POCUMENT NUMBER IN AS

1		BEFORE THE				
2	FLORIDA	PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION				
3	In the Matter of:					
4		DOCKET NO. 110138-EI				
5	PETITION FOR INCREASE IN RATES BY GULF POWER COMPANY.					
6		/				
7						
8	710	TIME 12 Corrected				
9	VOLUME 13 - Corrected (CORRECTED AS TO RENUMBERING OF TRANSCRIPT PAGES ONLY)					
10						
11	Pag	es 2489 through 2549				
12	PROCEEDINGS:	HEARING				
13 14 15	COMMISSIONERS PARTICIPATING:	CHAIRMAN ART GRAHAM COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISÉ COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS				
16		COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN				
17	DATE:	Thursday, December 15, 2011				
18	TIME:	Concluded at 11:50 a.m.				
19	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148				
20		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida				
21	REPORTED BY:	·				
22	REPORTED BI.	LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6732				
23		, ,				
24	APPEARANCES:	(As heretofore noted.)				
25						

1			E	XHIBITS			
2	NUMBER:					ID.	ADMTD.
3	187						2545
4	188						2589
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
		FLORIDA	PUBLIC	SERVICE	COMMISSION		

2.2

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Good morning, everyone. I tell you what, I, I slept like a dead dog last night for about a good, solid seven and a half hours. It felt great. I got up and went to the gym this morning. I feel pretty fantastic. And maybe what it is, because this is the last day that I have to hold this thing in my hand. This is it.

(Laughter.)

So that all being said, we teed up a lot of things before we left, a lot of options and a lot of what-ifs.

Mr. Stone, since you seem to be at the helm of a lot of this, let's hear what your thoughts are, and then I'll see where I need to leap off from there.

MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, I would hesitate to guess at which questions I should lead off with. I did such a bad job answering one question yesterday that I would, I would rather be reminded which question you would like me to try and answer.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: All right. Let's see if one of the Commissioners want to start off. I mean, I don't have a problem starting. But, you know, let's, let's see what some of the thought processes were, because, you know, we dumped a lot of stuff on people and told

them to go home to think about it.

Commissioner Brown.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: I'd be happy to start off some questions, really for Staff. So I don't know which one of you want to answer this, but we heard a lot of discussion yesterday about Staff's opinion on using the MDS methodology. Do you categorically oppose use of the methodology?

MS. KUMMER: No, ma'am, we do not. MDS by its nature -- it's a model. It requires you to allocate some costs that you can't separate out through accounting. Staff has some concerns or some questions, I guess, about some of the assumptions that are used in that model. But this is not to say that we would never approve an MDS. It's going to depend on the individual situation.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: And a more thorough detailed analysis of the pros and cons?

MS. KUMMER: We, we believe that the

Commission -- well, I view Staff's role as providing you

with information so that you can make a thoroughly

reasoned, sound, factually sound decision.

I think that is better accomplished in this case, because it is a complex issue, by allowing Staff to present a written recommendation that will present

pros and cons. It will draw from the information that has been included in the record. It will provide a road map, if you will, connecting the discovery that has been presented. It's sometimes a little hard to wade through all that stuff if you're not knee deep into it like technical staff is. And I think it will make you more comfortable with whatever decision you make.

commissioner brown: Thank you. And about the evidence in the record, in addition to the prefiled testimony and the exhibits, what other evidence is in the record for us to evaluate using the MDS methodology?

MS. KLANCKE: Staff has conducted extensive depositions in this case, including the depositions of FIPUG's Witness Pollock, who is stipulated and not present at the hearing, whose deposition transcript and interrogatory responses were included in the record. Staff is putting together a list, but it's voluminous, of everything that deals with this issue that has been moved into the record in this case.

In addition, Witness Stowe were deposed, and Witness O'Sheasy was deposed. We think that those deposition transcripts are very beneficial, in addition to their prefiled testimony, which in and of itself contains an entire MDS study associated with the testimony of Witness O'Sheasy that needs careful

deliberation. And that's, and we believe that the process that we have in place with respect to that is the recommendation.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

MR. WILLIS: To go a little further,

Commissioner Brown, there's also about 80 production of

document requests and interrogatory requests that you'd

have to wade through. If you were to stack it up,

there's about close to six inches or better of material.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you.

MR. WILLIS: To give you an idea.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. Just a question for Mr. Stone and Mr. Moyle regarding economic development. We talked a lot about that, and obviously everyone in this room is a proponent for spurring on economic development.

My question for both of you, since you both addressed that issue, can you quantify the number of jobs created by using this methodology?

MR. STONE: That would require speculation on our part. We do know by comparison that the, the types of jobs that our sister company in Mississippi has been able to attract by having the cost causative principles of MDS reflected in their rate design, we believe that that will materialize on our system as well. It's a

question of when. And this, this would prove to be a tool that we would use, because by what we believe fairly allocating costs to all our customers, we believe that will put us in a posture where industrial customers could locate in our area, even in the midst of the troubling economic times that we're in, and that's what we're about.

2.2

I want to be clear. The company, the company's stake in this issue is to get the costs right. There are, there are no revenues to the company associated with the change in methodology, unless new economic activity occurs. And we believe it's in the best interest of all our customers, and that's what we're here for is to advocate on behalf of our customers.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: But you do have some of that information from your sister -- from Gulf's sister companies?

MR. STONE: We would -- we could try to assemble that to show -- I can't remember how long ago it was that they changed from a different cost of service methodology to one that incorporated MDS. We could try to go back and see if there's any historical evidence of that. I just don't know what -- I don't know what would be available, but we could certainly try

to do that.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Do all of the Southern Company's utility companies, do they all use the MDS methodology?

MR. STONE: I know that Mississippi does.

Quite frankly, I'm not familiar with Alabama's cost of service study or Georgia's cost of service study.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Moyle?

MR. MOYLE: I'll -- let me try to answer your question this way. I recently was at an event where the Governor's new chief of business development economics, I don't have the title right, but I think it's Gray Swoope, and I may not have the name right, but he came from Mississippi. And a very articulate gentleman, and he talked about the things that Florida was trying to do to lure business here.

And he got a question from somebody that said what, what are the things that are problematic? You know, you used to be doing this job for Mississippi, and you've kind of changed jerseys and are doing it for Florida now. What are the arguments that are used when you're competing or when you were competing against Florida?

And he talked about economic uncertainty in regulatory uncertainty. Economic uncertainty runs, you

know, not state lines, but permits and things like that.

