DOCUMENT NUMBER OF

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

08268 AUG-18

APPEARANCES:

RUSSELL BADDERS, Beggs & Lane, 3 West Garden Street, Suite 700, Pensacola, Florida 32576, appearing on behalf of Gulf Power Company.

JOHN T. BUTLER, Steel, Hector & Davis, LLP, 200 South Biscayne Boulevard, Suite 4000, Miami, Florida 33131-2398, appearing on behalf of Florida Power & Light Company.

JOHN W. McWHIRTER, JR., McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin, Davidson, Decker, Kaufman, Arnold & Steen, 117 South Gadsden Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of Florida Industrial Power Users Group.

DOUGLAS W. HALL, Carlton, Fields, 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 500, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of Florida Power Corporation.

JAMES D. BEASLEY, Ausley & McMullen, 227 South Calhoun Street, Post Office Box 391, Tallahassee, Florida 32302, appearing on behalf of Tampa Electric Company.

ROB VANDIVER, Associate Public Counsel, c/o The Florida Legislature, 111 West Madison Street, Room 812, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400, appearing on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida.

WM. COCHRAN KEATING, IV, FPSC General Counsel's Office, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, appearing on behalf of the Commission Staff.

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	COMMISSIONER PALECKI: We'll call this prehearing
3	conference to order. Staff, could you please read the notice.
4	MR. KEATING: Pursuant to notice issued July 22nd,
5	2002, this time and place has been set for a prehearing
6	conference in Docket Number 011605-EI, review of investor-owned
7	electric utilities' risk management policies and procedures.
8	COMMISSIONER PALECKI: We'll take appearances,
9	starting down at this end.
10	MR. BUTLER: John Butler of the law firm of Steel,
11	Hector & Davis, L.L.P., appearing on behalf of Florida Power &
12	Light Company.
13	MR. BEASLEY: I'm Jim Beasley with the law firm of
14	Ausley & McMullen representing Tampa Electric Company.
15	MR. BADDERS: Russell Badders with the law firm of
16	Beggs & Lane representing Gulf Power Company.
17	MR. HALL: Doug Hall with Carlton, Fields Law Firm
18	representing Florida Power Company.
19	MR. VANDIVER: Rob Vandiver appearing on behalf of
20	the Citizens of the state of Florida.
21	MR. McWHIRTER: John McWhirter of the McWhirter,
22	Reeves Law Firm appearing on behalf of the Florida Industrial
23	Power Users Group.
24	MR. KEATING: Cochran Keating appearing on behalf of
25	the Commission Staff.

1	COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Staff, do we have any
2	preliminary matters that we need to tend to?
3	MR. KEATING: There are none that I am aware of.
4	COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Do any of the parties have any
5	preliminary matters that they'd like to discuss at this time?
6	Okay. Let's move on to the prehearing order. Does
7	everyone have a copy of the prehearing order?
8	All right. We'll go ahead and walk through this
9	section by section to determine whether or not any corrections
10	are necessary. Are the appearances correct on the prehearing
11	order? Any changes to the appearances?
12	We'll move on to the let's move on to both
13	Sections I and II and III. These are, more or less,
14	boilerplate sections. We don't have
15	MR. KEATING: Commissioner, you will and the parties
16	will notice in Section II in the case background in the third
17	paragraph there is an order cite which is not complete and that
18	is for a consummating order that is expected to be issued
19	today. And when that is issued that order number will be
20	inserted.
21	COMMISSIONER PALECKI: All right.
22	MR. KEATING: And that appears again in the I
23	believe under Issue 6 the same change will be made.
24	COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Any changes to Section IV,
25 l	Inosthearing procedures? Hearing none I move on to Section V

prefiled testimony and exhibits and witnesses. Here, we usually do have some changes or corrections. If all the parties have had a chance to review the order of witnesses as well as the issues that they will be testifying to, are there any changes there?

MR. HALL: Commissioner, the indication of the issues under Pamela Murphy, because those have been reorganized, should be corrected to read "1B," "1C," and "7A." And also, Javier Portuondo and Pamela R. Murphy should be added as rebuttal witnesses for Florida Power Corp on Issue 7A.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: And that was Portuondo and who else?

MR. HALL: Pamela R. Murphy.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: And Murphy. Okay. All right. Are there any other changes to the order of witnesses?

