		9	00001
1		BEFORE THE	
2	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		
3	IN THE MATTER OF:		
4		DOCKET NO. 150148-EI	
5	PETITION FOR APPROVA INCLUDE IN BASE RATE	S THE	
6	REVENUE REQUIREMENT CR3 REGULATORY ASSET		
7	ENERGY FLORIDA, INC.		
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
8		DOCKET NO. 150171-EI	
9	PETITION FOR ISSUANC NUCLEAR ASSET-RECOVE		
10	FINANCING ORDER, BY	DUKE	
11	ENERGY FLORIDA, INC. DUKE ENERGY.	D/B/A	
12		/	
	PROCEEDINGS:	SPECIAL AGENDA	
13	COMMISSIONERS		
14		COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR	
15		COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISÉ COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN	
16		COMMISSIONER JIMMY PATRONIS	
17	DATE:	Tuesday, November 17, 2015	
18		Commencing at 9:34 a.m.	
19		Concluding at 10:15 a.m.	
20		Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148	
		4075 Esplanade Way	
21		Tallahassee, Florida	
22		LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR Official FPSC Reporter	
23		(850) 413-6734	
24			
25			

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

2.0

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Good morning, everyone.

Let the record show it is Tuesday, November the 17th,
and this is our Special Agenda for Docket 150148-EI,
150171-EI. We'll call this meeting to order. If I can
get staff to read the notice, please.

MS. GERVASI: Thank you. Good morning,

Commissioners. Rosanne Gervasi with the Office of

General Counsel on behalf of the Commission staff.

Pursuant to notice, this date and time has been set for

a Special Agenda Conference in Docket Nos. 150148 and

150171-EI in order for the Commission to consider and

rule upon the draft nuclear asset-recovery financing

order filed on November 12th, 2015.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Staff, are you going to introduce this item?

MS. GERVASI: Yes, thank you, sir. On May 22nd, 2015, in Docket No. 150148-EI, Duke Energy Florida, or DEF, filed a petition for approval to include the revenue requirement for the CR3 regulatory asset in base rates. On July 27th, 2015, pursuant to newly enacted Section 366.95, Florida Statutes, DEF filed a petition in Docket No. 150171-EI, excuse me, to issue lower cost nuclear asset-recovery bonds to securitize the CR3 regulatory asset, along with a

proposed financing order to finance its nuclear asset-recovery costs, plus upfront financing costs and carrying charges. The Commission thereafter consolidated the two dockets.

Section 366.95(2)(c) requires the Commission to issue a financing order if it finds that the issuance of the bonds and the imposition of the nuclear asset-recovery charges authorized by the financing order have a significant likelihood of resulting in lower overall costs or would avoid or significantly mitigate rate impacts to customers as compared with the traditional method of financing and recovering nuclear asset-recovery costs. The Draft Financing Order makes this finding.

Section 366.95 also requires the financing order to contain a number of key elements important in the bond issuance process: It must specify the amount of nuclear asset-recovery costs to be financed using nuclear asset-recovery bonds; it must describe and estimate the amount of financing costs which may be recovered and the period over which they may be recovered; require the nuclear asset-recovery charges to be nonbypassable and paid by all existing and future customers receiving transmission or distribution service from DEF or its successors or assignees;

include a formula-based true-up mechanism for making periodic adjustments in the nuclear asset-recovery charges to correct for any overcollection or undercollection of the charges or to otherwise ensure the timely payment of the bonds and the financing costs; specify the nuclear asset-recovery property that is to be created and that shall be used to pay or secure the bonds and the financing costs; contain a state pledge to the bondholders that the state will not alter the provisions of Section 366.95 which make the nuclear asset-recovery charges imposed by the financing order irrevocable, binding, and nonbypassable charges; or take or permit any action that would impair the value of the nuclear asset-recovery property or revise the costs for which recovery is authorized.