I would venture to say that to the extent that you have such a wide disparity in energy rates, currently, as we sit here today, and I don't think that's disputed, I mean, the industrial rates are amongst the highest in the southeast, that if I or someone else were representing Alabama or particularly Mississippi, trying to lure a prospective new big business to the area, I would hammer really hard on, on the, you know, on the industrial rate segment and say, look, energy costs are a big part of your car factory. Here's the rates that you can be expecting to pay in Mississippi, and look what you'd be paying in Florida.

And, you know, everybody, there's an intangible about beaches and things like that, but big car companies, they got to report to shareholders and board members, and they will not lose focus of the bottom line. So from my view, to the extent that there's a wide disparity in a key cost component such as energy, it makes Florida less able to compete.

In terms of the number of jobs, I mean, you know, I think that will be realized at some future point. They're hard to quantify. But, you know, to the extent expansion takes off and people are pitched about energy rates that are less disparate than they are now,

I think that's a positive and I think it would attract jobs.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Quick question. Major

Thompson, I need to understand or try to understand,
when electricity is delivered to the various different
bases, do you guys own it once it comes to the -- do you
handle all the distribution of electricity, or does Gulf
have to come on base if there is a transformer that
blows or something else that happens?

MAJOR THOMPSON: I'm not sure about the Navy bases, but for some of the Air Force bases, they do have their own distribution system. That whenever it hits the gate, it becomes Air Force's. And I think Gulf may be able to speak to this a little bit better than me.

But in some cases that is the, the case.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: So you know on the Air Force base it is, but the Navy bases you're not sure?

MAJOR THOMPSON: I'm not sure about the Navy bases.

Can I speak to one thing about the economic development as well?

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Sure.

MAJOR THOMPSON: Because the FEA represents probably the largest employer in this, in this region, and the more money that the wing commanders and base

1	commanders have for a mission, that means there's a
2	bigger mission. The bigger mission you have, the more
3	troops you need. The more troops you have, the more
4	economic growth in this region. So I just wanted to
5	throw that out as also a possibility for you to consider
6	when choosing which method you want to go with.
7	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: When's the next BRAC process
8	coming up?
9	MAJOR THOMPSON: I'm not aware of one
10	scheduled to come up, but I didn't want to throw out
11	there that that's, that could be a possibility, but
12	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I thought I heard somebody
13	say something in the next four to six years, but
14	MAJOR THOMPSON: Well, with these large cuts,
15	I would imagine that there's going to be some pressure
16	on to do, to do another one.
17	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. So as far as we know,
18	there isn't anything scheduled?
19	MAJOR THOMPSON: I am not aware of one
20	scheduled.
21	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Thanks.
22	Commissioner Balbis.
23	COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
24	Just a few comments.
25	You know, obviously what's before us today, a

portion of this stipulation is a major shift in cost allocation procedures and policies. And this Commission, I think as recently as the fuel clause proceedings, when I believe it was Florida Public Utilities proposed a cost allocation methodology shift, we voted to deny that request because the information they provided was lacking, and it was after a thorough review, if I recall that decision.

So one thing that, that, again, this

Commission has done is taken a careful look at any major

changes in cost allocation methodology. And we're

presented today with a stipulation which would require

us to make that change without full information from

Staff to analyze it.

And I personally like stipulations. I know this Commission has made comments encouraging stipulations because, you know, with a stipulation we get certain things. We get, number one, the expediting of the process, whether the hearing time is reduced or any of the Agenda Conference is reduced. So some sort of efficiency with the stipulation.

Then we also get concessions that we may not have been able to get from any party. In this case we're offered a stipulation at the end of the hearing process. We have a -- what's included in this

stipulation is a change in cost allocation methodology
that I for one am not against what's proposed and I'm
not for it. And if, after a thorough review of the
record, we determine that that is the appropriate cost
allocation methodology, I am convinced that this
Commission will make that decision.

The other thing we're getting that's included in this stipulation are adjustments to their O&M costs. Again, this Commission has the ability, if we find O&M costs need to be adjusted based on the information that's in the record, we can make those adjustments, along with all of the other issues associated with this stipulation.

So I see what's before us is something that does not gain us any time. It does not necessarily gain us any concession that we could not get if we deem it appropriate. And I'm not comfortable with making a major shift without the full information on cost allocation methodology at this time.

MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, I have been given the information that you asked about with regard to the other states.

Georgia Power Company also employs the MDS methodology in its cost of service and rate design. So Georgia and Mississippi, two of our sister companies.

So that would leave us and Alabama. Some of the other utilities that employ it include Kentucky Utilities,

LG&E, TDA, Wisconsin Public Service, and Virginia

Electric Power, and this is in Mr. O'Sheasy's testimony.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thanks.

Commissioner Brisé.

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I appreciate Commissioner Balbis's comments and

Commissioner Brown's questions.

I think I'm in a similar posture with respect to having to make this decision today. I am neither opposed or supportive of the MDS methodology at this point, and part of that is that I don't know that we quantify, we can quantify the benefits on the economic development side as a by-product. And looking at the impact, the baseline impact on residential customers of \$1.74 per month, and then the mom and pop shops of \$3 and change per month. That is not to say that after further review of all of the information in the record that I cannot get to a position where I think it makes sense and I could stand and support my decision to pursue the track or to support the track of the MDS in terms of the allocation.

And I certainly hope that if we, if the Commission decides not to pursue the stipulation, that

this forecloses the idea that we support the ideas of stipulations. I would hope that as the process moves along that the parties would continue to work to fine-tune the concepts put in this stipulation so that when we come to the point of making a decision, if, if the body decides not to go down that path today, that we can make a decision and affirmatively have all the facts that we need to stand on to say, we have decided X, and, yes, there may be an impact on consumers, the residential customers, and, yes, there may be an impact on, on the mom and pop shops, but these are the broader benefits that we, that we think will be provided to, to the general service area.

So that is, that is my sense at this moment. But I certainly hope that the parties will not take the concept off the table. I know that practically you may take where we are mechanically in the process, take it off the table. But I certainly hope that at the appropriate time that the issue as it's packaged could come forward again after we have ample time to, to review the record.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am, not for the first time, but in the first time in a little while in the somewhat uncomfortable

position of not completely agreeing with everything that I've heard from my colleagues. Although I respect every comment that, that you've made, I just don't completely concur.

2.0

I think we need to be very careful when we label things major shifts. What we are considering, my understanding of what is before us is, right now for consideration, is six issues -- five issues?

MR. STONE: I believe it's seven.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Seven, seven issues out of over a hundred.

Basically what it hinges on is a change in application of a methodology. A methodology is a technical construct. I am not aware of any methodology in ratemaking that is absolutely perfect in every application, in every case, in every year, in every region to every customer group.

