	FILED AUG 28, 2015 DOCUMENT NO. 05380-1	5	
	FPSC - COMMISSION CLI	-	000001
1		BEFORE THE UBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	
2	FLORIDA P	UBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	
3	In the Matter of:		
4		DOCKET NO. 150075-EI	-
5	PETITION FOR APPROV ARRANGEMENT TO MITI		
6	OF UNFAVORABLE CEDA	AR BAY POWER	
7	PURCHASE OBLIGATION FLORIDA POWER & LIG	•	
8		/	
9			
10	PROCEEDINGS:	SDECIAL ACENDA	
11		SPECIAL AGENDA	
12	COMMISSIONERS PARTICIPATING:	COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISÉ	
13		COMMISSIONER KONALD A. BRISE COMMISSIONER JIMMY PATRONIS	
14	DATE:	Thursday, August 27, 2015	
15	TIME:	Commenced: 11:10 a.m. Concluded: 11:58 a.m.	
16	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center	
17		Room 148	
18		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida	
19	REPORTED BY:	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR Official FPSC Reporter	
20		(850) 413-6734	
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	FLORIDA E	PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	

APPEARANCES JOHN T. BUTLER, ESQUIRE, 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, Florida 33408-0420, appearing on behalf of Florida Power & Light Company. JON C. MOYLE, JR., ESQUIRE, Moyle Law Firm, P.A., 118 North Gadsden Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of Florida Industrial Power Users Group. CHARLES REHWINKEL, DEPUTY PUBLIC COUNSEL, and JOHN J. TRUITT, ESQUIRE, Office of Public Counsel, c/o the Florida Legislature, 111 W. Madison Street, Room 812, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400, appearing on behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida. MARTHA BARRERA, ESQUIRE, FPSC General Counsel's Office, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, appearing on behalf of the Florida Public Service Commission Staff. MARY ANNE HELTON, DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL, Advisor to the Commission, Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850.

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

PROCEEDINGS COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. So we are here for Special Agenda item Docket 150075-EI, and before us is a motion for approval of a settlement agreement. And I'm not going to look at the clock, so I'm going to say it's 11:10. This is a panel that is comprised of Commissioners Edgar, Brisé, and Patronis. Staff, are there any preliminary matters? MS. BARRERA: No, Commissioner, staff isn't aware of any. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Then what I'd like to --MR. MOYLE: FIPUG -- FIPUG -- FIPUG has one, just one --COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Moyle, one preliminary? Okay. MR. MOYLE: Yeah. Actually we have two other things, but I think they can be handled post-decision. But the one preliminary thing, my understanding of our proceeding today is it's a non-evidentiary proceeding. It's --COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Correct. MR. MOYLE: Okay. I just wanted to make FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

sure we were on the same page on that. 1 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: We are. 2 3 MR. MOYLE: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: So what I'd like to 4 do then is to ask our staff to tee up the item, 5 give us a brief overview, and then I'll go to the 6 7 parties for comment and then to Commissioners. Mr. Ballinger. 8 9 MR. BALLINGER: Good morning, Commissioners. Tom Ballinger with Commission 10 staff. As you're aware, the settlement was filed 11 12 on July 24th in this docket, and the signatories to the settlement are FPL and the Office of Public 13 14 Counsel. The remaining party to the proceeding, 15 FIPUG, was not a signatory to the settlement. A hearing was held in this docket on the 16 17 merits of the case on July 28th, and discussion about the settlement was not taken at that time. 18 So 19 this is your opportunity to discuss the settlement 20 with the parties. 21 The parties were provided the opportunity, 22 though, to file briefs on the settlement itself. 23 The Office of Public Counsel and FPL filed joint 24 briefs on that, and FIPUG also filed a brief 25 addressing the settlement.

After the settlement was -- after the briefs were filed, staff put together a summary, which was distributed to your offices late last week, of the settlement and highlighted certain things. I'd like to just kind of walk through that quickly with you now before we tee this up.

## COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Please.

MR. BALLINGER: The first part of the settlement is it approves as prudent the decision to enter into the purchase agreement, FPL and CBAS.

The next bigger one of the settlement was of the \$520 million of the regulatory asset, 85 million of that would be placed into base rates and recovered through current rates for approximately a year and a half until FPL's next test year. What this does is it reduces the amount of dollars that would flow through the capacity clause per the original petition before you. It's about a \$30 million reduction, if you will, through the capacity clause in revenue requirements.

The remaining part of the asset, regulatory asset would be recovered through the capacity clause as proposed by FPL on its original petition.

Another large factor in this was FPL would

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

also agree to double the liability insurance for environmental liability from \$20 million to \$40 million. Part of that part in the settlement, though, had a term where a signatory could request the Commission expand that coverage or extend it and put a term of December 31st, 2019, for the Commission to enter a final order. Staff questioned that, and the parties recognized that they cannot bind the Commission to enter an order by a specific date, and they agreed to that. So that date is out there as guidance, if you will, to avoid a lapse in coverage.

The next two parts of the settlement that benefit ratepayers are the original petition had all the leases and contracts reverting to FPL, and then those costs would be borne by ratepayers. In the event that subleases for things like railcars or land lease were not obtained by FPL, all the costs would go through to customers. The settlement now caps that at 50 percent of the value of the leases in the case there is no sublease. If there is a sublease, all the credits would go back to the customers.

One little typographical error that you had on the -- on the summary that I gave to you,

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

25

000007 it's the third bullet from the bottom discussing the 1 2 railcar lease, and it says that the railcar lease 3 would be through the capacity recovery clause. Ι pulled this language, a lot of this, from the 4 motion, not the actual settlement, because motions 5 tend to be written in more English and not the 6 7 settlements. That was a mistake actually in FPL -in the motion filing it. The settlement is through 8 9 the fuel clause, not the capacity clause. That is correct with the original petition, so just take 10 that -- and the settlement as the fuel clause. 11 And with that, I'm available for any questions, or we 12 13 can hear from the parties. 14 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, 15 Mr. Ballinger. Commissioners, before I go to the parties, 16 17 are there any questions for staff? No. Okay. 18 Mr. Butler. 19 MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Commissioner 20 Edgar. 21 Good morning, Commissioners. I'm John 22 Butler, counsel for FPL. With me are Bob Barrett, 23 FPL's Vice President of Finance, and Terry Keith, 24 FPL's Director for Cost Recovery Clauses. 25 Mr. Barrett and Mr. Keith will be available to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

respond to any technical questions you may have about the terms of the settlement agreement.

First, let me confirm that FPL concurs with the oral modification that staff just made regarding recovery of railcar lease payments. The settlement agreement proposes that they be recovered through the fuel clause subject to the recovery limitations that he described. And I apologize for any confusion that was created by the motion for approval of the settlement agreement mistakenly stating that those would be recovered through the capacity clause. That was my error, and I apologize to you for it.

Now let me briefly explain why FPL believes that the settlement agreement is in, excuse me, in the public interest and should be approved.

First, the settlement agreement provides a fair and reasonable basis for FPL to move forward with the Cedar Bay transaction, which will deliver several important benefits for FPL's customers.

The Cedar Bay transaction will save customers \$70 million on an NPV basis and \$156 million nominally. It will provide fuel diversity and reliability benefits from having the Cedar Bay facility available for operation as

needed, and it will reduce air emissions as a result of the facility's reduced operation and early retirement.

Second, the settlement agreement shifts part of the recovery of the Cedar Bay purchase price to base rates while base rates are frozen under the 2012 settlement agreement that FPL is operating under. As a result, the amount recovered from customers under the capacity clause for 2015 and 2016 will be reduced by approximately \$30 million compared to FPL's original proposal. In fact, under the settlement agreement, FPL's customers will pay about \$10-to-\$15 million less in 2015, 2016 through the capacity and fuel clauses than they would if the existing Cedar Bay PPA remained in place. So under the settlement agreement, customers are not only projected to save \$70 million NPV over the next decade, they will begin to receive those savings immediately.