MR. BEASLEY: Commissioner, on Page 6 of the draft prehearing order, the issues listed for Witness W. Lynn Brown for Tampa Electric Company are shown as 7A and 7B. If I could, add to that 1B. 2. 3. and 4.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: All right. Anything else?

MR. McWHIRTER: Mr. Chairman, Lee Gooch is coming in from Chicago, and we would appreciate it if the Commission could accommodate his schedule and let him testify the first day. It's entirely possible that that will happen in the ordinary course of events, but in the event that it doesn't.

we'd like to announce that that is a need on our part. He needs to get back in Chicago on Tuesday.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: We always try to accommodate witnesses that have travel schedules that need to be met. Do any of the parties have any objection if we do need to take Mr. Gooch early so that we can take him before his flight leaves and that he can testify on the first day? Hearing no objections, we'll go ahead and do what we can to accommodate Mr. Gooch's schedule.

MR. McWHIRTER: Thank you, sir.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Section VII, statement of basic positions, any changes, modifications, or corrections?

MR. BUTLER: There is for FPL. On the statement of basic position here would be replaced by the following: FPL is prepared to accept Staff's proposed resolution of issues dated, and I'm sorry, I'm not sure of the date, it's July 31 or August 1, 2002, with the addition of the phrase, quote, and/or physical, unquote, between, quote, financial, unquote, and, quote, hedging, unquote, in the first sentences of paragraphs three and four.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Thank you. Do any of the other parties have any changes they'd like to make?

MR. HALL: Commissioner, on Page 17, Issue 4, the sponsoring witness for Florida Power Corporation will be Javier Portuondo; that's not noted.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: All right. We were just on 1 2 basic positions, but as long as we have that, we'll go ahead 3 and take that up now. That's Issue 4. And could you repeat 4 the change, please. MR. HALL: It's just to add Portuondo as the 5 6 sponsoring witness at the end of that position. COMMISSIONER PALECKI: All right. All right. And 7 now are there any changes to either basic positions or changes 8 9 on the parties' positions on any of the issues? MR. BUTLER: There are for FPL on some of the 10 specific issues. Do you want me to give you those all now, or 11 are you going to go through them one at a time? 12 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: No. Let's go ahead, and why 13 don't do it party by party rather than issue by issue? So 14 15 we'll take all of Florida Power & Light's at once. 16 MR. BUTLER: Okay. For 1A, the position would become 17 the same as the statement of basic position that I had just read. Unless you want me to, I won't read it again. 18 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Unless the court reporter 19 would need that again -- is that suitable? So that will be the 20 same as your statement of basic position that you've just read 21 22 to us? 23

MR. BUTLER: That's right. On Issue 1B, the last sentence that begins "FPL believes that approval of its proposed risk-sharing plan" should be deleted.

24

25

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Is that the entire sentence to 1 2 be deleted? 3 MR. BUTLER: Yes, the entire sentence would be 4 That's right. deleted. 5 On Issue 2, the statement of position would be 6 deleted down to after "oil," end paren, comma, on the beginning 7 of Page 14. You go up to the top of 14 after it starts on the 8 bottom of 13, it says, "oil," end paren, comma, and then "the 9 gains from." 10 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Yes. I see where --11 MR. BUTLER: The sentence which starts with capital "T," "the gains from futures contracts." 12 13 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: And you'll delete everything 14 prior to "the gains from"? 15 MR. BUTLER: That's right. In the position on --16 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Before we move on. does 17 everyone have that? I know that there's different page 18 numbering on the different versions of draft prehearing orders. On my version, it's on the bottom of Page 14. But it's my 19 20 understanding that Florida Power & Light would delete the 21 entire first portion. And if you would look at the bottom of 22 their statement of position on Issue 2 after the words "fuel oil" in parentheses, you will see the words "the gains from 23 24 futures contracts." The position would start off with the 25 words "the gains from;" is that correct?

1 MR. BUTLER: That's right, yes, sir. 2 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Does everyone have that change 3 on their versions of the prehearing order? All right. 4 What about Tampa Electric Company? Do you have --5 MR. BUTLER: Not done yet. 6 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: You still have more for 7 Florida Power & Light? 8 MR. BUTLER: Yes. sorry. 9 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: All right. 10 MR. BUTLER: On Issue 3, it's essentially the same change. It's on my Page 15, but all down to -- in the fourth 11 line from the bottom where again there's residual fuel oil, end 12 13 paren, comma, strike down through there and start with "the 14 premiums received for options contracts." 15 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: If you could, please repeat 16 that for me. 17 MR. BUTLER: Okay. Everything would be struck in FPL's position down to the four lines from the bottom. There's 18 19 a parenthetical that ends "residual fuel oil," end paren, 20 comma. It would then start with "the premiums received for 21 options contracts." 22 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Does everyone have that? We 23 are basically deleting about the first two-thirds of FPL's 24 position as stated in the draft and starting off with the words 25 "the premiums received."

