# FILED OCT 18, 2013 DOCUMENT NO. 06328-13 FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK 000001

1	BEFORE THE		
2	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		
3	To the Method of		
4	In the Matter of:	DOCKET NO. 130007-EI	
5	ENVIRONMENTAL COST E	RECOVERY	
6	CLAUSE.	/	
7			
8			
9			
10			
11	PROCEEDINGS:	PREHEARING	
12	COMMISSIONEDS		
13	COMMISSIONERS PARTICIPATING:	COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS	
14		PREHEARING OFFICER	
15	DATE:	Thursday, October 17, 2013	
16	TIME:	Commenced at 9:55 a.m. Concluded at 10:22 a.m.	
17	DI ACE.		
18	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148	
19		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida	
20	REPORTED BY:	JANE FAUROT, RPR	
21		Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6732	
22			
23			
24			
25			

APPEARANCES

JOHN T. BUTLER, WILLIAM P. COX, MARIA J. MONCADA, and R. WADE LITCHFIELD, ESQUIRES, 700 Universe Blvd., Juno Beach, Florida 33408-0420, on behalf of Florida Power and Light Company.

JAMES D. BEASLEY, J. JEFFRY WAHLEN, and ASHLEY M. DANIELS, ESQUIRES, Ausley Law Firm, Post Office Box 391, Tallahassee, Florida 32302, appearing on behalf of Tampa Electric Company.

JEFFREY A. STONE, RUSSELL A. BADDERS and STEVEN R. GRIFFIN, ESQUIRES, Beggs & Lane, Post Office Box 12950, Pensacola, Florida 32591, appearing on behalf of Gulf Power Company.

JOHN T. BURNETT, DIANE TRIPLETT, and MATT VERMEER, ESQUIRES, Post Office Box 14042, St.

Petersburg, Florida 33733, appearing on behalf of Duke Energy Florida, Inc.

JON C. MOYLE, JR., and KAREN PUTNAL, ESQUIRES, c/o Moyle Law Firm, P.A., 118 North Gadsden Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of Florida Industrial Power Users Group.

I	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	

APPEARANCES	(Continued)	:

GARY V. PERKO, ESQUIRE, Hopping Law Firm, Post Office Box 6526, Tallahassee, Florida 32314, appearing on behalf of Duke Energy Florida, Inc.

J.R. KELLY, PUBLIC COUNSEL, CHARLES
REHWINKEL, JOE McGLOTHLIN, and PATRICIA A.
CHRISTENSEN, ESQUIRES, Office of Public Counsel, c/o
The Florida Legislature, 111 West Madison Street,
Room 812, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400, appearing
on behalf of the Citizens of Florida.

JAMES W. BREW and F. ALVIN TAYLOR,

ESQUIRES, PCS Phosphate - White Springs, c/o

Brickfield Law Firm, 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street,

NW, Eighth Floor, West Tower, Washington, DC 20007,

appearing on behalf of PCS Phosphate - White Springs.

ROBERT SCHEFFEL WRIGHT and

JOHN T LAVIA, III, ESQUIRES, Florida Retail

Federation, c/o Gardner Law Firm, 1300 Thomaswood

Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32308, appearing on

behalf of Florida Retail Federation.

1	APPEARANCES	(Continued):

CHARLES MURPHY, ESQUIRE, FPSC General
Counsel's Office, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard,
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, appearing on behalf
of the Florida Public Service Commission Staff.

MARY ANNE HELTON, DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL, Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, Advisor to the Florida Public Service Commission.

#### PROCEEDINGS

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Good morning. Welcome to the clause prehearing conference.

We are going to discuss five dockets today:

Docket Number 130002 with the energy conservation

clause; 130003, the purchased gas adjustment clause;

130004, natural gas conservation clause; 130007,

environmental cost-recovery clause; and 130001, the fuel

and purchased power cost recovery clause.

So I would like to call this hearing to order, and, staff, could you please read the notice.