I am -- and I'm also a little frustrated at the timing with some of this. Having reviewed all of the issues prior to the beginning of the hearing, as I'm sure pretty much everybody did, but because I did have the opportunity to serve as Prehearing Officer, I had additional time perhaps to spend with all of the issues, and of course we were all at the customer hearings, and it seemed to me that there were many issues that were

potentially available for stipulation. And I had hoped prior to the hearing that there would be more discussions and perhaps more compromises of the parties.

But yet it came to us as it, as it did, and I'll say, having, having been here some years, we don't always get to pick how things are presented to us and how things are packaged. We are a decision-making body, and as such are reactive often to the information that is presented to us.

But I do believe that Gulf is in many ways differently situated than the other electric IOUs certainly that come before us. They're different by geography, they're different by their numbers, they're different by the type of industry that is there.

I do believe that northwest Florida is competing more for quality of life issues and job development, business, tourism, et cetera, with other states in the southeast region, in many ways more so than with central or south Florida.

I also recognize that Gulf, I believe, was the first to bring an economic development tariff to the Commission several years ago, something that many of the utilities before us have, have followed through, but I believe that they were the first.

And I want to point out some language
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

specifically from the '02 Gulf order that was adopted by this Commission, and also make the point that that again predates me, so I did not participate in this decision at all. But there is specific language, and it's on page 77, and it says, when dealing specifically with the issue of cost of service and rate design, language from the order says that, "Our prior orders show that it was the theoretical construct with which we disagreed, not the end result." And it goes on to say, "This Commission is not bound by any prior decision in this matter if it deems that circumstances warrant a change."

And I know that we are all aware of this, but in light of the discussion that we had late last evening about precedent setting in any decision that we make versus a stipulation or a final order, it is very clear to me that no Commission is bound by previous decisions of a Commission, and, likewise, that we are all duty-bound to look at the individual circumstances that are before us. Every case is unique, every stipulation is unique.

What has been presented to us, I believe, is very, very carefully constructed to the circumstances of this particular utility in this particular case at this particular time with this particular customer base. And a change consideration of, of one methodology versus

another methodology I think makes that point more than almost, almost anything.

2.4

So I would just ask that before we, if indeed we're considering it, before we say, you know, it's just, after three days of hearing, this is not the time to consider a stipulation, that we think very carefully about what the actual issue is that is before us. And I would not want to do anything that would chill the opportunity or the consideration of any party, all parties in any future case to continue to work together during the hearing process.

So with that, I believe that if this is something that we want to consider, it is timely now. And I also believe very strongly that we are not binding ourselves in any way in any future case. And I do believe that any impact on any individual customer or any other customer group cannot be quantified at this moment in time because there are many other factors in this case to be considered, many of which have the impact of mitigating any impact over any of the numbers that are presented to us.

So I would just ask that we take maybe a little bit more time this morning to think about what's before us.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Well --

1 MAJOR THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman? 2 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Hold on. 3 MAJOR THOMPSON: Oh, I'm sorry. 4 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: It's my turn. 5 (Laughter.) MAJOR THOMPSON: 6 Okay. 7 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I, I appreciate the comments 8 from all the Commissioners. I a hundred percent agree 9 with comments that Commissioner Balbis said about 10 I can tell you I, I encourage them all stipulations. 11 the time to no end. I think you guys understand your 12 business and you understand what a win is and where the 13 win, where the win point is, and so you guys can stipulate things that come out to win-win situations. 14 15 I believe that this is -- as I said yesterday, 16 I'm excited about the thought. This is something that 17 I've dealt with before I even came on this Commission in a former life. So I hate to see us, as Commissioner 18 19 Edgar said, hastily run from the potential, run from the 20 opportunity. 21 I'm not sure that this board is willing to make the decision today to do what you're looking to do, 22 but I want to -- I would like to preserve the, the 23 24 ability to do it. 25 I think people need more hard numbers.

think the Staff needs more time to massage the numbers.

It's difficult for me when I'm not looking at things side by side to decide what the impact is going to be.

What is it going to feel like? How is it going to hurt?

And so I guess what I'm looking for are suggestions on how we can keep this fragile egg on life support, but continue moving us forward.

MR. STONE: Commissioner Graham?

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Yes, sir.

2.0

MR. STONE: One of the suggestions that I'd heard last night that I did think about last night was that a decision, if the Commission was not comfortable making a decision today, that a decision on the stipulation could be made before the briefs are filed.

Timing wise that would be difficult, because the timing, the brief is scheduled to be filed on the 9th, and the next time I know that you have an opportunity to come together without making some special accommodations would be on the 10th.

But it occurred to me that to preserve the status quo, we could, with your permission, have two briefs. We could brief all of the issues that are not covered by the stipulation by the deadline of the 9th. We could hold our brief on the seven issues that are in the stipulation until you have an opportunity to

consider the stipulation. And depending on if the stipulation is approved, then of course there would be no need for further brief.

If the stipulation is denied, then of course we would then have the opportunity to file our brief on the remaining seven issues.

That is an option that preserves the opportunity for the Commission to take a little bit more time and maintain the status quo that is, that the stipulation is trying to enable, and that is to relieve the parties of the, of the need to file briefs. Because once we file briefs, we have taken firm positions on the issues that are trying to be stipulated, and that is what will crack the egg.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Staff, comments on Mr. Stone's suggestion?

MS. KLANCKE: We -- Staff has some angst with respect to this. Our analysis, by necessity, includes the positions of the parties. We feel that their input is essential with respect to advising you in a comprehensive way on both sides.

I know that Marshall similarly has expressed last night and continues to, so I'll defer to him, with respect to this idea which we kicked around on our side and truly tried to give some real thought to.

MR. WILLIS: Commissioners, I understand where the company is coming from on the two-brief idea. I understand that once they brief the four expense issues, it's kind of all for naught at that point.

If the Commission were to want to preserve their right and move forward, it would probably be beneficial for everyone involved, since everyone is going to be briefing, if we could possibly continue a hearing to a date before the 9th to make that decision. I think it would be beneficial to the parties and then they know exactly what they had to brief.

If it comes after that point in time and we have two briefs, it, we can deal with it. It makes it difficult for us because we will be writing a recommendation in the meantime, we'll be drafting this issue, but we won't be drafting it with the parties' briefs at that point.

So it puts us sort of behind the eightball in our recommendation. That's purely a selfish motive behind my part there, to have it before the briefs, because it does put us behind the eightball, but I wanted you to be aware of that.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Let me back up a little bit so I can understand. The briefs currently are due on the 9th?