MR. BUTLER: On Issue 4, which is on my Page 16, the last two lines where it says "irrespective of whether the Commission approves FPL's proposed risk-sharing program" would be struck. So the statement of position would end with "fuel adjustment clause," period.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: All right.

MR. BUTLER: On Issue 7A on the top of Page 18, for me, the position there should be struck and replaced by the same position as FPL's statement of basic position that I read earlier.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Thank you.

MR. BUTLER: And finally, Issue 7B, the same thing. The entire position should be struck, and the statement of basic position substituted.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Thank you. And before we move on to Tampa Electric Company's changes and/or corrections, Staff, you had mentioned to me that there may be a change that needs to be made on one of the issues. Why don't we take care of that now, make sure there are no objections to that change? And I'd like to make sure we do that now so that all the parties can make sure that their positions correspond to the change in the wording of the issue.

MR. KEATING: What Staff would propose is a change in the wording of Issue 2. For the parties' benefit, Staff realizes that on Issues 2, 3, and 4 we discuss regulatory

treatment for gains and losses on futures contracts for options premiums and for transaction costs, and another type of transaction that's come up in discovery and in discussions has been swaps which is not explicitly covered. Regulatory treatment for swaps settlements is not explicitly covered in these issues, so we would propose to add it to Issue 2, which looks to be as good a place as any, and reword the issue to say: What is the appropriate regulatory treatment for gains and losses on futures contracts and net settlements associated with swaps an investor-owned electric utilities incurs from hedging fuel and purchased power transactions?

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: So basically what we're doing is adding other transactions such as swaps that a utility can utilize in order to hedge or minimum risk.

MR. KEATING: Right.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Does any party have any objection to that modification of Issue 2? Hearing no objection, we will go ahead and allow that modification, and that will be the current wording on Issue 2. And that will give the parties a little more flexibility to talk about some of these other mechanisms.

MR. BEASLEY: I'd like to reserve the right to see that issue and make sure that our position squares with it, but we'll be happy to work with the Staff on making sure our position is properly stated.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: All right. You have no 1 2 objection to the issue. You just want to make sure that you 3 can correspond your position to the issue. 4 MR. BEASLEY: That's right. 5 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Staff, there's no problem 6 there. is there? MR. KEATING: No. We will -- understanding that this 7 8 is a new wording of the issue and that some of these positions 9 may need to change to reflect that, we will get with the 10 parties after the prehearing --11 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: And if you could, let the 12 parties see that in black and white as soon as possible --13 MR. KEATING: Yes. 14 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: -- so they can do whatever they need to to modify their positions on Issue 2. 15 16 All right. With that, we'll go ahead and ask Tampa 17 Electric Company to outline any changes. 18 MR. BEASLEY: Commissioner Palecki, we don't have any changes at this time. There have been some discussions among 19 20 the parties and the Staff. And if those discussions come to 21 fruition, we'd like to reserve the right to modify our position 22 on the issues to reflect that, but at this time we have no 23 changes. 24 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Certainly. I understand that 25 some of the parties are still engaged in discussions with

1 Staff. I just want to let you know that myself and the other 2 Commissioners very much appreciate the fact that you're working 3 and making efforts to try to resolve some of these issues. 4 Staff, there's no problem there, is there? 5 MR. KEATING: I'm sorry? 6 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Is there any problem with 7 allowing the parties the opportunity to modify positions based 8 upon their discussions? I understand they're supposed to be 9 meeting immediately following this prehearing conference. MR. KEATING: Correct. We've met this morning and 10 11 are going to continue our meeting this afternoon to see if we 12 can get any further towards a resolution of the issues in the 13 docket. 14 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: All right. 15 MR. KEATING: So I don't see any problem with allowing the flexibility for parties to change their positions 16 if something can be agreed to. 17 18 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Good. And that's true for all parties, not just for Tampa Electric Company. 19 20 Gulf Power. 21 MR. BADDERS: We have one change and one addition. 22 The change is on Issue 1C at Line 19. That line begins "savings for customers." Insert the word "is" after 23 24 "customers." So that entire sentence will read. "This 25 incentive to manage the program in a manner that achieves