MS. TAN: By notice issued September 27th, 2013, this time and place is set for a prehearing conference in the following dockets: 130001-EI, 130002-EG, 130003-GU, 130004-GU, and 130007-EI. The purpose of the prehearing conference is set out in the notice.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay, thank you. And now if we can take appearances.

MR. BUTLER: Shall I go?

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Sure. But before we do that, we have noted twice now that there are five dockets to address today, and we are going to take all the appearances at once. So you should enter your appearance in which docket that you are entering an

1 appearance to. So, Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you. John Butler appearing on behalf of Florida Power and Light Company in the 01, 02, and 07 dockets. I would also like to enter an appearance for Ken Rubin in the 01 and 02 dockets; and for William P. Cox and Maria Moncada in the 07 docket; and, finally, for Wade Litchfield in the 1, 2, and 7 dockets. Thank you.

MR. BADDERS: Good morning. I'm Russell Badders on behalf of Gulf Power entering an appearance in the 01, 02, and 07 dockets for myself, Jeffrey A. Stone, and Steven Griffin.

MS. TRIPLETT: Good morning. Dianne Triplett on behalf of Duke Energy Florida appearing in the 01, 02, and 07 dockets. In those dockets I would also like to enter an appearance for John Burnett and Matt Vermeer (phonetic), and in the 07 docket for Gary Perko with the Hopping Green firm. Thank you.

MR. BEASLEY: Good morning, Commissioner. Jim Beasley along with Jeff Wahlen and Ashley Daniels of the law firm of Ausley and McMullen appearing on behalf of Tampa Electric Company in the 01, 07, and 02 dockets.

MR. JACOBS: Good morning, Commissioner. My name is Leon Jacobs. I'm appearing on behalf of Southern Alliance for Clean Energy along with George

Cavros, and that's in the 02 docket.

MR. REHWINKEL: Good morning, Commissioner.

Charles Rehwinkel and Joe McGlothlin with the Office of Public Counsel, and Patty Christensen. Patty

Christensen and I are making an appearance in all dockets, and Mr. McGlothlin is in the O1 and O7 dockets.

MR. WRIGHT: Good morning, Commissioner.

Robert Scheffel Wright and John T. LaVia, III, appearing in the 0001 docket on behalf of the Florida Retail Federation. We are also appearing in the 0007 docket on behalf of DeSoto County Generating Company.

MR. BREW: Good morning, Commissioner. James Brew and F. Alvin Taylor for White Springs Agricultural Chemicals, PCS Phosphate. And we are appearing in the 01, 02, and 07 dockets.

MR. MOYLE: Good morning. Jon Moyle with the Moyle law firm on behalf of the Florida Industrial Power Users Group, FIPUG. I would also like to enter an appearance for Karen Putnal with our firm, and we are in the 01, 02, and 07 dockets.

MR. KEATING: Good morning, Commissioner.

Beth Keating with the Gunster law firm. I'm here today for FPUC in the 01 and 02 dockets, for FPUC and Florida City Gas in the 03 docket, and for FPUC, Indiantown, Florida Division of Chesapeake Utilities, and Florida

1	City Gas in the 04 docket.	
2	MR. HORTON: Commissioner, Norman H. Horton,	
3	Jr., appearing in the 04 docket for Sebring Gas.	
4	MS. TAN: And Lee Eng Tan for the 02 docket.	
5	MR. LAWSON: Mike Lawson for the 03 docket.	
6	MS. CORBARI: Kelley Corbari, the 04 docket.	
7	MR. MURPHY: Charles Murphy for the 07 docket.	
8	MS. BARRERA: Martha Barrera and Julie Gilcher	
9	for the 01 docket.	
10	MS. HELTON: And Mary Anne Helton advising you	
11	in all the dockets.	
12	COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay, thank you. And	
13	I'm just curious as to why Ms. Keating has been banished	
14	to the	
15	MR. KEATING: I know, right?	
16	COMMISSIONER BALBIS: witness stand.	
17	(Audience laughter.)	
18	* * * * *	
19	COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. We will now move	
20	on to the 130007 docket, which is the environmental	
21	cost-recovery clause docket.	
22	And, Mr. Murphy, there you are. Are there any	
23	preliminary parties that we need to address?	
24	MR. MURPHY: Only that the parties have been	
25	able to resolve all issues that will be heard by the	