MR. WILLIS: The 9th of January.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: And you'd want for us to meet on the 8th to decide if we're going to go with the stipulation or not go with the stipulation; is that what I'm hearing you say?

MR. WILLIS: Yes. That's what I would prefer, Chairman. The 8th or before.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Now I guess my question is, what happens between now and the 8th to give us the information that we need make that decision?

MR. WILLIS: I think that's going to be based on each individual office and what you desire or need to make that decision. I don't, I don't envision that we're going to write a recommendation on this issue without all the information in the record, which we would in a normal recommendation, but we certainly can supply each individual office with whatever discussions or material you desire on the subject, and each individual office may have a different desire to that point.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Like, for instance, like a bullet points, pros and cons sort of thing, and then just dollar amounts, potential dollar amounts --

MR. WILLIS: If you desire something like that, we can do that. If someone wants to go really

deep into the issues, we, we can supply that information also. We can, we can have someone who can dig right into the exhibits and the issues.

2.2

MS. KUMMER: I would just hesitate. We talk about dollar impacts. As Commissioner Edgar pointed out, all that is going to be dependent on the final revenue requirement. So all we can give you is a preliminary number, because that, in all likelihood, would change. I have never been in a rate case that didn't change something. So what we would give you will be simply what is based on what was filed.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Well, it's unfortunate that most of this is going on during the holidays, and we have that three-week gap that's sitting there right now. These dates that we have, are these all statutory, statutorial dates? I mean, is there a way of pushing all this back 30 days, or does this basically push back their rate earning by 30 days?

MR. WILLIS: Everything that we have set up post-hearing is based on an eight-month statutory deadline. And those items have to occur within that time frame for Staff to be able to get that recommendation filed by the deadline we're required to file it on, the Commission to meet at that Special Agenda, for us to be able to meet the statutory

requirement of completing this case and getting an order issued in eight months.

MR. MOYLE: Mr. Chairman?

2.2

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Yes, sir.

MR. MOYLE: If I could just be heard briefly on a couple of things.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Please.

MR. MOYLE: My recollection, I may not have this exactly right, but I thought in the Power & Light last rate case that there was some slippage with respect to some of the issues, and I'm not a hundred percent sure, but if there's a statutory deadline, it may be subject to waiver by the, by the company. So, you know, I'm not, I'm not so sure that's an obstacle that can't be addressed.

The other point, and I tend to agree, I think keeping the hearing open and coming back for a discussion is helpful from a, from a process standpoint, in that I think, you know, you have some questions that, you know, we hopefully could air the issue out.

And there's been some questions that have been asked just from the bench that, you know, I think the answers are, are sound, they're coming from lawyers, but they may not have come from, from witnesses.

And to the extent that, you know, you needed FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

questions, I mean, I think Staff asked some questions or made some points last night about a model not functioning correctly or some of those things, and, you know, if those could be asked live, I think it would be informative. I don't think those questions were asked during the hearing process, and that kind of, you know, gets to our deposition objection.

If -- you know, I think the interchange between you all where you understand, here's the issue -- and it's clear, Staff is opposed. I mean, Marshall said last night they're opposed to this and will be writing a rec in opposition, I think. I mean, I don't want to misquote him, but there are concerns here.

And to Commissioner Edgar's point about the frustration over, over the timing, I mean, you know, we've been working with the parties, but we've had another -- you know, respectfully, they've had some views, they took no position, but as things moved on it's clear that the long historical precedent has been not to, not to approve this.

But I think from my perspective keeping the record open gives you greater flexibility, as Mary Anne suggested, because to the extent that there's an evidentiary point, you know, where something is said. I mean, my colleague here just whispered in my ear that

said that the Navy also has their own distribution, that they don't rely on Gulf. Isn't that right?

MAJOR THOMPSON: That's correct. All the Navy bases and Air Force bases have their own distribution system once the energy hits the fence.

And January 8th is a Sunday. I'm the only one out of the town, I think. So it's selfish for me to ask -- I just wanted to point that out.

MR. MOYLE: And no one is going to question his word. But just from a purely evidentiary standpoint, I'm not sure that that, you know, gets you there. So keeping the record open I think is, is the better, better way to proceed.

And I, the only other comment, if I have a second, I was just going say, Commissioner Edgar mentioned last night about the English degree and the law degree, and I'm similarly handicapped with a history degree and a law degree, and it's a spot where it sounds like there are two long-standing historical traditions that may be bumping up against each other, one being the substantive MDS issue that historically it has not been viewed favorably, and the other being the historical preference and encouragement of the Commission to the parties to get together and work on stipulations, which, which we've done and are presenting for you.

So it's a little bit of, you know, I thought history is poised to change in at least some respect, and I think you know, know the view of history that

So thank you for letting me make a couple of comments.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, sir.

Commissioner Edgar.

FIPUG would like to see.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have often been the one to, over the years, to ask for more time, to ask for things to be deferred, and I have, I think always, and if not always, almost always have tried to honor that when those requests have been made by others, whether it be one or more Commissioners or the Staff or parties. And I will continue to do so, and if that is the will of the majority that more information is needed, I absolutely can understand that.

However, I'm not sure what more is, is needed. And so I guess I would ask, it feels to me, I know everybody is trying to be respectful, and no one values that more than I do, I assure you, but it also feels to me that we are almost, you know, overprocessing, proceduralizing, levying this to a degree that may not be necessary.

I mean, a stipulation or a requested FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

stipulation is before us. It isn't all that complicated. And so if we are going to add additional information to the record or additional witnesses or ask Staff to do something, then I guess I would just ask, so that I can be prepared, what information it is that we need or that we are looking for so that, that I can be prepared on that as well.

MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard in response.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Hold on a second.

Commissioner Brown.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. And as a follow-up to Commissioner Edgar, I personally want to have the opportunity to evaluate the pros and cons of adopting this methodology from all the parties that are supporting the stipulation.

And that being said, have we seen a copy -has Staff seen a copy of the stipulation as proposed and
how that affects Issues 106, 107, and 108 with regard to
yesterday we talked about deleting -- striking some of
the positions? Is that the full adoption of the
stipulation?

MR. STONE: The stipulation is not in writing.

It was, it was read -- it was read -- read -- it was

spoken into the record. And I, I can, can once again go

through the changes to the wording.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: That's okay.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: That's quite all right.

MR. STONE: I'm glad you said no.

I need to respond to Mr. Moyle, and I need to be clear. Gulf, as I stated, has no revenue interest in the MDS and, in fact, as part of the stipulation, is giving up part of its request for revenue to get the MDS. We cannot and will not waive the statutory clock on the remainder of the case. That will kill the stipulation if that is a condition of moving forward from today.

