

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition for rate increase by  
Progress Energy Florida, Inc.

Docket No. 050078-EI  
Submitted for filing:  
June 27, 2005

**PEF'S OBJECTIONS TO WHITE SPRINGS AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS,  
INC. D/B/A PCS PHOSPHATE – WHITE SPRINGS' SECOND SET OF  
REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS (NOS. 17-50)**

Pursuant to Fla. Admin. Code R. 28-106.206, Rule 1.350 of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, and the Order Establishing Procedure in this matter, Progress Energy Florida, Inc. ("PEF") hereby serves its objections to White Springs Agricultural Chemicals, Inc. d/b/a PCS Phosphate – White Springs' ("White Springs") Second Set of Requests for Production of Documents (Nos. 17-50) and states as follows:

**GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

PEF generally objects to the time and place of production requirement in White Springs' Second Set of Requests for Production of Documents and will make all responsive documents available for inspection and copying at the offices of Progress Energy Florida, Inc., 106 E. College Ave., Suite 800, Tallahassee, Florida, 32301 at a mutually-convenient time, or will produce the documents in some other manner or at some other place that is mutually convenient to both PEF and White Springs for purposes of inspection, copying (at White Springs' expense), or handling of the responsive documents.

With respect to the "Definitions and Instructions" in White Springs' Second Set of Requests For Production (Nos. 17-50), PEF objects to any definitions or instructions

CMP \_\_\_\_\_  
COM \_\_\_\_\_  
DTR \_\_\_\_\_  
ECR \_\_\_\_\_  
BCL \_\_\_\_\_  
DPC \_\_\_\_\_  
WMS \_\_\_\_\_  
RCA \_\_\_\_\_  
SCR \_\_\_\_\_  
REC   1    
ITH \_\_\_\_\_

that are inconsistent or in conflict with PEF's discovery obligations under applicable rules. PEF also objects to any definitions or instructions that attempt to impose discovery obligations on PEF beyond those called for under the applicable rules. If some question arises as to PEF's discovery obligations, PEF will comply with applicable rules and not with any of White Springs' definitions or instructions that are inconsistent with those rules. PEF objects to any definitions or instructions to the extent that they attempt to seek information or documents from PEF's attorneys that is protected by the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine. PEF also objects to any request that calls for documents to be produced from the files of PEF's outside or in-house counsel in this matter because such documents are privileged and/or work product and are otherwise not within the scope of discovery under the applicable rules and law. Furthermore, PEF objects to any definition or request that seeks to encompass persons or entities other than PEF who are not parties to this action and thus are not subject to discovery. No responses to the requests will be made on behalf of persons or entities other than PEF. Furthermore, PEF objects to any request that calls for PEF to create documents that it otherwise does not have because there is no such requirement under the applicable rules and law.

PEF objects to White Springs' definition "16" given that it includes "affiliates" in the definition of "Progress," and PEF objects to any definition or request that seeks to encompass persons or entities other than PEF who are not parties to this action and thus are not subject to discovery. No documents will be produced on behalf of persons or entities other than PEF. PEF also objects to White Springs' Instruction "3" given that PEF has no obligation under applicable rules to seek out or obtain information or documents from former employees.

Additionally, PEF generally objects to White Springs' requests to the extent that they call for documents protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the accountant-client privilege, the trade secret privilege, or any other applicable privilege or protection afforded by law. PEF will provide a privilege log in accordance with the applicable law or as may be agreed to by the parties to the extent, if at all, that any document request calls for the production of privileged or protected documents.

Further, in certain circumstances, PEF may determine upon investigation and analysis that documents responsive to certain requests to which objections are not otherwise asserted are confidential and proprietary and should be produced only under an appropriate confidentiality agreement and protective order, if at all. By agreeing to provide such information in response to such a request, PEF is not waiving its right to insist upon appropriate protection of confidentiality by means of a confidentiality agreement, protective order, or the procedures otherwise provided by law or in the Order Establishing Procedure. PEF hereby asserts its right to require such protection of any and all information that may qualify for protection under the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, the Order Establishing Procedure, and all other applicable statutes, rules, and legal principles.

PEF generally objects to White Springs' Second Set of Requests for Production to the extent that it calls for the production of "all" documents of any nature, including, every copy of every document responsive to the requests. PEF will make a good faith, reasonably diligent attempt to identify and obtain responsive documents when no objection has been asserted to the production of such documents, but it is not practicable or even possible to identify, obtain, and produce "all" documents. In addition, PEF

reserves the right to supplement any of its responses to White Springs' requests for production if PEF cannot produce documents immediately due to their magnitude and the work required to aggregate them, or if PEF later discovers additional responsive documents in the course of this proceeding.

PEF also objects to any request that calls for projected data or information beyond the year 2006 or prior to 2004 because such data or information is wholly irrelevant to this case and has no bearing on this proceeding, nor is such data or information likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Furthermore, if a request does not specify a timeframe for which data or information is sought, PEF will interpret such request as calling only for data and information relevant to the years 2004-2006.

PEF objects to any attempt by White Springs to evade the numerical limitations set on requests for production in the Order Establishing Procedure by asking multiple independent questions within single individual questions and subparts. PEF also objects to White Springs' instruction "17," and PEF will provide discovery responses in the time frame set forth in the Order Establishing Procedure in this matter. Additionally, PEF objects to White Springs' instruction "15," as there is no such obligation under the applicable rules or the Order Establishing Procedure.

Finally, where a document only exists in paper form, PEF will produce such documents in paper form. Where documents exist in both paper and/or electronic form, PEF will produce such documents in paper form unless White Springs specifically requests production in electronic form.

By making these general objections at this time, PEF does not waive or relinquish its right to assert additional general and specific objections to White Springs' discovery at

the time PEF's response is due under the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure and the Order Establishing Procedure. PEF provides these general objections at this time to comply with the intent of the Order Establishing Procedure to reduce the delay in identifying and resolving any potential discovery disputes.

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS:**

**Request 29:** PEF must object to this request as vague and ambiguous to the extent it refers to all documentation for a model referred to in request 29. Assuming this request actually refers to the proprietary model developed by Dr. Cicchetti's firm and referred to in request 28, PEF further objects to this request because it is unclear as to the meaning of the phrase "all documentation for the model." This request is overbroad, burdensome, and seeks proprietary information that belongs to Dr. Cicchetti's firm and not to PEF.

Respectfully submitted,




GARY L. SASSO  
Florida Bar No. 622575  
JAMES MICHAEL WALLS  
Florida Bar No. 0706272  
JOHN T. BURNETT  
Florida Bar No. 173304  
DIANNE M. TRIPLETT  
Florida Bar No. 0872431  
CARLTON FIELDS, P.A.  
Post Office Box 3239  
Tampa, FL 33601-3239  
Telephone: (813) 223-7000  
Facsimile: (813) 229-4133

R. ALEXANDER GLENN  
Deputy General Counsel – Florida  
PROGRESS ENERGY SERVICE  
COMPANY, LLC  
100 Central Avenue, Ste. 1D  
St. Petersburg, FL 33701  
Telephone: (727) 820-5587  
Facsimile: (727) 820-5519

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished electronically and via U.S. Mail this 31<sup>st</sup> day of June, 2005 to all counsel of record as indicated below.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney

Jennifer Brubaker Felicia Banks Jennifer Rodan <b>Office of the General Counsel</b> Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850	John W. McWhirter, Jr. McWhirter, Reeves, Davidson, Kaufman & Arnold, P.A. 400 North Tampa Street, Ste. 2450 Tampa, FL 33601-3350 -and- Timothy J. Perry McWhirter, Reeves, Davidson, Kaufman & Arnold, P.A. 117 South Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301 <b>Counsel for Florida Industrial Power Users Group</b>
Harold McLean <b>Office of the Public Counsel</b> c/o The Florida Legislature 111 W. Madison Street, Room 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400	C. Everett Boyd, Jr. Sutherland Asbill & Brennan LLP 2282 Killearn Center Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32309
Mike B. Twomey P.O. Box 5256 Tallahassee, FL 32314-5256 <b>Counsel for AARP</b>	James M. Bushee Daniel E. Frank Andrew K. Soto Sutherland Asbill & Brennan LLP 1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20004-2415
Robert Scheffel Wright, John T. LaVia, III, Landers & Parsons, P.A. 310 West College Avenue (ZIP 32301) Post Office Box 271 Tallahassee, Florida 32302 <b>Counsel for Florida Retail Federation</b>	Richard A. Zambo Richard A. Zambo, P.A. 2336 S.E. Ocean Boulevard, #309 Stuart, Florida 34996

	<p>-and-</p> <p>Karin S. Torain PCS Administration, (USA), Inc. Suite 400 Skokie blvd. Northbrook, IL 60062</p> <p><b>Counsel for White Springs</b></p>
--	---