BEFORE THE 1 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 2 In the Matter of: 3 PETITION FOR INCREASE IN RATES DOCKET NO. 080677-EI 4 BY FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY. 5 2009 DEPRECIATION AND DISMANTLEMENT DOCKET NO. 090130-EI STUDY BY FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT 6 COMPANY. 7 8 9 VOLUME 32 10 11 Pages 4275 through 4350 12 ELECTRONIC VERSIONS OF THIS TRANSCRIPT ARE A CONVENIENCE COPY ONLY AND ARE NOT 13 THE OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING, THE .PDF VERSION INCLUDES PREFILED TESTIMONY. 14 PROCEEDINGS: HEARING 15 COMMISSIONERS 16 PARTICIPATING: CHAIRMAN MATTHEW M. CARTER, II COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR 17 COMMISSIONER KATRINA J. McMURRIAN COMMISSIONER NANCY ARGENZIANO 18 COMMISSIONER NATHAN A. SKOP 19 DATE: Saturday, September 5, 2009 20 TIME: Commenced at 9:30 a.m. Concluded at 12:54 p.m. 21 PLACE: Betty Easley Conference Center 22 Room 148 4075 Esplanade Way 23 Tallahassee, Florida 24 REPORTED BY: JANE FAUROT, RPR (850) 413-6732 25 PARTICIPATING: (As heretofore noted.)

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1	INDEX	
2	WITNESSES	
3	NAME:	PAGE NO.
4	Renae B. Deaton	17100 110:
5	Cross-Examination by Mr. Wiseman	4270
6	Cross-Examination by Mr. Wiseman Cross-Examination by Ms. Bradley	4290
7	Cross-Examination by Ms. Bradley Cross-Examination by Ms. Kaufman Cross-Examination by Mr. Wright	4319
8	Cross-Examination by Ms. Brown Redirect Examination by Ms. Clark	4343
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
<b>1</b> 5		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1		EXHIBITS		
2	NUMBER:		ID.	ADMTD.
3	488	FPL's Surveillance Report for April 2009	4281	4347
4 5	.489	FPL's Response to SFHHA POD Number 39	4283	4348
6	490	FPL's Response to SFHHA POD Number 84	4286	4348
7		Exhibit 35 on Comprehensive		4333
8		Exhibit List, Page 4, Items 9, 10, 11 and 14; Page 4,		
9		Item 3, Item 5 and Item 95		
10	160 - 167			4345
11	379, 380			4345
12	484			4345
13	485			4346
14	486			4347
15	487			4347
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4

### PROCEEDINGS

(Transcript follows in sequence from Volume 31.)

CHAIRMAN CARTER: We are back on the record.

And when we last left, Mr. Wiseman, you were on

cross-examination. You may proceed.

MR. WISEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

### BY MR. WISEMAN:

- Q. Ms. Deaton, you have a document before you that has been marked for identification as Exhibit 487 with the short description of GBRA Ignores Depreciation. Do you have that?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And did you discuss this exhibit with anyone during the break?
  - A. No.
- Q. Okay. Now, can you take a look at the exhibit, and would you agree that what will happen under GBRA -- I believe, first of all, the first unit that FPL would propose to put into rate base through the GBRA mechanism is West County Unit 3, is that right?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. So when West County Unit 3 gets put into rate base, that is going to produce an increase to

base rates, right?

- A. Yes.
- Q. And that would be reflected in this graph by that sort of first step up in the stairstep above -right where the dotted line starts, right?
- A. I'm not sure what the relationship between the increase cost of service due to capital additions and this large sloping line of unrecognized depreciation, since it is going in in June of 2011.
  - Q. I'm not asking you about that part it.
  - A. Okay.
- Q. All I'm saying is rates will be set in this case at whatever level they are set at, correct?
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. And then when you put -- if you get the GBRA mechanism approved, when you put West County Unit 3 into rate base through the GBRA mechanism, the base rate will go up by some amount, correct?
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. Okay. And then I think there are two more units that are supposed to go into service through the GBRA mechanism through 2015. I believe one is Cape Canaveral and the other is Riviera Beach, is that correct?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. And so when Cape Canaveral -- whichever one is next, whenever that goes into rate base through the GBRA mechanism, that base rate will go up again, correct?
- A. That is correct. It will go up further to match the cost of the plant.
- Q. Okay. And what you have told us previously is that depreciation will not -- there will be no adjustment to base rates to reflect depreciation that has accumulated since the setting of rates in this case?
- A. No adjustment for depreciation for other plant items, no adjustment for other plant items that have gone into service, such as transmission and distribution, or any other adjustments. These are limited to the plants that are going into service to recognize their costs.
- Q. All right. So you would agree that until and unless FPL files another rate case, that depreciation that continues to accumulate will be unrecognized, and base rates will go up as FPL adds new generation to its rate base, isn't that right?
- A. We are only identifying these plants, the cost of these plants that are going in service. And if the Commission has surveillance reporting requirements that -- if we are overearning, GBRA doesn't change. I think Witness Ousdahl has testified that GBRA will not

effect earnings. In fact, it brings us back to the 1 2 middle. 3 And this, you know, talks about unrecognized depreciation, it also doesn't talk about unrecognized 4 5 other plant additions, or increased O&M, or anything else that is reported in the monthly surveillance 6 7 reports. MR. WISEMAN: Mr. Chair, I would ask that I be 8 given a yes or no answer to the question. 9 10 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Deaton, if you can 11 answer yes or no, please answer yes or no. 12 THE WITNESS: Yes. GBRA does not recognize 13 depreciation of other plant items, it doesn't recognize 14 increase to other plant items, it doesn't recognize 15 increased O&M expenses to other plant items. It only 16 recognizes the cost of the plant. 17 MR. WISEMAN: All right. If I could have 18 marked as the next exhibit in order --19 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Number 488, Commissioners. 20 Number 488. 21 MR. WISEMAN: And the short title for this is 22 FPL's Surveillance Report for April 2009. 23 (Exhibit Number 488 marked for 24 identification.) 25 CHAIRMAN CARTER: You may proceed.

1	MR. WISEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2	BY MR. WISEMAN:
3	Q. Ms. Deaton, could you refer to Schedule 2,
4	Page 3-A of 3, which I think is the seventh page of the
5	document. Let me know when you have that.
6	MS. CLARK: Mr. Wiseman, would you repeat
7	where you want us to be?
8	MR. WISEMAN: Yes. It's Schedule 2, Page 3A
9	of 3. And I have it as the seventh page, excluding the
10	cover sheet. Ms. Clark, do you have that?
11	MS. CLARK: Thank you.
12	BY MR. WISEMAN:
13	Q. Ms. Deaton, do you have that page?
14	A. Yes, I do.
15	Q. Now, do you see that there is a column, it is
16	the fourth column over that says depreciation and
17	amortization?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. And then down at the bottom there is a row
20	that says pro forma system per books adjusted. Do you
21	see that?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. And it states here that the annual amount of
24	depreciation on FPL's system is approximately
25	\$765 million. Do you see that?

1	A. I don't know if this is an annual number or
2	not.
3	Q. Would it appear to you to be something other
4	than an annual number?
5	A. It says April 2009.
6	Q. So you don't know whether this is an annual
7	number?
8	A. No.
9	MR. WISEMAN: Let's go forward. It is what it
10	is. It's an official report filed with the Commission.
11	Could I have marked for identification
12	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Number 489.
13	MR. WISEMAN: And the short title of this is
14	GBRA Add Ons.
15	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Say, again?
16	MR. WISEMAN: GBRA Add Ons.
17	CHAIRMAN CARTER: GBRA Add Ons.
18	MR. WISEMAN: Yes. And, I'm sorry, this was
19	489?
20	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Yes, sir, 489. You may
21	proceed.
22	MR. WISEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
23	(Exhibit Number 489 marked for
24	identification.)
25	

	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
L	0	
L	1	
L	2	
L	3	
L	4	
L	5	
L	6	
	7	
L	8	
L	9	
?	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	

25

### BY MR. WISEMAN:

- Q. Ms. Deaton, the document that has been marked for identification as Exhibit Number 489 is SFHHA Interrogatory Number 39. Do you have that?
  - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. And you sponsored the answer to this interrogatory, correct?
  - A. Yes, I did.

MS. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I just want to -- I just looked at one of the interrogatories in this one. I object to the description of this. I have no objection to it being a response to interrogatory, but I object to the characterization of it. If Mr. Wiseman is willing to take that description off.

MR. WISEMAN: I am happy with whatever description you want on it.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Let's go with FPL Response to SFHHA Interrogatory Number 39.

You may proceed.

