| 1 | FIORINA | BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION |
|----|--|---|
| 2 | THORIDA | FUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION |
| 3 | In the Matter of: | |
| 4 | | DOCKET NO. 140226-EI |
| 5 | REQUEST TO OPT-OUT | |
| 6 | RECOVERY FOR INVESTOR ELECTRIC UTILITY ENER EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS E WAL-MART STORES EAST, SAM'S EAST, INC. AND INDUSTRIAL POWER USER | NERGY |
| 7 | | ST, LP AND |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | / |
| 10 | PROCEEDINGS: | PREHEARING CONFERENCE |
| 11 | COMMISSIONER | CHATDMAN, ADEL CDAHAM |
| 12 | PARTICIPATING: | CHAIRMAN ART GRAHAM PREHEARING OFFICER |
| 13 | DATE: | Tuesday, July 7, 2015 |
| 14 | TIME: | Commenced at 1:30 p.m. Concluded at 2:02 p.m. |
| 15 | PLACE: | Betty Easley Conference Center |
| 16 | PLIACE: | Room 148 |
| 17 | | 4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida |
| 18 | REPORTED BY: | LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6734 |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| | | |

APPEARANCES:

JESSICA CANO, ESQUIRE, 700 Universe
Boulevard, Juno Beach, Florida 33408, on behalf of
Florida Power & Light Company.

DIANNE M. TRIPLETT, ESQUIRE, 299 First Avenue North, St. Petersburg, Florida 33701, and MATTHEW BERNIER, ESQUIRE, 106 East College Avenue, Suite 800, Tallahassee, Florida 32301-7740, appearing on behalf of Duke Energy Florida, Inc.

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

JEFFREY A. STONE, RUSSELL A. BADDERS, and STEVEN R. GRIFFIN, ESQUIRES, P.O. Box 12950, Pensacola, Florida 32591-2950, appearing on behalf of Gulf Power Company.

BETH KEATING, ESQUIRE, Gunster Law Firm, 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 601, Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1839, appearing on behalf of Florida Public Utilities Company.

GEORGE CAVROS, ESQUIRE, 120 E. Oakland Park Boulevard, Suite 105, Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33334, appearing on behalf of Southern Alliance for Clean Energy.

APPEARANCES (Continued):

ROBERT SCHEFFEL WRIGHT and JOHN T. LAVIA, III, ESQUIRES, Gardner, Bist, 1300 Thomaswood Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32308, appearing on behalf of the Wal-Mart Stores East, LP and Sam's East, Inc.

JAMES W. BREW, OWEN J. KOPON and LAURA A.

WYNN, ESQUIRES, Stone, Mattheis, Xenopoulos & Brew, PC,

1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW, Eighth Floor, West

Tower, Washington, DC 20007, appearing on behalf of

White Springs Agricultural Chemicals, Inc. d/b/a PCS

Phosphate - White Springs.

JON C. MOYLE, JR., and VICKI GORDON KAUFMAN, ESQUIRES, Moyle Law Firm, P.A., 118 North Gadsden Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of Florida Industrial Power Users Group.

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

LEE ENG TAN, ESQUIRES, FPSC General Counsel's Office, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, appearing on behalf of the Florida Public Service Commission Staff.

APPEARANCES (Continued):

Florida 32399-0850.

MARY ANNE HELTON, DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL,

Advisor to the Commission, Florida Public Service

Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee,

PROCEEDINGS

| 2 | CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Good afternoon, everyone. |
|---|---|
| 3 | It feels kind of weird being in here at 1:30. Actually, |
| 4 | it feels kind of weird being in here by myself. I'm not |
| 5 | used to what prehearing officers do. |

Let the record show this is a Prehearing Conference for Docket 140226-EI. The date is January (sic) the 7th, and so we will call this prehearing to order.

Staff, would you please read the notice.

MS. TAN: Yes. Although it is July 7th. You said January.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: My bad.

MS. TAN: By notice issued June 4th, 2015, this time and place is set for a Prehearing Conference in Docket No. 140226-EI. The purpose of the Prehearing Conference is set out in the notice.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Let's take appearances.

MS. CANO: Good afternoon. Jessica Cano on behalf of Florida Power & Light Company.

MS. TRIPLETT: Good afternoon. Dianne

Triplett on behalf of Duke Energy Florida. And I would

like to make an appearance for Matthew Bernier as well.