We have suggested that we could accommodate a Commission decision on the stipulation on the 10th by briefing all of the remaining issues on the 9th and having our brief ready to file as early as the 10th, or perhaps the 11th would be more practical, on the remaining seven issues, depending on the outcome of the vote on the stipulation.

That would cause the Staff to lose at most two days, and they would only be losing those two days on seven issues.

But we cannot -- if a condition of, of extending the opportunity to decide on the stipulation is a, is Gulf would have to waive its statutory clock,

that, that is something we simply can't do. We are suffering a severe revenue shortfall. We have postponed this case as long as we possibly could. We have taken substandard returns for an extended period of time, and the statutory clock is the only thing that protects us in this instance.

2.2

And so that is part of the fragile egg that is before you, and I know everyone is getting tired of breakfast.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Stone.

Marshall, can you respond to some of his concerns regarding the time frame again, so that we can better understand? It's --

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Commissioner Brown, Joe

McGlothlin with OPC. Before you pose that question, I

would like to respond to something that Mr. Stone said

for clarification.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay.

MR. McGLOTHLIN: And this involves our somewhat specialized and unique situation in all of this. I stressed yesterday that we take no position on the rate design and cost of service issues, and for us the matter is simply one of revenues.

What Mr. Stone said a moment ago was that Gulf Power was giving up revenues in order to get the MDS.

That is not our view of what's happening from our perspective.

For us it's less complicated than anybody else here. We've taken positions on Issues 62 and 80. In return for concessions of revenues, we're willing to drop those issues. That is the sum total of our involvement in this situation. We take no position on the MDS or the other rate design issues.

I've heard Gulf say, and I understand that from their perspective all this hangs together, and if they don't get the MDS, then they don't give up the money.

From our perspective, if the money is provided, we will drop those issues. If the money is not provided, if the stipulation as has been described is not approved, then we will continue to litigate

Issues 62 and 80 and the other revenue issues, which add up to something more than \$80 million of revenues that we are pursuing on behalf of all customers. So I just want to make that distinction very clear.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Willis, can you help us out?

MR. WILLIS: Getting back to Mr. Stone's comments, I fully agree with him. It's really up to the company. The statute was put in place for the company's

protection. The company is the only one that can waive the eight-month time frame for the Commission to consider the case.

In this case Mr. Stone is, is correct. There is about a two-day difference, if you were to consider it on the 10th. If they were to file their briefs that afternoon or the next day, we could probably deal with that with no problem. It's a matter of us plugging in the briefs at that point.

We actually start our recommendation prior to that. We'll be doing it during Christmas holidays, pulling all this stuff together. It's a matter of, to make our recommendation complete, we have to plug in the arguments of all the parties into there and take those into consideration, and that takes some time to do that.

It, it puts us back by two days at that point, but it's only on those seven issues that it does it on, and it's a matter of us plugging that in in our portion of responding to the briefs.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to follow up with some comments.

And I agree with at least one thing

Commissioner Edgar said, and that was this Commission's

position on precedent is something we take into account, but by no means does it tie our hands on the decision we make. So I agree with you on that issue.

And, again, I restate the fact that at the end of this process this Commission may find the MDS methodology is the appropriate methodology to use.

We're now entering into discussions where we're adding two days of additional work for Staff, possibly extending the schedule, which again is against the purpose of a stipulation. A stipulation is supposed to eliminate work and reduce time, not increase it.

So, and as far as the information that I would need from Staff, which is against the stipulation that has questions, I would require the information that is included in a well-prepared and thought out recommendation.

So it seems to me the quickest process, the process with the least amount of work that keeps our options open, is proceeding with the scheduled process where briefs are due, the parties state their positions, Staff prepares recommendations, it comes to us. Again, our hands aren't tied by precedent, we find MDS is appropriate, we'll move forward in that direction.

We also have the risk of arguing the merits of issues while the record is open. I don't know if that's

a concern with Staff or not. So, you know, we have a lot of risk, we have time being extended, we have additional work being created for what I see as very little benefit.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I guess I have a problem -or I'm trying to understand what it is you just said.

If they're going to brief, they have to understand or
have to know if they're briefing with or without the
stipulation, because that's the only way that all these
parties come together is with the understanding that the
new process within the brief and the added dollars are
all on the table. And if that stipulation is not there,
the briefs are completely different.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: I agree that if the stipulation is approved, those issues would be removed from the briefs.

But my point is if we proceed without the stipulation being approved, each party has the opportunity to state their position on each issue. So we know that Gulf is in favor of the MDS technology. We know that FIPUG is in favor of the MDS methodology. Going through all of these issues, we know where each party states. So nothing is going to change. And we will have the ability to decide on each of those issues individually. It may work out that it ends up where we

were with the stipulation in place or not.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Well, as you just heard

Public Counsel say, their position on two of the revenue issues change, depending on Gulf's ability to give up those funds.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: So if their -- okay. So let's play that out. So if their position changes now, they're not in favor of Issue 62, which is around \$130,000 issue, that I assume they would be against including the operational expenses for aircraft in revenue requirements. We can take that into account. It's not as if now we have to add that revenue requirement in because OPC -- I'm not being clear on this. Let me try one more time.

And let me start at the beginning here. The purpose of the stipulation would be to make the process more efficient or get concessions that we normally would not be able to get, or parties would not be able to get. We've already agreed that we're not saving any time. If anything, we're extending time. And the concessions that are being made, if this Commission finds that those changes to those issues are appropriate, we can make those changes. So, again, I don't see what we're gaining from this stipulation.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Edgar.

this, but I was just going to point out, if -- and I'm saying if -- we decide to not take any official vote action today but to request full briefs by all parties and a full detail and thorough issue-by-issue recommendation by our Staff that would then come before us, that it's not just the cost of service and rate design, that it does include, and I think you just touched on that, but Issues 11, 62, 63, and 80, which, per the stipulation, would be removed from consideration, in keeping with the \$675,000 adjustment.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: You may have moved past

So I just want to keep in the forefront of all of our minds that we are not just talking about the cost of service issues but also the four other revenue related issues.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: All right. I think we need to do something to move forward. I -- my suggestion initially was how do we preserve this stipulation and try to get the information that some people are requiring to move forward. I like the suggestion that Mr. Stone put out there. Staff, Marshall agreed that they can work within those parameters.