1 savings for customers is in exchange for the company's 2 willingness to provide certain caps on the customers' exposure 3 under the proposed hedging program." 4 On Issue Number 2 --5 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Let's make sure everyone has 6 that. Does everyone have that change to Issue Number 1? 7 All right. Issue Number 2. 8 MR. BADDERS: To coincide with the change made by 9 Staff, we will insert "or swaps" after "through futures" on 10 Line 2. 11 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: On Issue 2 and that would be 12 on the first sentence? 13 MR. BADDERS: Yes. sir. COMMISSIONER PALECKI: "Through futures," and you 14 15 would insert the words "or swaps." 16 MR. BADDERS: "Or swaps." 17 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Thank you. 18 MR. BADDERS: That is all the corrections we have. 19 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Thank you. 20 Florida Power & Light. 21 MR. HALL: Yes. sir. I would note that there is no 22 position for Florida Power noted on Issue 7B, and that I have 23 provided Mr. Keating with a statement of our position on that issue. And also, we would also like to include that we reserve 24 25 the right on Issue 2 to look at that issue as restated and make

1	any necessary changes and also to make any necessary changes
2	that may be occasioned by the ongoing settlement discussions.
3	COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Certainly.
4	MR. BUTLER: Commissioner Palecki, I'm sorry, I think
5	you just referred to his company as "Florida Power & Light."
6	COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Oh, I'm sorry.
7	MR. BUTLER: I just wanted to make sure for the
8	record that you were talking about Florida Power Corporation.
9	COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Florida Power Corporation.
10	MR. HALL: That's who I was talking about.
11	COMMISSIONER PALECKI: We should make that clear for
12	the record. Thank you, Mr. Butler.
13	MR. BUTLER: Thank you.
14	COMMISSIONER PALECKI: And let me make sure I'm
15	clear. On Issue is it Issue Number 1? I'm sorry, there was
16	one issue you said that you had no
17	MR. HALL: There is the prehearing order the draft
18	prehearing order does not reflect a position for Florida Power
19	Corp for Issue 7B, and I just wanted to note that we have
20	provided that this morning to Mr. Keating.
21	COMMISSIONER PALECKI: So you've provided that to
22	Staff. Have you provided a copy of that to the court reporter?
23	MR. HALL: No, but I have one here.
24	COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Good. If you could provide
25	that to the court reporter I'd appreciate it

1 MR. HALL: Yes. sir. 2 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: All right. Office of Public 3 Counsel. 4 MR. VANDIVER: We have no changes at this time, but 5 we would also like to reserve the right to make our changes 6 consistent with the changed Issue 2 --7 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Certainly. 8 MR. VANDIVER: -- and incorporate whatever ongoing 9 discussions may take place. 10 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Good. And FIPUG. 11 MR. McWHIRTER: Ditto. 12 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: All right. Thank you. All 13 right. So we've gone through the positions of the parties 14 except for Staff. 15 Staff, do you have any changes or corrections? 16 MR. KEATING: Staff has no changes or corrections to 17 its position at this point. Of course, if we do come to a 18 proposed resolution of -- not a proposed resolution but an 19 actual resolution of the issues, I'm sure that our positions 20 may change accordingly. 21 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Thank you. Okay. Let's go to Section IX, exhibits. And why don't I go through the exhibit 22 23 llist in the order in which the witnesses are proffered? And I see that we have Mr. Portuondo with Florida Power Corporation 24 25 first. Are there any changes, additions, modifications?

1 MR. HALL: No. sir. 2 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Okay. Next, Korel M. Dubin 3 with Florida Power & Light and Joseph Stepenovitch -- how is 4 that pronounced? 5 No changes. MR. BUTLER: 6 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: No changes. All right. 7 (Laughter.) 8 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Gulf Power. W. N. McKenzie. 9 MR. BADDERS: We have no changes. 10 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Tampa Electric, Joann T. 11 Wehle. 12 MR. BEASLEY: No changes, sir. 13 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: FIPUG. 14 MR. McWHIRTER: No changes. COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Okay. Now, we have a Staff 15 16 witness. Todd Bohrmann. 17 MR. KEATING: No changes. And this may be the 18 appropriate point for Staff to bring this up. If we do not reach a resolution informally of the issue -- Staff doesn't 19 20 tend to use various discovery responses provided by the parties 21 as exhibits -- we will attempt to work with the parties on this 22 list to see if -- on those particular items to see if those are 23 matters that can be stipulated into the record at hearing. 24 And we will get with the parties -- I will get with 25 the parties this afternoon to provide them with the specific