Third, the settlement agreement provides additional coverage limits in a longer term for the environmental liability insurance that FPL will maintain on the Cedar Bay facility. This will provide further protection for customers against the possibility of environmental liability arising out

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

of the FPL -- or of FPL owning and operating the facility.

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

Fourth, the settlement agreement puts limits on FPL's recovery of railcar lease and ground lease payments. This will provide additional protection for customers against unanticipated costs under those leases after the Cedar Bay facility is retired.

Finally, if you approve the settlement agreement today, FPL will be in a position to accelerate the closing for the Cedar Bay transaction. Each month sooner that the transaction closes means one less month of the unfavorable PPA capacity payments that are currently flowing through the capacity clause. So there are numerous strong reasons that the settlement agreement is in the public interest and should be approved.

There are just a couple of additional points worth noting. The settlement agreement is a reasonable compromise to the parties' positions on the nine issues set out in the Prehearing Order for resolution. FPL's and OPC's joint brief shows how the terms of the settlement agreement are supported by the evidence in the record from last month's hearing. Approving the settlement agreement is a

reasonable and appropriate response to the evidence that you heard in that hearing and clearly serves the public interest.

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

You heard from FIPUG's counsel at the hearing, and may hear again today, that FPL supposedly is paying too much for the Cedar Bay interest. Unlike FIPUG, FPL was actually at the table negotiating this deal, and I can assure you that that is not the case. FPL negotiated hard with Carlyle and got the best deal we could, a deal that saves customers \$70 million NPV over the next decade.

Due to a declining trend in natural gas prices, the Cedar Bay PPA has become more valuable to Carlyle at the very same time that it is becoming an ever greater burden on FPL and our customers. You certainly can't blame Carlyle for wanting to get paid what the PPA is worth in the current market. At the same time, you can't blame FPL for being willing to pay the current market price for the PPA, when doing so will save customers \$70 million. In fact, from an incentive standpoint, FPL and other utilities should be encouraged to seek out opportunities to save customers money no matter what market conditions exist when those opportunities arise. Approving the settlement agreement today will send the right signals to provide

that incentive. Thank you.

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

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. OPC.

MR. TRUITT: Madam Chair, Commissioners, John Truitt and Charles Rehwinkel from the Office of Public Counsel.

First, we'd like to thank you for setting a Special Agenda to consider the settlement agreement. And I'd also like to say this case was unusual in that non-parties were involved, and we'd like to thank all involved for the cooperation throughout the docket.

We agree with many of FPL's comments, and we'd just like to say briefly that after conducting voluminous discovery, including depositions of non-parties, we're convinced this settlement is the best resolution for this case and in the public interest. The settlement is reasonable for all parties, creates customer savings, includes additional protections for customers, and avoids the long-term costs of the PPA. For these reasons, we believe the settlement is in the public interest, and we respectfully request the Commission approve the agreement. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you.

		000013
1	Mr. Moyle.	
2	MR. MOYLE: Thank you, Madam Chair. And	
3	I guess we have as much time as we think we need.	
4	I'll you didn't put a time limit on our	
5	comments; right?	
6	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I did not.	
7	MR. MOYLE: Okay. I won't abuse it,	
8	but	
9	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I'm counting on	
10	that.	
11	MR. MOYLE: it avoids me having to	
12	keep a clock.	
13	So for the record, Jon Moyle. I represent	
14	the Florida Industrial Power Users Group. And	
15	Mr. Butler was right on some of his comments. FIPUG	
16	was not at the negotiating table, and FIPUG has not	
17	signed on, you know, to the settlement agreement in	
18	large part because we don't think that it is a good	
19	deal for our members and for the ratepayers at	
20	large. And I appreciate the clarification there's	
21	no evidence coming in today. Your staff basically	
22	took a document, the settlement agreement, that I	
23	don't even think is in the record, I don't think	
24	it's evidence that's been filed, but there's no new	
25	evidence, so the record we're traveling under is the	

record that was adduced at your evidentiary hearing where witnesses were sworn under oath and we had the evidentiary hearing. I appreciate you conducting that, and we were able to, you know, to develop some points.