MR. BEASLEY: Good afternoon, Chairman. James

| 1 | D. Beasley, J. Jeffry Wahlen, and Ashley M. Daniels on |
|----|--|
| 2 | behalf of Tampa Electric Company. |
| 3 | MR. GRIFFIN: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. |
| 4 | Steven Griffin with the Beggs & Lane law firm on behalf |
| 5 | of Gulf Power Company. I'd also enter an appearance for |
| 6 | Jeffrey Stone and Russell Badders. |
| 7 | MS. KEATING: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. |
| 8 | Beth Keating with the Gunster law firm, and I'm here |
| 9 | today for Florida Public Utilities. |
| 10 | MR. CAVROS: Good afternoon, Chairman Graham. |
| 11 | George Cavros here on behalf of Southern Alliance for |
| 12 | Clean Energy. |
| 13 | MR. WRIGHT: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. |
| 14 | Robert Scheffel Wright on behalf of Wal-Mart Stores East |
| 15 | and Sam's East, Incorporated. I'd also like to enter an |
| 16 | appearance for my law partner John T. Lavia, III. Thank |
| 17 | you. |
| 18 | MR. KOPON: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. |
| 19 | Owen Copon for PCS Phosphate. I'd also like to make an |
| 20 | appearance for James Brew and Laura Wynn. |
| 21 | MS. KAUFMAN: Mr. Chairman, Vicki Gordon |
| 22 | Kaufman on behalf of the Florida Industrial Power Users |
| 23 | Group. And I would like to enter an appearance for Jon |
| 24 | Moyle. |
| 25 | MS. CHRISTENSEN: Good afternoon. Patty |
| | |

| 1 | Christensen, and I'd like to enter an appearance on |
|----|---|
| 2 | behalf of Charles Rehwinkel for the Office of Public |
| 3 | Counsel. |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Welcome, everybody. |
| 5 | I hope you all had a happy 4th weekend. That would be |
| 6 | 4th of July. |
| 7 | MS. TAN: I'd like to also make an appearance |
| 8 | for staff. Lee Eng Tan on behalf of staff. |
| 9 | MS. HELTON: And Mary Anne Helton, and I'm |
| 10 | here to advise you today. |
| 11 | MS. TAN: Thank you. |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Preliminary matters. |
| 13 | MS. TAN: At this point there are none and |
| 14 | none are expected. |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Let's proceed through |
| 16 | the draft Prehearing Order. Are there any sections that |
| 17 | there need to be any corrections to or any changes made |
| 18 | to? |
| 19 | MR. BEASLEY: Mr. Chairman, Tampa Electric has |
| 20 | one suggested change in the order of witnesses, VI on |
| 21 | page 4 and 5. |
| 22 | CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. |
| 23 | MR. BEASLEY: We would ask that our witnesses, |
| 24 | Mark Roche and J. Terry Deason, appear after Gulf's |
| 25 | witness, John Floyd. And we've conferred with the |

| 1 | parties, and that's acceptable to them. |
|----|---|
| 2 | CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: So you want for Deason |
| 3 | and what was the other one? |
| 4 | MR. BEASLEY: Mr. Roche on page 4. |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. |
| 6 | MR. BEASLEY: They would both come right |
| 7 | after it would be Mr. Roche and then Mr. Deason after |
| 8 | Gulf's witness, John Floyd. |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. I can do that. |
| 10 | Any other comments about those two |
| 11 | changes? |
| 12 | MS. KAUFMAN: Oh, no, not about those changes, |
| 13 | Mr. Chairman, but I have another comment. |
| 14 | MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman? |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Yes, sir. |
| 16 | MR. WRIGHT: At this time, it might be |
| 17 | appropriate to note that by agreement of the parties we |
| 18 | would have Mr. Baker present his surrebuttal testimony |
| 19 | at the same time as he presents his direct. |
| 20 | CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: And that's Witness |
| 21 | MR. WRIGHT: Kenneth E. Baker, Mr. Chairman. |
| 22 | CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Is it just Baker? Is |
| 23 | Steve Chriss going to do the same? |
| 24 | MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chriss did not present |
| 25 | surrebuttal testimony, Mr. Chairman, so it is just |

2.0

Mr. Baker.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Do the rest of the parties want to do that as well, do the direct and rebuttal together?

MS. TRIPLETT: Mr. Chairman, Duke Energy
Florida is amenable to that, and I think it's already
marked by asterisk to show that. So Mr. Duff would just
be going before Mr. Floyd, and then there would be the
Tampa Electric witnesses.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. I heard somebody click.