1 discovery responses that Staff is going to ask their permission 2 to stipulate into the record, if possible. 3 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Good. Well. we appreciate 4 those efforts. If you can get the exhibits stipulated 5 beforehand, it would save a lot of time for the Commission at 6 the hearing, so we appreciate that. 7 Let's look at the rebuttal witnesses. And we'll 8 start off with Florida Power & Light and it's Stepenovitch. 9 Isn't that not correct? 10 MR. BUTLER: That is correct. And the exhibits are 11 correct. 12 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Well, why don't I ask -- well, 13 there's only one witness listed under rebuttal, and so no 14 changes at all --15 MR. BUTLER: No. 16 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: -- in the rebuttal section? 17 All right. Are there any proposed stipulations? Are 18 there any pending motions? 19 Now, I see there are numerous pending confidentiality 20 matters. Staff, where do we stand on these confidentialities? 21 MR. KEATING: We have listed here seven pending 22 confidentiality requests. I know that an eighth has been 23 recently filed towards the end of last week that's not 24 reflected on this list. Four of the requests come from each of 25 the four IOUs with regard to information included in Staff's

1 mana
2 for
3 orde
4 requ
5 whic
6 case
7 Corp
8

management audit of the utilities' risk management procedures for fuel procurement. Those are in the process of having an order drafted as well as the other three confidentiality requests that are listed here in this draft prehearing order which relate to either responses to Staff discovery or, in one case, Florida Power Corporation -- part of Florida Power Corporation's proposed hedging program.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: When you say the orders will be issued shortly, you're still not expecting that they'll be issued prior to the hearing, or are you?

MR. KEATING: I would expect that we will have orders drafted on the two -- at least if not all of these are done, at least on the two items that are discovery responses to Staff. In the event that any of that information -- any party wishes to use that information at hearing, and most definitely with respect to Florida Power's request for a portion of its hedging program, that is clearly something that will become part of the record.

With respect to the four requests regarding the Staff management audit, I believe those are not -- do not necessarily need to be resolved prior to the hearing. I don't anticipate that that material would be used at hearing and would need a ruling prior to hearing. However, Staff is working towards getting those orders drafted prior to the hearing as well.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Thank you. Let me ask the

1 parties: Do any of the parties anticipate any difficulty if 2 these pending requests for confidentiality are not ruled upon 3 prior to the hearing? Will there be any evidentiary problems 4 that we anticipate? 5 MR. BUTLER: No. 6 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: No? 7 MR. BEASLEY: Not for us. 8 MR. BADDERS: Not for us. 9 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Good. All right. Thank you. 10 MR. BUTLER: Before you leave that section, 11 Commissioner Palecki. I would note that FPL has a discovery 12 response to Staff due today for which we will be filing a 13 notice of intent to request confidential classification, but I do not see that as raising any evidentiary problems for the 14 15 hearing. 16 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: All right. Thank you. Staff. do you have -- anticipate any evidentiary problems from those 17 18 pending discovery matters? I know that you're asking for 19 discovery to get information that you may wish to enter at the 20 Is that something you can work out with the parties? hearing. 21 MR. KEATING: Yes. I believe it is. 22 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Thank you. Okay. Are there 23 any other matters? Anything else whatsoever? 24 MR. McWHIRTER: Mr. Chairman, Florida Power & Light 25 from Mr. Butler's statement apparently has made a fairly

significant change in its position. The testimony of both Mr. Stepenovitch and Ms. Dubin relates to a program that will appear to now be abandoned. It would facilitate cross-examination of those witnesses if the testimony could be redacted to eliminate the portions of that testimony and the portions of the exhibit that are now obviated by the new position, if I understood the new position correctly. It also might entail changes in our testimony.

MR. BUTLER: We're not prepared to make the redactions, but I think we could agree that portions of the testimony that relate to issues that we would not be supporting, we could eliminate and certainly not have that subject to hearing.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Well, how can we work this out so that FIPUG does not have to cross-examine on various portions of issues that are no longer at issue? I understand you don't want to redact, but how can we make this a workable situation?

MR. BUTLER: Actually, I'm saying I think we can redact. I can't do it as I sit here right now --

MR. McWHIRTER: No, I wouldn't want you to do that.

MR. BUTLER: -- but I think we can do that. And we can do it before the hearing. I would think probably within the next, you know, couple of days we can do that, and it certainly would give Mr. McWhirter time to decide what he needs

to cross-examine.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Good. Yes. If you could, please contact Mr. McWhirter, and just let him know when he can expect to see those changes, we'd appreciate it. And then you'll provide those to the other parties as well, I assume?

MR. BUTLER: Certainly.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Thank you. Is there anything else?

MR. BADDERS: Yes, Commissioner Palecki. It appears -- I may be wrong, but it appears that Issues 2, 3, and 4, that we're all in agreement. Am I correct about that?

MR. KEATING: I'm not entirely sure. And the reason why is, Staff has taken the position that gains and losses on -- sorry, gains and losses on futures contracts, net swaps settlements, options premiums, and transactions costs involved with those types of transactions should be allowed for recovery through the fuel clause if they are -- if they have been prudently incurred.

In discovery, there has been -- from certain witnesses we had certain hesitation as to whether the witnesses would agree that cost recovery should be limited to prudently incurred costs in that area. That's my only hesitation.

Otherwise, it seems to me that the parties are generally in agreement that these types of costs should be allowed through the fuel and purchased power cost recovery clause. It's just a

matter of whether we can all agree that they're subject to prudence review.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Well, let's talk to the parties. Do you have any problem with the Staff's position that these expenditures can be recovered under the fuel clause if they are prudently incurred?

MR. BADDERS: We are not asking for anything imprudent to be approved, and we can live with Staff's language.

MR. BEASLEY: As can we.

MR. BUTLER: As --

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Florida Power & Light.

MR. BUTLER: -- can we. Yes, for FPL.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Florida Power Corporation?

All right. FIPUG, do you have any --

MR. McWHIRTER: FIPUG has a phraseology concern that I raised with Staff this morning. The way it is stated is that the utility can recover the gains on hedging transactions and can recover the premiums that they receive for contracts that they sell, and that customers will pick up the cost of premiums that they pay and the losses. And our understanding of the case as was originally presented was that it was a win-win situation for the utilities. It was explained to me this morning and I think the idea is -- and I broach it now because we're still using the word "recovery" -- that anytime there's a

profit on a hedging transaction, that profit is credited to the benefit of the customer's account in the fuel clause, and anytime there's a cost. the customers bear the total cost. With that -- if that's what everybody has agreed upon, then we don't have any problem with stipulating to those two issues. COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Well, let me get back to the other parties and find out if that's satisfactory. You've heard Mr. McWhirter. MR. BUTLER: We discussed --

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: I'm not sure I understand the distinction between what you've stated, Mr. McWhirter, and what the Staff has stated, but do the parties have any objection to that?

MR. BUTLER: Commissioner Palecki, in the meeting we had this morning, as I understand Mr. McWhirter's concern, he wants to make sure that if there are -- basically if there are gains, that those are credited to the benefit of the customers, you know, sort of as the parallel to if there are losses or costs, that those are charged to the customers. And FPL understood that to be Staff's position, and it is our position. We think it ought to work both says.

MR. BEASLEY: Same with Tampa Electric.

MR. BADDERS: We're in agreement also.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: All right. And Florida Power Corporation?

MR. HALL: We can agree with Staff's position on Number 3. I don't think we're at this point prepared to stipulate to Staff's position on 2, but we will continue those discussions.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: All right. And why don't we show that we have a stipulation on Issue 3? Florida Power Corporation, if you could continue to discuss Issues 1 and 2 with Staff, we would appreciate it.

And, Staff, if you do come to a stipulation on those issues, if you could, please conform the final order on procedure to indicate that there is a stipulation on those issues, if you reach a stipulation. And what I mean -- actually, I should be more clear -- the final version of the prehearing order that you'll take to me for my signature.

MR. KEATING: Understood. And I think -- just to be clear, I think that Mr. McWhirter will find that the Staff positions on Issues 2, 3, and 4 as stated in the draft prehearing order are perhaps a little more artfully worded than the document we were discussing this morning and make it more clear that we would be covering gains and losses through the clause.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: All right. Office of Public Counsel, we haven't heard from you on that --

MR. VANDIVER: I think our position would be consistent with what Mr. McWhirter said.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: All right. Is there anything else, anything further from any of the parties? Staff?