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

We filed a post-hearing brief. I don't know if you all have been able to see the post-hearing brief because it was filed in a redacted basis. But I think, you know, looking at that in terms of the key evidence that we believe suggests this is not a good deal is quite important. And I'll go over that, but I won't verbalize the numbers because we still are not settled on -- on a confidentiality point.

But the facts in the record that FIPUG suggest make this not a good deal for the ratepayers are the following. This is a 20-plus-year-old coal plant. It's not a brand new coal plant. It has age on it. It's been located between the -- right on the St. Johns River, with the Atlantic Ocean being close by. We all know in Florida what an environment near the salt or the fresh water can do to a facility. It's an old coal plant.

There are a lot of federal regulations that are -- that are out there, and you heard some

testimony on that. Recently the Clean Power Plan was announced and released, and coal plants are not something that a lot of people are saying, yeah, we need to site new coals plants, build new coal plants. In fact, a lot of coal plants are being closed around the country. And -- and so, you know, Cedar Bay, you heard the facts on it, but I think you also are aware, based on filings that have been made, you know, that Duke has a coal plant that they're closing. I think Gulf has a coal plant that they're closing. Natural gas is what people are building. So, you know, coal is not in vogue, I guess, is -- is the point.

The idea, you know, given that it's, you know, an old coal plant, given that coal is not -not doing well and a lot of coal plants are closing, and given that this facility is located on a site that there was no debate about the site has some existing environmental issues, we don't think that it makes a lot of sense to go and pay \$520.5 million for this asset, and we don't think it makes sense for a lot of reasons.

In our brief, we said there was a mountain of evidence that suggested FPL was -- was paying too much, was paying an inflated price for this. And

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

23 24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

briefly to review that, that included expert testimony from FIPUG's witness Mike Lane, who said that the price being paid was -- was inflated or overstated; that included testimony from the Office of Public Counsel's expert witness, who said in his judgment no more than 370 million should be paid for this asset; it included evidence from the very same person who FPL put before you and he raised his right hand and said, yeah, I think this price is okay. He -- he said that after the deal had been struck and his document coincidentally matched up with the -- with the purchase price. But it's the same gentleman, Mr. Herr, who two years before was tasked to look at the value of the PPA. And he did -- he did it for Cogentrix or Carlyle, looked at it, and he came in with a sum of money that the PPA was worth that was materially and significantly lower than -- than the 520.

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

Another piece of evidence that FIPUG brought out during the hearing and pointed to in its brief is what Goldman Sachs sold the asset for.

**COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Mr. Moyle, I have indulged, as I said I would, but I do believe that we have heard your summary of the testimony, and all three of us were there to actually hear the

testimony, so if you would speak to the motion that is before us.

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

MR. MOYLE: Okay. Well, I quess Mr. Butler, in making his -- and I was just done with that. That was the other point I was going to make. But, you know, Mr. Butler, in making his summary, didn't -- didn't bring up the purchase price. He said, well, we're going to have a little more insurance and, you know, a few things. He didn't say, oh, and we've reduced the purchase price by any amount. I mean, what the purchase price does, it's still the 520.5. There was no reduction in that. And FIPUG has suggested, as you all did when you were considering a settlement where FIPUG did sign and OPC did not sign, you all looked at that settlement and said we think that there's some additional monies in savings for ratepayers, and I think it was 27 or 28 million that you all saved ratepayers in your role as the regulators when that settlement agreement was before you, and would suggest that it might be appropriate for you to look at this and suggest, given the evidence that I've referenced to you, that there are some additional savings that FPL overpaid for -- for this asset.