# BY MR. WISEMAN:

- Q. Ms. Deaton, you sponsored the answer to this interrogatory, correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Now, the interrogatory asked whether FPL intends to include in the GBRA costs associated with

transmission and/or distribution capital additions, 1 2 right? That is correct. 3 4 And then in your answer, it is the third sentence of the answer, it says, "Therefore, those 5 6 transmission facilities that are required to 7 interconnect and integrate the power plant to an existing transmission network nor approved pursuant to 8 9 the Florida Power Plant Siting Act are recoverable 10 through GBRA." Do you see that? 11 Α. Yes, I do. 12 And I want to focus on the phrase, "And 13 integrate the power plant to an existing transmission 14 network." Am I correct that by that phrase you are 15 referring to transmission network upgrades? 16 Α. Yes, I am. 17 MR. WISEMAN: All right. Now, if I could have 18 marked as another exhibit, this would be --19 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Number 490. 490. 20 title? 21 MR. WISEMAN: GBRA capital additions. 22 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Let's hang on a second 23 before we write the title down to see if Ms. Clark has 24 an objection to it. Why don't we go with FPL Response

to SFHHA POD Number 84.

You may proceed.

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WISEMAN: Thank you.

(Exhibit Number 490 marked for identification.)

#### BY MR. WISEMAN:

- Now, you have before you a document that has been marked for identification as Exhibit Number 490, which is FPL's Response to SFHHA POD Number 84, correct?
  - Α. Yes.
- And that POD asked FPL to describe each Q. project including its estimated capital costs, the recovery of which you anticipate could be initiated through the GBRA during the period January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2015, correct?
  - Yes.
- Q. Okay. Now, can you refer to page -- the first page of the attachment, which is a page that contains data related to the West County Unit 3 project?
  - Uh-huh, yes. Α.
- Q. Okay. Now, it shows there that of the amount of capital additions -- first of all, am I correct this shows the total amount of capital additions that FPL, at least as of the time this answer was prepared, anticipated would be proposed to be put into rates through the GBRA mechanism, right?

	_
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4

1

- A. These are the capital additions that were presented in the need determination, and those would be the capital additions that we would base the GBRA on.
- Q. Okay. And for transmission interconnection and integration, there is a figure there of \$41.6 million, correct?
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. Can you tell me of that \$41.6 million, how much of that relates to network upgrades?
  - A. I have that data.

MR. BUTLER: Mr. Wiseman, just to follow the terminology on the schedule, you would be asking about the transmission integration component as opposed to the transmission interconnection component?

MR. WISEMAN: Yes.

THE WITNESS: Actually, they did not provide me West County 3. I have Cape Canaveral and Riviera here.

MR. WISEMAN: Well, I will ask you those in a second, but if I could ask a question of counsel if they would -- if we would be able to get into the record the amount of the costs for West County Unit 3 that are associated with transmission integration? I had talked to FPL about this specific request before and thought the witness would be prepared to answer these questions.

1 MR. BUTLER: We wouldn't object to providing 2 that breakout for West County. She has it for the other 3 units and apparently just doesn't have it for West County. 4 5 THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't know why West 6 County 3 is missing. 7 CHAIRMAN CARTER: You may proceed. 8 MS. CLARK: I believe the answer is yes. 9 MR. WISEMAN: Thank you. 10 CHAIRMAN CARTER: That's what I thought it 11 was. 12 MR. WISEMAN: I thought we had -- yes, fine. 13 BY MR. WISEMAN: 14 Can you turn to the second page for Cape 15 Canaveral? Of the \$33 million referred to for 16 transmission interconnection and integration, how much 17 of that relates to integration or network upgrades? 18 \$8.1 million. A. 19 All right. And for Riviera, which is the 20 third and final page of the attachment, of the 21 \$132 million listed there, how much is for integration 22 or network upgrades? 23 Α. 110 million. 24 All right. Now, will you accept, subject to 25 check, the costs of the three projects that are listed

1 in this response, specifically West County Unit 3, Cape Canaveral, and Riviera Beach total \$3,255,000,000? 2 3 Three billion, how much? Α. 3,255,000,000. 4 0. 5 Α. That's close. 6 Q. So that is a yes? 7 A. Subject to check. Okay. And that is the amount that FPL would 8 Q. 9 propose to be added to rate base under the GBRA 10 mechanism between 2010 and 2015, correct? 11 That is not the revenue requirements. These 12 are the capital costs. 13 Q. I didn't say the revenue requirement. I said 14 the rate base, I believe. 15 A. Right. 16 Q. Okay. So just so the record is clear, that is 17 the amount, the \$3,255,000,000 is the amount that FPL 18 projects would be added to rate base through the GBRA 19 mechanism between 2010 and 2015, right? 20 Α. Yes. 21 Okay. Now, will you accept, subject to check, 22 that if that amount were offset by depreciation for the 23 years 2012 through 2015, using \$765 million as the 24 annual amount of depreciation, that would reduce the 25 increase to rate base by -- I'm sorry, \$2,295,000,000?

1	A. No, I don't know how much other plant
2	additions that are associated with that depreciation
3	would be going up.
4	Q. I didn't ask you about other plant additions.
5	I asked about the depreciation. If you accept, subject
6	to check, that \$765 million is the annual amount of
7	depreciation, would you agree that \$765 million for the
8	years 2000 each of the years 2012 through 2015 would
9	reduce rate base by \$2,295,000,000?
10	A. I really can't say. The depreciation rates
11	are being set in this case. Also, I don't know what the
12	going forward depreciation amount would be.
13	MR. WISEMAN: Mr. Chairman, I asked her,
14	subject to check, there is a document in the record
15	CHAIRMAN CARTER: She said she didn't know.
16	Move on.
17	THE WITNESS: I just don't know.
18	MR. WISEMAN: Okay. I have no further
19	questions.
20	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Bradley.
21	CROSS EXAMINATION
22	BY MS. BRADLEY:
23	Q. Now, as I understand it you are in charge of
24	designing rates for Florida Power and Light customers in
25	Florida, is that correct?

1	A. Yes, ma'am.
2	Q. And that would have to be in compliance with
3	Florida law, would it not?
4	A. Yes, ma'am.
5	Q. Did you attend any of the customer hearings?
6	A. No.
7	Q. Did you read any of the transcripts?
8	A. No.
9	Q. Did you have anyone brief you on those?
10	A. I saw some summary e-mails, yes.
11	Q. How detailed were they, and did they cover all
12	the hearings or just some of them?
13	A. Yes, all the hearings were covered, and there
14	was a listing of the number of customers and the issues
15	that were raised in the customer service hearings.
16	Q. Have you made any adjustments to your designed
17	rates based upon the customer hearings?
18	A. No. Bills are going down and customers are
19	going to be seeing lower bills next year.
20	Q. So you haven't made any adjustments to what
21	you have proposed?
22	A. No, we proposed what we filed.
23	MS. BRADLEY: No further questions. Thank
24	you.
25	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you, Ms. Bradley.

Ms. Kaufman. 1 2 MS. KAUFMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3 CROSS EXAMINATION BY MS. KAUFMAN: 4 It's still morning. Good morning, Ms. Deaton. 5 6 Good morning. Α. 7 I am Vicki Kaufman with the Florida Industrial Q. Power Users Group, and we spoke during your deposition, 8 9 right? 10 A. Yes. 11 You talked a lot to Mr. Wiseman and in your Q. 12 summary about the fact that customers are going to see 13 an overall decrease in their bill in 2010, correct? 14 Α. On average, yes. 15 Okay. And I am correct that the major factor 16 driving that decrease in 2010 is the reduction in fuel 17 prices? 18 The reduction in cost is due to lower fuel Α. 19 prices and increased efficiencies of our system. 20 Q. Well, would you agree that the major driver is the reduction in fuel costs? 21 22 Hang on just a minute. I think it would be 23 close between efficiencies and lower fuel prices. 24 We talked about this at your deposition, 25 didn't we? Do you have your deposition with you? Would

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1 you take a look at Page 63, please.

MS. CLARK: I would like to have a moment to get there, as well.

MS. KAUFMAN: Sure. Just let me know when you all are ready.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on one second.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

## BY MS. KAUFMAN:

- Q. Are you there, Ms. Deaton?
- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. When we discussed this in your deposition at Page 63, Line 5, I asked the question: Is the fuel factor, the fuel clause factor, is that the major factor that is driving the reduction that you are referring to in your testimony? And your answer was: I would say it is the primary. In fact, I don't know if it is the major one. I'm not sure. Let me look at something here. I said sure. And then what was your answer on Line 12?
- A. Yes, the fuel clause factor, but the fuel clause factor is influenced by lower fuel prices and increased efficiencies.
- Q. And isn't the reduction in the price of fuel that we have all discussed at quite some length, that is the major driver of the overall bill decrease that we

are seeing, correct? 1 2 I don't have the total fuel price difference between this year and last year -- I mean, this year and 3 next year, what we filed. The efficiency savings that 4 5 we have estimated --6 MS. KAUFMAN: Ms. Deaton, excuse me. Mr. 7 Chairman, I'm asking her a very specific question. she doesn't know, I think she can say she doesn't know. 8 9 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Ms. Deaton. 10 BY MS. KAUFMAN: 11 Q. Do you need me to repeat that, Ms. Deaton? 12 We are projecting efficiency savings --13 Excuse me. Q. 14 A. I'm sorry. 15 MS. KAUFMAN: I'm asking the witness --16 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Repeat the question. If you 17 can answer --18 THE WITNESS: You are asking me the 19 difference -- whether efficiency --20 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on. Hang on. 21 THE WITNESS: Sorry. 22 CHAIRMAN CARTER: If you can answer the 23 question yes or no, answer it yes or no. You can still

explain it. Don't give us the long version. Give us

the short version. And if you don't know, just say I

24

1 don't know.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Repeat the question.

MS. KAUFMAN: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: What's the question?

### BY MS. KAUFMAN:

- Q. My question is isn't the decline, the significant decline we have seen in fuel prices the major driver behind the fact that we are going to see an overall decrease in bills in the year 2010?
- A. I don't know if it is the major factor. I do know that we are estimating fuel efficiency savings in 2010 of \$645 million.
- Q. And you don't know how the -- you don't know anything about the fuel prices themselves?
- A. I don't recall the total fuel price difference.
- Q. You say in your direct testimony, I think,

  Page 8, and I don't have the line. I don't know that

  you need to refer to it, but I believe that you say that

  base rate revenues make up 49 percent of FPL's revenue.
  - A. In 2010, I believe. Hang on. Page 8.
  - Q. Of your direct, at Line 6.
- A. Yes, in 2010 they are projected to make up 49 percent of the total bill.

1	$oldsymbol{Q}$ . So if we do the math, the 51 percent to make
2	the 100 is due to the various factors, correct?
3	A. The clause factors and gross receipts tax.
4	Q. Right. And you know, I'm sure, that the fuel
5	adjustment factor changes once a year, correct?
6	A. That is correct.
7	Q. And you would also agree with me that it can
8	change even more frequently if there is a 10 percent
9	variation and the company comes in for a midcourse
10	correction, correct?
11	A. I understand that the company is required to
12	report to the Commission if they are within plus or
13	minus 10 percent of our projections, either under or
14	overrecovery. That may or may not trigger a midcourse
15	correction.
16	Q. But you would agree with me that the company
17	has the ability to request a midcourse correction, and
18	they have done so in the past, haven't they?
19	A. That is correct.
20	Q. Now, again, we have heard a lot of discussion
21	in this hearing, but could you agree with me that fuel
22	prices for your 2010 projections are substantially lower
23	than 2009?
24	A. They are, yes. The 2009 fuel prices are 52.23
25	in December of '09, and they go down to \$35. That's

about a \$17 decrease.

Q. So you would agree we have seen a pretty big declining from last years fuel prices, particularly in natural gas?

A. Yes.

Q. And FPL -- many of FPL's plants are powered by natural gas, correct?

A. That is correct.

**Q.** And in Florida, obviously, we are in hurricane season now, and we have been fortunate to far, but would you agree that sometimes hurricanes disrupt the delivery of natural gas across the Gulf?

A. I'm not the fuel procurement witness, but I do understand that in prior hurricanes that that has been an issue, but I believe that that issue has been addressed going forward. They have dealt with -- found ways to deal with that.

Q. So you don't think that a hurricane hit would have any impact on FPL's fuel prices?

A. I'm not saying that. I am saying that it may or it may not.

Q. Certainly would you agree that if fuel supply was disrupted, we could see a spike in natural gas prices, and we have seen that in the past, haven't we?

A. That is correct.

1	Q. And I think that goes to some of the questions
2	I believe Mr. Wiseman asked you about the fact that,
3	obviously, fuel is very volatile in terms of being able
4	to predict prices?
5	A. Yes, fuel is volatile.
6	Q. Now, I want to talk to you for a few minutes
7	about the principles of gradualism and the 1.5 times
8	system average
9	A. Certainly.
10	Q rule that we discussed in your deposition.
11	And I asked your counsel to ask you to have the
12	materials that you refer to on that topic in your
13	testimony, I believe your rebuttal. So did you bring
14	those with you?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. All set?
17	A. Okay.
18	Q. We discussed in your deposition, and we have
19	heard some talk today that the Commission has applied, I
20	will just call it a general policy to limit increases to
21	any rate to 1.5 times the system average, and that no
22	class should receive a decrease. Would you agree with
23	that?

rate classes on base rates and they have also applied it

24

25

Yes, they apply -- they have applied it to the

based on total rates in the past with clauses. 1 2 And can we refer to that as the principle of 3 gradualism? A. 4 Certainly. 5 Q. Some questions were asked to you about the 6 Tampa Electric rate case order that recently came out. 7 Α. Uh-huh. 8 Do you have a copy of that? 9 Yes, I do. Α. 10 MS. KAUFMAN: And, Mr. Chairman and 11 Commissioners, I have not made copies of all of these 12 orders based on the prior rulings. 13 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. 14 BY MS. KAUFMAN: Ms. Deaton, if you would turn to Page 87 of 15 16 that order, and if you would read the sentence that 17 begins, "No class should." It is at the very top. Ιt 18 is the first sentence on my copy. 19 A. Yes, I have that. 20 Q. Can you read for us that first sentence on the 21 top of Page 87? It starts, "No class should receive." 22 Α. Yes, I am just looking at something before. 23 "No class should receive an increase greater than one 24 and a half times the system average percentage increase

in total, and no class should receive a decrease.

1	appropriate allocation must recognize approved changes
2	and consolidation of classes, treatment of current IS
3	customers, and restructuring of lighting rate
4	schedules."
5	Q. And you are aware that that is the policy the
6	Commission applied in the Tampa Electric case?
7	A. That was the policy the Commission applied in
8	the Tampa Electric case, and that impacted just one rate
9	class, the lighting rate class.
10	Q. Well, are you aware that if the Commission had
11	not applied that principle of gradualism that the
12	industrial class would have actually received a decrease
13	in that case?
14	A. Yes. It appears that they did not apply a
15	decrease to interruptible general service.
16	Q. Now, Mr. Wiseman looked at MFR Schedule E-13a
17	with you. Do you still have that?
18	A. I have it in my book. Okay.
19	Q. Before we turn to that, there were some
20	questions that I wanted to ask Mr. Ender that have been
21	directed to you. And I wanted to ask him if he was
22	familiar with the term rate shock. Are you familiar
23	with that?

Q. You've never heard the term rate shock?

Yes, I am familiar with bill shock.

24

25

A.

- A. Rate shock sometimes equates to bill shock.
- **Q.** Okay. But are you not aware that it relates also to the impact of a reduction or an increase in a particular rate?
  - A. It could.
- Q. Okay. And one of the reasons the Commission has applied or used that 1.5 system average rule is to mitigate rate shock, correct?
- A. I believe they have applied it to mitigate bill increases, and that is what I have said in my rebuttal testimony.
- Q. Okay. We will talk about that in a second. So you don't agree that they have applied that policy to mitigate rate shock?
- A. No. I think they have applied it to mitigate bill impacts.
- Q. Let's take a look at E-13a, and let me ask you this. And I want you to focus on rates, because I think we have had a lot of discussion about the fact that the majority of the decrease that is going to be seen in 2010 is related to the volatile fuel factor, so I want to look -- I want to talk to you about rates. And I want to ask you if there is a percentage increase that you might find to fulfill the definition of rate shock, what would that be?

1	<b>A.</b> I would not look at just the base rates alone.
2	I would look at the total bills, and I would look at
3	E-8.
4	MS. KAUFMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I could get an
5	answer to my question. I'm trying to be real clear and
6	precise and the witness is wanting to tell me something
7	else.
8	CHAIRMAN CARTER: You asked her what should
9	she do, and she told you what she would do.
10	MS. KAUFMAN: I asked her if there would be a
11	percentage at which a rate
12	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ask again.
13	MS. KAUFMAN: Okay.
14	BY MS. KAUFMAN:
15	Q. Looking at E-13a, concentrating on rates,
16	okay. Putting aside bill, we are going to go to that.
17	Is there a percentage of rate increase, increase to a
18	particular rate that you would say would meet the
19	definition of rate shock?
20	A. Not without looking no, not without looking
21	at the total package.
22	Q. Okay. Well, if you look
23	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on a second.
24	Commissioner Skop.
25	ms. kaufman: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Kaufman. 1 BY MS. KAUFMAN: 2 If you look at the Line 1 that Mr. Wiseman 3 Q. talked to you, the CILC-1D rate, if FPL's rates are 4 5 approved that rate is going to receive an increase of 6 59 percent, correct? 7 Α. That is correct. And I think he said they will -- the overall 8 ο. bill will result in a decrease because of the fuel 9 10 component, correct? 11 The fuel and the capacity factor, yes. 12 Ο. Right. Now, that is for 2010. Obviously, you 13 haven't filed your projections for 2011 or 2012. Yes, we have. We haven't filed fuel factors 14 Α. 15 for '11, no. Okay. Let me back up so it is clear. You 16 Q. 17 filed those projections and those were for 2010? That is correct. 18 Α. 19 Q. You haven't filed any fuel factors for 2011 or 2012, and you will do that in the normal course of your 20 21 regulatory proceedings, correct? 22 That is correct. We filed projections for A.

Q. But, for example, just to go one year further out to your fuel filings for 2011, as we sit here today

23

24

25

2011 in this case.

1 we don't know what the fuel price is going to be in 2 2011, do we? 3 No, we don't, but we do know that they will be A. lower than they would be absent the efficiency 5 improvements that we are making in our system. 6 But we don't know, for example, if there could 7 be some fuel disruption and we might see a spike in fuel 8 prices that would amount to an increase in the total 9 bill, is that correct? 10 That is correct, and we also don't know if 11 there will be further fuel reductions. 12 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on second. 13 Kaufman, let her answer. 14 MS. KAUFMAN: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. 15 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. I mean, let's kind of 16 tone it down a little bit. I know everybody wants to be 17 home on Saturday, and I apologize for that. But just 18 ask the question again, and let her answer it. 19 BY MS. KAUFMAN: 20 Let me try again, if that would be all right 21 with you, Ms. Deaton. 22 I think I was saying that you filed or the 23 company has filed their projections for 2010 for fuel 24 and based on that we know there is going to be a 25 decrease?

- A. That is correct.
- Q. Okay. But they haven't filed for 2011, or 2012, or further out, right?
  - A. No, we only file one year at a time.
- Q. Exactly. And one reason that you only file one year at a time, would you agree, is because fuel prices do, you know, vary from period to period?
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. So my question was we don't know as we sit here today whether there will be fuel increases in 2011, '12, you know, down the road, that will result in an increase in the overall bill?
- A. I agree that we don't know if the fuel prices -- the fuel factors will go up. I do know that if they do go up, they will not go up as much as they would have absent efficiency savings that we are making on our system. And we also don't know if fuel prices will go down, as they have been doing, to cause even lower fuel prices in the future.
- Q. But as we sit here today, we really can't say what is going to happen to fuel in 2011, '12, '13.
- MS. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, that's been asked and answered at least twice.
- CHAIRMAN CARTER: Move on. It's been asked and answered. While you are getting your notes

1 together, Commissioner -- okay. All right. You may 2 proceed, Ms. Kaufman. 3 MS. KAUFMAN: I'm sorry. 4 BY MS. KAUFMAN: 5 Let's go back to rebuttal, and I wanted to go 6 back and look at some of those other orders that you 7 talked about. And one of those that you talked about 8 was the Gulf Power order, correct? 9 A. That is correct. 10 And that is an order, if I understand your 11 testimony, where you said that the Commission deviated 12 from the 1.5 times the system average? 13 Α. That is correct. 14 By the way, can you just tell us what is the 15 system average increase? I think it is on E-13a. 16 No, that is not correct. 17 Okay. Well, can you tell us what the system 18 average increase is in a percentage? 19 Α. On Schedule E-8. 20 Uh-huh. Q. 21 Α. The system average with clauses is 9.2 percent 22 and the system average without clauses is 25.4 percent. 23 Okay. So just without setting aside the 24 clauses, it is the system average base rate increases of 25 approximately 25 percent, correct?

1 Α. Yes, the base rate average is 25 percent. 2 Q. Okay. 3 A. And that includes base rates and customer 4 service charges. 5 Okay. And that is the number close to the 6 number shown on Line 40 of E-13a, right? 7 Α. I think they are pretty close. 8 Okay. That's close enough for my purposes. 9 Yes. Α. 10 If you would now look at the Gulf order, which 11 I think is one of the orders that you referred to in 12 your testimony. 13 Α. Yes. 14 And if you would look under the section that 15 is titled Allocation of Revenue Increase. And I'm 16 sorry, I don't know that my pages are the same as yours. I think we talked about that at the deposition. On my 17 18 copy it's Page 33, but it may not be the same. 19 Yes, I have it. A. 20 Okay. So the section we are going to look at Q. 21 is called allocation of revenue increases, and there is a chart there, but below the chart the Commission says 22 23 that because they are committed to gradual process 24 toward uniform rates of return for all classes, the 25 revenue increase will be divided between the residential

and outdoor classes so as to bring them both up to the 1 2 same rate of return as shown below. Do you see where 3 that is? I see that. 5 Okay. And the next sentence says that this 6 amounts to a percentage increase without fuel, so the 7 Commission removed the fuel component, correct, when 8 they were applying this principle? 9 It's not clear to me --A. 10 Q. Do you --11 A. It's not clear to me that they didn't look at 12 fuel. 13 Q. Well, do you see the sentence that is right 14 after where I read that says this amounts to a 15 percentage increase without fuel of 5.71 for the RS 16 class and 5.34 for the OSS class? 17 Yes, I see that. A. 18 Okay. So doesn't the Commission specifically 19 remove the fuel component from the calculation there? 20 A. To determine the increase to the rate class --21 for the base rates to the rate classes, yes, they would 22 look at it without fuel, but I don't know that they 23 didn't look at fuel overall in determining whether to 24 deviate from the one and a half times. 25

Q.

Is there anywhere in this order where they say

that they have looked at fuel in order to deviate from 1 the 1.5? 2 Not in this order, but in the 830465 order 3 Α. they did. 4 Okay. But let's concentrate on the Gulf 5 Q. order. 6 7 Α. This order. So we have agreed that there was a deviation 8 9 from the rule. We agreed that fuel wasn't looked at, 10 correct? 11 Α. Right. Well, no, I agree that they removed fuel in order to calculate the increase for the 12 residential and OS classes. 13 Okay. That's fair. And the increase there, 14 or the deviation from the 1.5, would you agree with me 15 16 for the RS class was 5.71 percent? The same page we were just looking at. 17 A. Yes. 18 And for the OS rate it was 5.34? 19 20 That is correct. 21 Okay. And, again, this is only the rate. How 22 does that compare with the deviation that you are suggesting, say, for the CILC-1D class we have been 23 24 talking about? What is the percentage deviation from 25 the 1.5 times system average?

1	A. The percentage deviation?
2	Q. Uh-huh.
3	A. About 15 percent higher.
4	Q. We're talking about relative to the system
5	average of 25 percent?
6	A. Yes. The system average is 25 percent and
7	CILC-1D is 41 percent.
8	Q. Wouldn't you have you looked at Mr.
9	Pollock's JP-9?
.0	A. Yes, I have.
1	$oldsymbol{Q}$ . Okay. Do you have a copy of that in front of
L2	you, or can you get one?
L3	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on a second,
L4	Ms. Kaufman. Ms. Clark, I agreed to give her a break.
15	Is this about the time, because she has been going for
16	about an hour.
L7	MS. CLARK: Are you okay to continue?
18	THE WITNESS: I'm okay.
19	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Are you okay for now?
20	THE WITNESS: Yes.
21	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay.
22	THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.
23	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Kaufman.
24	BY MS. KAUFMAN:
25	O. Let me know when you are there, Ms. Deaton.

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4

A.	Yes.	Ι	have	JP-9

- Q. Okay. And, again, we are talking about the relative impact compared to the system, and isn't it correct that, for example, for the CILC-1 class that Mr. Pollock shows on JP-9, that it is about 231 percent?
- A. I would agree it is more than two times the system average.
- Q. And you don't disagree that he has calculated it correctly at 231 percent, do you?
- A. He has -- in calculating the percent increase he has not taken into account the other operating revenue increases, so he has left that out of this calculation.
- Q. Again, just to be clear, we are talking about the rate?
  - A. Right.
- Q. And he correctly calculated that at 231 percent.
- A. I haven't checked his numbers, but subject to check, they look appropriate.
- Q. Okay. And similarly for the GSLD-1 in the HLFT classes, as well as some others, it is a 216 percent increase?
- A. That is correct. These customers will also be seeing the largest bill decreases.

1	<b>Q.</b> In 2010.
2	A. Correct.
3	Q. Now, another case that you talked about was
4	I don't know if I can talk about this. This was a
5	Peoples Gas case. Maybe I should skip over that one.
6	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Right. Let's don't do that.
7	MS. KAUFMAN: Okay. Sorry.
8	CHAIRMAN CARTER: You are doing quite well so
9	far.
10	MS. KAUFMAN: I forgot that until
11	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Keep your streak alive.
12	MS. KAUFMAN: I looked at it and saw that.
13	Let me just get
14	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Take a moment.
15	BY MS. KAUFMAN:
16	Q. Let's just talk I'm done with that. I had
17	forgotten about the Peoples case. Let's talk for a
18	minute about the GBRA. There has just a lot of
19	discussion about it, and I'm not going to replow the
20	ground that Mr. Wiseman went over, but I do want to ask
21	you this. You refer, and I think other FPL witnesses
22	do, as well, to the fact that you are asking the
23	Commission to continue the GBRA, correct?

A. That is correct.

24

25

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Q. And you are aware, are you not, that the GBRA

was part of a comprehensive settlement of FPL's 2005 1 2 rate case? 3 That's correct. Α. And you are aware that the settlement expires 5 at the end of this year? 6 That is correct. 7 And you are aware that the GBRA, pursuant to 8 the settlement, expires at the end of this year? 9 A. That is correct and that is why we are asking 10 the Commission to continue it. 11 And would you agree with me that in a 12 settlement such as the one that resulted in the 2005 13 rate case, that by necessity there is a lot of give and 14 take between the parties? 15 I agree with that. 16 Q. And would you also agree that to FPL's credit 17 part of their give was to freeze base rates? 18 A. That is correct. 19 And there was a lot of other back and forth, 20 but part of the back and forth included the GBRA, 21 correct? 22 That is correct. 23 Now, I think this is probably an obvious 24 question, but FPL is not offering to freeze base rates 25 in this case, correct?

A.	No. I	TPL is	prop	oosing	, to	cont	inue	a reg	gulato	ry
efficient	method	d for	incl	ıding	in	base	rates	the	cost	of
new power	plants	that	are	comme	ensu	ırate	with	fuel	savin	ıgs
the custor	ners wi	ll se	е.							

- Q. Yes, I understand FPL's position. My point is that when the parties to the 2005 case agreed to the GBRA, there were a lot of other, as I said, gives and takes involved in that settlement. Would you agree to that?
- A. I think I agree that a settlement is a give and take.
- Q. And would you also agree that -- and I have the order, but I don't think we will need it. Would you also agree that when the settlement was presented to the Commission, and its approval was sought, the parties included language which basically said we would ask you to accept this entire agreement and, you know, if not to be colloquial, the deal is off?
  - A. That is my understanding, yes.

MS. KAUFMAN: One more question about the GBRA and, Mr. Chairman, I think we will be done.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Great.

## BY MS. KAUFMAN:

Q. You had a lot of discussion with Mr. Wiseman about this and with the Commissioners, but when GBRA --

	Ш
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

when items eligible for the GBRA, if the GBRA were to be approved, are rolled into rate base, the Commission or the parties don't look at any of the other revenues, or expenses, or other items concerning FPL's financial status, would you agree with that?

A. No, it's -- yes, I agree with that it is an interim measure until the next base rate case when all items can be looked at. And I also understand Witness Ousdahl testified that it really doesn't change our earnings level, and that the Commission has the surveillance reports available to it if it deems that we need to come in for a base rate case.

MS. KAUFMAN: I don't know if I said one more
question, but we also --

CHAIRMAN CARTER: You did.

MS. KAUFMAN: Okay. Well, can I have one more?

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Go ahead.

MS. KAUFMAN: Okay.

## BY MS. KAUFMAN:

- Q. We also have heard several times that it has been about 20 years since FPL came in for a rate case, correct?
- A. It has, yes. Well, FPL filed a rate case in 2005. Before that it was 1984. FPL was able to reduce

rates three times, once for the tax savings docket in 1990 and two times subsequent to that saving customers \$600 million per year.

- Q. The last time there was a fully -- it has been about 20 years since there was a fully litigated rate case, is that true? Probably more than that, actually.
- A. Well, I'm not the attorney to determine what is fully litigated. I know we filed a full rate case, and it went all the way through discovery in 2005, and before that the Commission determination in the 1984 case was the one before that.
- Q. Right. And I'm not trying to pin you down, you know, to specific dates. My point being that it has been a long period of time absent settlements in regard to when your rates have been reviewed, you know, in the kind of proceeding that we are here today in.
- A. Well, they were reviewed in 1999 when the Commission had us come in to review them, which resulted in the settlement reducing rates, and then again in 2002.
- Q. Let me try this one more time, and then I will leave it, because I think that -- I hope that the record is clear that it has been quite some time since all of us have gathered here as we are today for a rate case.
  - MS. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I think just to be

ئ 

clear that rate cases have been filed. If Ms. Kaufman wants to make it clear have we gone through the same length of proceeding through putting witnesses on, that is a different question.

Ms. KAUFMAN: Okay. Well, thank you, Ms. Clark.

## BY MS. KAUFMAN:

- Q. The way Ms. Clark phrased it, it is true that it has been quite some time since we have gone all the way to the end of a proceeding and putting on witnesses, correct?
- A. Yes. FPL has been able to avoid raising rates for quite some time, and, in fact, has lowered rates three times.
- Q. And I guess it would be fair to ask you, you don't know when FPL plans to come in for another rate case, do you?
  - A. No, I do not.
- Q. And to the extent, you know, it is years and years, and plants are eligible for GBRA, they will be -- and if the GBRA is approved, they will be put into rate base without a review of the other expenses and revenues of the company, other than looking at the surveillance reports?
  - A. Yes. The Commission has the surveillance

1	reports to review, and those are reviewed monthly it is
2	my understanding. And, yes, with GBRA plants they would
3	go into service.
4	MS. KAUFMAN: If you will just give me one
5	second, Mr. Chairman.
6	CHAIRMAN CARTER: I am afraid to. We might
7	end up with that one question that turned into ten.
8	But, go ahead.
9	MS. KAUFMAN: All right. I'm sorry.
10	CHAIRMAN CARTER: It's okay. Take your time.
11	Take your time.
12	MS. KAUFMAN: Thank you very much for
13	indulging me.
14	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you, Ms. Kaufman.
15	Mr. Wright, good morning.
16	MR. WRIGHT: Good morning.
17	CHAIRMAN CARTER: It's actually afternoon,
18	isn't it?
19	MR. WRIGHT: It is afternoon. Good afternoon,
20	Mr. Chairman.
21	I don't have much for Ms. Deaton. You know,
22	it could turn into 10 or 15 minutes. I understood that
23	somebody wanted to take a break. It might be a good
24	time. If not, I am happy to proceed.
25	CHAIRMAN CARTER: I have given Ms. Clark an

opportunity to give the witness a break on the --1 MS. CLARK: I am waiting for her cue. Until 2 she gives that to me, we are ready to go. 3 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Are you okay? 4 THE WITNESS: I think I can go to 12:30. 5 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Oh, great. He will be done 6 by then. 7 THE WITNESS: 8 Okay. 9 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Maybe. MR. WRIGHT: I have some things --10 THE WITNESS: You said ten or 15 minutes. 11 12 MR. WRIGHT: I'm supremely confident that I'll 13 be done by then. 14 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Wright. 15 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CROSS EXAMINATION 16 BY MR. WRIGHT: 17 18 Good afternoon, Ms. Deaton. Q. 19 Hello, Schef. Α. 20 My name is Schef Wright, and I represent the Q. 21 Florida Retail Federation in this case. I just have a 22 few questions, not relating to rate design or cost of 23 service that follow along some of your conversation with Ms. Kaufman. 24 25 First, I would like to -- I just want to ask

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

i	
1	you a
2	RBD-2.
3	follow
4	base r
5	typica
6	declir
7	
8	unfeas
9	saving
10	the fu
11	Ç
12	the fu
13	, z
14	come c
15	S
16	Į z
17	,
18	paid f
19	Į z
20	9
21	Į z
22	Witnes
23	,

25

you a couple of questions about your updated Exhibit RBD-2. I just want to make sure that I have the following right. It looks to me that if there were no base rate increase in this case that the bill for a typical 1,000 kilowatt hour residential customer would decline by \$17.23 per month, is that correct?

- A. That would be correct, but it would be unfeasible to have the fuel efficiency improvements and savings that we have been making put into effect through the fuel clauses without having a base rate increase.
- Q. You have already built the plants that provide the fuel savings, have you not?
- A. Yes, so far. West County 2 is scheduled to come on-line in November.
  - Q. November of what year?
  - A. This year.
- Q. Okay. That plant is essentially built and paid for, is it not?
  - A. No, it is not completed.
  - Q. How much have you got left to spend on it?
- A. I don't know that. You will have to ask Witness Hardy.
- Q. Okay. Isn't it true that -- you took us off on this tangent about not being able to pay for the plants. Isn't it true that the company would recover

all of its O&M expenses, all of its interest costs and 1 still have a positive net operating income even with no 2 3 base rate increase? I have no idea. You would have to speak to 4 Α. Witness Barrett. 5 Okay. Well, I think the MFR schedules bear 6 that out, but I will proceed. 7 Those aren't mine. 8 Α. 9 Okay. You did answer my question Q. 10 affirmatively that the residential typical 1,000 kWh bill would decline by \$17.23? 11 12 The difference between the fuel factor in A. 13 December of this year of 52.23 and the fuel factor that 14 we filed for January of 2010 is approximately \$17. 15 If you divided -- I want to know what the 16 percentage decrease would be if there were no base rate 17 increase. When I do the arithmetic, I calculate that 18 the decline from 109.32 to approximately 91.31 is 16-1/219 percent. Will you agree that with no base rate increase 20 the typical 1,000 kWh residential customer's bill would 21 otherwise decline by 16-1/2 percent effective next

22

23

24

25

January?

A. Subject to check. I haven't done the math.

Q. Okay. Ms. Kaufman and you had a conversation about efficiency savings, and I would like to explore

that a little bit. You made the statement that you are 1 estimating efficiency savings of \$645 million next year. 2 Is that an accurate characterization of your testimony? 3 That is the estimate. A. 4 Okay. Now, I note, again, from RBD-2, and 5 also I will aver to you from part of the company's fuel 6 7 filing that it looks like the average cost per kilowatt hour or, say, per 1,000 kilowatt hours is coming down by 8 9 about \$17? 10 A. Yes. Okay. Is that fairly representative across 11 12 rate classes? 13 Α. Fairly. 14 Okay. So, do you know what the company's projected megawatt hour sales, or kilowatt hours sales, 15 16 or gigawatt hour sales are for next year? That is in my -- 101 billion kilowatt hours, 17 A. 18 if I am reading this right. 19 That is the number I have. Thank you. 20 So you would agree, I think, that 101 billion 21 kilowatt hours is the same as 101 million megawatt 22 hours, yes? 23 A. Yes. 24 Okay. And I have two calculators. I would be

happy to lend you one.

1	A. No thanks.
2	Q. But I'm sure you will agree that \$17 per
3	megawatt hour times 101 million megawatt hours is just a
4	little more than \$1.7 billion, correct?
5	A. Sounds right.
6	$oldsymbol{Q}$ . Okay. So that's the total decline in the
7	company's fuel cost bill projected for next year,
8	roughly?
9	A. I can't testify to that. The fuel filing has
LO	been filed and those numbers are presented there.
11	Q. Well, you did just answer affirmatively
12	without qualification that the average fuel factor is
13	coming down by about \$17 per megawatt hour companywide?
14	A. I said it was, you know, give or take, but the
15	fuel factor is calculated and applied to the rate
16	classes fairly evenly, except for losses. So I wouldn't
17	say it is exactly \$17.
18	Q. And I'm not trying to hold you to exactly \$17,
19	but I bet we could agree it is probably between 16 and
20	18, couldn't we?
21	A. I'm not the fuel witness.
22	Q. Well, would you agree that 645 million divided
23	by 1.7 billion is around 35 or 36 percent?

Q. 645, your number on the claimed fuel

A. 600 and what?

24

1 efficiency savings, divided by roughly \$1.7 billion of total fuel cost reductions? 2 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Skop. 3 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 4 I am going to take the unusual step here to address 5 something that I see occurring as we speak. 6 7 Mr. Litchfield, the document that you have before you, may I please see that document? Not the --8 9 not the item, but the other white piece of paper that 10 you have in your hand. 11 No, the one in your other hand. 12 MR. LITCHFIELD: The white piece? 13 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Yes, please. You have 14 that flipped around. May I see that, please? 15 Ms. Bennett, did Commissioner Edgar ask you to 16 prepare a document outlining the various scenarios related to a decision date that this Commission would 17 18 make as to the conclusion of this hearing? 19 MS. BENNETT: No, sir. We have been 20 working -- staff has been working with the calendar 21 trying to figure out what is going to happen and when, 22 and we are going to meet with -- I am hoping to meet 23 with the parties after today to kind of discuss the 24 briefing schedules, but, no.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. I apologize. Any

Commissioner is entitled to ask for anything, but what I 1 have observed, or think that I have perceived observed, 2 I was wondering whether it was a document that may have 3 been prepared internally may have found its way into the utility's hands. And, again, I don't know if staff 5 prepared this document. Does this document look 6 7 familiar? MS. BENNETT: The one I am working off of is 8 9 over here, and I will be glad to make a copy of it for 10 everybody. 11 MR. BUTLER: Mr. Chairman. 12 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Butler. 13 MR. BUTLER: I just want to state for the 14 record that what Mr. Litchfield had is a document we 15 were preparing, hoping to --16 17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Very well. Again, I am just concerned about things that I see. I don't mean to make any --

MR. BUTLER: I just want to make it clear for the record, as I said, that this is something FPL was preparing in looking at scenarios that might be available for possible decision periods. And I just want to make it clear for the record that's what Mr. Litchfield had in his hand that I had provided to Commissioner Skop to review.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: That's fine. You can have the document back.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: You can have the document back. I appreciate it. I'm just trying to ensure the integrity of the process, and I see a lot of discussion in the back of the room with documents in relation to the yellow sheet that is the Commission's docket of cases. So, again, I don't mean to make any accusations or what have you, but, again, there is things that are happening around me that I have significant concerns with as a Commissioner and as an attorney.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Chairman, I will just say, I have the standard yellow sheet right here that we use to look at the calendar, and I have been looking at it this morning, realizing that the witnesses, you know, are taking substantial time. And we have all said we are not going to rush, and I certainly have been looking at my calendar and the Commission calendar to try to see what going further --

**COMMISSIONER SKOP:** And, again, no -- no offense.

commissioner edgar: So, it seems like you -since you mentioned my name specifically, like you were
trying to allege something, and I will tell you I

absolutely have been looking at the calendar and trying
to think through what the dates mean. I'm not sure
what -- what more you are getting at.

commissioner skop: My understanding was that staff had been working on some dates, perhaps at the request of one or more Commissioners. And, again, I have seen lot of discussion in the back of the room between the yellow Commission docket and a white piece of paper. And, again, I thought --

Again, no allegations. My apologies to Mr. Litchfield. But, again, I have concerns as to ensuring the integrity of the process. I think FPL is a very — is a company that has a high degree of integrity, and I'm not trying to question that, but I'm trying to ensure the integrity of the process is maintained. So, again, there —

commissioner edgar: Well, Commissioner, it seems that you were trying to question staff about me, and I am just not understanding. And, yes, the yellow paper, and I have many more white pieces of paper.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Well, again, I don't want to make any -- I just wanted to raise a concern, and, basically, I guess, assure myself that, again, that -- that, again, there are two different pieces of paper. But my concern was founded upon not

speculation, but my understanding that staff had been requested to look at some dates, specifically to understand what the ramifications were as to the conclusion date of the hearing. And, again, I just wanted to express my concern.

Not to bring this up, but, again, there are some things that I'm not happy with. And, again, I am -- you know, I don't like what I am seeing. And again, I just -- and when those issues arise, I am going to do what I feel is necessary to convince myself that there is nothing more that had been going on. So, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner, you were very careful to apologize to FPL, but you did not apologize to Commissioner Edgar.

commissioner skop: If there were any -- again, there were no allegations, so, again, I extend an apology. But, again, I have seen lot of discussion this morning that has brought a reasonable concern to mind.

But, again, I apologize if there is any offense that should be taken. And, again, I will extend an apology.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: When I gaveled the meeting to order this morning, you were not here, Commissioner,

I told everyone that the next meeting dates are September 16 and September 17th, 2009. I told all the parties to be prepared, because we will start at 9:30, and we will probably go all the way to 9:30 p.m., at least 12 hours to get this thing done.

In the context of where we are going from there, the schedule for briefing and those things will follow -- will fall out from there as we normally do it. So, I mean, I am the one that mentioned the calendar this morning, because I was working with the parties to try to get them some time to have a full opportunity to have their cases heard.

You may proceed on your cross-examination, Mr. Wright.

Oh, did you need to take a break now?

THE WITNESS: I just did.

CHAIRMAN CARTER: You did.

Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Ms. Deaton.

## BY MR. WRIGHT:

 $\mathbf{Q}$ . I think the question that I had asked you is, and I -- the question I had asked you is based on your estimate of \$645 million of efficiency savings relative to a total fuel cost decrease in the range of

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4

\$1.7 billion. What I said was, wouldn't you agree that the efficiency savings piece of that is about 35 or 36 percent. I will tell you --

- A. That sounds about right.
- ${f Q}.$  I redid my arithmetic using a calculator instead of my brain in the meantime, and it is closer to 38.
  - A. Okay.
  - Q. Okay. So you will accept that?
  - A. Subject to check, yes.
- Q. Okay. My question, my next question for you is how did you calculate the efficiency savings to which you testified earlier?
- A. Based on the system heat rates presented by Witness Hardy in 2002 versus what they will be this year with all the efficiency improvements we have made with the plants over the years and the new plants that have gone into service.
- Q. Would I be better served, perhaps, to ask
  Mr. Hardy about this further?
- A. He has determined what the efficiency savings are and the heat rates. We have taken that and calculated using projected fuel prices, actual and projected fuel prices, to determine the fuel dollar savings. So I am the witness for the fuel dollar

3

2

4

5

6 7

8 9

1.0

12

11

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

He is the witness for the efficiencies. savings.

I will just ask you a couple of questions. Q. Your answers may well be I don't know, and if so, that will be that.

Conceptually, when you replace a power plant like one of FPL's fossil steam units that has a 10,000 heat rate with a combined cycle unit that has a, let's say, a 7,000 heat rate, you're saving -- the efficiency savings there is 3,000 Btu per kilowatt hour?

- That is correct.
- Okay. Do you know whether that was the only Q. part of the savings that got factored to efficiency savings?
- It is my understanding improvements in existing plants were also factored.
- Okay. Would you agree that the saving, the Q. efficiency saving is the improvement in the efficiency of the plants, and that the decline in fuel costs exogenous in the market applies to the lower heat rates, as well?
  - Α. That is correct.
- Okay. And I can pursue this further with Mr. Hardy, I gather, correct? If I want to know more about how the efficiency savings were calculated, I should ask him?

1 Α. Yes. Witness Hardy would be the efficiency 2 witness. MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Deaton, and thank 3 you, Mr. Chairman. That was all the questions I had. 4 5 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Thank you. 6 Commissioner Skop. 7 COMMISSIONER SKOP: No questions. CHAIRMAN CARTER: Staff. 8 9 MS. BROWN: We have just a very few questions, Mr. Chairman. That will be even less if we can get an 10 11 agreement from the parties with respect to staff's 12 discovery exhibits. I think we have one, but we should 13 probably confirm that. CHAIRMAN CARTER: Why don't you state it for 14 15 the record, and then we will make sure we are all on the 16 same page. 17 Okay. I will. We are asking to MS. BROWN: 18 admit FPL's Response to Staff's Third Set of 19 Interrogatories Numbers 9, 10, 11, and 14. They are 20 shown on Page 4 of Staff's Comprehensive Exhibit List. 21 Then we are asking for Staff's Fourth Set of 22 Interrogatories Number 30. It is Number 3 on Page 4 of 23 the comprehensive exhibit list. Number 5 on Page 4 24 includes FPL's Responses to Staff's Sixth Set of

Interrogatories, and the numbers we want from there are

1	64, 65, 67, 68, 71, and 76. And, finally, FPL's
2	Response to Staff's Seventh Set of Interrogatories
3	Number 95, also included on Page 4 of the comprehensive
4	exhibit list.
5	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Let's hear from the parties.
6	MS. CHRISTENSEN: If we are referring to the
7	packet that was provided yesterday, then we have no
8	objection.
9	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Wiseman.
10	MR. WISEMAN: No objection.
11	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Bradley.
12	MS. BRADLEY: No objection.
13	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Kaufman.
14	MS. KAUFMAN: No objection.
15	MR. LaVIA: No objection.
16	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Clark.
17	MS. CLARK: No objection.
18	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Show it done.
19	(Exhibit 35 on Comprehensive Exhibit List,
20	Page 4, Items 9, 10, 11 and 14; Page 4, Item 3, Item 5
21	and Item 95 marked for identification and received into
22	evidence.)
23	MS. BROWN: So we have admitted those?
24	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Yes, ma'am. They are
25	entered into the record.

MS. BROWN: All right. 1 MS. CLARK: Mr. Chairman. 2 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Yes, ma'am. 3 MS. CLARK: I know we are moving on, and I was 4 5 just asked to check on the cross-exam for Ms. Morley. We feel like we might able to get through her today as 6 well and just wanted to bring that to our attention. 7 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. We will see. We will 8 cross that bridge when we get to it. 9 10 Staff, anything further? 11 MS. BROWN: We have just a few questions. 12 CHAIRMAN CARTER: You are recognized. 13 CROSS EXAMINATION 14 BY MS. BROWN: 15 Good afternoon, Ms. Deaton. Q. 16 Good afternoon. 17 Nice to speak with you, again. You are aware, 18 are you not, that AFFIRM has raised an issue on the 19 method for designing time-of-use rates in this 20 proceeding? 21 Yes, I am. 22 Are you familiar with how FPL designs its 23 time-of-use rates? 24 Yes, I did design them. Α. 25 We discussed how FPL designs time-of-use rates Q.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

at your deposition taken on August 20th on Page 72 through 73 of that document. Do you have it?

A. Yes.

- Q. Could you describe that process for the Commissioners, the process you used to design time-of-use rates?
- A. Would you like me to read from the deposition or no?
  - Q. Whichever you want.
- A. We design them consistent with the precedent that this Commission has set for time-of-use rates by setting them to a revenue neutral with the otherwise applicable standard rate customer charges are set at unit costs to include increased costs in some cases for the time-of-use meter.

And if there is a demand charge, it is set equal to the demand charge for the otherwise applicable rate. And then the energy charge is split between on-peak and off-peak, such that based on the class average usage of energy on-peak, the charges between on-peak and off-peak are set such that they produce a revenue neutral revenue between the time-of-use rate and the nontime-of-use rate.

The off-peak energy rate is initially set at the unit cost, and the on-peak energy rate is initially

1	set at the total cost, including demand charges. And
2	adjustments are made to both to achieve the revenue
3	neutrality.
4	Q. Can you explain why off-peak rates are less
5	than on-peak rates?
6	A. Off-peak rates are set lower than on-peak
7	rates to encourage usage in the off-peak hours.
8	Q. If you would, turn to Page 69 of your
9	deposition, starting on Lines 21 and continuing on to
10	Page 71.
11	A. What line, I'm sorry?
12	Q. Starting on Line 24.
13	<b>A.</b> 24, okay.
14	Q. That is a discussion of AFFIRM's contention
15	that the GSDT-1 rate was unfair, correct?
16	A. Right.
17	Q. And then on Page 70 of your deposition
18	starting at Line 18, continuing through to Page 71,
19	Line 22, you respond to AFFIRM's contention.
20	A. Right, that they can save money by shifting
21	usage to the off-peak hours.
22	Q. Right. So it is a fair summary of that
23	discussion to say that time-of-use rates are designed to
24	encourage customers to shift usage and that is how
25	customers can save under a GSDT rate?

- A. That is correct.
- Q. Now, if you would turn to Page 73 of your deposition starting on Line 20. This states -- do you have it?
  - A. 73, Line 20, yes.
- Q. This states that the average load factor for customers currently receiving service under the HLFT rate is 80 percent, correct?
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. On Page 74 of your deposition, at Line 2, you state that HLFT rate was set assuming customers had at least a 70 percent load factor, correct?
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. So is it reasonable to believe that any customer whose load factor was above 70 percent could benefit from the HLFT rate, assuming they met the other requirements of the tariff?
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. In his testimony, Witness Klepper for AFFIRM stated that he thinks a new commercial time-of-use rate should be developed. If you were going to design a new time-of-use rate, as AFFIRM suggests, would you first need to identify all customers with usage characteristics similar to AFFIRM's clients to determine who might take service under such a new rate?

L	
1	A. That is correct. You would have to identify a
2	new rate class.
3	Q. Would you also have to isolate the load data
4	for that subgroup of GSD customers from the rest of the
5	GSD customers?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. And that would be to determine cost allocation
8	factors?
9	A. That's correct.
.0	Q. Do you have that load data available today?
.1	A. No.
_2	Q. What would it take to gather that data?
.3	A. I mean, it is just a matter of accumulating
_4	historical data. It wouldn't take a whole lot of
.5	effort, I don't think.
. 6	Q. Okay. Would implementing a new rate class
_7	that takes customers from an existing rate class affect
.8	the costs and resulting revenue requirements allocated
.9	to the existing rate classes?
20	A. Yes, it would.
21	Q. Do you know today exactly how the costs and
22	revenues would change for existing GSD customers if some
23	GSD customers migrated to a new rate schedule?
24	A. No.

**Q.** Is that information readily available?

1	A. Not without producing everything that we have
2	here.
3	Q. Would you explain what you mean what is
4	meant by load diversity?
5	A. I believe Witness Klepper refers to the
6	diversity versus time-of-usage, whether they are on the
7	peak or off-peak.
8	Q. How is that how is that important to rate
9	design?
10	A. If the class truly has unique characteristics,
11	there might be an opportunity to develop a rate for that
12	rate class, just as we do with the seasonal demand
13	time-of-use rates or the high load factor time-of-use
14	rates.
15	Q. Okay. I wanted to ask just a couple of
16	questions about the CDR credit.
17	A. Okay.
18	Q. We talked about this in your deposition?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. At Page 81, starting on 17, would you explain
21	what the CDR credit is?
22	A. Well, the CDR credit is a payment or a credit
23	to customers who are willing to declare at least 200
24	kilowatts of their load as nonfirm and allow it to be
25	interrupted as a load control measure by the company.

1	$oldsymbol{Q}$ . And that is the CDR credit is similar to
2	the load management credit that residential customers
3	can receive under FPL's on-call program, correct?
4	A. That is correct.
5	Q. And these two programs are generally referred
6	to as load management programs?
7	A. That is correct.
8	Q. Are credits for load management programs
9	normally set in a rate case?
LO	A. No, they are not.
11	Q. Where are they usually set?
12	A. In the DSM dockets or the
L3	MS. BROWN: Okay. Now, I have just one
L <b>4</b>	exhibit that I would like to have marked, Mr. Chairman.
L5	CHAIRMAN CARTER: That will be Number 491,
L 6	4-9-1. A short title?
L 7	MS. BROWN: Yes.
L8	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Or your best efforts.
L9	MS. BROWN: This is Witness Deaton's
20	Late-Filed Deposition Exhibit Number 2.
21	BY MS. BROWN:
22	Q. Ms. Deaton, do you have that before you?
23	A. Yes, I do.
24	Q. It is a document entitled Estimate of the
25	Percentage of Base Revenues to Total Bill for a 1,000

Kilowatt Hour Residential Bill, Assuming that GBRA is 1 2 Not Continued in 2011. That is correct. 3 A. You are familiar with this? 4 Yes, ma'am. 5 Α. 6 And was it prepared by you or under your 7 supervision? 8 A. Yes, it was. MS. KAUFMAN: Mr. Chairman. 9 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Yes, ma'am, Ms. Kaufman. 10 11 MS. KAUFMAN: I am so sorry to interrupt 12 Ms. Brown, but I fear we may be having a discussion as 13 we had yesterday in regard to the exhibit that was not 14 admitted. And I apologize, I can't remember the number. 15 But, again, this is talking about a step 16 increase. If you look at Footnote Number 3, and I won't 17 reiterate all the arguments that Mr. McGlothlin made 18 yesterday, but I did want to object before there was 19 more questioning on the exhibit. So, I think that this 20 is beyond what has been asked for in the case and beyond 21 Ms. Deaton's testimony. 22 MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, in light of the 23 ruling that you made yesterday, we will withdraw this. 24 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Show it done.

MS. BROWN: We missed that part.