MS. TAN: And then the only witness that is still available in terms of doing their direct and surrebuttal testimony would be Witness Pollock for FIPUG, if they're interested in putting up their testimonies together.

MS. KAUFMAN: I am going to have to check on that and let you know, if that's all right. I just don't have an answer to that. I can let you know by the time we have to get all our prehearing changes in.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay.

MS. KAUFMAN: But I did have another issue with Mr. Pollock, if it's my turn.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Sure.

MS. KAUFMAN: Due to Mr. Pollock's

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ability to get here. 8 9 10 not to be here a second day. 11 12 13 14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

availability, I know this hearing has been set for two days and I know there's been some email traffic with the other parties, but if it's at all possible, he would like to testify on the second day of the hearing. Some parties have indicated they don't know if the hearing will -- if the second day will be needed. But I'd just throw that out as a request to the parties due to his

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I can tell you my plan is

MS. KAUFMAN: Well, if that's the case, then I'm going to speak to Mr. Pollock.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Now, I guess I'd be amenable to taking him as the last, unless that's a concern for somebody.

Okay. Here comes the concerns.

(Laughter.)

MS. KAUFMAN: Why did I know that?

MS. CANO: Well, as one of the Petitioners, it seems appropriate that Mr. Pollock would take the stand at the beginning of the proceeding consistent with the order of witnesses presented in the draft Prehearing Order.

If there's truly a conflict that can't be resolved, we have offered to stipulate the testimony

and exhibits of the witness so that he doesn't have 1 to travel at all, and that offer still stands. 2 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: So say you all? 3 MR. BEASLEY: We're onboard with that, sir. 4 MR. GRIFFIN: Yes, sir. 5 MS. TRIPLETT: Yes, sir. 6 7 MS. KEATING: Yes, sir. MS. KAUFMAN: Well, number one, at this point 8 9 we're certainly not prepared to stipulate in 10 Mr. Pollock's testimony. It -- I think it would be very helpful if he would -- could go at the end. I think 11 12 that traditionally in these proceedings, at least in my 13 experience, the parties have all worked together to 14 accommodate the various schedules of the witnesses. 15 Mr. Pollock is a witness well known to the other parties 16 in this proceeding. 17 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Is there a specific witness 18 that anybody feels needs to go after Mr. Pollock? I 19 won't bite your head off, I promise. Let's take about five minutes and think about it. Let's take a break for 2.0 21 about five minutes. 22 (Recess taken.) 23 Yes, sir. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mr. Chair, we have a couple of 24 MR. BEASLEY: 25 alternatives to propose for your consideration, the

first of which is recognizing that the issues are framed 1 up pretty well in all of the documents and pleadings and 2 the testimony and witnesses of the exhibits -- or of the 3 The first alternative would be to have this witnesses. 4 a paper hearing where we would brief the Commissioners 5 on all of the testimony and exhibits and state our 6 7 positions and handle it that way. The other alternative would be for us to 8 9 meet on day two of the hearing schedule, have the witnesses go in the order in which they're 10 scheduled, and proceed in that fashion. 11 12 And we think either of those would be 13 legitimate alternatives that would solve 14 Mr. Pollock's scheduling.

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Then I believe that makes it problematic for Wal-Mart, because I thought they had to go on the 22nd and they can't make the 23rd.

MR. WRIGHT: That's correct. They have a conflict on the 23rd, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Well, option one, making this all a paper deal.

MR. WRIGHT: I would have to consult with my client. I don't believe that we would be agreeable to that, Mr. Chairman.

MS. KAUFMAN: I don't think FIPUG would be

agreeable to that either, Mr. Chairman.

25 Mr. Ch

And I just wanted to point out one thing, if I might, that Mr. Wright actually pointed out to me. I didn't have the most up-to-date copy of the prehearing, but we talked about Mr. Pollock's surrebuttal, so he would -- if we keep the natural order of things, he would be going -- well, he's not listed last, but he would be going toward the end anyway. So if he takes the stand twice or if we do it separately, he would still be at the end of the batting order.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Well, you have his direct.

He's supposed to be first. We agreed that we're going to take him after the two Wal-Mart witnesses; is that correct?

MS. KAUFMAN: Well, I was, I was thinking if the hearing went for two days, he would go on day two, wherever that fell out in the order.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Well, we have two days set aside.

MS. KAUFMAN: Understood.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: But if the hearing is done in one day --

MS. KAUFMAN: I know. I totally understand,
Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay.

2

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman?

3

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mr. Wright.

4

MR. WRIGHT: Just briefly. Thank you.

5

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Sure.