MR. KEATING: I would just point out that in Florida Power & Light's changes to some of its positions, it references a proposed resolution of issues that's been the subject of some discussion today and will continue to be the subject of some discussions after the prehearing conference. It may -- to add the appropriate context to the positions that Florida Power & Light has taken, I'm not sure what they have in mind as to include that proposed resolution as part of this prehearing order for the Commissioner's reference. It seems to me that that may make more clear what the position actually is that they're taking.

MR. BUTLER: I think that would be a good idea because the one that we're referencing is actually what I think is described as the second version of the proposal. There may be other versions after today, and to get the proper frame of reference, I concur with Mr. Keating's suggestion.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Do all the parties concur?

MR. BADDERS: I don't have any objection for him attaching it with regard to his position, but it's not something that we've agreed to at this point.

MR. BEASLEY: That would apply with respect to Tampa Electric, although we're hopeful that we can come to a resolution.

MR. HALL: And that's also Florida Power's position. 1 2 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: All right. 3 MR. KEATING: And that's pretty much what I had in 4 mind, was simply to flush out what Florida Power & Light's 5 position was and perhaps not to indicate that that proposed 6 resolution is anything that anybody else has agreed to at this 7 point. 8 MR. McWHIRTER: I think that's procedurally 9 appropriate. 10 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: All right. 11 MR. KEATING: If I have Mr. McWhirter's approval, 12 then I think that's a good idea. 13 COMMISSIONER PALECKI: I don't think there's any 14 objection from any of the parties. There is -- well, there's actually two other matters I'd like to discuss. The first one 15 16 has to do with whether we take up direct and rebuttal at the 17 same time. That is almost always my preference, that we have 18 the witness go ahead and do both direct and rebuttal, but if 19 there are any extraordinary circumstances or complicated, 20 difficult issues that require that they be done separately, I'd 21 like to hear them. 22 Staff, I think -- had you indicated that you would 23 like to see separate direct and rebuttal, and if so, why? 24 MR. KEATING: I don't think that Staff would have a 25 strong preference one way or the other.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Do any of the parties have a preference? Because if not, we'll go ahead and take up direct and rebuttal at the same time unless any party has an objection.

MR. BADDERS: While we would prefer to take them in the normal course, we won't object, but I think it may be somewhat confusing if our witness gets on the stand and starts talking about some of the issues if they haven't already been discussed by that witness who he's rebutting. It may work out in the normal course of the witnesses, but I haven't been able to read through that to make sure.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Well, why don't I do this?

I'll strongly encourage the parties to take up both direct and rebuttal at the same time; however, if you find it's necessary to do them separately, we will grant you leave to do that.

MR. BADDERS: Thank you.

MR. KEATING: Commissioner, just to add another point to that discussion. It may be -- and we may have to see how the hearing actually goes, but if we are to allow Witness Gooch for FIPUG to testify on the first day if we are running short on time, it may be that addressing the direct and rebuttal separately would better allow him to increase his chances of being done on the first day.

COMMISSIONER PALECKI: Well, we'll take that up when we come to it. And that brings me into the next issue I wanted

to discuss. This hearing is scheduled for two days, August 12th and 13th. And it's my understanding that there's a very good possibility that we can finish this hearing in one day. I think there are many fewer contested issues today than there were a couple months ago, and just wanted encourage the parties so that anything the parties could do to move this hearing along so we can finish in a single day would be appreciated. And I think you should all come to this hearing with the expectation that we'll finish in a day, and that if we need to go late, we'll go late into the early evening hours, if necessary. All right. Does anyone have anything else? I adjourn the prehearing conference. (Prehearing conference concluded at 2:20 p.m.)

1	STATE OF FLORIDA)
2	: CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
3	COUNTY OF LEON)
4	T TRICIA D-MARTE OCC: 1 TO 1 TO 1 TO 1 TO 1
5	I, TRICIA DeMARTE, Official Commission Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.
6	
7 8	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said
9	proceedings.
9 10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee,
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' attorneys or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in
12	the action.
13	DATED THIS 7th DAY OF AUGUST, 2002.
14	Line Demont
15	Fricia DeMarte TRICIA DEMARTE
16	FPSC Official Commission Reporter (850) 413-6736
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	