

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition for rate increase by Florida Power & Light Company.

DOCKET NO. 160021-EI

In re: Petition for approval of 2016-2018 storm hardening plan, by Florida Power & Light Company.

DOCKET NO. 160061-EI

In re: 2016 depreciation and dismantlement study by Florida Power & Light Company.

DOCKET NO. 160062-EI

In re: Petition for limited proceeding to modify and continue incentive mechanism, by Florida Power & Light Company.

DOCKET NO. 160088-EI FOF (C) (2)
ORDER NO. PSC-16-0231-PCO-EI
ISSUED: June 10, 2016

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

JULIE I. BROWN, Chairman
LISA POLAK EDGAR
ART GRAHAM
RONALD A. BRISÉ
JIMMY PATRONIS

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

BY THE COMMISSION:

On March 15, 2016, Florida Power & Light Company (FPL) filed its Minimum Filing Requirements (MFRs) and testimony in support of rate increases in its base rates and charges to be effective January 1, 2017, January 1, 2018, and a step increase for the Okeechobee Energy Center effective on the commercial in-service date of the unit, currently projected to be June 1, 2019. The rate case was assigned Docket No. 160021-EI. Simultaneous with the rate case filing, FPL filed a petition requesting approval of its 2016 through 2018 Storm Hardening Plan (Docket No. 160061-EI), as required by Rule 25-6.0342, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), and filed its 2016 Depreciation and Dismantlement Study (Docket No. 160062-EI), as required by Rules 25-6.0436 and 25-6.04364, F.A.C.

On March 25, 2016, Order No. PSC-16-0125-PCO-EI (Order Establishing Procedure/OEP) was issued establishing the filing dates and prehearing procedures to be followed in Docket No. 160021-EI. The OEP set the hearing dates as August 22 through September 2, 2016; the filing date for Intervenor testimony as July 14, 2016; the filing date for Commission staff's testimony as July 25, 2016; the filing date for Rebuttal testimony as August 8, 2016; the discovery deadline as August 12, 2016, the date of the Prehearing Conference; and the filing date for the Briefs as September 12, 2016. The Office of Public Counsel (OPC),

Florida Retail Federation (FRF), American Association of Retired Persons (AARP), Florida Industrial Power Users Group (FIPUG), Wal-Mart Stores East, LP and Sam's East, Inc. (Walmart), Federal Executive Agencies (FEA) and South Florida Hospital and Healthcare Association (SFHHA) are parties to this docket.

On April 8, 2016, OPC filed an Unopposed Motion to Modify Key Activities Dates and Discovery Timeframes (Modification Motion) requesting that certain filing and discovery deadline dates established in the OEP be modified. FPL, FIPUG, and Walmart had no objections to OPC's Modification Motion.¹ The time to file written objections to OPC's Modification Motion ran on April 12, 2016. No written objection to the Modification Motion was filed.

On April 15, 2016, FPL filed a petition for limited proceeding to modify and continue its Incentive Mechanism (Petition). On April 22, 2016, Commission staff filed a Motion to Consolidate Docket Nos. 160021-EI, 160061-EI, 160062-EI and 160088-EI (Consolidation Motion). FPL, FEA, Walmart, and SFHHA supported the motion; FIPUG and OPC took no position on the Consolidation Motion at the time of filing. The deadline for responding to the Consolidation Motion ran on April 29, 2016, without any written objections being filed.

On May 4, 2016, Order No. PSC-16-0182-PCO-EI² was issued revising the OEP and granting the Commission staff's Consolidation Motion. Order No. PSC-16-0182-PCO-EI bifurcated the testimony filing schedules for the four dockets. For Docket Nos. 160021-EI (rate case) and 160062-EI (Depreciation Study) the filing schedule was as follows:

- | | | |
|-----|--|--------------------------------|
| (1) | Utility's testimony and exhibits | March 15, 2016 |
| (2) | Intervenors' testimony and exhibits | July 7, 2016 |
| (3) | Staff's testimony and exhibits, if any | July 18, 2016 |
| (4) | Rebuttal | August 1, 2016 |
| (5) | Prehearing Statements | August 5, 2016 |
| (6) | Prehearing Conference | August 12, 2016 |
| (7) | Discovery deadline for direct and intervenor testimony | August 12, 2016 |
| | Discovery deadline for rebuttal testimony | August 16, 2016 |
| (8) | Hearing | August 22 to September 2, 2016 |
| (9) | Briefs | September 16, 2016 |

For Docket Nos. 160061-EI (Storm Hardening) and 160088-EI (Incentive Mechanism), the filing schedule was as follows:

- | | | |
|-----|--|----------------|
| (1) | Utility's testimony and exhibits –Docket No. 160061-EI | March 15, 2016 |
|-----|--|----------------|

¹ At the time of OPC's Modification Motion, these were the only official parties to the rate case.

² Order No. PSC-16-0182-PCO-EI, issued on May 4, 2016, in Dockets Nos. 160021-EI, In re: Petition for rate increase by Florida Power & Light Company; 160061-EI, In re: Petition for approval of 2016-2018 storm hardening plan, by Florida Power & Light Company; 160062-EI, In re: 2016 depreciation and dismantlement study by Florida Power & Light Company; and 160088-EI, In re: Petition for limited proceeding to modify and continue incentive mechanism by Florida Power & Light Company.

| | | |
|-----|---|----------------------------|
| | Utility's testimony and exhibits - Docket No. 160088-EI | April 15, 2016 |
| (2) | Intervenors' testimony and exhibits | May 31, 2016 |
| (3) | Staff's testimony and exhibits, if any | June 21, 2016 |
| (4) | Rebuttal | July 5, 2016 |
| (5) | Prehearing Statements | August 5, 2016 |
| (6) | Prehearing Conference | August 12, 2016 |
| (7) | Discovery deadline for direct and intervenor testimony | August 12, 2016 |
| | Discovery deadline for rebuttal testimony | August 16, 2016 |
| (8) | Hearing | August 22 to Sept. 2, 2016 |
| (9) | Briefs | September 16, 2016 |

On May 9, 2016, OPC filed a Motion for Reconsideration of Order No. PSC-16-0182-PCO-EI Before the Full Commission (Motion for Reconsideration), requesting that the testimony filing schedule for the rate case and Depreciation Study dockets also be applied to the Storm Hardening and Incentive Mechanism dockets. AARP, FRF, FIPUG and SFHHA support OPC's Motion for Reconsideration; FPL does not support the Motion for Reconsideration; Walmart has no objection; and counsel for FEA did not respond prior to filing. On May 10, 2016, OPC filed a Request for Oral Argument on its Motion for Reconsideration and has requested that each party be given 10 minutes to present its position on the motion.

This Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Section 366.06, Florida Statutes.

DECISION

Having determined that oral argument would assist us in understanding and evaluating any mistakes of law or fact overlooked in rendering Order No. PSC-16-0182-PCO-EI, we granted oral argument on our own motion.³

Law

Rule 25-22.0376, F.A.C., applies to requests for reconsideration of non-final orders, and states:

- (1) Any party who is adversely affected by a non-final order may seek reconsideration by the Commission panel assigned to the proceeding by filing a motion in support thereof within 10 days after issuance of the order. The Commission shall not entertain a motion for reconsideration of an order disposing of a motion for reconsideration.
- (2) A party may file a response to a motion for reconsideration within 7 days after service of the motion for reconsideration.
- (3) Failure to timely file a motion for reconsideration or a response shall constitute a waiver of the right to do so.

³ Rule 25-22.0022, F.A.C.

(4) Any motion or response filed pursuant to this rule shall contain a concise statement of the grounds therefore and the signature of counsel or other person filing the motion.

(5) The Commission will not entertain a motion for reconsideration of a notice of proposed agency action.

The legal standard for reconsideration of an order is to bring to the attention of the administrative agency some point of fact or law that it overlooked or failed to consider when it rendered its order. Diamond Cab Company of Miami v. King, 140 So.2d 889, 891 (Fla. 1962); Stewart Bonded Warehouse, Inc. v. Bevis, 294 So.2d 315 (Fla. 1974); Pingree v. Quaintance, 394 So.2d 161 (Fla. 1st DCA 1981).

OPC's Position

OPC sets out a series of facts presumably to show that it will experience hardship under Order No. PSC-16-0182-PCO-EI. OPC states that Order No. PSC-16-0182-PCO-EI was issued on May 4, 2016, 27 days before the order requires Intervenors to file their testimony on Storm Hardening and Incentive Mechanism issues. [Motion for Reconsideration at pp. 4-6] Under the schedule for the rate case and Depreciation Study dockets, OPC would have approximately three months to file testimony. OPC notes that FPL's testimony for the Storm Hardening docket was filed simultaneously with FPL's testimony and MFRs on March 15, 2016, and FPL's testimony for the Incentive Mechanism docket was filed on April 15, 2016. The time FPL has to respond to its direct testimony discovery is 25 days.⁴ Utilizing the July 7 Intervenor filing date would have allowed OPC to issue and review discovery on the Storm Hardening and Incentive Mechanism issues prior to filing its testimony.

OPC served discovery on FPL regarding Storm Hardening issues on March 17, March 30, April 5, and May 6, 2016.⁵ OPC also filed discovery on FPL regarding the Incentive Mechanism on April 6 and April 27, 2016.⁶ OPC has received responses to its March 17, March 30, and April 5 Storm Hardening discovery. OPC has not received responses to its May 6 Storm Hardening discovery which is due on May 31, 2016, the date OPC is currently required to file its Incentive Mechanism testimony. OPC has also not received responses to its April 27 Incentive Mechanism discovery which are due at the earliest on May 23, 2016, 8 days before its testimony is due to be filed.⁷

OPC further argues that the basis for the consolidation of the dockets was the recognition that the issues and information in the Depreciation and Storm Hardening dockets were so

⁴ Order No. PSC-16-0125-PCO-EI, issued on March 25, 2016, in Docket No. 160021-EI, In re: Petition for rate increase by Florida Power & Light Company, at p. 3.

⁵ OPC's First Interrogatories Nos. 1-87; OPC's First Request for Production of Documents Nos. 1-47; OPC's Third Set of Interrogatories Nos. 106-107; OPC's Second Request for Production of Documents Nos. 48-85; OPC's Fourth Set of Interrogatories Nos. 108-165; and OPC's Eleventh Set of Interrogatories Nos. 257-297.

⁶ OPC's Eleventh Set of Interrogatories Nos. 257-297; OPC's Eleventh Request for Production of Documents Nos. 125-131, filed in Docket No. 160021-EI; OPC's Admission Nos. 1-5; OPC's First Set of Interrogatories Nos. 1-17; and OPC's First Set of Production of Documents No. 1, filed in Docket No. 160088-EI.

⁷ Because OPC's April 27 Incentive Mechanism discovery to FPL was filed on April 27 before the Consolidation Order was issued, FPL could take the position that the Rules of Civil Procedure apply and its response is not due until May 27, 30 days after service.

embedded in the rate case MFR calculations that these dockets were rationally included in the rate case. [Reconsideration Motion at p. 5] OPC states that because the information contained in the Storm Hardening docket is so embedded in the rate case MFRs, and Order No. PSC-16-0182-PCO-EI, does not specifically identify which issues are to be addressed in its Storm Hardening and Incentive Mechanism filings due on May 31, it is impossible for its experts to determine what issues should be addressed at that time. Essentially, OPC argues that the testimony in all four dockets is so interrelated that determining what to address in its May 31 testimony to meet Order No. PSC-16-0182-PCO-EI's requirements is virtually impossible. [Reconsideration Motion at 6] Finally, OPC argues that no party, including Commission staff in its Consolidation Motion, requested a bifurcated filing schedule, and that "Commission Staff in its Motion for Consolidation appears to have relied on all these dockets having the same testimony filing dates as a basis for the Consolidation not being prejudicial." [Reconsideration Motion at p. 6 at ¶ 10] OPC simply assumed that once consolidated, all of the dockets would proceed on the agreed upon filing schedule presented in its Modification Motion.

Analysis

FPL's testimony supporting the 2016-2018 Storm Hardening Plan was filed simultaneously with the rate case MFRs on March 15, 2016. OPC has served, and has received, responses to three sets of discovery regarding Storm Hardening to date. While it is true that OPC has served and not yet received all of its responses to its discovery regarding the Incentive Mechanism, if the rate case schedule for discovery is adhered to, OPC will have responses to its April 27 testimony on May 23, 8 days prior to the currently scheduled testimony filing date. The interconnectedness of the Storm Hardening Plan and Incentive Mechanism data with the data contained in FPL's MFRs and supporting calculations is not a new development or one which should have taken OPC by surprise. Neither OPC nor any other party filed a request for one unified filing schedule in response to the Motion for Consolidation.

Reviewing the Motion for Reconsideration in its entirety, we find that OPC has generally alleged that consolidation of these dockets under bifurcated filing schedules will prevent it from being able to competently prepare its testimony for Docket Nos. 160061-EI and 160088-EI. This appears to be a hardship argument. And, it is true that OPC will not be able to file testimony which incorporates FPL's responses to its May 6 discovery because FPL's responses are not due until May 31, the date Intervenor testimony is due under the schedule established in Order No. PSC-16-0182-PCO-EI, the subject of OPC's Motion for Reconsideration. However, OPC has not clearly identified any specific mistakes of fact or law sufficient to support reconsideration of the filing schedule for Docket Nos. 160061-EI and 160088-EI found in Order No. PSC-16-0182-PCO-EI. Without a specific mistake of fact or law, a motion for reconsideration must be denied, even when there is a "feeling that a mistake may have been made"⁸ or when the reviewing body would have reached a different decision. We find that the legal standard for reconsideration has not been met, and, therefore, deny OPC's Motion for Reconsideration.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED that the Motion for Reconsideration of Order No. PSC-16-0182-PCO-EI Before the Full Commission filed by the Office of Public Counsel is hereby denied. It is further

⁸ Stewart Bonded Warehouse, Inc. v. Bevis, 294 So.2d 315, 317 (Fla. 1974).

ORDER NO. PSC-16-0231-~~PCO~~-EI
DOCKET NOS. 160021-EI, 160061-EI, 160062-EI, 160088-EI
PAGE 6

ORDERED that these dockets shall remain open pending final resolution of Florida Power & Light Company's requests for a permanent base rate increase, for approval of its 2016 Depreciation Study, for approval of its 2016-2018 Storm Hardening Plan, and for approval of its Incentive Mechanism.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 10th day of June, 2016.

Carlotta S Stauffer

CARLOTTA S. STAUFFER

Commission Clerk

Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399
(850) 413-6770
www.floridapsc.com

Copies furnished: A copy of this document is provided to the parties of record at the time of issuance and, if applicable, interested persons.

SBr

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.569(1), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

Any party adversely affected by the Commission's final action in this matter may request: 1) reconsideration of the decision by filing a motion for reconsideration with the Office of Commission Clerk, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, within fifteen (15) days of the issuance of this order in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code; or 2) judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility or the First District Court of Appeal in the case of a water and/or wastewater utility by filing a notice of appeal with the Office of Commission Clerk, and filing a copy of the notice of appeal and the filing fee with the appropriate court. This filing must be completed within thirty (30) days after the issuance of this order, pursuant to Rule 9.110, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure. The notice of appeal must be in the form specified in Rule 9.900(a), Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.