

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Commission review of numeric
conservation goals (Progress Energy Florida,
Inc.).

Docket No. 080408-EG

Submitted for Filing: June 26, 2009

**PEF'S OBJECTIONS TO NRDC'S & SACE'S SECOND
REQUEST TO PRODUCE DOCUMENTS (Nos. 4-13)**

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 the National Resources Defense Council (NRDC) and Southern Alliance for Clean Energy ("SACE's") Second Request to Produce Documents (Nos. 4-13) and states as follows:

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

PEF generally objects to the time and place of production requirement in NRDC's and SACE's Second Request to Produce Documents and will make all responsive documents available for inspection and copying at the offices of Progress Energy Florida, Inc., 106 E. College Ave., 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 NRDC/SACE for purposes of inspection, copying, or handling of the responsive documents.

With respect to the "Definitions" and "Instructions" in NRDC's and SACE's Second Request to Produce Documents, PEF objects to any definitions or instructions that are inconsistent with PEF's discovery obligations under applicable rules. If some question arises as to PEF's discovery obligations, PEF will comply with applicable rules and not with any of NRDC's and SACE's definitions or instructions that are inconsistent with those rules. 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 that are otherwise not subject to discovery. 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.

Additionally, PEF generally objects to NRDC's and SACE's request 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 NRDC's and SACE's First Request to Produce Documents 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 NRDC's and SACE's 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 Interrogatory or Request for Production that purports to require PEF or its experts to prepare studies, analyses, or to do work for NRDC's and SACE that has not been done for PEF, presumably at PEF's cost.

Finally, PEF objects to any attempt by NRDC's and SACE to evade the numerical limitations set on document requests in the Order Establishing Procedure by asking multiple independent questions within single individual questions and subparts.

By making these general objections at this time, PEF does not waive or relinquish its right to assert additional general and specific objections to NRDC's and SACE's 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 5: PEF objects to this request to the extent it asks PEF to do work or perform analyses for NRDC and SACE, presumably at PEF's expense, where such work or analyses may not have been previously done for PEF. Under governing rules, PEF is not obligated to create information or materials that do not presently exist. PEF will respond to the request to the extent that the information or materials requested already exist.


Request 13: PEF objects to OPC's request number 13 as overbroad, irrelevant and not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. PEF also objects to the information requested from 1992-2007 since such information has no relevance to or bearing on this proceeding. PEF further objects to this request because any such arguably relevant documents and information requested from 1992-2007 have been previously produced and made available by PEF in the ongoing Energy Conservation Cost Recovery Clause.



R. ALEXANDER GLENN
General Counsel - Florida
JOHN T. BURNETT
Associate General Counsel – Florida
PROGRESS ENERGY SERVICE COMPANY, LLC
299 First Avenue North
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
Telephone: (727) 820-5184
Facsimile: (727) 820-5519

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished via electronic and U.S. Mail this 26th day of June, 2009 to all parties of record as indicated below.



JOHN T. BURNETT

Erik Saylor, Esquire
Katherine Fleming, Esquire
Office of General Counsel
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

E. Leon Jacobs, Jr.
Williams & Jacobs, LLC
1720 S. Gadsden St., MS 14
Suite 201
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Susan Clark
Radey Law Firm
301 South Bronough Street, Suite 200
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Ms. Suzanne Brownless
Suzanne Brownless, P.A.
1975 Buford Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32308

Jeremy Susac
Florida Energy & Climate Commission
c/o Governor's Energy Office
600 South Calhoun St., Suite 251
Tallahassee, FL 32399

George S. Cavros, Esq., P.A.
120 E Oakland Park Blvd., Suite 10
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33334