreement, 45. And this one should reflect that Gulf has made the appropriate test year adjustments to remove capacity revenues and capacity expenses recoverable through the capacity cost-recovery clause.

Okay. The next one is with respect to Issue 46, and this one should reflect both an amalgamation of the issue statement as well as the latter sentences of Gulf's current position, and I will take a stab at it now. "As adjusted, Gulf has made the appropriate test year adjustments to remove environmental revenues and environmental expenses recoverable through the Environmental Cost-Recovery Clause. Consistent with the stipulation entered into by all the parties and approved by the Commission on November 1st, 2011, the Crist Unit 6 and 7 turbine upgrades, upgrade investments, and expenses were removed from the environment cost-recovery clause and are now being included for recovery in base rates in this proceeding."

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.

MS. KLANCKE: Okay. That brings us to Issue Number 65. Okay. The stipulation language with respect to Issue Number 65 should be reflected as the first sentence of Gulf's position in that it should be the appropriate amount of advertising expenses for the 2012 projected test year is 1,132,000. And there should also be a parenthetical at the very end of that sentence that specifies this is a system figure. And we are anticipating that Gulf will provide us with the jurisdictional figure, as well.

MR. STONE: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.

MS. KLANCKE: Okay. That takes us to 68, and I am very pleased to identify this as a Category 1 stipulation, and it should be reflected as executive financial planning expenses should not be included in operating expenses.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And a Category 1 is different than a Category 2 in what way?

MS. KLANCKE: This means that all of the parties are in agreement with respect to this issue.

MS. WHITE: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. And I'm seeing nods.

MS. KLANCKE: I wasn't quite finished, though. We also pick up the first -- well, the only sentence reflected in Gulf's position, so it would be, "Executive financial planning expenses should not be included in operating expenses. In the course of responding to discovery, Gulf identified 84,000 (\$84,000 system) of -- 48. I apologize, 48,000 (\$48,000 system) of executive financial planning expenses that Gulf agrees need to be removed from operating expenses and consequently reflected in the adjustments to NOI."

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.

MS. KLANCKE: Okay. That brings us to 73, Issue Number 73. The stipulation language with respect to this issue should pick up the first sentence of Gulf's position, so it should say the appropriate amount of other post-employment benefits expense is 3,759,786 (3,840,710 system).

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.

MS. KLANCKE: That takes to Issue Number 78. The stipulation language should reflect the sentence contained within Gulf's current position, and should specify the appropriate amount for the injuries and damages reserve accrual of 1,566,288 jurisdictional (1,600,000 system) is included in the 2012 projected test year.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.

MS. KLANCKE: And that takes us to Issue

Number 85. This issue should be -- the stipulation

language should be reflected as the appropriate amount

of Gulf's transmission O&M expense is 116,609,000 -
11,609,000, and that is on a system basis, and Gulf is

going to provide us with a jurisdictional figure with

respect to that issue, as well.

MR. STONE: That is correct. And that number just for clarification is 11,609,000.

MS. KLANCKE: I apologize. That takes us to Issue Number 104.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.

MS. KLANCKE: The stipulated language should reflect an amalgamation of the issue statement as well as the latter sentences of Gulf's position, so it should specify -- the first sentence should be, "The minimum kW demand to qualify for the realtime pricing (RTP) rate schedule be reduced from 2,000 kW to 500 kW. And then starting with the 2,000 kW applicability threshold has been in place since the initial implementation of realtime pricing at Gulf in 1995. More than half the customers who meet the 2,000-kilowatt threshold avail themselves of realtime pricing. Gulf's experience, metering and billing abilities, and the diversity of

customers indicate it is time to open it up to more and smaller customers. Gulf presently has about 300 to 350 customers who would meet the 500 kW threshold."

MR. STONE: In her recitation of the stipulation, I believe Ms. Klancke omitted the word should after rate schedule in the very first sentence. So the very first sentence of the statement of stipulation would be the minimum kW demand to qualify for the realtime pricing (RTP) rate schedule should be reduced from 2,000 kW to 500 kW.

MS. KLANCKE: With that addition.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Yes.

MS. KLANCKE: I apologize.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: That's okay. We've got it.

MS. KLANCKE: With respect to -- that brings us to 105 on the same page, and this one specifies the minimum kW demand for new load to quality for the commercial/industrial service rider (CISR) should be reduced from 1,000 kW to 500 kW. And then we pick up beginning at Gulf's statement, "This change is to simplify the minimum size requirement by making the qualifying load to be 500 kW in all cases. The current size requirement treats new load and retained load differently. The simplification will make the rate

easier for customers to understand and for Gulf to administer."

MR. STONE: And just for clarification, instead of quality it should have been qualify.

MS. KLANCKE: Qualify in the first sentence.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Yes.

MS. KLANCKE: Okay. That takes us to Issue

118. With respect to the stipulation language it should

reflect, "Gulf shall file, within 90 days after the date

of the final order in this docket, a description of all

entries or adjustments to its annual report, rate of

return reports, and books and records which will be

required as a result of the Commission's finding in this

rate case."

And that concludes the stipulations that we have today. I also have for your consideration -- I would like at this time to list the pending stipulations. Staff is aware of several pending stipulations which include stipulations with respect to Issues 19, 26, 34, 35, 53, and 58. In addition, at this time we have been able to reach an agreement with respect to dropping Issue Numbers 81 and 87. That is all the stipulations pending or actual that staff is aware of at this time.

MR. STONE: It is my understanding that staff

is awaiting discovery on Issues 3, 4, 5, and 6. That the parties are prepared for that to be a stipulation, once staff has a chance to review the discovery.

MS. KLANCKE: That is correct.

2.0

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Ms. Klancke, thank you.

And, Mr. Stone, thank you. From the parties, since I
have not heard any concerns expressed, I will ask you -my understanding is that, as it has been described,
comports with the understanding of each of you on behalf
of your clients?

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Yes, that was accurate.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Commissioner. Thank you.

MS. WHITE: That's accurate. Thank you.

MS. KAUFMAN: Yes, ma'am, that's correct.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Wonderful. Thank you.

Ms. Klancke, next steps.

MS. KLANCKE: Since we have gone through all of the draft prehearing order and proposed stipulations, staff at this time would like to ask the parties that with respect to the extent that I'm going -- staff shall make the adjustments and position changes which we have discussed here, and ask the parties to review them expeditiously. With respect to any additional changes, corrections, or edits to the draft prehearing order, please provide them to me no later -- or to staff no

later than Tuesday, December 6th, 2011.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: So, to recap, Ms.

Klancke, you will put together a draft that reflects all of the discussions and agreements and decisions that we have made today. You will circulate that. We ask all the parties to review and get changes, suggestions, and perhaps even additional proposed stipulations to

Ms. Klancke's 's office by close of business, Tuesday, December 6th.

MS. KLANCKE: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Any concerns about that?

MR. McGLOTHLIN: No.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Wonderful.

MR. STONE: None from the company.

MS. KLANCKE: Staff has no further issues for discussion at this time.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. As long, again, as we are all gathered together, any other items that would be useful to discuss?

MR. STONE: Commissioner Edgar, there is the possibility, as we get to the end of the discovery period, that there may be an opportunity for the parties to agree to excuse certain witnesses. We would like to keep a place open for that possibility with the

Prehearing Officer's permission. And if we can reach that agreement, perhaps we can reflect that in the prehearing order, as well.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: That is fine with me.

Thank you for raising it. If witnesses can be stipulated, especially in light of the stipulations that have agreed and/or be excused as we go, clearly we will need to circulate that amongst the other Commissioners for their review, for my review, but I am certainly willing to accommodate that.

Mr. Wright, did you have another -- no? Okay.

MR. WRIGHT: There are a couple of other lurking potential stipulations. We are working with Gulf on 102.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Good. Yes, Mr. Sayler.

MR. SAYLER: The parties would, after everything concludes, like a sidebar with staff to discuss some other procedural matters.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. We'll make them available. Anything else? Okay.

A longer prehearing than I was planning on, but that's okay. I think it has been productive. I very, very, very much appreciate everybody's cooperation and working together. I would ask our staff to stay after for a few moments to see if there are other things

1	that can be discussed that will help us move forward.
2	Thank you all.
3	We are adjourned.
4	(The Prehearing Conference concluded
5	at 4:46 p.m.)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 2 STATE OF FLORIDA 3 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 4 COUNTY OF LEON 5 I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, Hearing Reporter 6 Services Section, FPSC Division of Commission Clerk, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard 7 at the time and place herein stated. 8 IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the 9 same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true 10 transcription of my notes of said proceedings. 11 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' 12 attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I 13 financially interested in the action. 14 DATED THIS 1st day of December, 2011. 15 16 17 RPR Official FPSC Hearings Reporter 18 **2**50) 413-6732 19 20 21 22 23

24

25