Let me comment briefly. FPL has said 70 million, they're going to save ratepayers 70 million. You know, that's based on projections. And we all, we all know that projections may be right, they may be wrong. Recently we've seen they're wrong. So I think Mr. Butler said they will save. I think he should have said they may save.

And Mr. Butler said FIPUG may bring up the point that FPL overpaid for this asset. That should have been a will, because FPL did pay -- overpay for this asset. It's too much. The ratepayers should not be saddled with this inflated price. And we would ask that you direct the parties to go back and reduce the price to a more reasonable sum consistent with the evidence that we've talked about here today and recited in our brief. So thank you for the opportunity to present our argument to you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Moyle.

Commissioners, as you're aware, you've heard from staff to present the item, you've heard from the parties at hearing. What is before us is whether the filed settlement agreement is in the public interest. So my suggestion/request is that we take approximately ten minutes to consider the arguments that we've heard, and then we'll come

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

1

2

3

back, have the opportunity to ask questions, if any, 1 2 or make comments, and then be ready and in a posture for decision. 3 So with that, we are on break until 11:45 4 by the clock on the wall. Thank you. 5 (Recess.) 6 7 Okay. We are back on the record. And when we took a slight break to consider the 8 9 arguments that had been presented to us, I said that 10 we would come back to Commissioners for questions or discussion. So, Commissioners, are there questions 11 for the staff or for the parties? 12 Commissioner Patronis. 13 14 MR. PATTON: I just have a quick question for one of the parties. Thank you, Madam Chairman. 15 16 To Mr. Moyle, I'm kind of trying to follow 17 the train of logic. In your opinion, did FP&L have 18 a bad negotiator? What -- what -- what was -- in 19 your opinion? 20 MR. MOYLE: In my opinion, yes. You 21 know, you can look at -- you can look at 22 something -- so -- so I think there was a reason 23 why I asked a question about, when the witness was 24 up there, about was he familiar with the -- with 25 the AARP discount at hotels. And I don't think

that they negotiated strongly. I don't -- you know, they admitted they didn't have an incentive to negotiate strongly because they make more money paying a higher price as compared to a lower price. They get a return on the amount that they pay, so, you know, 520 is better than 420.

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

So, you know, it's my belief, and I think we make the point clearly -- again, I'm at a little disadvantage with respect to not being able to, you know, point to exact numbers, but I don't think when you look at how it played out, FPL -- the history on this is that, you know, FPL contacted them and said, hey, are you guys interested in doing a deal? Usually when somebody -- if I call you and say, Mr. Patronis, can I -- I like your car. Can I, you know, talk to you about it? And you may say, yeah, well, make me an offer. I mean, that's not how it -- how it worked. FPL called them up. The next thing you knew, you got a letter back from, you know, from the other side saying, you know, here's -- here's what we'll take for it. And then you saw that number. It's confidential. But then, you know, the delta -- delta and magnitude from where they ended up was, in my judgment, not particularly significant.

000021 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Commissioner Brisé. 1 2 MR. BUTLER: I'm sorry. Commissioner 3 Edgar? COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Sir. 4 MR. BUTLER: May I respond to what 5 Mr. Moyle said, because it's kind of offensive? 6 7 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: You may respond because Commissioner Brisé has given you the floor, 8 9 but not because of your description of the 10 comments, so --11 MR. BUTLER: Thank you. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: You're welcome. 12 13 MR. BUTLER: I just would like to respond 14 that, one, there is not a shred of evidence that 15 Mr. Moyle can point to of anything other than active, vigorous negotiations by FPL in the record 16 17 for this case. So he's simply stating his opinion 18 in that regard. 19 Number two, this company has a long 20 history, and it's evidenced with this particular 21 deal, of actively looking for the best opportunities 22 to save customers money. That's the incentive that 23 was here. And we entered into a transaction that 24 does -- I will agree with Mr. Moyle, it's projected 25 to save money, but it's projected over a wide range

of conditions to save customers money. We didn't have to do this. There's nothing that was, you know, naturally causing the agreement to expire or otherwise come up for renegotiation, so we looked for an opportunity to save customers money. We got the best deal we could. If we could have gotten it cheaper, we would have wanted to get it cheaper.