2.0

The Draft Financing Order includes all of those requirements that are contained in Section 366.95. It establishes the strength and the stability of the underlying nuclear asset-recovery charge for the benefit of the rating agencies and the ultimate bondholders; it also incorporates the stipulations on the financing order issues that the Commission approved at the October 14th hearing in this case, including the designation and role of the Bond Team in structuring, marketing, and pricing the bonds; that a designated

Commissioner will resolve any disputes that may arise among the Bond Team, and that his or her decision will be final and not subject to review by the full Commission; that two days after pricing the Commission's financial advisor will advise the Commission in writing as to whether the structuring, marketing, and pricing of the bonds resulted in the lowest nuclear asset-recovery charges consistent with the financing order and market conditions at the time of pricing; that the Commission will take its financing advisor's opinion letter into account in determining whether to issue a stop order no later than 5:00 p.m. On the third business day following pricing of the bonds.

2.0

The Draft Financing Order represents the collaborative and cooperative efforts of all parties and staff. It has been fully vetted by the Commission's outside bond counsel, financial advisor, and staff, and DEF and its advisors, the OPC, and all parties participated in drafting it.

Staff and the parties are in agreement that this Draft Financing Order should be approved with the inclusion of certain minor corrections, which staff filed by way of an errata sheet yesterday, which the parties brought to our attention since the draft order

was filed.

Also, we today realized that ordering paragraph No. 7, which is on page 49 of the Draft Financing Order, was inadvertently included in this draft. It should have been omitted, and so we agree with OPC and DEF that that paragraph should be omitted. And we suggest breaking ordering paragraph No. 6 into two paragraphs so that we don't have to renumber any subsequent ordering paragraphs such that paragraph --

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Hold on one second.

Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Ms. Gervasi -- thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MS. GERVASI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: I'm so sorry, but I did not catch -- which paragraph was it that should be omitted? I understand what you're saying, but I missed the number.

MS. GERVASI: Okay. It's ordering paragraph
No. 7 --

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you.

MS. GERVASI: -- should be omitted, and that is on page 49. Let me get there. It has to do with DEF requesting an interim increase through the capacity cost recovery charge if the bonds are unduly delayed.

That should be omitted.

And we suggest that ordering paragraph

No. 6 be broken into two so that ordering paragraph

No. 6 will read: "ORDERED that the nuclear

asset-recovery charge shall be allocated to the

customer rate classes in accordance with the allocation

methodology adopted in the RRSSA approved on

November 12th, 2013, in Order No. PSC-13-0598-FOF-EI.

It is further," and then paragraph 7 would read,

"ORDERED that the approved allocation methodology for

DEF is," et cetera, to the end of that sentence. And

then, "It is further."

Okay. And then finally, in lieu of briefs, the parties filed letters to the docket file reserving their right to speak at today's agenda. Staff recommends that DEF, followed by OPC and the other parties, be given the opportunity to briefly provide their comments at this time, and staff is available for questions.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioners, any questions of staff before we hear comments from the parties?

Okay. Duke.

MS. TRIPLETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dianne Triplett on behalf of Duke Energy Florida. And

the good news is that we come to you with an agreed-upon financing order, so you don't have to hear me unless you have any questions. So I just wanted to take just 30 seconds to thank your staff and the rest of the parties for working collaboratively to reach this, I think, very good outcome that we can all be here in agreement with the words that are in the financing order. And as I said, if y'all have any questions, I'm happy to address them. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you.

OPC.

MR. REHWINKEL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, Charles
Rehwinkel and J. R. Kelly with the Office of Public
Counsel. And I have a few brief remarks that I think
would be important for the process.

The Public Counsel appreciates this opportunity to participate in this historic process. This will, in all likelihood, be our very last opportunity to address the Commission on the CR3 asset. We would like to thank the Florida Legislature and the Governor for the passage and approval of legislation that gives the customers the opportunity to save hundreds of millions of dollars.

We would like to commend Duke for their efforts to make amends to customers in these difficult

times. They did not have to seek this legislation but they did. Accordingly, their shareholders will earn no return on the Crystal River Unit 3, and that's important. We recognize that benefit to Duke's customers. And I would like to especially thank President Alex Glenn for his role in bringing this customer benefit to us.

2.0

We also want to thank your staff for their hard work and looking out for the interests of customers in shepherding this financing order through the hearing and negotiation process to give the Bond Team the best chance for structuring, pricing, and issuing bonds that will provide customers with the lowest cost and best value. We especially commend staff and Commission's choice in hiring Saber and Mr. Criddle, the outside bond counsel, to vigorously and expertly represent the interests of customers who will pay 100 percent of the cost of these bonds over the next 20 years.

At this point, and based on the changes noted by your staff and based upon what we have seen in the draft order that you are voting on today, the Public Counsel appreciates the spirit in which our input has been received. We concur in the consensus draft that has been submitted for your consideration, and we thank

Duke f regard

2.0

Duke for working cooperatively with the parties in this regard.

We believe that the financing order, where appropriate, preserves the settlement agreements reached in 2012 and 2013, and it fully comports with the requirements of Section 366.95 in that regard.

This is important to all customer representatives, and we thank the parties and staff for ensuring that.

Perhaps most importantly the Draft Financing Order accurately describes the effects of the guarantees of payment of the bonds that should give investors the greatest level of comfort and facilitate the highest level of credit rating and the lowest achievable cost to the customers.

The order allows staff and their consultants to vigorously represent the interests of customers through every step of the way up to the point of actual issuance. We are greatly encouraged by the fact that the financing order provides that you will be receiving an opinion letter from your consultant immediately before the time of issuance. This is the customers' safety net. The extensive expertise and experience of your advisors will be embedded in that letter and will be an important test of the quality of the structure and pricing of the bonds at the time of issuance. We

2.0

urge you to give great deference to that opinion letter. We know you will listen to that advice since it is important to get it right the first time because that is the only time that it can be done. Twenty years is a long time and \$1.3 billion is a lot to finance.

Commissioners, finally, the financing order is in the public interest as proposed and amended here today, and we urge you to approve and issue it. As proposed and if adopted in that form, we will not ask for reconsideration or appeal it.

And our final thank you is to you,

Commissioners, for your approval of this order. Thank
you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Rehwinkel.
Mr. Brew.

MR. BREW: Thank you. Good morning. James Brew for PCS Phosphate.

I just want to quickly reiterate that PCS fully supports the Draft Financing Order that you have in front of you as amended by staff this morning. And I would just like to point out that this has been a long time in coming, but this required an extended effort by all the parties to balance the rate agreements that we did in '12 and '13 and amended

earlier this year, the statute, and the realities of actually issuing the bonds.

And I would just like to express my appreciation for all the parties and staff for involving all the stakeholders in developing the Draft Financing Order that we have for you today. I can tell you that there were long discussions over individual words. Parties have really focused on what has gone into the order, and we fully support it as drafted. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Brew.

Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Commissioners. Schef Wright on behalf of the Florida Retail Federation.

The Florida Retail Federation joins the company, the citizens of the State of Florida, and the other consumer parties in fully supporting the issuance of this financing order.

I'd like to particularly affirm the OPC's comments and everyone's thanks to you, to the company, and to your staff for really working very, very hard to bring this financing order in for a very valuable and beneficial landing.

In practical terms, getting this done will

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

2.0

save Floridians lots and lots of money, hundreds of millions of dollars. This is significantly more money in regular residential customers' pockets and it's lower cost for Florida's business. It will significantly benefit the Florida economy. We particularly appreciate your efforts in setting up these procedures expedited to bring this in for a timely landing and the timely issuance of the financing order. We urge you to approve the order as it is presented to you today and thank you very much in advance for doing so.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Wright.
Mr. Moyle.

MR. MOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record, Jon Moyle on behalf of the Florida Industrial Power Users Group.

And FIPUG also would like to thank this

Commission, the Legislature, the parties for improving
on a bad situation. We have been before you a number
of times, as some of the other Intervenors mentioned,
with settlement agreements. This all kind of flows out
of the Crystal River 3 nuclear power plant that met an
unfortunate fate, and the ratepayers have been paying
for that. And Duke, to their credit, came up with an
idea of saying, hey, here's an idea that ratepayers can

pays less, took it to the Legislature, it was approved, the Governor signed it, and you all have moved it forward.

So we look forward to the approximate \$600 million in savings that would flow from your action, your anticipated action today, which we encourage you to take.

and this is a little bit of an unusual procedural matter. When you all previously considered this, you said the parties can talk and there may be a couple of questions, and FIPUG raised three questions that we just want the record to be clear on. And this is — these are 20-year bonds, so at some point if questions arise, I suspect, probably not the lawyers here, but at some point people might come back and look at the transcript, and I think it would be helpful to have clarity with respect to three questions. And so that was the document that FIPUG filed.

But just briefly, the three questions, and
I've talked with staff, I think they're able and should
be prepared to address them, but there's language in
the financing order that in one part gives the ability
to those who are going to be doing this deal to seek
some variable financing, but then there's language in

another part that says, no, essentially this is going to be a fixed rate deal. And the FIPUG members do not want to have interest rate exposure on the equivalent of an adjustable rate mortgage. We want a firm, fixed mortgage, and we want to make sure that that is the intention of this Commission and staff. So that's one question.

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

The two other questions are largely legal in nature. The financing agreement uses the term "joint and several liability" in one place. And in law school when they taught you joint and several liability, it's kind of a concept that at least my first reaction was, boy, that doesn't seem real fair intuitively where some -- one party can be responsible for all of the obligation. And in a legal context, if you have a judgment against three people, the person who has the judgment can decide to collect from one person and not collect from the other two. I don't think that's what's intended with this. But the use of the term "joint and several liability," I just wanted to make sure that it was not going to be used in the strictly legal context that I just kind of recounted of the law school.

So I think that's a good, important clarification point that the people who hold the bonds

1 won'

2.0

won't have the discretion to go after, you know,

Mr. Brew's client as compared to, you know, some other

folks.

And then the third point is the word

"guarantee" is used a lot in this agreement with a

capital G, "Guarantee." And I just want to be clear

that this order and this relationship is not creating a

traditional legal guarantor/guarantee relationship, so

it's not like the ratepayers are signing anything where

somebody can come in and contract and say you

guaranteed this debt.

And so those were the three points that FIPUG raised that we would appreciate clarification on. And assuming the clarification is sufficient, we do have one further comment that we'd like to make on the somewhat unique process whereby, because time is of the essence, you all are going to designate a Commissioner to act for the Commission on the proposed interest rate when things are getting ready to go.

So those are the comments, Mr. Chairman.

But, again, I think the overarching comment is thank

you and all the parties and staff for working hard.

Your staff hired outside experts. They did a very good

job, raised a lot of good points, and I think some of

the points that we're presenting to you today have kind

of flowed out of those conversations. So that's all I have right now.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Moyle.

Staff, let's start with number one, fixed or adjustable.

MR. MAUREY: Yes. Mr. Moyle is correct.

There is language in the financing order that gives the Bond Team the flexibility to pursue variable rate instruments in issuing these bonds. But ultimately, and it's on page 30, I'll point you to finding of fact 68 where it expressly states that the Commission -- "We find that each tranche of the nuclear asset-recovery bond should have a fixed interest rate." So that even if a variable rate is used for the convenience of the transaction, it is required to be converted to a fix rate before the bonds are issued.

On the second matter of joint and several liability, Mr. Moyle -- from a strict constructionist legal context, this use of this term in this document is from a financial context as it's used by the rating agencies, Standard & Poor's specifically. But also on -- if I could turn your attention to page 22 of finding of fact 23, it holds that "holders of nuclear asset-recovery bonds may not arbitrarily seek to impose the entire burden or repaying nuclear asset-recovery

bonds on a single customer or a select group of customers outside the true-up mechanism." So there is no intention of using joint and several liability in the legal context.