1	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Show it done.
2	MS. BROWN: We're sorry.
3	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Bradley.
4	MS. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, can we move to
5	strike her response to that question?
6	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Done.
7	MS. BRADLEY: Thank you.
8	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Chairman, may I ask
9	staff
10	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Commissioner Edgar.
11	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. About how
12	much longer do you have?
13	MS. BROWN: We're done.
14	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Oh, well, sorry. But if
15	I may let me ask this, about how much redirect?
16	MS. CLARK: I'm thinking five minutes.
17	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Chairman, may I ask
18	for a break, please.
19	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Done. We will come back at
20	a quarter of.
21	(Off the record.)
22	CHAIRMAN CARTER: We are back on the record.
23	And when we last left, staff had completed its
24	cross-examination.
25	Ms. Clark, you're recognized for redirect.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

MS. CLARK: Just a couple. 1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 2 BY MS. CLARK: 3 Ms. Deaton, is it fair to say that a guiding 4 Q. 5 principle of rate design is to match revenue recovery 6 from a class with the cost to serve that class? 7 Α. Yes, ma'am. Now, Ms. Kaufman asked you some questions 8 regarding a recent -- I believe a recent Gulf order, and 9 10 you mentioned a Gulf order in 1983, is that correct? 11 A. Yes. 12 And did that order speak to the notion of 13 parity? Yes, it did. 14 A. 15 Could you find in that order where the 16 Commission spoke to that issue and read that into the 17 record, please? 18 It might be easier if I read from my rebuttal 19 testimony. 20 I'm on page -- I actually have a Lexus copy, Q. 21 so it may not be the page, and I am on Page 29, and it 22 starts, in doing so. 23 My numbers must be off. What section? 24 It is in the section of allocation of revenue 25 increase.

1	A. Okay. Okay, I have you. "In doing so, we are
2	departing from our policy in previous cases of limiting
3	the increase to any one class to not more than one and a
4	half times the system average increase. Were we to
5	apply that policy in this case, some classes whose
6	present rates of return are above parity would receive
7	an increase. Thus, the greater equity lies in
8	allocating the increase to those classes with
9	substantially lower rates of return."
LO	Q. And that is the notion of parity to move
L1	everyone to their cost of service, right?
L2	A. That is correct.
L3	Q. Thank you.
L 4	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on one second. Ms.
L5	Perdue, would you mind pulling your mike down? It's
16	blocking the camera there. Thank you.
L7	Ms. Clark, you may proceed.
L8	MS. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I believe that is
19	all the redirect I have.
20	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Excellent. Exhibits. From
21	my list from Staff's Comprehensive Exhibit List, I am
22	showing 160 through 167.
23	MS. CLARK: I would move those exhibits,
24	Mr. Chairman.
25	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Are there any objections?

1	Without objection, show it done.
2	(Exhibit Numbers 160 through 167 admitted into
3	the record.)
4	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on a second before we
5	go to the next set. Then for rebuttal exhibits from
6	Staff's Comprehensive Exhibit List Number 379 and 380.
7	Ms. Clark.
8	MS. CLARK: I would move those exhibits.
9	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Are there any objections?
10	Without objection, show it done.
11	(Exhibit Numbers 379 and 380 admitted into the
12	record.)
13	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Now, let's go to the back
14	pages, everybody.
15	Mr. Wiseman, let's start with 484.
16	MR. WISEMAN: I would move the admission of
17	484.
18	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Are there any objections?
19	MS. CLARK: No objection.
20	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Without objection, show it
21	done.
22	(Exhibit Number 484 admitted into the record.)
23	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Wiseman, 485.
24	MR. WISEMAN: 485.
25	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Are there any objections?

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

MS. CLARK: No objection. 1 2 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Without objection, show it 3 done. (Exhibit Number 485 admitted into the record.) 4 5 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Wiseman, 486. 6 MR. WISEMAN: Yes, 486. 7 MS. CLARK: Now, we would object to that. During the cross-examination of this witness, I think it 8 9 was illustrated that this is not an accurate depiction 10 of the hypothetical. 11 CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Wiseman, to the 12 objection. 13 MR. WISEMAN: Yes. Two things. Actually, I 14 believe she, in fact, admitted to the accuracy of the 15 hypothetical and to the way that depreciation relates to 16 rate base and how that effects rates. And if the 17 objection is that FPL doesn't agree with it, then that's 18 They can argue that on brief. To me that is 19 not -- the fact that that they don't agree with it isn't 20 the basis for an objection. 21 MS. CLARK: I believe Mr. Wiseman agreed that 22 at least the depiction on the second page in was not an 23 accurate depiction of his hypothetical. 24 MR. WISEMAN: The only thing that was 25 inaccurate was the description in the parenthetical.

1	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Hang on. Hang on.
2	MR. WISEMAN: I'm sorry.
3	CHAIRMAN CARTER: We will do this the same way
4	as we did before when there was the other exhibit that
5	had the information in. We will strike that page and
6	admit it. Move on.
7	(Exhibit Number 486 admitted into the record.)
8	CHAIRMAN CARTER: 487.
9	MR. WISEMAN: We would move the admission of
10	487.
11	MS. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection
12	to that if he takes out the description, if he takes out
13	ignores and just puts a slash in it.
14	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Change the title. Show it
14 15	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Change the title. Show it done.
15	done.
15 16	done.  (Exhibit Number 487 admitted into the record.)
15 16 17	done.  (Exhibit Number 487 admitted into the record.)  CHAIRMAN CARTER: 488.
15 16 17 18	done.  (Exhibit Number 487 admitted into the record.)  CHAIRMAN CARTER: 488.  MR. WISEMAN: I would move the admission of
15 16 17 18 19	done.  (Exhibit Number 487 admitted into the record.)  CHAIRMAN CARTER: 488.  MR. WISEMAN: I would move the admission of  488.
15 16 17 18 19 20	done.  (Exhibit Number 487 admitted into the record.)  CHAIRMAN CARTER: 488.  MR. WISEMAN: I would move the admission of  488.  MS. CLARK: No objection.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	done.  (Exhibit Number 487 admitted into the record.)  CHAIRMAN CARTER: 488.  MR. WISEMAN: I would move the admission of  488.  MS. CLARK: No objection.  CHAIRMAN CARTER: Show it done.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	done.  (Exhibit Number 487 admitted into the record.)  CHAIRMAN CARTER: 488.  MR. WISEMAN: I would move the admission of  488.  MS. CLARK: No objection.  CHAIRMAN CARTER: Show it done.  (Exhibit Number 488 admitted into the record.)
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	done.  (Exhibit Number 487 admitted into the record.)  CHAIRMAN CARTER: 488.  MR. WISEMAN: I would move the admission of  488.  MS. CLARK: No objection.  CHAIRMAN CARTER: Show it done.  (Exhibit Number 488 admitted into the record.)  CHAIRMAN CARTER: 489.

1	objection.
2	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Show it done.
3	Exhibit Number 489 admitted into the record.)
4	CHAIRMAN CARTER: 490.
5	MR. WISEMAN: I would move the admission of
6	490.
7	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Clark.
8	MS. CLARK: I do not believe we have an
9	objection to that. Let me just look.
10	CHAIRMAN CARTER: We changed the title on that
11	one, too.
12	MS. CLARK: Yes. Thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN CARTER: No objection?
14	MS. CLARK: No objection.
15	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Show it done.
16	(Exhibit Number 490 admitted into the record.)
17	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Staff, 491.
18	MS. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, we withdrew that.
19	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Show it done.
20	Okay. Thank you. You may be excused. Have a
21	great day.
22	Let me just say from the standpoint of
23	preliminary matters, Ms. Clark, you're recognized.
24	MS. CLARK: Back to the schedule,
25	Mr. Chairman.

1	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Okay. Let me see here.
2	Now, our next witness is Morley, right?
3	MS. CLARK: That is correct.
4	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Let me ask before we call
5	the witness up, Mr. Wiseman, do you have cross?
6	MR. WISEMAN: No cross.
7	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Christensen?
8	MS. CHRISTENSEN: A very few questions.
9	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Bradley?
10	MS. BRADLEY: None.
11	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Ms. Kaufman?
12	MS. KAUFMAN: I am told Mr. Moyle has a little
13	bit.
14	CHAIRMAN CARTER: Mr. Wright?
15	MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I believe I have in
16	the range of eight to 15 minutes for Ms. Morley.
17	CHAIRMAN CARTER: I said Staff, I said the
18	other day when I set this Saturday that I was going to
19	be rigid about the schedule, because I did interfere
20	with peoples' weekends and things of that nature. And
21	we are adjourned. See you guys on the 16th, 9:30 a.m.
22	(Transcript continues in sequence with
23	Volume 33.)
24	

1 2 STATE OF FLORIDA 3 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COUNTY OF LEON 4 5 I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, Hearing Reporter 6 Services Section, FPSC Division of Commission Clerk, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard 7 at the time and place herein stated. 8 IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the 9 same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true 10 transcription of my notes of said proceedings. 11 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' 12 attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I 13 financially interested in the action. 14 DATED THIS 11th day of September, 2009. 15 16 JANE/ TAUROT, RPR 17 Official PBC Hearings Reporter (850) 413-6732 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25