I guess I'm just going to do a poll to see if the board is, if the board is okay with moving forward that way. And if I get two other votes, then we'll do

1 it that way. If not, then we'll figure out what we're 2 going to do from this point going forward. 3 And I'll start down on my left. 4 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. And I do want 5 to preserve the possibility of the stipulation. I don't want to take that off the table, but at the same time I 6 7 do want to evaluate some of the other evidence in the record. 8 9 That being said, I think the only option is --10 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thumbs up? 11 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Up. 12 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you. Commissioner Brisé. 13 COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Yeah. I think that that 14 15 is a viable option. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Well, I already counted to 16 17 three. Commissioner Edgar. 18 19 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I sincerely apologize, 20 but I'm not even sure what it is you just asked us to 21 thumbs up or thumbs down on. I mean, procedurally. 22 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mr. Stone, please restate 23 what it was that you suggested. If the Commission was not 24 MR. STONE: 25 comfortable voting today on the stipulation up or down,

there is a way to maintain the status quo of the stip -of the stipulation a little bit longer, and that would
be to go ahead and close the evidentiary record today.

The parties would then be able to start briefing, and
their briefs would be ready on the 9th. They would
submit briefs on all issues other than the seven issues
that are covered by the stipulation as it's currently
scheduled on the 9th. And with the Commission direction
to keep the status quo of the stipulation open, they
would withhold their briefs on the seven remaining
issues until after the Commission votes the stipulation
up or down.

If the stipulation is approved, there is no further brief needed. If the stipulation is denied, then the briefs would be filed. And as I indicated, although it does mean that we're going to actually expend the same effort that was trying to be avoided by having the stipulation voted today, we at least would not have changed our position vis-a-vis the public record until after the vote on the stipulation.

And we could submit those briefs on those seven issues as early as the 11th.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Before you decide, do you have a question?

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Yeah. I have -- I think
FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 the stipulation would have been a whole lot easier if we . 2 had it in writing before us so that we can look at it 3 and evaluate. And honestly, I think we would have been 4 in a much better posture today had that been made 5 available. And I would hope that, as we go through this 6 process, at least there's going to be a stipulation in 7 writing so that we can evaluate and develop our 8 questions and issues as we're dealing with Staff with 9 these things. 10 So, for me, and, you know, I may not be that 11 smart, but I think on paper things are a lot easier to 12 manage for me. So I would hope that that is something 13 that the parties can accommodate. 14 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Edgar. 15 MR. STONE: Commissioner Brisé, I will say 16 that the transcript of yesterday's proceeding will be 17 available, and it will document the agreement of the parties. 18 MR. MOYLE: 19 We have a written stipulation. 20 think we can address the concerns. 21 COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Mr. Chairman, can I please? 22 23 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Let -- I know you're 24 itching. 25 COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: No. No.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

Commissioner -- Chairman-Elect, please.

(Laughter.)

respect to Mr. Stone, I understand the transcripts are there. But in the -- I've been here only for a year and a few months, but every stipulation that has come before us has been presented to us in a formal manner and presented to us. That's all I'm asking. I don't think I'm asking too much.

MR. STONE: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I'm still a little confused on what information is coming in and who's briefing what and when and when we're voting.

I think I understand the issues that are before us. But if, as I asked, if Commissioners need more time and need, then I certainly -- I always try to support that and I will continue to always try to support that.

I can't give you a thumbs up or thumbs down because I don't understand it. We're saying we'll have briefs on some issues and then we'll take a vote on the stipulation and then brief other issues. Is that, is that what --

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Yes, that's correct. The briefs are due on, the briefs are due on the 9th or 10th, whatever that day is. They're going to brief everything except for the seven issues that are tied into the stipulation. And that's going to give us three weeks, and during that three weeks you can meet with Staff, you can talk to Staff, you can ask the questions you need or don't need to make you comfortable with the stipulation. And then you make the decision if you -- then you make the decision they want us to make today three weeks from now, and you decide if you want the stipulation to apply or not.

They will already have the other set of briefs for those other seven issues ready to go. But if we decide on the stipulation, they just won't turn them in.

If we decide we don't want the stipulations, then they'll turn them in.

commissioner edgar: Okay. So we're requesting a written stipulation signed by all of the parties who are participating to be submitted to us, and then we will vote on that when?

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: We'll vote on that, I believe, on the 9th, whatever day that we're back here.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: The 10th.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: The 10th.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: So that will be, the 1 2 stipulation will be added as an agenda item for the 3 January 10th Agenda Conference, with a written recommendation and analysis by Staff? 4 MR. WILLIS: Commissioners, I don't think we 5 intended to bring it back with a written recommendation. 6 7 We would just put the stipulation on the agenda for the Commission's consideration again, like we did today. 8 It's --9 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Like I said, I 10 11 just wanted to be clear on what it is we're asking and 12 directing. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. 13 So now --COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Chairman, I think it 14 15 seems needlessly complex and complicated. But if it is the will of the majority, then I will support it. 16 17 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Balbis. COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 18 19 And I just want to follow up on what Mr. Stone indicated that the record would be closed. And I have a question 20 for Staff. 21 2.2 Does that alleviate any of the concerns of possibly arguing the merits of an issue during the 23 24 hearing? 25 The closure of the record was MS. KLANCKE:

definitely of primary import with regard to our angst with respect to attenuating the process. I think that so long as -- as you know from last night, we've gone through all of the witnesses that were scheduled to appear. Currently we have all the presentation of evidence that's necessary. I, I continue to believe that the briefs are necessary for the purposes of inclusion, for the purposes of ensuring that you have all the information as presented by all the parties.

2.0

However, we are prepared to go forward however you'd like. I think that the closure of the record definitely alleviates a lot of the concerns.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Thank you. And then just a quick question. I mean, I know that Mr. Wright and Mr. McGlothlin, you are conflicted out. And there's been discussion that we will have information from -- or we have information from all of the parties and the stipulation will be signed by all the parties.

But you're maintaining that the parties that represent all the residential customers and the parties that represent all of the rate class GS, which is the small businesses, they will not be represented during this stipulation, or when considering the stipulation?

MR. McGLOTHLIN: I would have to answer your

question slightly differently. Because of the dynamics of the rate design, cost of service issues, and the manner in which there's an interplay among customer classes that affects them in the sense that some rates go up and some go down, as a representative of the citizens that include all customer classes, we take no position with respect to those issues that bear, that have that kind of effect.

And so with respect to the package that's been considered, our involvement is limited to the revenue issues, and we take no position on the others. That's about the best I can do, Commissioner. I hope that's helpful.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay.

Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Balbis. We're in essentially the same position as the Public Counsel are -- is.