Finally, regarding those -- the three matters from the November 9th letter, the proposed form of financing order before you speaks only in terms of the state pledge and the true-up mechanism for guaranteeing payment of the bonds. There is -- nowhere does the financing order speak of any particular entity itself individually or jointly serving as the financial guarantor of the bonds. The true-up mechanism is the -- and the execution of the true-up mechanism is the guarantor of the bonds, no particular entity.

And I did -- one final comment on the last remark about the single Commissioner, and it may have just been, I may have misheard it incorrectly, but he spoke about how they would be -- to talk about the interest rate. The findings of fact related to the use of a single Commissioner were for dispute resolution on the Bond Team. The deal will be brought back before the full Commission after pricing in order for the Commission to consider whether to issue a stop order.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mr. Moyle.

MR. MOYLE: Okay. Thank you for allowing the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

record to be clear on those three points. And, yes,
the dispute resolution portion, which I hope doesn't
include an interest rate dispute, but anyway that
process, while unique and I'm not sure has been done
before here, but given the circumstances, FIPUG agrees
with that in this case, that it's appropriate to have a
single Commissioner in effect be delegated the
authority of the Commission for the purpose of
resolving disputes that might arise. So I want the
record to be clear on that point as well.

2.0

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you. Anybody want to add anything to Mr. Moyle's comments? Ms. Triplett.

MS. TRIPLETT: How could you tell? Thank you.

Just very briefly because Mr. Moyle raised it. Not surprisingly, the words "guarantee" and "joint and several liability" were some of the words that had the most discussion on -- in this financing order. And I think we got comfortable with how it is reflected in the financing order because it is a finding of the Commission.

It will be a different story -- I think that the Bond Team is still considering -- when we get to the point of what appears in the marketing and the prospectus materials with respect to these bonds. And

I say that because there -- we don't want investors to be confused or misled about what a guarantee means or what joint and several liability means. So it's going to be important that when we craft that language, that we are comfortable that we're not going to mislead the bondholders, while at the same time, of course, fulfilling the goal of making sure that bondholders do understand the incredible credit attributes of these bonds. So -- but having said that, the words in the financing order, again, we're comfortable with where we came out, and especially appreciate the additional clarification from Mr. Maurey. Thanks.

2.0

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Mr. Rehwinkel.

MR. REHWINKEL: Yes. Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. I want to strongly support the comments of Mr. Maurey in response to the issues that were raised, and I agree with Ms. Triplett as well.

We like this order, we agree with the interpretation that Mr. Maurey has given you, and we think it arms the Bond Team with the necessary tools and flexibility to do the best for the customers, and that's what we like about it.

Yes, there's a lot of hard work ahead with the Bond Team, but your financing order gives them what they need to get the job done. So we support it.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Any other comments from the parties before I bring this to the Commission?

Okay. Commissioners? Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

If I may, just a few comments and maybe one or two
quick questions.

First of all, from my read and discussions with my staff and with Commission staff, I do believe that the document before us with the modifications that have been described does accurately codify the stipulations that we approved and the intent of the statute that was passed by the Legislature and signed by the Governor.

I believe very strongly, it's something that I say often, words matter. And so the time and effort and thought that went into all involved in really parsing through and thinking through specific words and wordings I think shows and will be a large part of the success of this effort. So thank you to all for your efforts in that regard in particular.

I would like to point out just one or two areas of the document that I think are of particular note. One is on paragraph -- is in paragraph 55, which is at the very bottom, so it's actually on page 28, and

that is the last sentence of paragraph 51, which says that these "bonds will achieve the lowest overall cost standard and the greatest possible customer protections." I think that kind of sums up the whole effort and the intent, and that that language is in the document and is very clear I think is important.

We've had a little bit of discussion about paragraph 50, which is on page 27, and that is the paragraph that describes the potential resolution process for issues of disagreement and the fact that one Commissioner will be designated.

My reading of this, and I think this should be on the record, my reading of this where it says, "This Commission should designate one Commissioner to resolve any issues," is that that would be a designation from the Chairman as our statutory chief administrative officer.

I recognize, as Mr. Moyle said, that's, you know, not always our general proceeding, but we are implementing a brand new statute, and under the timing and the circumstances and the way this Commission works together, I think that is absolutely appropriate and very workable, although I hope it won't be implemented.

And then I had just one question for our staff, and that is regarding the language in paragraph

38 on page 26, at the very top of page 26 where it says 1 that the "total estimated cumulative revenue 2 3 requirement would be \$708 million lower, on an undiscounted basis, compared to the total estimated 4 5 cumulative revenue requirement under the traditional recovery method." And, Mr. Maurey, if you could just 6 7 speak to how that number of 708 million was arrived at. MR. MAUREY: Yes. When -- in the May filing 8 9 that was discussed earlier, it was contemplated there'd be a certain base rate charge for recovery of the 10 retirement of CR3, and that was a provision approved in 11 12 the Revised and Restated Settlement Agreement. 13 In the filing made in July to pursue 14 securitization, it would result in a lower revenue 15 requirement being collected from customers, and the difference between those two petitions, those two 16 amounts was the 708 million. 17 18 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: With that, Mr. Chairman, 19 I'm done with my comments and questions at this time. 2.0 I would be pleased to make a motion at the appropriate 21 time at your pleasure. 22 CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you, Commissioner 23 Edgar. 24 Commissioner Brown.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25

And this is a very creative mechanism to resolving a long and protracted process that we all know and we've acknowledged here, and thank all the parties, especially staff, the Legislature, the Governor for passing this statute that has given us this financing order ultimately.

2.0

And, you know, the primary purpose here is to mitigate the costs that are passed on to customers.

And there are -- to me, there appear to be a lot of adequate customer protections in here. And,

Mr. Rehwinkel, you touched on a few of them, but if I may ask you here, what are the highlights of the customer protections in this financing order that you believe are in the best public interest? And you touched on some of them.

MR. REHWINKEL: Thank you, Commissioner

Brown. And I think the first customer protection is

that the -- this order, and I think you've heard it

from all the parties, it fulfills and it supports the

settlement agreement that we entered into.

It recognizes the 20-year period for spreading these costs over, and it directs the Bond Team to get as close as possible to 20 years. It gives them a little bit of flexibility, but that's a direction that they have, and we think that's a

protection.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

24

The big protection within the Bond Team is the advisor that you -- the Commission has hired, and the engagement of your staff and your outside consultant on the Bond Team with that opinion letter that's going to come in, I think it has to come in on the second day, at least a day ahead of when your 72 hours expires, that letter will tell the world, tell the -- well, it'll tell the Commission. It may not be -- it'll tell the Commission if there are any concerns or material problems with the structuring and pricing of the bonds such that you will know that you need to put the brakes on and give more direction to the Bond Team. So I think that's kind of the main thing that we see as a protection in here.

The requirement that there be the lowest cost standard is also a protection for the customers because, like I said and I think as the Commission recognizes, you're financing \$1.3 billion over 20 years, so those dollars add up. And I think you've got the right people in place to enforce that standard. those are the highlights from our standpoint.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you. And you nailed it. And I think that this financing order has been carefully crafted with active participation from the Commission staff to provide these customer protections.

2.0

It's critical, and I've had this discussion with staff, that the cooperation among the parties, among the Bond Team is critical to achieving the best results for customers. And I look forward to getting updates. This is an area of interest particularly to me. And I really greatly appreciate all the efforts, the transparent process that's put in place and thank the parties. And, Mr. Moyle, thank you for bringing those items up to our attention as well. When I read it before I got your letter, I agreed that some of those areas were of interest to me as well. So I appreciate you providing that inquiry and clarification, staff, on those matters.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have no other issues here or questions at least and support a motion.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: What motion?

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Commissioner Edgar -- I thought it was Commissioner Edgar's motion.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Well, there hasn't been one yet.

Commissioner Brisé.

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to express my appreciation to all the

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

parties and our staff for their hard work to get us to this point.

2.0

Now we are basically at the midpoint. A lot of the hard work really begins after this order has been voted upon. Having worked with the parties in a prior set of issues prior to us getting here, I truly appreciate the spirit of cooperation that exists that everyone has to ensure that we get the best deal for consumers here, and I think this order is a reflection of that. And I think that as we move forward, as the Bond Team begins to do its work, that those same goals of reaching the best deals for consumers moving forward will be our ultimate result.

The couple of things that I appreciate about the order is the fact that it provides for the flexibility necessary to ensure that any investors that want to play in this space have the opportunity to do so, and, therefore, as we broaden that space, it creates greater opportunities for our consumers to reach greater savings in the process.

So as we move forward, I certainly hope that we won't have to use that provision that allows for the one Commissioner to resolve disputes, but I'm glad that it's there in order for us to do that in a reasonable manner.

2

3

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

2.0 21

22

23

24

25

So with that, when the motion is made, I'll be ready to support it.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Commissioner Patronis.

COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to bring to light that in the last 11 months the product of work on this Commission has been very positive in the balance of prudently watching the ratepayers' dollars. So I just want to really give a lot of credit back to the Legislature and the Governor for putting Julie Brown back on the Commission. So there's got to be some type of tie-in to this. But what a fantastic year it's been, and this is nothing but good news for our entire state. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: You know, she's not Chairman yet.

Commissioner Edgar for a motion.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Recognizing all of the comments and the discussion here today, I would ask -- I would move that we direct our staff to incorporate into the document the changes to page 49, paragraphs 6 and 7, also the changes that are included in the document that is titled "Errata to 11/12/15 Draft Financing Order," and that with those changes we approve the Draft Financing

1 Order that we have discussed today.

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: It's been moved and seconded, we'll call it the Edgar motion. Any further discussion about the Edgar motion?

I want to take a second, too, to thank Duke for bringing this forward. I think this is very creative. And once again, I think as, not repeating what everybody else said, this is, I think, the best thing for the ratepayers. I want to thank the legislators and the Governor for allowing us to handle this the way we're handling it. I want to thank staff and the other parties for your patience, your due diligence to getting to the end of this. I want to thank my Prehearing Officer, Commissioner Brisé, my Solomon. There's just -- someone has got to sit back and bring the two sides together, bring peace to all this, and he's been able to do that over the years, and I do appreciate him stepping up and doing it specifically in this case.

And I want to thank the Commissioners. I know each and every one of you have met not just one time but many, many, many, many times with staff going over this and reviewing it and understanding it and pushing for changes to make sure that everybody is protected in this entire process. I do appreciate

that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

That all being said, if there's no further discussion, we have a motion and a second on the floor. All in favor, say aye.

(Vote taken.)

Any opposed? By your action, you've approved the Edgar motion.

I heard somebody's -- Mr. Rehwinkel.

MR. REHWINKEL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to, on behalf of the customers, I want to thank Duke. I think the legal team represented here by Ms. Triplett and the accounting team represented by Javier Portuondo, they made a concerted effort to make this process work instead of being one that was contentious like we've seen in other places around the country on the securitization processes. They really wanted this to work, not only in the securitization financing order, but in the settlement of the Crystal River asset figure from the 0148 docket, as well as the amendment to the RRSSA that made the 20-year provision work between the settlement and the financing order. So without that, I think this would have been a different work product, and they put a lot of effort into it and I just think it needs recognition. thank you.

1	
T	

CHAIRMAN GRAHAM: Thank you.

Okay. If nothing else to come before us, we will adjourn this Special Agenda. And we will start IA at 10:30 over in the IA room. That's about 15 minutes. Thank you very much. We're adjourned.

(Special Agenda Conference adjourned at 10:15 a.m.)

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

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			
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 20th day of November, 2015.			
14	\mathcal{L}^{\perp} \mathcal{L}^{\perp}			
15	Linda Boles			
16	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR			
17	FPSC Official Hearings Reporter (850) 413-6734			
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				