1	PARTICIPATING:
2	LESLIE PAUGH and ROBERT ELIAS, FPSC Division
3	of Legal Services.
4	TODD BORRMANN, FPSC Division of Electric &
5	Gas.
6	ROGER HOWE, Office of Public Counsel
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21.	
22	
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS

CHATRMAN JOHNSON: Item 14.

MS. PAUGE: Commissioners, this is Staff's recommendation regarding the guideline that should be used to determine when a utility must provide a preliminary explanation of projected fuel cost.

The recommendation is that if there is an increase in the six-month fuel factor by 5% or more from the previous recovery period, the utility must affirmatively demonstrate prior to approval of recovery that the actions or events which gave rise to the need for recovery and the underlying costs are reasonable.

Do the Commissioners have questions?

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I just wanted to make a comment. I had mentioned it to Joe before, about the possibility of moving the fuel adjustments to a yearly basis. And I believe that Staff is looking into that.

ms. PAUGH: Staff has set an informal meeting with all of the parties in the fuel docket for this week on just that subject.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: Who is on the fuel docket?

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Are the parties here to

answer questions or -- oh, did you want to speak?

MR. EOWE: Chairman Johnson, I'm Roger Howe
of the Public Counsel's Office.

Our concern is stated in the recommendation, and that is that using a 5% threshold in our view would create a point below which the company would not have to disclose certain matters, which could be, certainly in a dollar sense, significant to that particular utility.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Would it be appropriate to say in these instances you must, but where there's a significant event you ought to?

ME. HOWE: We tried to address that with the language that you find in the Staff recommendation that I had offered. It appears on Page 5. And I use the terms "having a material effect on costs sought to be covered." I believe the Commission is used to dealing with issues of materiality in a accounting sense, and so forth, and it will vary from company to company. For example, Gulf Power versus Florida Power and Light, what's material for one might not be material for another.

But I'm concerned at the Commission's attempts to tighten up the standard has created -- has raised the bar such that the companies will is not

have to disclose significant material events because that particular event does not lead to a 5% increase in their fuel cost recovery factor.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: Why isn't 5% appropriate for materiality?

MR. MOWE: It might be. For example, with Plorida Power and Light, I would imagine a couple billion dollars a year flows through the fuel adjustment clause. You might have some very significant numbers lost in that 5% threshold, numbers that you wanted to hear.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yeah, but this never precludes looking at it. It just is an early warning.

MR. HOWE: It might preclude looking at it because if it's not offered in the first instance, it isn't necessarily going to come up at any later date either.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: That goes against the very concept of this policy. I mean, clearly the Public Counsel's Office, through Jack Shreve, followed us across the state, seven or eight hearings and many lacerations and tongue lashings by him, as well as the public, as well as certain senators and so on.

And our attempt here is to just have a fail-safe device so that this Commission does not find

itself in a similar position sometime in the future. But you're telling me that our rule does exactly the opposite?

MR. HOWE: I believe it could, yes, sir.

And that's because what would happen -- pick a significant dollar amount, an event. I think the current practice is, with all of the companies generally, we have one instance where we feel things got passed by -- but generally the companies make a good effort in their prefiled testimony to identify any material matter they think might bear upon their fuel cost recovery. And we'd like to see that continued.

We would not like to see the company testing it against a 5% threshold and choosing to omit it and then get lost all together.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Is that possible, Mr. Elias?

MR. ELIAS: No.

you because I saw you run up here, and I'm sure that she is as well versed or perhaps better versed on this. I'm sorry.

MR. BLIAS: Correct. (Simultaneous conversation.)

MS. PAUGH: Commissioner, this 1 recommendation merely adds a threshold proof, it adds 2 an additional proof; it creates no gap, it takes away 3 nothing. Public Counsel's argument is essentially that we create a gap where we're not going to take a 5 look at something. 6 I totally disagree with that. We always 7 take a look at everything, and this in no way affects 8 9

a prudency review that would occur in any case in any event.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Howe.

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. HOWE: I guess I state in response, because of the myriad of things that happen with these utilities -- I mean, various fuels, various methods of fuel delivery, different types of generating units in different locations -- there's a lot of things that can happen. And every six months I kind of go into overload trying to keep up with all they had filed. And --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Hopefully now it will only be on a yearly basis.

MR. HOWE: We have to rely on the company's disclosure on material factors.

If, for example, the company failed to disclose a matter because it did not exceed the 5% threshold, and in the future, you know, in the true-up proceedings, it had hit its projections right on the money, I'm not sure we'd ever see any disclosure of "By the way, back there six months ago we had an item less than 5% that you Commissioners need to be aware of and you employees of Public Counsel's Office might want to inquire into further." I think it could get lost in the process.

