
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

APPEARANCES: HARRY W. LONG. JR., ESQUIRE, Assistant General Counsel, Regulatory Affairs, Tampa Electric Company, P. O. Box 111, Tampa, Florida 33601, appearing on behalf of Tampa Electric Company. JOHN W. MCWHIRTER, JR., ESQUIRE, McWhirter. Reeves, McGlothlin, Davidson, Decker, Kaufman & Arnold, P.A., 400 North Tampa Street, Suite 2450, Tampa, Florida 33601-3350; VICKI GORDON KAUFMAN, ESQUIRE, McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin, Davidson, Decker, Kaufman & Arnold, P.A., 117 S. Gadsden Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of Cargill Fertilizer, Inc. ROSANNE GERVASI. ESQUIRE and JENNIFER A. RODAN. ESQUIRE, FPSC General Counsel's Office, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, appearing on behalf of the Commission Staff.

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 COMMISSIONER BAEZ: We'll call this hearing to order. 3 Ms. Gervasi, would you read the notice, please. 4 MS. GERVASI: Pursuant to notice, this time and place 5 has been set for a hearing in Docket Number 020898-EQ. petition 6 by Cargill Fertilizer, Inc. for permanent approval of 7 self-service wheeling to, from, and between points within Tampa Electric Company's service area. 8 9 COMMISSIONER BAEZ: And we'll take appearances 10 starting here. 11 MR. LONG: Harry W. Long appearing on behalf of Tampa 12 Electric Company. 13 MS. KAUFMAN: Vicki Gordon Kaufman and John 14 McWhirter, and with us is Mr. Roger Fernandez, and we're here on behalf of Cargill Fertilizer, Inc. 15 16 COMMISSIONER BAEZ: Thank you. 17 MS. GERVASI: Rosanne Gervasi and Jennifer Rodan 18 appearing on behalf of the Commission. 19 COMMISSIONER BAEZ: Thank you, Ms. Gervasi. Are 20 there any preliminary matters? 21 MS. GERVASI: There is. Commissioners, I'm happy to 22 be able to tell you that after a lot of hard work and effort on the part of both parties, Cargill and TECO have entered into a 23

joint settlement agreement, and they are today filing a joint

motion for approval of that settlement agreement. For this

24

25

2

3 4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

reason, and the parties agree, there is no need for a full evidentiary hearing this morning after all.

Staff has reviewed the agreement, and it is our recommendation that the agreement is fair and reasonable and that it should be granted. It's a good workable compromise on behalf of both parties.

COMMISSIONER BAEZ: Thank you, Ms. Gervasi. Commissioners, what's your pleasure on this? We do have -you've been provided copies of the settlement and of the joint motion. It is within our discretion to either take this up as a panel here at the bench today, or we can also -- we also have the option of setting it for an agenda, and I'm just curious as to what your thoughts might be.

COMMISSIONER DAVIDSON: My thought would be, if staff has reviewed the agreement and is comfortable with its terms and the parties are comfortable with its terms, that we issue a decision approving the settlement agreement by a bench decision this morning.

COMMISSIONER BAEZ: Okay. Commissioner Bradley.

COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: I would concur with that.

COMMISSIONER BAEZ: Very well. Would it be productive for you to have the parties at least summarize for the record the terms of the agreement?

COMMISSIONER DAVIDSON: It would. And I had one additional question --

COMMISSIONER BAEZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DAVIDSON: -- which is one that's asked often by the Commissioners. If there is some allegation of breach or nonperformance of a term of the settlement agreement, are there dispute resolution proceedings, or is that going to come back to the Commission? Thanks.

COMMISSIONER BAEZ: Well, you have a question before you, but, Mr. Long and Ms. Kaufman or Mr. McWhirter, we're going to give you a chance to give your take on the negotiations and the agreement, and then you have a question before you, each of you, from Commissioner Davidson.

MR. LONG: Thank you, Commissioner. Well,

Mr. Long, you can go ahead and start.

Commissioner Davidson, in response to your question, I presume that if the parties have any difficulties in performing under the settlement, that those matters would be brought back to the

Commission for review and resolution, but it's our hope that there certainly wouldn't be any problems of that kind.

Let me start by saying I'd like to thank the staff very much for their assistance, especially in the last few days. I think without the persistent and dedicated efforts of the staff, it's doubtful that we would have been able to reach an agreement that I think at this point both parties are comfortable with.

As a general matter I'll describe what the essence of

the arrangement is and then invite Cargill to supplement that in any way appropriate. As you know, the docket that is pending involved a request for self-service wheeling by Cargill, and essentially Cargill wanted to have the benefit of its QF generation to use, first, to avoid interruptions, to avoid the need, when possible, to purchase optional provision power, and then to support itself during times of planned and unplanned outages of its QF facility or its sulfuric acid plant.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In essence, what the parties have done is we've come up with an alternative arrangement that we believe accomplishes those objectives for Cargill without the necessity for wheeling of any kind. And in its simplest form what we've agreed is that, first of all, during those periods when Cargill might otherwise be subject to interruption or the need to purchase optional provision power, they can tender to Tampa Electric power from one of three QF facilities, and simultaneously they will be eligible to purchase an equivalent amount of power from Tampa Electric's system supply to be delivered to one of the three designated loads covered by the agreement. effect, they would get the benefit of their generation, although their generation is not being transported. There's a separate purchase transaction and a separate sale from Tampa Electric's system supply. Basically the price paid for the power purchased from Cargill will be the same as the price paid

for the power sold by Tampa Electric plus an appropriate adder that the parties have agreed to.

Now, in circumstances where Cargill is not facing the threat of interruption or the need to purchase optional provision power, it's been agreed that they can again simultaneously tender for sale to Tampa Electric from these same three QF facilities up to 8,000 megawatt hours of power in any annual period. And, again, Tampa Electric will simultaneously sell power to be delivered at the one of three sites designated by Cargill. And, again, the pricing is the same. The price paid for the power purchased from Cargill will be the same as the price of the Tampa Electric system power sold plus an appropriate adder.

In the case of the transaction that takes place when there is no threat of interruption or the need to purchase optional provision power, the adder that we've agreed to is somewhat larger than the adder that would apply in the case of interruption or they need to purchase optional provision power, but in principle, the transaction works the same way. And we believe that since the sale to Cargill is a bundled sale from Tampa Electric's system resources in effect, that this is a transaction that is solely within the jurisdiction of the Florida Public Service Commission and does not involve unbundled wheeling, which, as we had discussed before, would otherwise be subject to service under a FERC-approved tariff.

If the Commission adopts the settlement as proposed, it's the intention of the parties to make the appropriate filings with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to terminate the transmission service agreement under the FERC tariff that governs -- currently governs self-service wheeling for Cargill.

So, Commissioners, that is, in essence, the deal. If you have questions, we'd certainly like to try to answer them.

And if Cargill has anything they'd like to add, I'd invite them to do so.

COMMISSIONER BAEZ: Ms. Kaufman.

MS. KAUFMAN: Thank you, Commissioners. First of all, we want to echo Mr. Long's initial comments, and we want to really thank the staff for helping the parties reach this agreement. We've all spent two long nights, Monday and Tuesday, and your staff was with us all the way. So sometimes it just takes that extra nudge, you know, late in the day, but nonetheless, as Mr. Long said, we think we have an agreement that's very workable.

Cargill is very pleased because, as you know, QF generation is very efficient, and it's encouraged by the Legislature and by your own rules, and Cargill is very pleased that it will be able to utilize this sort of generation in its operations and its processes.

I want to respond to Commissioner Davidson. I agree

with Mr. Long. I'm very hopeful there will be no disputes. If a dispute were to arise, I'm also hopeful that in the first instance we would discuss it with our colleagues at Tampa Electric and try to reach an accommodation. Barring that, of course, I think we would come back to you, and you would have jurisdiction to make a decision in regard to the settlement agreement.

Mr. Fernandez, with your indulgence, has a comment or two that he would like to make.

MR. FERNANDEZ: Well, the first one is absolutely certain that I don't believe we'll be here sitting on the same side of the table without the encouragement of the staff and their active participation and using their brains and their knowledge to try and help us bring together. So I thank them very much. And certainly I think that it takes two to tango, so the colleagues, the representatives from Tampa Electric and the counsel that have supported our company have a lot to do with the fact that we're here today with a proposal that I think -- while not doing everything that we would have liked and probably not what TECO would have liked, it's -- it allows us to conduct our business of making phosphate fertilizer in the state of Florida. We appreciate it very much.

COMMISSIONER BAEZ: Thank you, Mr. Fernandez.

Commissioners, do you have any other questions?

COMMISSIONER DAVIDSON: No.

1	COMMISSIONER BAEZ: All right. We can entertain a
2	motion.
3	COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: I think that we probably have
4	a motion on the table, but maybe Commissioner
5	COMMISSIONER BAEZ: Oh, I'm sorry.
6	COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Davidson might like to
7	formalize it.
8	COMMISSIONER DAVIDSON: It wasn't a motion, but
9	COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Well, I will make the motion.
10	I move that we accept the agreement between the two parties,
11	and that's it.
12	COMMISSIONER BAEZ: And grant the joint motion
13	COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: And grant the joint motion,
14	yes.
15	COMMISSIONER BAEZ: just to be clear. Very well.
16	There's a motion.
17	COMMISSIONER DAVIDSON: Second.
18	COMMISSIONER BAEZ: And a second. All those in favor
19	say "aye."
20	(Simultaneous affirmative vote.)
21	COMMISSIONER BAEZ: I just want to take a moment to
22	thank the parties. I know that a lot of kudos have been passed
23	on to the staff, and I want to join them in doing that. But I
24	think this particular case is a prime example of how it pays
25	not to give up on the settlement process and not to give up on

the alternative dispute resolution, as Commissioner Davidson has -- this case has been docketed for guite some time now. And I can remember at least two separate occasions where a hearing has been continued in order that the parties might keep discussing the issues to try and come to some resolution, and $\ensuremath{\mathrm{I}}$ think that's a great sign that the parties never did give up on trying to resolve those issues. And I want to commend you, and I also want to commend staff again for their gentle nudging, as Ms. Kaufman put it. Congratulations all around. Thank you very much.

Ms. Gervasi, if there's nothing else --

MS. GERVASI: There is one small housekeeping matter --

COMMISSIONER BAEZ: Okay.

MS. GERVASI: -- and that is the matter of the petition to intervene that was filed in the docket on October the 17th by the Southern Alliance For Clean Energy, Inc. I spoke with the petitioner, and he explained to me that the purpose for filing intervention was to be able to file a brief if briefs were to be filed. And I let him know that all indications at that point were that the case would settle and that there would be no need for the filing of briefs. And he agreed then that if that were the case, that we could simply just state in the order that there is no need for a ruling on that petition.

1	COMMISSIONER BAEZ: If you want to handle I just
2	have one question. Would it be cleaner just to have them
3	withdraw their petition at this point or it's just I mean,
4	we can note in the order that the petition is moot.
5	MS. GERVASI: And I did suggest that they withdraw
6	it, Commissioner, and he said he'd just prefer for the order to
7	state that it simply need not be ruled upon.
8	COMMISSIONER BAEZ: Very well.
9	COMMISSIONER DAVIDSON: To make it clean, I can move
10	that the petition to intervene is rendered moot.
11	COMMISSIONER BRADLEY: Second.
12	COMMISSIONER BAEZ: All right. All those in favor.
13	(Simultaneous affirmative vote.)
14	MS. GERVASI: Thank you.
15	COMMISSIONER BAEZ: Great. You can make the proper
16	notations.
17	Anything else?
18	MS. GERVASI: No, sir.
19	COMMISSIONER BAEZ: Having nothing else before the
20	Commission, this hearing is adjourned. Thank you to all. Have
21	a great day.
22	(Hearing concluded at 9:55 a.m.)
23	
24	
25	

1	STATE OF FLORIDA)
2	: CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
3	COUNTY OF LEON)
4	T TOTAL DEMANTE DDD OCC. TO O TO DO TO TO
5	I, TRICIA DeMARTE, RPR, Official Commission Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.
6	•
7	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this
8	transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.
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 22nd DAY OF OCTOBER, 2003.
14	Line Dinat
15	FPSC Official Commission Reporter (850) 413-6736
16	(850) 413-6736
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22 23	
23 24	
25	