Our membership includes very large, high consumption, high load factor customers. Our membership also includes thousands of small general service customers. We don't have residential members of the Retail Federation, but we've got the full range, and that's why we take no position on the cost of service allocation methodology.

requirements issues. They will not be represented, because we have consciously made the decision to take no position. We just don't advocate for small GS or large GSLD high load factor customers, because that would pit our advocacy, advocating for one part of our membership versus another, and we just can't do that.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. And I hope that

be represented in the stipulation only as to the revenue

So the answer is, our members' interests will

Staff will provide the information on the impacts for those two customer classes prior to whichever of the two briefs is appropriate.

MR. WILLIS: And, Commissioner, we'll do our best. We provide the impact based on customer class, but it would have to be based upon what the company requested, since no other issues will be decided that are at play at this point. The only way we can deal with it is to look at it as a broad perspective on what the company asked for.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Well, provided that the record will be closed and that alleviates Staff's concerns on the legal issues, then I would support, and I'm not even sure what the process is, but the two due dates for briefs, if that's appropriate.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Was that a thumbs up or

thumbs down?

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: It's a thumbs up as to what I think we're voting on, which --

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay.

Commissioner Brown.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Moyle indicated that there is a written stipulation. And if that is the case, before we close the record I think we need to mark it as an exhibit.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Well, I think -- and you jumped ahead of me, but one of the things we're going to do is we're just going to ask for a written stipulation that's signed off by all parties and make sure that that's an exhibit and part of the record, and that Staff gets that by the end of the day tomorrow.

MR. MOYLE: Yeah. Just a point of clarification. I think, I think actually it will be a motion that FIPUG and the -- Gulf and the Executive Agencies file a motion for approval of a stipulation. And then the document will say, here's what the stipulation is, representing, as you've heard a number of times, that neither the Retail Federation or OPC takes a position. But it will lay out what we've been talking about and what Mr. Stone in effect read into the record last night.

I don't know that we need to file the 1 2 stipulation before the record closes. You know, I think 3 we can file it as a motion. 4 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: That's all, that's all legal 5 mumbo jumbo. Thumbs up or thumbs down? MR. MOYLE: 6 Thumbs up. 7 (Laughter.) Thank you. 8 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: 9 Commissioner Edgar. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And I am still confused 10 11 on the process that we're directing. But so, for that technical question, if we close the record here shortly, 12 13

on the process that we're directing. But so, for that technical question, if we close the record here shortly we receive a written stipulation, that would be post-hearing. So when we come back on January 10th, we would, the parties would not have the opportunity to make any comments or respond to questions; is that correct?

MS. KLANCKE: That is correct.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I see our General Counsel over there getting ready to jump out of his chair, so Mr. Kiser.

MR. KISER: What I wanted to add, and I hope I don't cause additional confusion over it, is that the elements that go into making up the, quote, stipulation, I don't think it goes away, no matter what you do. It

is in the record, those issues are out there. And if at a later point, when you get down to discussing the final case, and assume for the moment you don't have an agreed-upon stipulation, if the Commission one by one takes up the elements that were in the old stipulation and don't style it as a stipulation, that's just simply what you want to see as part of the final order, I think you can resurrect it. So I don't think that it ever really goes away.

And I think some people are worried, or that was the impression I was getting, is that if we don't reach some vote now that affirmatively says we're for that, that it's forever gone and out the door and we can't ever go back and resurrect it, and I don't think I agree with that.

is, from our Chairman-Elect, I think the concern is, rightfully so, that he wants to make sure that what everybody sitting here in a row nodding their head agreeing on, somebody is not going to say two weeks from now that that's not quite the way I understood it.

And so I think what he's looking for is somebody to write it out and somebody to, everybody to put their name on the line, saying this is where I am with the stipulation. If the stipulation goes through,

this is what we all agreed to. If that -- am I putting words in your mouth?

And I think that's what he's looking for. I don't know how legally you have to do it. I don't know if it's motions or if it's this or that. I just think that he wants to make sure what Mr. Stone said yesterday and repeated today, that we're not getting anybody backpedaling because maybe J. R. whispered in their ear, oh, but you can't be neutral, or somebody else whispers in your ear, I'm not quite sure we want to be there, and then all of a sudden there's backpedaling.

I think if everybody is agreeing on the stipulation, he wants to make sure that it's ironclad, so if it's agreed upon, it's agreed upon as stated.

Does that make sense?

And I guess somebody over there with a law degree has got to tell me how to best make my Chairman-Elect happy.

MS. HELTON: I think it's always better to have the document formalized in a written format so that everybody is looking at the same words on the same piece of paper.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. So now I'm going to go down this thing over here, looking for thumbs up or thumbs down, that we can't put those words on paper and

1 get everybody to sign them by end of the day tomorrow. 2 MR. STONE: You will have the complete 3 cooperation of Gulf Power Company. MR. WRIGHT: Thumbs up. 4 MR. McGLOTHLIN: With the caveat we have to 5 6 see the language, we'll work with the other parties to 7 see what happens. 8 MR. MOYLE: (Motioned thumbs up.) 9 MAJOR THOMPSON: (Motioned thumbs up.) 10 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you. Now --11 MS. HELTON: Mr. Chairman, may I answer Commissioner Edgar's question with respect to --12 13 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Sure. I think I disagree with some of MS. HELTON: 14 15 the lawyers sitting down this end of the table with 16 respect to whether the parties could talk or not. 17 We have a long-standing tradition, and I think it's actually codified in our rule, that for 18 19 post-hearing decisions made by you after the record is 20 closed, that parties are not allowed to participate. 21 That's a deliberation process between you and the Staff, 2.2 if you choose to include the Staff in that, in that 23 process. We're in a little bit different posture, 24 25 though, with what has been talked about here so far

today, and that is, while the record may be closed, you don't have a -- you aren't really in a post, a true Commission post-hearing process with respect to the issues that are still live under the stipulation.

So I think that I would be comfortable with, if it was within your desire, I think you have the discretion to hear from the parties with respect to the issues that are live under the stipulation at that Agenda Conference if you, if the discussion is limited to just that stipulation and just those issues.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Edgar, she was answering your question. I didn't know if you had a follow-up.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: What I hear is we have a difference of opinion amongst attorneys. And I will say for ridiculous redundancy, for the fifth time probably, I still am not clear on what it is we're asking our Staff to do or what information it is that, that is needed.

And, therefore, you know, not everything, Mr. Chairman, is a yes or a no. I don't understand what we're requesting or proposing. However, between the Chairman's office, the Chairman to be's office, the General Counsel's office, Executive Director's office, I assume somebody will figure it out and tell me what it

is that is coming before us. 1 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Staff, the document 2 that we're requesting for the stipulation, do we need to 3 give this an exhibit number and make it a late-filed 4 Is that how you put this? 5 exhibit? MS. KLANCKE: We could do it either way. 6 I 7 believe the parties have proposed providing it to us in a motion, which would not be required to -- which can be 8 filed after the closure of the evidentiary record. 9 10 we're open to suggestions. 11 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I need for you to make a decision. 12 My suggestion would be for them 13 MS. HELTON: to file a motion asking the full Commission to approve 14 15 the stipulation as has been set forth on the record. That way you do not have to make it an exhibit, and then 16 it will be primed up and ready for you to decide on the 17 first Agenda Conference in January. 18

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Now that motion comes in a written form; is that correct?

MS. HELTON: Yes, sir.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. And as I stated earlier, by the end of the day tomorrow. They've already put their thumbs up.

MS. KLANCKE: They've acquiesced.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I just want to make sure that you are -- that we are legally sound on what we're looking for.

Okay. All right. Then it sounds like we have a direction. Last-minute thoughts is not going to take this train off the track.

MR. STONE: Nothing to do with the stipulation. I want to move on from there.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay.

MR. STONE: Mr. Badders has some exhibits that we need to enter into the record that were requested during the course of the hearing.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay.

MR. BADDERS: Thank you, Chairman. Over the course of the last few days there were three late-filed exhibits requested of the company, either by a Commissioner, through one of our witnesses, or through one of the other parties, and at this time I'd like to enter those into the record.

In front of you you have Exhibit 188. This exhibit, late-filed exhibit, was requested by Commissioner Brown. I do not believe any of the parties have an objection to this being moved in at this time.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Is that the total dollars, total labor dollars?

1	MR. BADDERS: Yes, Chairman.
2	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay.
3	If there's Mr. Sayler.
4	MR. SAYLER: I was going to say no objection.
5	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: If there is an objection,
6	tell me there's an objection. If not, I'm assuming
7	there's no objection.
8	So we will enter 188 into the record.
9	(Late-Filed Exhibit 188 admitted into the
10	record.)
11	MR. BADDERS: Thank you. The next one is
12	Exhibit 190. This is Gulf Power's 2011 Ten-Year Site
13	Plan. I also believe no party has an objection to this
14	being admitted.
15	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: We've already entered that
16	into the record.
17	MR. BADDERS: Okay. This is the full copy.
18	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay.
19	MR. BADDERS: Then finally, there's a
20	confidential exhibit. It's 187. I do have copies for
21	everyone beside me. This is Gulf Power's 2010
22	Transmission Planning Study.
23	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Transmission Planning Study?
24	MR. BADDERS: Yes.
25	CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. We will, if there's
	II

no objections, we will enter 187. That's the request 1 2 that Mr. Balbis had, Commissioner Balbis had. Enter 187 into the record. 3 (Exhibit 187 admitted into the record.) 4 5 MR. BADDERS: Thank you. And I have copies of that and I will provide that with the, to the court 6 7 reporter. 8 MR. MOYLE: FIPUG had registered an objection 9 and we withdraw that objection. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Okay. So I'm past 10 Gulf. 11 Mr. Wright? 12 Public Counsel? 13 14 FIPUG? 15 MR. MOYLE: The only just lawyerly point of clarification is, is that Mr. Kiser made some comments 16 17 that sort of said, well, you can take the stipulation regardless. It was, it was presented with everything 18 19 being dependent, so I don't want there to be any 20 misconception of that. It's a package deal, so I'm not --21 22 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: It's all or nothing. 23 MR. MOYLE: Right. 24 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. I -- with the clarification 25 MR. McGLOTHLIN:

that I put on the record earlier with respect to our role.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Duly noted. Good.

MR. BADDERS: Chairman, one thing just for housekeeping. I know that this was confidential. It was provided pursuant to a notice of intent already, so it's under a notice of intent, and we will file the request for confidentiality within 21 days.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Staff, is there anything that we need to know, understand, put on the record?

MS. KLANCKE: We are not aware of any.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: So now when I, I guess I am recessing the meeting until December -- give me -- I'm sorry, 'til January, what date?

MS. HELTON: I think that we are closing out the hearing, we are closing the record, and that when you come back for the Agenda Conference on, I think it's January the 10th, you will be -- or January 11th, whatever the date is -- you will be voting on the stipulation. And based on that vote, then the parties will know whether to file additional briefs the next day, and then Staff will then know what issues to draft analysis on for you with respect to your vote in the schedule that's set out in the Order Establishing Procedure and on the CASR, so that we can meet the

eight-month clock.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: So I'm just flat adjourning the meeting and closing the record?

MS. HELTON: Correct.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay.

Commissioners, any last-minute thoughts, conversations?

Commissioner Brisé.

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: I just want to thank the parties for accommodating our needs today and working with us. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I want to thank everybody for, actually this fun 18 hours that you gave me.

(Laughter.)

No. I, once again, I'm probably going to sound like a broken record. I encourage the whole stipulation process. I like it when you guys come together with a solution that by no other means may not have come forward. I mean, I encourage that kind of stuff. And I think what we've done today is preserve that, because I don't think we, I don't think we collectively, maybe one or two of us may have been ready, but collectively I don't think we were ready to make that decision today. And so I think this goes from a no to a maybe. So it pushes things back, because I

couldn't count to three today.

I do want to thank you guys all for playing nice. And I think this is a good note for me to end my chairmanship. Of course, I hope that you all have -- well, Commissioner Balbis.

Hold on before I give you parting thoughts.

Commissioner Balbis.

touching on it. I was going to point out that this is the last proceeding where you will be Chairman, and I just wanted to point out that it has been a pleasure serving with you as the administrator of these proceedings. And as frustrating as things got, it's one thing that you did do throughout this hearing and through all the proceedings is to keep things moving smoothly and respectfully, and I've been impressed with how you've managed these, and I want to thank you for your chairmanship.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you very much.

I wish you all a merry Christmas and happy holidays. I hope you all travel safe, and I look forward to seeing all of you after the new year. Thank you very much. We are closing the record and we are adjourned.

(Proceeding adjourned at 11:50 a.m.)

1	
2	STATE OF FLORIDA) : CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
3	COUNTY OF LEON)
4	
5	I, LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR, Official Commission Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing
6	proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.
7	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I
8	stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision;
9	and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,
11	employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties'
12	attorneys or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.
13	DATED THIS 20th day of December,
14	2011.
15	2.
16	INDA BOLES, RPR, CRR
17	FPSC Official Commission Reporter (850) 413-6734
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	