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

000022

But, as I said in my initial comments, you know, the very reasons that we wanted to do this deal, which is the current environment of fairly low gas prices make paying these very high capacity payments and then not really anymore benefiting all that much from the energy charge side of the equation, we really wanted to do the deal and save customers money. By the same token, that makes it a pretty good asset to, you know, Carlyle and Cogentrix, and so they weren't especially inclined to want to sell it. But we were able to reach terms that were favorable to customers and that, you know, allowed us to be able to bring some customer savings to the table. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Butler. And as was made clear at the very beginning of discussion on the item before us, this is not evidentiary, and Mr. Moyle certainly was

000023 expressing his opinion and, I presume, that of his 1 client. 2 Commissioner Brisé. 3 COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Thank you, Madam 4 Chair. 5 Are there any other factors, and this 6 7 question is really to OPC, outside of the numbers that make this deal a good deal for consumers when 8 9 we think about energy overall in the State of Florida? 10 MR. TRUITT: Well, Commissioner, as you 11 stated, first, the PPA is obviously the most 12 13 expensive option in everything in this. So 14 that's -- that's the number argument. 15 But, again, some of our other concerns 16 have a particular environmental bent, so that's the 17 environmental protection policy. I think that's 18 going to help out any -- mitigate any possible risk 19 there. But then in terms of the other choices, 20 21 when you look at these numbers in this plant, and I 22 know there's been arguments with the Clean Power 23 Plan and such, when you look at the glide path and 24 you look at the Clean Power Plan, and that'll be in 25 the second interim in the rates, it's going to be

000024 running, I honestly think, at this midpoint in time, 1 and customers are going to be on the hook for those 2 3 enormous capacity payments, if I can borrow a word from FPL. That really is the main driver. This is 4 the most efficient way to get out of it. 5 And to go to Mr. Moyle's point that some 6 7 of the risks that may come in, that's why I'm saying with the most efficient way to get out, to get rid 8 9 of those risks, that's why we can stand behind this wholeheartedly. 10 11 COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Thank you. 12 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. 13 Commissioners, any further questions at 14 this point? No. Staff, any additional comment in light of 15 the discussion that we've had? 16 17 MR. BALLINGER: No, ma'am. 18 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. So, again, 19 Commissioners, the item that is before us is a 20 request for approval of the proposed settlement 21 agreement, which, if approved, would be a 22 comprehensive resolution of all of the issues that 23 are in the docket of which we have had hearing. So 24 is there discussion? Is there a motion? 25 COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Madam Chair, I would

000025 like to move that we approve the settlement as 1 described before us today. 2 3 COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Second. **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** There is a motion; 4 there is a second. Seeing no further discussion, 5 all in favor, say aye. 6 7 (Vote taken.) No opposed. The settlement agreement is 8 9 approved. Thank you to our staff, thank you for -to the parties, and we are adjourned. 10 MR. MOYLE: I had a couple of --11 12 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Oh, I'm so sorry. I 13 apologize. Yes, Mr. Moyle, you did say that at the 14 very beginning. Scratch the "we are adjourned." MR. MOYLE: Okay. This has been an 15 unusual case. 16 17 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Agreed. 18 MR. MOYLE: There are certain pending 19 matters related to confidentiality, and I wanted to make sure we were going to get rulings on those, 20 21 those pending matters. 22 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Are those before the 23 Prehearing Officer at this point or to staff? 24 MS. BARRERA: Staff is in the middle of 25 assessing the confidentiality and making our draft