Commission in November, and the ones that remain will be 1 2 heard by the Commission in December. 3 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. And if any of the 4 parties object to that, now would be the time. Okay. 5 We are going to proceed through the draft prehearing order. We are going start with Section X, proposed 6 7 stipulations, at this time, which I believe Mr. Murphy already handled with the preliminary matters, but if you 8 9 just want to --10 MR. MURPHY: Can we just take them in order 11 from the beginning, at this point? 12 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. I was just 13 following the script that you provided me, Mr. Murphy. 14 MR. MURPHY: That's an earlier version of it. 15 **COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Okay. 16 (Audience laughter.) 17 MR. MURPHY: That was when there was some 18 uncertainty. 19 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Are there any other 20 changes that I might need to know about? 21 MR. MURPHY: Just roll with it, it will be 22 fun. 23 (Audience laughter.) 24 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: All right. Let's try 25 this again.

Section I, case background. Are there any 1 2 questions or comments? 3 Hearing none, Section II, conduct of 4 proceedings. Section III, jurisdiction. 5 Section IV, procedure for handling 6 confidential information. 7 Section V, prefiled testimony and exhibits; 8 9 witnesses. Section VI, order of witnesses. 10 11 MR. MURPHY: Commissioner, witnesses can be 12 excused from the hearing. If a witness who has 13 testified about FPL's NO2 Project is excused from the 14 November hearing, the prehearing order will reflect 15 their participation in the December hearing. Staff will 16 work to confirm with each Commissioner whether they want 17 to cross-examine any of the witnesses before they are 18 excused by the Prehearing Officer, and prefiled 19 testimony and exhibits of excused witnesses will be 20 identified and admitted into the record. MR. BUTLER: Commissioner Balbis, I have one 21 22

small change on the issues that are identified for rebuttal of the FPL witnesses on Page 5.

23

24

25

For Mr. LaBauve, Issue 9 shouldn't appear as a rebuttal issue. That's only an issue for his direct

1 testimony.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: I didn't hear that last part, I'm sorry.

MR. BUTLER: Issue 9 for FPL Witness LaBauve on Page 5, rebuttal, should be deleted. He only testifies on Issue 9 with his direct testimony.

Thank you.

commissioner balbis: Okay. And I probably should have started with this. Obviously, I signed an order yesterday. I mean, we had requests for surrebuttal testimony to be provided, and in order to allow the parties to respond to that, prepare the surrebuttal testimony and respond to surrebuttal testimony, I have scheduled a continuance of the hearing just limited to the testimony, the surrebuttal testimony that's provided.

So I should have started with that, and I appreciate the parties working together and coming up with a resolution, because I certainly want to make sure that everyone has their due process rights preserved.

So I assume that no one has any objections to that ruling. And, again, I just wanted to thank everyone for working together on that.

Okay. So I believe we are on Section VI.

MR. MOYLE: Can I ask a clarifying question on

that?

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Sure.

MR. MOYLE: We had talked informally about working with each other on witnesses for the issues that remain in dispute that I think are now going to be heard in December. And am I correct in assuming that this prehearing order will likewise govern the proceeding in December, or will there be another way of handling that?

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: It's my understanding, and staff can correct me if I'm wrong, that this prehearing order will apply to both.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, sir. This is the only prehearing that we'll have, and this order would govern both. I anticipate that with the issues that the stipulations would move up to the issues section except for the issues that are in December, and then those would be set for there in the issues section.

MR. MOYLE: Okay.

**COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Okay. And I think we are on Section VI, order of witnesses.

MR. MOYLE: Yes. I guess the only point I would make is that we had worked, and we have all worked well with each other on scheduling witnesses to the extent there are expert witnesses having to come in from out of town. FIPUG has a witness that we may seek that

accommodation from the parties, but we'll just work 1 2 informally to try to make sure that can take place 3 without a problem. 4 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: And would this be for 5 the November or the December? MR. MOYLE: December. 6 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. But you're not 7 proposing to go outside of the 19th or 20th dates? 8 MR. MOYLE: 9 No. COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Just the order of that? 10 11 MR. MOYLE: Right. 12 **COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Okay. 13 MR. WRIGHT: Commissioner, DeSoto is in the 14 same boat. One of our witnesses is only available on 15 December 19th. But we have always worked this out; 16 we'll do it this time. 17 **COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Okay. 18 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. 19 MR. BUTLER: And FPL may jump into that boat, 20 as well, but we'll be happy to work with the other 21 parties to be sure that we can accommodate all of the 22 witnesses' schedules. 23 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Well, I'm sure 24 the parties understand the 19th and 20th were very

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

difficult to obtain, so as long as we stay within those

1 two days it shouldn't be an issue. 2 MR. BUTLER: That's what we are planning to 3 It's just the order of the witnesses within those 4 days that might shift around. COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. All right. Any 5 other questions or comments on order of witnesses? 6 7 We will move on to Section VII, basic positions. Any questions, comments, or changes to the 8 9 parties' basic positions? 10 MR. MOYLE: FIPUG would have some supplemental 11 information to put for its basic position and would ask 12 that we be given until, say, noon tomorrow to provide 13 that to staff. 14 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Yes, I don't have a 15 problem with that. 16 MR. MOYLE: Okay. **COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Any other comments? 17 18 Section VIII, issues and positions. 19 MR. MURPHY: Commissioner, Issues 10, 10A 20 through C, and 11 will be addressed during the December 21 hearing. The status of Proposed Issue 10D will need to

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: And my question for the parties for those issues that will be addressed in the December hearing, do you need additional time to look at

22

23

24

25

be decided.

your positions on those and possibly change them, or is 1 2 everyone comfortable with what they are at this time? 3 MR. BUTLER: We may end up needing to address 4 our issues after the surrebuttal testimony has been filed, our positions on the issues. I believe that was 5 anticipated by your order issued yesterday, so we will 6 7 do it by the deadline that is set in that order. COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Any other 8 9 comments on issues and positions? MR. MURPHY: I would reiterate that the 10 11 stipulations would move up there for the November part 12 of this, and then the December ones would remain still 13 in contention, or still at issue. 14 MR. BUTLER: FPL has not yet provided a position. It doesn't look like much of anybody has 15 16 other than FIPUG on their Proposed Issue 10D. We can do 17 that by the end of the day. 18 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. And I will rule on that today, so it will give you enough time. 19 20 MR. BUTLER: Okay. 21 MR. MOYLE: The rule on the --22 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Whether or not the 23 Proposed Issue 10D is to be included or not. It's my 24 understanding that's in dispute, or no?

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

MR. MOYLE: Well, I thought maybe we would

1 talk about it today. 2 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Yes. When I get to the 3 rulings section I was going to get to that. 4 MR. MOYLE: Okay. So we will be heard on that 5 later today. I just want to be clear. We will have a chance to talk about the Issue 10D --6 7 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Yes. MR. MOYLE: -- we'll just do it later. 8 9 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Yes. 10 MR. MOYLE: Okay. 11 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: In about two minutes, I 12 think. MR. MOYLE: Okay. 13 14 MR. REHWINKEL: Commissioner, as far as the 15 position on this, the Office of Public Counsel would not 16 be prepared to provide a position until noon tomorrow --17 **COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Okay. 18 MR. REHWINKEL: -- regardless if the issue 19 stays in. COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay, thank you. Okay. 20 21 Now let's move on to Section IX, the exhibit list. 22 MR. MURPHY: Staff will prepare a 23 comprehensive exhibit list for the purpose of numbering 24 and identifying the exhibits at hearing. Staff will

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

provide the exhibit list to the parties as soon as

1 possible.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay, thank you.

Section X, proposed stipulations.

MR. MURPHY: All issues that will be before the Commission in November have been resolved. Those are Issues 1 through 9 and 12 through 17.