MS. PAUGH: Commissioners, if I may. Public Counsel's suggestion is so broad that any matter having a material effect, which is virtually undefinable, would create a preliminary proof for every dollar conceivably that goes through the fuel clause and it guts the policy of interim recovery.

If that's what the Commissioners would like to do, that's fine. But I think you need to understand that that's the effect, in my opinion, of his suggestion.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Howe, is there an intermediate point that you would take us to, or it's either that or nothing?

MR. HOWE: I'll go out on a limb,

Commissioner Garcia, and say that perhaps you do not

need an explicit statement. And the reason I say that

is I think in years past you generally had complete

disclosure, and all material matters had come to the Commission's attention. It might be worth the Commission's while to think about whether -- this arose out of the Crystal River-3 outage.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: And we thought to some degree that we were doing this to placate, among others, your boss.

COMMISSIONER KIESLING: How about "address" his concerns is a better word than placate.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Address his concerns,
thank you. I'm going to miss you, Commissioner
Kiesling. (Laughter)

MR. HOWE: Yes, sir. I guess you're putting me in a position where I either need to say -- to back off from a general statement like materiality and pick a percentage, and I cannot pick a number. If you ask me to retreat from a general term like "materiality," I cannot offer anything except to state that perhaps it was an one-time event that isn't likely to occur again. I can't tell you for sure that Mr. Schreve would agree with that lest statement.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: I certainly wouldn't want to be whipped around like I was by Mr. Shreve again either. But I think this is a fail-safe device that I think does exactly what it was intended. I

didn't see it as you saw it, and I guess we could -- I
don't know how we could change language to address
your concern, but I think our rule addresses your
concern because we always have the right to do a
prudency review and we do.

This simply doesn't allow us to do it as par for the course procedure and say, "Okay, we approve this," and go through a laborious process of explaining why we did it.

In this particular case had we had -- had this been the issue that brought this up, we would have then done it on the front end to some degree, and it would have allowed everyone to see the facts before them. And it would have probably been in the -- and the company might have still pulled it and we wouldn't have had to go through the procedure.

MR. HOWE: I appreciate the situation you're in. And I hope you appreciate my perspective, and that's I do not see the mechanism that is going to cause the event that leads to a fuel cost increase of less than 5% necessarily coming to our, or the Commission's, attention at a future date.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Mr. Howe, let me ask you, this is not an improvement over of the present situation in your opinion? (Pause) MR. HOWE: I guess not. And the reason I say that is I feel as a -- routinely we have seen disclosures by the companies below what would be a 5% threshold.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: How would you change this language? Or is it impossible to change it in such a way that it would be acceptable?

MR. HOWE: I guess then I'd have to revert back to pride of authorship and say it just needs a materiality standard that would need to be refined over time for the Commission to find out what is or is not material. If you find the companies, for example, disclosing too many things, you might want to bump it up a bit.

quantify that with some type of percentage, or dollar amount or something, materiality is in the eye of the beholder.

MR. HOWE: That's true.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: And different people may consider different things material.

MR. HOWE: I understand. And I think you, as an accountant, understand that sometimes there's judgments have to be made every day. The Commission's auditors go out and review the company's books and

records and apply a materiality standard. And it's flexible and it's evolved over time. But I don't 2 think they go in to audit a company with an automatic 3 trigger point, for example, using the same one for Gulf Power, for example, in the fuel cost area, that 5 they would use for Florida Power and Light who spends 6 a great deal more money on fuel. 7 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Lowering the standard 8 wouldn't help you at all? No, I guess not. 9 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I move Staff. 10 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Second. 11 CHAIRMAM JOHNSON: Any further discussion? 12 Seeing none, all those in favor signify by saying 13 "aye." 14 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Aye. 15 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Aye. 16 COMMISSIONER CLARE: Aye. 17 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Aye. 18 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Opposed. 19 COMMISSIONER DEASON: Nay. Show it approved 20 on a 4 to 1 vote. Item 15. 21 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Mr. Howe, if you can 22 develop something, I mean I'm willing to look at it in 23 the future because clearly I want to avoid this

happening again. And if there is something that we

can do, or do it better, I'm willing to consider it.

But I certainly want to at least have this on the

books so we can avoid what we just had happen. But if

you think there's more that we could do --

Perhaps I can help the process during the fuel cost recovery proceedings discovering what there's below 5%. We can find out if it's a reasonable threshold.

STATE OF FLORIDA) CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON 2 I, JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR, Chief, Bureau of 3 Reporting, Official Commission Reporter, 4 DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Agenda Item 14 in Docket No. 971513-EU was heard by the Florida Public 5 Service Commission at the time and place herein stated; it is further 6 CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported 7 the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed by me; and that this transcript, consisting of 13 pages, constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings. 9 DATED this 5th day of January, 1998. 10 11 12 JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR Chief, Bureau of Reporting 13 Official Commission/Reporter (904) 413-6732 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

25