000026 orders, which are recommendations to the Prehearing Officer. Given the complexity of the number of confidentiality requests we got, and some of them were withdrawn later, and we have -- we're in the process of identifying also documents that can be returned and such. So there will be rulings on confidentiality requests, you know, forthcoming. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay. Thank you. MR. MOYLE: So --COMMISSIONER EDGAR: And, of course, Mr. Moyle, you recognize that -- that we need to be very careful and want to make sure that it's handled appropriately and sensitively, which does take time. But, yes, that is process, and decisions will be forthcoming. MR. MOYLE: Okay. Good. And then I had one other matter, if I could -- if I could bring up. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: You may. MR. MOYLE: And it's related to confidentiality, but it might help if I just pass out the transcript of the last evidentiary hearing to --

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

**COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Well, before you pass something out, please -- please describe to me

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

what it is you are bringing before us.

MR. MOYLE: Okay. We -- we were -- at the hearing we were in, I think, a bit of a discussion as it related to a pending question to a witness, and I was saying, well, I ought to be able to ask this question, you know, I'm asking him, you know, this, and I was arguing why I should be able to ask him. And I think it was Mr. Wright -- there were some objections that took place. I think ultimately you said, okay, move on, go on to something else, which I did. Mr. Wright moved to strike a comment that I made. You said, hold on, I'll take that under advisement. Mr. Wright brought it up again and said, we'd like to move to strike the comment that Moyle made. You said, I want to talk to my lawyers about it.

## COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Uh-huh.

MR. MOYLE: At the end of the hearing, he brought it up again, and you said, I've talked to my lawyers, you know. He did not go over the line, or words to that effect, and you said, the motion to strike is -- is denied.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Uh-huh.

**MR. MOYLE:** The record will stay as it is. And I'm not citing from the transcript.

MS. HELTON: Madam Chairman, I'm not sure how this is related to the settlement for which this Special Agenda has been noticed. There has been a request for confidential treatment filed that deals with this issue, and it seems to me that it's appropriately right now before the Prehearing Officer.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. MOYLE: Well, let me -- let me, if I could, you had said, we will leave the record as it is. When the transcript was printed, notwithstanding your direction to leave the record as it is, it got printed with this blackout in there, the redaction of the very comment that was at issue. So, you know, you heard it, you made a ruling, but then your ruling was not followed in the transcript. So I wanted to bring that to your attention, since you were the judge presiding over this, and ask you to, you know, reaffirm your -your ruling.

## COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Okay.

MR. MOYLE: Because it's not -- what you ruled isn't what happened.

23 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Mr. Moyle, this is
24 the first that that has been brought to my
25 attention, or at least that concern, and, of

course, some portions of this proceeding are currently before the Prehearing Officer. I appreciate you bringing it to my attention, to our attention while we are all here on the record. And what I will do is review the information that you have stated, I will get with staff, and we will take all appropriate steps to make sure that the record is accurate.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

24

25

MR. MOYLE: Okay. That would be great. I appreciate it. Could I just, you know, just so we have a complete record, hand out the portions of the transcript that I just referenced?

**COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Share it with the parties, share it with staff, if you have information. However, I've said we will take care of it. We will take care of it.

MR. MOYLE: Okay.

**COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Thank you. Any other matters?

20 MR. MOYLE: I'll give it to the clerk to 21 -- thank you.

22 **COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Thank you. And, of 23 course, the clerk, of course.

MS. BARRERA: Madam Chairman, we just want to make sure that the following dates that

		000030
1	were set previously, you know, for the briefs and	000030
2	such are now hereby canceled.	
3	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Those are moot.	
4	MS. BARRERA: Thank you.	
5	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: All right. Any	
6	other matters?	
7	All right. Now we are adjourned.	
8	(Special Agenda adjourned at 11:58 a.m.)	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	

	000031
1	STATE OF FLORIDA )
2	COUNTY OF LEON ) CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
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
9	transcription of my notes of said proceedings.
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, 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 28th day of August, 2015.
14	
15	Linda Boles
16	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR FPSC Official Hearings Reporter
17	(850) 413-6734
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION