FILED SEP 21, 2016 DOCUMENT NO. 07709-16

	FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK		000001
1		BEFORE THE	
2	FLORIDA PU	BLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	
3	In the Matter of:		
4		DOCKET NO. 160134-EI	
5	PETITION FOR ACCOUNTING		
6	RECOGNITION OF GULF POWER COMPANY'S OWNERSHIP IN PLANT		
7	SCHERER AS BEING IN RETAIL CUSTOMERS.	SERVICE TO	
8		/	
9			
10			
11	PROCEEDINGS:	COMMISSION CONFERENCE AGENDA ITEM NO. 6	
12	COMMISSIONERS		
13	PARTICIPATING:	CHAIRMAN JULIE I. BROWN COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR	
14		COMMISSIONER ART GRAHAM COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISÉ	
15		COMMISSIONER JIMMY PATRONIS	
16	DATE:	Tuesday, September 13, 2016	
17	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148	
18		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida	
19	REPORTED BY:	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR	
20		Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6734	
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	FLORIDA PU	JBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	
I	I		

000002

PROCEEDINGS

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

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Moving on to Issue 6. We've had folks waiting here since 9:30 on this.

All right. While folks are getting situated, I want to thank staff for waiting along as well.

MR. MOURING: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Curt Mouring with Commission staff.

Item 6 is staff's recommendation on Gulf Power Company's request for accounting recognition of the company's ownership interest in Plant Scherer Unit 3. In its request, Gulf is seeking to notify the Commission that a portion of its capacity interest in Scherer Unit 3 is now dedicated to serving is native load and has requested approval to stop making Commission-ordered adjustments to remove Scherer Unit 3 investment and operating expenses from its monthly earning surveillance reports.

The Office of Public Counsel has intervened in this docket and is here to address the Commission. The Sierra Club and Florida Industrial Power Users Group are also present and have asked to address the Commission on this matter. And, finally, representatives from the company are here to address the Commission. Staff is prepared to answer any questions the Commission may have.

000003

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you. And since it is Gulf's petition, I'd ask Mr. Stone if he'd like to address the Commission now or after the parties -- I mean, the interested persons have --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

24

25

MR. STONE: Madam Chairman, in the interest of time, we support the staff recommendation. We believe we're the only party that's adversely affected by the staff recommendation, and we support the staff recommendation. I would like the opportunity to respond to any other comments.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Certainly. And we've got Office of Public Counsel who wishes to address, and we'll do it in this order, five minutes each: OPC, FIPUG, Sierra Club. And I want to say, Mr. Moyle, it's been too long. I miss you.

MR. MOYLE: The sun's still up.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: The sun's still up.

So Public Counsel is here, and I don't believe I've had a chance to meet the counsel here.

20 MS. MORRIS: Once before actually. Stephanie
21 Morris. I'm fairly new, but, yes.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Nice to see you. MS. MORRIS: Okay. Well, at your pleasure. CHAIRMAN BROWN: You may begin. MS. MORRIS: Thank you. Good afternoon, Madam

Chair and Commissioners. I'm Stephanie Morris appearing on behalf of the customers of Gulf Power.

000004

As a preliminary matter, to the extent that today's action is not noticed as a proposed agency action that provides a point of entry to be heard to the substantially affected retail customers, we respectfully object. But to the extent that today's decision has no substantive precedential value on the determination of retail cost responsibility, then we would have less concern as long as any order is clear on this point.

As we read the recommendation, the outcome of today's decision is purely procedural in nature, and that is all it can be to our understanding. The issue of whether, based on all the facts and not just the ones Gulf has presented, that any Scherer costs should be the responsibility of the retail customers and not what Gulf refers to as, quote, native load, which includes wholesale customers over which the Commission has rate-setting authority, should be fully vetted and litigated, a premature -- or fully vetted and litigated in a formal hearing within the rate case proceeding, a premature ruling or a statement in this proceeding puts the cart before the horse, so to speak, and may compromise the rate case process and interfere with ratepayers' best interests. Specifically, it would be

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

2

premature for an order in this docket to opine about the Commission's historic discussions about Gulf's stated plans regarding Scherer.

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

A prior alleged acknowledgment about the economics of the utility's plans does not equate to a determination of need, which Gulf acknowledged in its May 5th letter request was never issued by the Commission.

So in summary, it's OPC's position that the best course of action is to make it clear that any change in the surveillance reporting does not prejudice or effectively prejudge the issue of whether retail ratepayers absorb the cost recovery burden in this matter.

We think it's appropriate that the Commission handle these issues in the rate case, which is the most appropriate forum where the issues can be fully vetted and litigated to the best interests of ratepayers and other parties. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you. And before we proceed, can you please just state that last statement again regarding any change in the surveillance reporting?

MS. MORRIS: Regarding any --

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Any change in surveillance

reporting.

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

MS. MORRIS: Oh, it does not prejudice or effectively prejudge the issue on whether the retail ratepayers absorb the cost recovery burden.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

All right. Mr. Moyle.

MR. MOYLE: Thank you, Madam Chairman, and thank you for the remarks. Before getting into the particulars, I would just like to take a moment, and the last time we were together the storm was threatening and we were working hard to finish the rate case, and we did and immediately had to go get ready for hurricane preparation. But I'd like to thank Gulf for their efforts to help the City of Tallahassee. I'm a resident and been here 20 something years, but everybody pulled together. And I wanted to thank Gulf for their efforts, as well as the City, to help recover. So thank you. Thank you for that.

The reason we're here today is because of Plant Scherer. And Plant Scherer is a coal-fired power plant that you all have considered before in many contexts. I find in the staff recommendation there's a footnote. Footnote 1 talks about a decision that you all made related to Plant Scherer in 1990. And the issue -- Public Counsel's point, as I understand it, is

this decision today before you, you know, shouldn't impact your ultimate decision about what to do with Plant Scherer. And FIPUG and, I think, others believe that that issue is one that needs to be considered in a case holistically, you know, to dig in and look at that and make a determination about what the right thing to do is with this coal-fired power plant.

You know, you all have had before you in other contexts, you know, retirements of coal-fired power plants. The Cedar Bay case that we spent time on last year, there was a purchased power agreement associated with that, but there was also testimony that the net value of that power plant was zero because of market conditions. So Plant Scherer is a coal-fired power plant. I think that Gulf Power is going to be coming before you asking that it be placed into rate base. And I think on behalf of the consumers, this warrants a close, careful look as to the impacts and whether this is the, you know, the right thing, the best thing, particularly given market conditions and given coal. There was mention earlier of the Clean Power Plan. So there's a lot of uncertainties.

I guess what our point is is that at the appropriate time, we think it should be looked at very carefully in a case. I know today is kind of an

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

1

accounting issue, not the right time to have the full debate and discussion. We think probably the rate case is the best time. Gulf has filed a test year letter, and that would give all the parties ample opportunity. I think there is some discussion about a clause proceeding.

My practice and history has been with clause proceedings, they go pretty fast often times, and sometimes it's hard, you know, when you have substantive issues, to handle those in the clauses because most times in the clause proceedings things get worked out. So when we do have the larger Scherer discussion, I expect it will delve into some of these issues. And we don't have any problem with the staff recommendation, would support it, I mean, with the caveat that this is not -- the decision today will not be held up as, well, this is something you already have decided and are moving forward. This is kind of an accounting issue, and we don't have any objection with it, you know, with that clear understanding. And at the right point in time, we'd like to have a full and frank discussion about Plant Scherer. So thank you for the chance to share those comments with you.

> CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Moyle. And we've got Sierra Club here. And I do want

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

22 23 24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to note that we are in receipt of the Sierra Club's letter, so that is in the docket file. Okay.

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

MS. KUNKEL: Great. Thank you. Diana sends her regards that she couldn't make it, but looks forward to seeing you all tomorrow. Stephanie Kunkel on behalf of the Sierra Club and its more than 30,000 members.

Consistent with staff's recommendations and Public Counsel's remarks, we urge you to defer any decision on the merits here pending further record development. As we explained in our July comments, the Commission has every reason to deny the proposal to add Georgia coal-burning generation to Gulf's rate base.

Again, just very briefly those three points. There's no evidence of local customers needing coal generation. The costs and risks to local customers are not properly identified in the record before you, and we believe that that is a serious omission. Sierra Club maintains that all of the costs and risks of burning fossil fuels for power should be documented and scrutinized. Doing so helps the Commission look out for customers, especially as the environmental harm associated with fossil fuels can quickly translate into economic exposure. And the third reason to deny the proposal is timing. Why rush when Gulf has not cited any deadline for seeking Commission approval now?

Electric markets are changing so fast, the space of even a few months could help identify and pursue better alternatives.

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

For these reasons explained in the July comments, Sierra Club has respectfully urged you to deny Gulf's proposal. To be clear, we do support denial without prejudice or deferral without any decision on merits. Either way, Gulf can come back, if it wants to, for the Commission review in a full proceeding where the Commission would be able to complete its fact-finding process through discovery, hearing, and robust stakeholder participation, and we believe that this outcome is consistent with the outcome recommended by staff. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you. And going back, circling back to Mr. Stone.

MR. STONE: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I was remiss. I should have identified myself for the record. I'm Jeffrey A. Stone of the law firm Beggs & Lane, and I serve as Gulf Power's general counsel.

And to be clear, I am here in support of the staff's recommendation dated August 31, 2016. And in that recommendation, the Commission staff has urged, has recommended that the Commission order Gulf to file two forms of earnings surveillance reports: One similar to

what we've been filing in the past, since 1990, and the other reflecting the Scherer investment as though it is serving retail customers.

As I mentioned in my brief introductory comments, we are the only ones burdened by the staff recommendation because we're the ones that would have to file the surveillance report in two fashions. No one is precluded from being able to litigate the merits of Scherer being included in rate base in subsequent proceedings, and, in fact, Gulf is initiating those subsequent proceedings. We have already petitioned for ECRC recovery with regard to the environmental controls and equipment that are in service at Scherer, and that is before -- will be before the Commission at its regularly scheduled hearing in November. We've also filed a test year letter seeking -- notifying the Commission of our intention to file a base rate proceeding for the remainder of our investment. And so with that, we urge the Commission to approve the staff recommendation as written.

One further comment. Mr. Moyle cited to Footnote 1 of the staff recommendation that cited the 1990 order. I would just simply draw your attention to Footnote No. 3, which cites to the 1980 order of the Commission. And we believe all orders of the Commission

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

1

2

000012 should be considered in this matter. 1 2 CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Stone. Staff, any comments or response? 3 MR. MOURING: I don't believe so. I think we 4 5 don't have anything to add at this point. CHAIRMAN BROWN: I have a question for you. 6 7 Public Counsel, they said that they don't really have a problem with it as long as the outcome is purely 8 9 procedural in nature. And that is my understanding that what this is is basically, it's just an accounting 10 treatment, so to speak; correct? 11 12 MR. MOURING: Yes, ma'am. CHAIRMAN BROWN: So it is -- would you say it 13 14 would be purely procedural in nature? 15 MS. JANJIC: We would say that it's a reporting requirement, not accounting. So it would be 16 17 procedural, yes. 18 CHAIRMAN BROWN: So the reporting doesn't 19 necessarily prejudge the issue of placing Plant Scherer 20 in rate base. By approving this, this is not 21 prejudging, as Office of Public Counsel noted in its 22 comments; correct? 23 MS. JANJIC: Correct. That is my 24 understanding, yes. 25 CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Commissioners, any

questions? Can I get a motion? COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Move staff. COMMISSIONER PATRONIS: Second. CHAIRMAN BROWN: All those in favor, say aye. (Vote taken.) All right. The motion passes. Thank you. (Agenda item concluded.)

	000014		
1	STATE OF FLORIDA)		
2	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 stated.		
6	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I		
7	stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.		
8			
9	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,		
10	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 financially interested in the action.		
12	DATED THIS 21st day of September, 2016.		
13	DATED THIS ZIST day of September, 2010.		
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		