6

MR. WRIGHT: Like you, I think this is going

7

to be a one-day hearing. My understanding is

8

Mr. Pollock can be here in the early afternoon of the

9

first day of the hearing.

10

The simple point I would make is that as the petition -- the effective Petitioners seeking

1112

the affirmative relief here, Wal-Mart and FIPUG

13

really should, in the normal course of business,

14

have the opportunity both to go first and last.

15

direct and his surrebuttal together as potentially

Accordingly, Mr. Pollock going last and taking his

1617

the last witness in the case is really completely

18

appropriate. And, frankly, this is the kind of

19

thing that we have always, in my experience,

20

collegially worked out. I don't think there's any

2122

direct and surrebuttal together last. Thank you.

reason for him not to be allowed to present his

23

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Well, then I think the

24

problem you run into is then people want to separate

25

their direct and their surrebuttals.

MR. WRIGHT: My understanding -- I thought that FIPUG was willing to have Mr. Pollock testify together with his direct and surrebuttal, just last as opposed to first. And we are willing to have Mr. Baker go first and present his direct and surrebuttal together, but that's a -- that's as much a matter of convenience for his travel schedule as anything else so he wouldn't have to be here on the second day.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I understand what you're saying, but that doesn't mean that Mr. Duff doesn't want to go last. Because, according to this list I have in front of me, he's the last person on here.

MR. WRIGHT: And in response to that, I would simply make the point that they are the opponents of the Petitioners' positions here, and accordingly they really should be in the middle. And Mr. Pollock should have the opportunity, as a Petitioner, to go last if the Petitioners so wish.

MS. TAN: Chairman, at this time Mr. Duff has said that they will do his rebuttal and surrebuttal together, so he will actually not be last. This is just reflective of the order. If you notice, he's denoted. And what will happen in the new Prehearing Order is it'll reflect that he'll go in the beginning.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: But tell me if I'm wrong.

What I'm seeing is Mr. Pollock has not agreed to do -well, I think people want to have testimony after
Mr. Pollock's direct. And if he wants to do his
surrebuttal and his direct together, then it should all
be at the beginning and not necessarily all at the end.
Now don't get me wrong, I don't have a problem -- if
we're still here and we can get all this done on the
22nd --

2.0

MR. WRIGHT: I don't -- I think your premise is not consistent with what I've heard. What I've heard is that Duke is happy for Mr. Duff to present his surrebuttal along with his rebuttal, which would put him in the middle pack, thus leaving only those who might be providing surrebuttal, which would only be at that point the Petitioners' witnesses, Mr. Baker on behalf of Wal-Mart and Mr. Pollock on behalf of FIPUG, going last in any event.

I don't think Duke has expressed a particular desire that Mr. Duff be allowed to follow Mr. Pollock. And even if they did, I would say that since we're the Petitioners, normally Petitioners get to go first and last, and that he should have that opportunity. And Mr. Baker has already agreed to go put his surrebuttal on with his direct at the outset of the hearing.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Yes, please.

MS. TRIPLETT: Mr. Chairman -- thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Let me just say from Duke's perspective,
my biggest concern was pushing the hearing to a second
day when that wasn't necessary. That's the first I've
heard that Mr. Pollock was actually available on the
first day and could be in the afternoon. So I don't
think it's -- from my perspective, if he wants to go
last, so be it.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Is that problem solved?

MS. KAUFMAN: Just so I understand now, since I'm the one that started this controversy, where we are now is with Mr. Pollock going last. And I will -- I will be sure and let the parties know that we're amenable to doing his direct and his -- I guess that's how it would come out, he would be doing his direct and his rebuttal together.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I guess my question is -
MS. KAUFMAN: On the first day, assuming that
we get there.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I guess my question is -and, Mary Anne, maybe you can chime in on this first and
then we can open it up to everybody else -- it's not
problematic for -- because a lot of people are doing
their direct and their surrebuttal together, but it's

not problematic that he's doing both of those at the end of all this.

MS. HELTON: It probably depends on to whom you direct that question. We have certainly been flexible in the past with all of the parties sitting at the table with respect to when their witnesses can come and whether they provide direct and rebuttal testimony together. And it's an accommodation that I have seen I think just about everybody be at the receiving end of in prior proceedings. So I don't think there's any legal impediment to that happening. Is it irregular a little bit? Yes. But there's no legal impediment to doing so.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: So the IOUs, you all say that you're fine with him going last. No.

MS. TRIPLETT: That was just me. I'm sorry.

That was just for Duke, and they were probably kicking

me.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: That's why I was asking.

MS. TRIPLETT: Thanks.

MS. CANO: Yeah. From FPL's perspective, if there's truly a conflict that can't be avoided here, yes, of course, we're willing to work with the parties, as we typically do, assuming none of the other solutions are acceptable.

MR. GRIFFIN: That is correct for Gulf Power

2.0

as well.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Before I -- before I open up this can of worms, because it's always dangerous when I think out loud, does it become a problem to have to

That's fine with FPU.

6 recall somebody because something comes out

MS. KEATING:

unforeseeable during Pollock?

MS. HELTON: I think that's -- the way we do our process, that's probably always a little bit of a risk, and I think that's a risk that everybody takes in allowing Mr. Pollock to go last. But everyone should have the benefit of Mr. Pollock's prefiled direct and rebuttal testimony, and presumably any cross-examination of Mr. Pollock will not go outside the scope of that. So that should help everybody in framing how they proceed during the course of the proceeding.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Staff, do you guys have any problems with all this?

MS. TAN: No, we do not at this time.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, Mary Anne.

Okay. So we've dealt with the witness order. I guess if for some reason we -- what time -- does this hearing start at 9:00, 9:30?

MS. TAN: 9:30.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: So if for some reason we get

through all this stuff, we will wait around until after 1 lunch for Mr. Pollock. 2 MS. KAUFMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and we 3 certainly appreciate the accommodation. And my first 4 phone call out of here is to Mr. Pollock. 5 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: But if we wait until after 6 7 lunch, come 1:30 if he's not here, then things become problematic. 8 9 MS. KAUFMAN: I hear you loud and clear. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. I just want to make 10 sure we understand. We may not be at that point, but 11 12 just so we're not sitting around for four hours waiting 13 on this guy to show up. 14 MS. KAUFMAN: Absolutely. I will assure -- I will convey to him that he shall be here no later than 15 after lunch on whatever the first day of the hearing is. 16 17 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: The 22nd. 18 MS. KAUFMAN: Yes. 19 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. MS. TAN: Mr. Chairman, may I just confirm? 20 21 That means that because Mr. Pollock will be going last, 22 that he will be doing his direct and surrebuttal 23 together. 24 MS. KAUFMAN: That's my understanding, subject 25 to check.

SACE

MS. TAN: There's -- how would you subject to 1 2 check? 3 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: There is no check. (Laughter.) 4 MS. KAUFMAN: That's my understanding. 5 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Okay. So we went 6 7 down through Section V or VI -- Section VI. So that means everybody is fine with the first six sections. 8 9 Good. Everybody is nodding their head. Section VII, everybody is fine. 10 11 Section VIII, staff. 12 MS. TAN: Chairman, the Order Establishing 13 Procedure requires that a party take a position at the 14 Prehearing Conference unless good cause is shown as to 15 why the party can't take a position at this time. Accordingly, if a party's position in the draft 16 17 Prehearing Order is currently no position at this time, 18 then the party must change its position at today's 19 Prehearing Conference or show good cause why it can't 20 take a position. Otherwise, the Prehearing Order will 21 reflect no position for that party for that issue. 22 In addition, SACE has proffered an Issue 4 23 for consideration in this hearing.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

has proffered an issue which states, "Given the

MR. CAVROS: Good afternoon, Chairman.

24

25

provisions in Chapter 366 and 120 Florida Statutes, can
the Commission grant Petitioners' requested relief
through Commission order in this docket?" The reason
for inserting that was -- is essentially to preserve my
client's right to argue any legal issues surrounding
Petitioners' request.

2.0

As you may recall, there were some informal discussions early last year regarding some of these issues, and they never reached a natural conclusion, if you will. So I would like to preserve the right to argue this perspective if my client chooses to do so.

That said, in reviewing Issue 2, it seems as though this issue could be subsumed in Issue 2.

And if the Commission and the parties are of similar mind, then we would withdraw this issue today.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I see all my IOUs nodding their heads correctly and everybody else seems to be nodding their heads, and I know staff said that it can be handled in Issue 2 or 3, so I am nodding my head as well.

MR. CAVROS: Okay. Very well then. We will withdraw the issue.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay.