MR. BUTLER: Sorry, Commissioner Balbis. I'm struggling to keep up with your rapid pace.

On Page 35 of the exhibit list, Mr. Enjamio's Exhibit JEE-6 appears as one of the direct testimony exhibits. It should be deleted there because it appears properly over on Page 38 as a rebuttal exhibit.

## **COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Okay.

MR. WRIGHT: Commissioner, I don't think this is material, but since we, DeSoto County Generating Company, will be filing surrebuttal testimony, we almost certainly will be filing some surrebuttal exhibits. I don't know if you want to include a placeholder sentence in the prehearing order that says DeSoto plans to file surrebuttal exhibits on October 23. If you do, that's fine. If you don't, as long as it's understood that we will be doing so, that's fine also.

**COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Yes, I could note that in the prehearing order.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Any other changes 1 2 to the exhibit list? 3 Okay. And I believe we covered Section X, 4 proposed stipulations. Any questions or comments on 5 that? Section XI, pending motions. 6 7 MR. MURPHY: There are no pending motions. COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Section XII, 8 9 pending confidentiality motions. 10 MR. MURPHY: There are three pending 11 confidentiality motions which staff will address before 12 the November hearing. 13 MR. BUTLER: May I ask, Mr. Murphy, are you 14 including on your list of three the notice of intent 15 that FPL filed yesterday in connection with late-filed 16 exhibits from the depositions? 17 MR. MURPHY: I'm not. 18 MR. BUTLER: Okay. This will make it four. 19 can provide you the information. We filed a notice of 20 intent to request confidential classification for 21 Mr. Yaeger's Late-filed Exhibit 3/4 that was filed on 22 October 15, and I can provide you the information. 23 MR. MURPHY: Okay. Thank you. 24 MR. WRIGHT: And, Commissioner, DeSoto will be 25 filing or submitting and serving today some discovery

responses. I believe that some of the information contained in those responses will be confidential, and accordingly we will be filing a notice to request confidential classification, as well.

**COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Okay.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

MR. MOYLE: And just taking a review, I'm not sure -- Mr. Pollock is filing testimony on the disputed issues that will be heard in December, and it appears that his exhibits that he filed with his prefiled testimony are not picked up in the exhibits. But I will get with staff and make sure those are properly reflected in the exhibit section.

## **COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Okay.

We will move on to Section XIII, post-hearing procedures. Note for the December hearing, briefs will be due on January 13th. Hopefully the parties are okay with that.

Section -- I'm sorry, did someone --

MR. REHWINKEL: Commissioner, before we leave on the positions on the issues, the Public Counsel had some no position at this time in here, and by default those would revert to no position under the rules. And we're happy with that except for Issue 16. To the extent that issue remains, we would have to say no on

that one. So Issue 16 our position would be no. And
then everything else, all the other issues where we are
no position at this time, it would default to no
position.

MR. MURPHY: Commissioner, just for clarification, you are still not opposed to the stipulation of 16?

MR. McGLOTHLIN: Well, I think we need some — this is Joe McGlothin. I think we need some clarification from Gulf on that. Because I think the parties are aware, upon our motion the three dockets have been consolidated with the rate case, and yet in this position statement there are references to the transmission upgrade projects that have been rolled into that consolidated matter.

MR. MURPHY: Commissioner, with your permission. My understanding is that if we're talking about the transmission, that is in the rate case now. That is no longer in the -- that those numbers are not included in this at this time. At least that's what staff has told me. Can Gulf confirm that those numbers --

MR. BADDERS: That is correct. And this is not intended to do any damage to the process that we have set up as far as the consolidation or anything that

will be handled either in the rate case or in the 92 1 2 docket. 3 MR. McGLOTHLIN: I think in terms of the 4 clarity of the prehearing order, if we can have that 5 reflected in some way, I think that would be an improvement. 6 7 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: I agree. I think it should be stricken, and if you want to reword it and get 8 9 it to staff and the parties it would be clearer. 10 MR. BADDERS: We will work with Public Counsel 11 and staff to modify that. 12 MR. REHWINKEL: Assuming that, then we will be 13 in a no position or nonobjection Type II stipulation 14 mode on Issue 16, as well. 15 **COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Okay. 16 MR. REHWINKEL: Thank you. COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Any questions on 17 18 Section XIII or what we have covered thus far? Okay. 19 So we will move on to Section XIV. And I 20 wanted at this time to discuss the Proposed Issue 10D, 21 and I'd like to hear from the parties, because I 22 understand there is some dispute on this issue. 23 whose ever issue this was can start, I believe, Mr. 24 Moyle.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

MR. MOYLE: Thank you. This is an issue that

FIPUG has put forward. And I think it always helps to step back and consider, you know, the framework, where we are. We have had a lot of issues that have been stipulated today, but these proceedings are kind of set up under Chapter 120 to consider disputed issues of fact if they arise.

There is also the legal issues, but the issue that FIPUG has put forward, FPL is seeking through the environmental cost-recovery clause to recover \$825 million associated with new combustion turbine units, and we are opposed to that, Public Counsel is opposed to it, and we are opposed to it on arguments that the clause does not contemplate that. It's not something that is legally permissible through the clause.

But then FIPUG is in a bit of a unique position that we also would argue that it is not something that can be authorized, given the settlement agreement that was entered into with FPL last year. And so it's a different argument, and it's contractually based, but nevertheless it's an argument that we think is appropriate to put forward in this docket.

And so the issue that FIPUG has proposed simply calls that out with specificity to bring to the Commission's attention, the contractual argument to say,

well, you know, it's kind of like even if all this was something that could be done under the law, which we don't think it is, but even if you assume that, we are arguing that it's contractually prohibited and precluded by the settlement agreement. Specifically, the language found in Paragraph 6 of the settlement agreement that is set forth in the proposed issue.

So we think it's wholly appropriate to be considered at this point in time. It has a direct impact on FIPUG's members, and we negotiated a settlement agreement that provided for a stay out in a rate freeze, and there was language that said -- I will paraphrase, but that essentially there wouldn't be efforts to recover things through clauses that had not historically, traditionally been recovered through clauses. And we don't believe historically and traditionally power plants have been recovered through clauses, and, you know, believe that the answer to the breach of contract question will be FPL is precluded contractually from continuing to seek recovery of these power plants through the environmental cost-recovery clause.

So I hope that gives you some insight and background into the issue, and why we have put it forward.

\_

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay, thank you. And to the party that is disputing this, I believe, Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

We actually find the issue kind of unholy, but putting that aside, we are not opposed to having this as an issue. We think it's really a legal issue in that it is asking contract interpretation questions. Obviously, it is being raised very late in the game after the point when all the testimony that could have addressed it has already been prefiled. So I think that it is kind of an awkward position for being something that would be addressed factually at the hearing, but we'll take a position on it as it is written.

Mr. Moyle took advantage of the opportunity to tell you why he thinks that it is contractually precluded, and I will just say that briefly that there is other language in the same paragraph of the settlement agreement which FPL believes makes it pretty clear that this is recoverable consistent with the terms of the settlement, and that is what we will be reflecting in our position. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Butler.

And I wouldn't be concerned. I have a convenient

memory, so I just ignored all that part that he stated.

But I appreciate your position on this. And are there

any other parties that are disputing this? And, if so, now would be the time to discuss it.

MR. MOYLE: And it sounds just -- it doesn't sound like it's a dispute, maybe just, you know, I'm not sure that it is disputed after hearing Mr. Butler, so we appreciate FPL's willingness to have it teed up.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Mr. Butler, to your comment on being added late in the game, I believe the order establishing procedure allows for issues to be added up to the prehearing conference, if I'm not mistaken. Staff can correct me on that.

MR. MURPHY: That's correct.

commissioner Balbis: Okay. So I know it came in late, but, you know, this is -- I don't want to say unusual procedurally how we are having the separate hearings, but I'll allow some leeway. I do think it is a valid issue. Will additional time be needed to develop positions from the parties on this issue?

MR. REHWINKEL: The Public Counsel, as I said, will need probably until noon tomorrow to provide a position and we are formulating one right now.

**COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Okay. Does noon tomorrow work for everyone?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, sir. Thank you.

MR. BUTLER: That's fine for FPL, as well.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. All right. So I will include Issue 10D, and the parties will have until noon tomorrow to provide positions to staff on that.

Okay. As far as other rulings, again, to be consistent, opening statements will be limited to five minutes per party. Now would be the time for parties to object or request additional time, and you can always waive your right to opening statements.

MR. BUTLER: Commissioner Balbis, will that five minute limit apply to the December 19/20 hearing on the NO2 Compliance Project?

### COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Yes.

MR. BUTLER: I'm thinking that we might like to see a little bit more time for opening statements on that just because it's a relatively complex project, it's going to be, kind of, the focus of that hearing, and if you could expand that to ten minutes. We might not need all of it, but I would be more comfortable with that.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Any objections to ten minutes from the parties? Okay. Hearing none, I will rule that for the November hearing it be limited to five minutes, and for December, ten minutes.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Other matters.

that?

Are there any other matters to address in this prehearing conference?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, Commissioner. For clarification, it is staff's understanding that after completing the record, the November hearing will be continued until December, when a separate hearing will be conducted on the FPL NO2 Project. The November hearing exhibits and prefiled testimony along with the December live testimony and any exhibits that are accepted at the December hearing will form the record of the December hearing. Is that the parties' understanding, as well?

MR. BUTLER: It is for FPL, yes. And just to clarify, the intent is to move forward in reaching resolution on the issues, is it 1 through 9, and the issues other than the 10 series and 11 based on the record that is developed at the November 4 to 6 hearing, correct?

MR. MURPHY: Yes. And as I understand it, a final order would be issued on those issues, and then a second final order would be for the NO2 Project.

MR. BUTLER: That sounds good to us.

**COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Is everyone okay with

MR. MURPHY: Commissioner, one more thing.

#### **COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Sure.

MR. MURPHY: I just want to apologize for sending you through this with a bad script. There's user error on the word processing.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: That's okay. I think we have all been pretty busy lately.

All right. Are there any other matters to discuss in this docket?

MR. MOYLE: FIPUG is fine with the process on that. Two final orders seems a little unusual. I just -- you know, we can talk about that maybe offline, but I don't know how you have two final orders in a single docket.

## **COMMISSIONER BALBIS:** Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Yes. I think the intent of not opening a second docket was to maintain the record that we have. And I think we can have a final order, an order that is final with respect to the issues that have been stipulated, and that was the purpose of including the subject to true-up portion of this, so that we could go forward with a hard deadline of January on the factors that are necessary for these companies.

The other final order would be strictly with respect to the issues on the NO2, and those numbers to the extent that they resulted in fallout numbers in the

1 previous one would be subject to true-up on the original 2 numbers. 3 MR. MOYLE: Okay. 4 MR. MURPHY: It is unusual. MR. MOYLE: Thank you. 5 MR. MURPHY: Yes. 6 7 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: And although it is 8 unusual, again, I want to thank staff and also the 9 parties, I mean, that we try to be creative in ways to 10 maintain everyone's due process rights and make sure 11 that these factors are set and no one is harmed by this. 12 So I appreciate everyone's flexibility on that. 13 Are there any other matters to discuss in this 14 docket? 15 Hearing none, I would like to adjourn the 16 prehearing in the 07 docket and then move on to the 01 17 docket. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

000030 STATE OF FLORIDA 1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 2 : 3 COUNTY OF LEON 4 I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, Hearing 5 Reporter Services Section, FPSC Division of Commission Clerk, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place 6 herein stated. 7 IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that 8 the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a 9 true transcription of my notes of said proceedings. 10 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, 11 nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected with the 12 action, nor am I financially interested in the 13 action. DATED THIS 18th day of October, 2013. 14 15 16 JANE FAUROT, RPR 17 Official FPSC Hearings Reporter (850) 413-6732 18 19 20 21 22

23

24