MR. CAVROS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. Anything else in 1 Section VIII? 2 Section IX, exhibit list. 3 MS. TAN: Chairman, staff will note that it 4 has prepared a Comprehensive Exhibit List which includes 5 all prefiled exhibits and includes those exhibits that 6 7 staff wishes to include in the record. We will check with the parties prior to the hearing to determine if 8 9 there's any objections to the Comprehensive Exhibit List or to any of staff's exhibits being entered into the 10 11 record. 12 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Section X. MS. TAN: There are no proposed stipulations. 13 14 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: XI. 15 MS. TAN: There are no pending motions. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: XII. 16 17 MS. TAN: There are no pending confidentiality motions. 18 19 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: XIII? MS. TAN: Staff recommends post-hearing briefs 20 21 be no longer than 20 pages. 22 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Is there any problems or 23 concerns with that? Okay. 24 MS. KAUFMAN: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. 25 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Sure.

MS. KAUFMAN: I was looking for where that --1 2 for where that was. That seems quite short to me, and so I think we would like more than 20 pages. I'm not 3 recalling ever having a brief that short, though I know 4 you appreciate it being as short as it can be. But I 5 would like to say 40 pages, and, you know, we'll do what 6 7 we can to make it shorter. CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I just figure because this 8 9 is such -- I mean, the focus on this is pretty narrow, 10 but --MS. KAUFMAN: It is. And since I'm not going 11 12 to be writing the brief, I'm a little hesitant to agree 13 to 20 pages. I wasn't aware that was really an issue. 14 It's not typical, at least in my memory, so. 15 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Staff, what's typical? MS. KAUFMAN: 40, at least --16 17 MS. TAN: I mean, it depends on the number of 18 issues in the docket. We have done 20 pages before. 19 can do more if the parties and you decide that it is 20 necessary to have more information. Typically there is 21 40 pages, but that is adjustable. 22 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: I guess since the burden is 23 on both Wal-Mart and FIPUG, I don't have a problem with

24

25

40.

MS. KAUFMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: It doesn't mean we need to 1 2 fill all 40, but --3 MS. KAUFMAN: Again, understood. MS. TAN: Chairman, staff notes that the 4 briefs will be due on August 20th, 2015. 5 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Okay. All right. Let's 6 7 move on to XIV. MS. TAN: Chairman, currently opening 8 9 statements are listed at ten minutes per party, unless 10 the parties choose to waive opening statements. Staff suggests that the opening statements be limited to a 11 shorter time frame, and perhaps we can encourage the 12 13 parties to work together on opening statements. 14 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: This is what I propose for 15 that: FIPUG will get ten; Wal-Mart will get ten; PCS Phosphate, or White Springs Agricultural or whatever the 16 17 correct terminology, will get ten. So that will be 30 18 for you guys. 19 For the IOUs, the five of you, I was going 20 to give you 30 as well. You guys can kind of split 21 that up any way you want to do that, because it 22 seems like you guys' position is pretty similar. 23 Now, let me know if there's a concern with that. 24 And then, Mr. Cavros, you would get ten,

and OPC would get ten. It seems like everybody is

25

| 1 | nodding their head, so is that okay? |
|----|---|
| 2 | MS. CANO: That's fine with FPL. Thank you. |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: You guys get shortened a |
| 4 | little bit, but I think you can handle it. |
| 5 | Okay. Where else do we go from there? |
| 6 | Other matters. |
| 7 | MS. TAN: There are no other matters to |
| 8 | address. |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Is there anything else from |
| 10 | you guys? I do appreciate your patience. I'm sorry if |
| 11 | I confused you. I haven't done this in about two years. |
| 12 | I think that's it. I thank you very much |
| 13 | for your time. I think it should be interesting. |
| 14 | Make sure that Pollock is here at least by 1:30 on |
| 15 | the 22nd. |
| 16 | MS. KAUFMAN: Yes, sir. Understood. |
| 17 | CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: All right. And that all |
| 18 | being said, I think we're adjourned. Thank you very |
| 19 | much, and travel safe everybody. |
| 20 | (Prehearing Conference adjourned at 2:02 |
| 21 | p.m.) |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| | |

| | 00002 |
|----|---|
| 1 | STATE OF FLORIDA) : CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER |
| 2 | COUNTY OF LEON) |
| 3 | |
| 4 | I, LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR, Official Commission |
| 5 | Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein |
| 6 | stated. |
| 7 | IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the |
| 8 | same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings. |
| 9 | |
| 10 | I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor |
| 11 | am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I |
| 12 | financially interested in the action. |
| 13 | DATED THIS 10th day of July, 2015. |
| 14 | |
| 15 | Linda Boles |
| 16 | LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR |
| 17 | FPSC Official Hearings Reporter (850) 413-6734 |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |