	FILED DEC 01, 2016 DOCUMENT NO. 09087-1 FPSC - COMMISSION CL	-
1	BEFORE THE	
2	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	
3	In the Matter of:	
4	DOCKET NO. 160021-EI	
5 6	PETITION FOR RATE INCREASE BY FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY. /	
7		
8	PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF	
9	2016-2018 STORM HARDENING PLAN BY FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT	
10	COMPANY/	
11	DOCKET NO. 160062-EI	
12	2016 DEPRECIATION AND DISMANTLEMENT STUDY BY FLORIDA	
13	POWER & LIGHT COMPANY.	
14		
15		
16	PETITION FOR LIMITED PROCEEDING TO MODIFY AND CONTINUE INCENTIVE MECHANISM	
17	BY FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY.	
18	/	
19		
20	PROCEEDINGS: SPECIAL AGENDA	
21	COMMISSIONERS PARTICIPATING: CHAIRMAN JULIE I. BROWN	
22	COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR	
23	COMMISSIONER ART GRAHAM COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISÉ COMMISSIONER JIMMY PATRONIS	
24		
25	DATE: Tuesday, November 29, 2016	
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	

1	TIME:	Commenced at 9:35 a.m.	000002
2	·	Concluded at 10:15 a.m.	
3	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148	
4		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida	
5	REPORTED BY:	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR	
6		Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6734	
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	FLORIDA I	PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	

## 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: All right. I'd like to call this special agenda to order today. The date is November 29th, 2016. The time is about 9:35. Welcome, all.

And before we get into the very important work of the day, I have just a few comments I'd like to share with you.

Since we all got together last, which was just a few weeks ago, many changes have gone on in our country. We have now a new president and vice president, newly -- new Cabinet members, new state senators, new state representatives. We will have new FERC commissioners and FCC commissioners. We will also have new state and federal Supreme Court justices. All these developments will impact the work that we do. And it's truly exciting to be in an industry with so many dynamic changes going on around our country and in our state, and I'm looking forward to continuing the work that we do together in this transformational time, and I just wanted to make that quick note.

Also, following our special agenda today, we have a very special guest with us who will be giving a presentation on the dynamic changes in the telecom industry. Commissioner Clyburn with the FCC will be

joining us, and I invite you all to join us afterwards to hear her discussion in our internal affairs meeting.

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

Last, I have some sad and unfortunate news to share with you, although I do believe a lot of you are already aware. Mrs. Blaise Gamba passed away tragically on November 13th. Ms. Gamba appeared before this Commission often. She served over ten years with the law firm of Carlton Fields. She was absolutely a bright, kind, and intelligent woman, and really dedicated a lot of her time to pro bono service and her community. She leaves behind her husband, William, and a very large, loving family.

On a personal note, I remember Blaise. She was the consummate professional, always well prepared, articulate, and it's just so sad to see someone with so much life leave this earth tragically. On behalf of the Commission and the Commissioners, we send our condolences to Mrs. Blaise -- Mrs. Gamba's family, friends, colleagues throughout the state and the nation.

And on that note, we will begin the busy work of the day, starting with Ms. Brownless.

MS. BROWNLESS: Good morning. The Commission is here today to discuss and vote upon the Joint Motion for Approval of Settlement Agreement entered into by the company and the Office of Public Counsel, South Florida

Hospital and Healthcare Association, and the Florida Retail Federation. Three other dockets addressing FP&L's 2016 to 2018 storm hardening plan, the 2016 depreciation and dismantlement study, and an incentive mechanism for wholesale electricity and natural gas transactions have been consolidated with this rate case. All issues raised in all four dockets are resolved in the Settlement Agreement we are discussing today.

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 Settlement Agreement was filed after an evidentiary hearing was conducted on August 26th through September 1st of this year in which the testimony of 35 witnesses was heard and 805 exhibits were admitted into evidence. All parties filed briefs or post-hearing statements on September 19th.

Subsequent to the filing of the Settlement Agreement on October 6th, the record was reopened and a second hearing was held on October 27th to take supplemental testimony on the terms and conditions of the Settlement Agreement that had not previously been addressed in the prior hearing. At this second hearing, the testimony of five witnesses were heard and six exhibits were admitted into evidence. FP&L, the intervenor signatories, AARP, the Larsons, the Sierra Club, Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, and Sam's East, Inc., filed briefs or comments on the Settlement Agreement on

November 10th.

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 remaining six parties to the docket who did not sign the Settlement Agreement take the following positions: FIPUG took no position; Wal-Mart and FEA do not oppose the Settlement Agreement; the Larsons, AARP, and the Sierra Club object. At this time, a summary of the Settlement Agreement will be given.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

And welcome, Mr. Maurey.

Commissioners, you have a copy of it, but I believe they're going to put a presentation on the PowerPoint behind us.

MR. MAUREY: Thank you. Good morning, Chairman, Commissioners. Andrew Maurey, Commission staff. We will start with the term of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Mr. Maurey, before you begin, I do also just want to ask the Commissioners to hold off on their questions until staff has completed its presentation. Thank you. Please continue.

MR. MAUREY: Okay. Thank you. The term of the settlement is four years beginning January 2017 through December 2020. During that term, there are three base rate increases planned: the first beginning in January of 2017 of 400 million; January 2018 of

211 million; a then a final base rate increase of 200 million associated with the Okeechobee plant, which -- when it goes into service, which is expected in June of 2019. With the exception of the Solar Base Rate Adjustments that will be discussed later in this presentation, there will be no other base rate increases during the term of the settlement.

000007

The return on equity for all regulatory purposes during the term of the settlement will be 10.55 percent. The range of return on equity will be 9.6 to 11.6 percent.

One of the provisions in the settlement is that FPL will refrain from engaging in any incremental financial hedges during the term of the agreement. It is anticipated, given the current hedges that are in place, as they mature, FPL will be unhedged with respect to natural gas prices by January of 2018.

MR. SHAFER: Good morning, Commissioners. Greg Shafer, Commission staff.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Microphone, please. MR. SHAFER: I'm sorry. CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you. MR. SHAFER: Good morning, Commissioners. Greg Shafer, Commission staff.

As Ms. Brownless noted, the -- Florida Power &

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

22

23

24

25

1

Light's 2016 depreciation study was rolled into this rate case docket, and those issues were addressed by the stipulation and settlement. As a result of the stipulation and settlement, FPL's 2017 depreciation expense will be reduced by \$128.8 million, and a \$1.0 billion theoretical reserve surplus, plus any remainder of reserve surplus as of December 31st, 2016, may also be amortized over the four-year agreement. The surplus must be used to maintain the company's return on equity of at least 9.6 percent but no higher than 11.6 percent.

000008

The stipulation and settlement also contains several tariff changes of note, the first being the implementation of meter tampering charges. Those meter tampering charges are \$200 for residential and small commercial customers and \$1,000 for non-demand commercial customers.

Other changes of note include all new street lighting and traffic signals will now be metered, and the -- there's an elimination of the re-lamping option for customer-owned lighting.

I should go back. On the metering of street lighting, that's customer-owned street lighting and traffic signals.

In addition, the Commercial Industrial Load

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Control and Commercial Demand Reduction Credits will remain at current levels. Those current levels were established in the 2012 stipulated agreement.

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 Cost of Service Methodology to be applied going forward -- or for this settlement will be the 12CP and 1/13th methodology for production plant, the 12CP methodology for transmission plant, and a new negotiated methodology for distribution plant.

In addition, going forward, the company will be required to file an MDS Cost of Service Study, Minimum Distribution System Cost of Service Study, in its next general base rate increase to compare -- to give the Commission the ability to compare that methodology's impact on the revenue requirement by class to other methodologies that may be provided by the company. And I would note that the MFRs currently require the 12CP and 1/13th methodology. And in the current case, the company had also filed a different methodology than that. So going forward, there will be that ability to compare those methodologies.

**MR. BALLINGER:** Good morning, Commissioners. Tom Ballinger with Commission staff.

The settlement also includes a continuation of a pilot Incentive Mechanism that was first approved in the 2012 Settlement Agreement. This would resolve all

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

issues in Docket 160088 that was also consolidated into the rate proceeding.

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

Per discovery responses, FPL indicated that this would be a four-year pilot, that it would terminate after the four years absent any action from FPL or the Commission. As noted here, the sharing threshold is set to \$40 million, and at that point that's when sharing of benefits would accrue, and the 514,000-megawatt-hour threshold was eliminated instead for a net of purchase and sales for O&M purposes.

The settlement also includes a storm damage recovery methodology which is similar to settlements in 2010 and 2012 where it has a \$4 surcharge that can be added per 1,000 kilowatt hours to recover the cost of storm damages. There is no accrual going on in current base rates.

Also, the settlement includes a transfer of the West County Energy Center's revenue requirements from the clause to base rates. This is a revenue neutral portion of the settlement. It's basically neutral to ratepayers.

Finally, the Okeechobee limited scope proceeding. This is a -- you've heard this before, GBRAs, which is a Generation Base Rate Adjustment for generation assets going in service. This would go into

effect on the in-service date of the Okeechobee unit, which is expected to be June of 2019. The revenue requirement will be capped at \$200 million. And it also has a true-up mechanism where if a lower amount comes in below that, the lower amount will be used to set the GBRA. If the cost of the Okeechobee unit is higher than predicted, FPL would have to come in and seek additional recovery of that amount.

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 new aspect of this settlement that hasn't been in other settlements is the Solar Base Rate Adjustment. It's very similar to the Okeechobee one of generation base rate, but this applies strictly to solar, and it has a cap of 300 megawatts per year of solar installations that FPL may build. As you see here, it has a cap of a cost not to exceed \$1,750 per kilowatt, and, again, as with the other Generation Base Rate Adjustments, it has a true-up mechanism.

There's two types of projects. One could be under a Power Plant Site (sic) Act, which is greater than 75 megawatts. If that were to occur, FPL would issue an RFP and go through the normal siting process. If it's a smaller project, less than 75 megawatts, FPL would file a cost-effectiveness analysis through the fuel clause and the Commission would analyze it there.

This next slide just explains the true-up

mechanism again, much like a GBRA. If the cost comes in lower, the lower unit would be -- lower number would be used. If it's higher, FPL may initiate a limited proceeding.

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 couple of other options or portions of the settlement. FPL will implement a 50 megawatt battery storage program. This could be for retail customers, either small or large, or it could be combined with the Solar Base Rate Adjustment projects, as I discussed earlier. FPL has the final say on where these projects would be implemented, and it has a cost cap of \$2,300 per kilowatt.

On the opt-out workshop there was no timeline given in the settlement, just that the -- FPL and the parties would work together to request the workshop with the Commission to discuss opt-out for DSM programs. Also, participation is not limited to the signatories for that workshop.

MR. MAUREY: The next provision deals with the Martin-Riviera pipeline. It's -- FPL is authorized to transfer to its FERC-regulated affiliate the Martin-Riviera lateral, which is currently in rate base, based on a demonstration that doing so would result in cost savings to customers. This is a placeholder for a future petition to pursue that option.

This concludes the overview of the Settlement Agreement. Staff is available for any questions.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you. And, you know, a rate case of this magnitude affecting 4.8 million customers obviously has required a lot of time, a lot of time on staff's part. I want to extend our appreciation for all of your hard work. A lot of you have done a lot of overtime: our technical staff, our legal staff, administrative staff, clerk's office, Mr. Staden's folks, even the Florida Channel. A lot of people have been working a great deal on this case with nine service hearings, two technical hearings covering ten days, over 4,000 discovery documents and prefiled testimony, and, again, thank you all for all the work you've done.

Commissioners, this brings us to the bench for questions at this time. If you would like, we can go paragraph by paragraph or just open it up broadly to questions.

Commissioner Edgar.

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: Obviously to staff -- and not that you need it, but I'm looking at page 15 -- can you describe to me, please, the process in a little more detail, not great detail, but a little more detail, as to how the cost-effectiveness will be reviewed, the process and procedure for that, if, indeed, a petition

is submitted to the Commission for the transfer of the Martin-Riviera pipeline?

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. MAUREY: Yes, ma'am. If -- after FPL evaluates the potential transfer from rate base to its FERC-regulated affiliate, it will -- if it can demonstrate that from a cumulative present value revenue requirement basis that the payment under -- recovery of those costs under base rates versus recovery through the fuel clause, if it's more cost advantageous to customers, they will make that transfer. If it is not, then the Martin-Riveria lateral will remain in rate base and customers will pay for that service, as they currently do.

**COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** So who ultimately makes that determination of cost-effectiveness for customers?

MR. MAUREY: FPL will make a presentation. Staff will evaluate it and bring it to the Commission for their determination that it meets the cost-effective standard.

**COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** Okay. Thank you. That's exactly what I was looking for.

And then -- and I'm not sure who to put this for, so, Mr. Maurey, you're first up.

MR. MAUREY: Sure.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: But feel free to point to

somebody else.

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

On page 14 there's a brief mention of the potential workshop for a pilot Demand-Side Management Opt-Out Program. I'm just curious as to a little more background and thinking on that. Clearly this Commission had a, you know, full procedure hearing, et cetera, on that issue generally, or specifically, and I believe at that point in time kind of where we had left it was if more information is forthcoming, that it is something that the Commission would be willing to take another look at. If that's not accurate, feel free to correct me. But recognizing that this is now a part of this overall proposed Settlement Agreement, can you speak to me in a little more detail as to how staff sees that moving forward?

MR. SHAFER: First off, Commissioner, I would agree that your -- with your characterization of the proceeding that the Commission held. Staff sent some discovery to the companies -- or to the company regarding the workshop item in the settlement, and essentially the response that we received indicated that at this point there's nothing more in terms of their perspective than a joint request for a workshop. Certainly from the staff perspective and consistent with what we believe the Commission's determination was in

the opt-out docket, we would be hopeful that there would be perhaps a strawman or something of that nature for us to consider during the workshop.

I fully expect that the parties will reach out to staff at some point prior to requesting that workshop, and we can, you know, discuss what types of details we'd like to see at that point.

**COMMISSIONER EDGAR:** All right. Thank you, Mr. Shafer.

Madam Chair, at the moment, at the moment those are my questions. I will, at the appropriate time, would like, if you agree, to make a few general comments.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Great. Thank you.

I do -- seeing no other lights from Commissioners, I have a few questions. Actually, Commissioner Brisé, go ahead.

**COMMISSIONER BRISÉ:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I have a few "big picture" questions.

So we can go back to the original request and sort of compare from a dollars' perspective the difference or the delta between the original request and what has been settled out here or has been proposed in this settlement, if we can walk through some of those things. MR. MAUREY: Yes. In the original request, it was approximately a \$1.3 billion request over a similar time horizon: January '17, January' 18, and June of 2019. This proposed settlement reduces that to 811 million from the 1.3 billion.

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 BRISÉ:** And what specifically generated that delta as you go through the settlement?

MR. MAUREY: Well, some of the elements of that delta can be explained. The difference in depreciation expense and the difference in return on equity, that explains probably 70 to 75 percent of the delta. The remainder of the delta is not specifically identified.

In its response to discovery, the company -well, let me back up. The company, in its ask, had put forth a program that it would need \$1.3 billion to implement, and it plans to continue to do that program but will do so within its means. It did not specify which investments may or may not be extended or taken up immediately.

**COMMISSIONER BRISÉ:** Okay. That's all I have for now.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you.

Staff, I'm going to ask a few clarifying questions, directing you, though, to the actual

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

agreement and not the PowerPoint presentation.

Starting with the storm cost recovery on page 7, my understanding from the hearing was that the storm reserve was depleted; is that correct?

MR. MAUREY: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. All right. And is there -- is there envisioned a future -- in the near future a proceeding to replenish that pursuant to the terms under here of the agreement to -- and to what level?

MR. MAUREY: Yes. The company has notified the Commission that it intends to file recovery of storm costs associated with Hurricane Matthew. This -- as Mr. Ballinger explained, this provision in the current settlement is almost identical to the settlement or the terms in the current agreement that expires the end of the year. So whether it comes in before December or after December, it will be treated in the same manner. It'll ask for the recovery. It will be implemented within 60 days following the petition. The Commission will have an opportunity to look at the actual costs incurred after a certain period and determine that all the costs that were recovered were permissible through the rule.

25

CHAIRMAN BROWN: And that amount would also

include the replenishment of the storm reserve as of August 31st, 2016.

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. MAUREY: That's correct. If they file before the end of December, the amount is very similar. That was set in the 2012 agreement that was -- would be the basis of this agreement as well.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: And just one clarifying question. I know we've had these discussions in our briefings, but just for the record, so if the storm costs are greater than \$4 per 1,000 kilowatt residential bill, this Commission has the discretion to spread that out over a longer period of time other than 12 months.

MR. MAUREY: That's correct.

**CHAIRMAN BROWN:** But if it's \$4 or less, it has to be within the 12-month period.

MR. MAUREY: That's our understanding, yes. CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

Moving on to the SoBRA, the SoBRA. All right. And these are just some clarifying questions again for the record.

Under paragraph 10, page 12, in that first paragraph, there is a provision there or a sentence that says, "The Commission's approval may occur before or after the minimum term." I want to first understand that. It's still limited to the 1,200 megawatts

throughout t

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

throughout the term and possibly one year after.

MR. BALLINGER: Yes, ma'am. That was to allow for -- in case the proceeding continued on beyond the term of the Settlement Agreement, that the project would still go into service after the term of the settlement. But the total megawatts are limited to 1,200 megawatts.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: But the Commission has the authority under the Settlement Agreement to approve SoBRAs after the expiration, though, of the agreement?

MR. BALLINGER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: It doesn't say for how long. MR. BALLINGER: No. I think it would determine on the proceeding. I would imagine the proceeding -- the request would be filed during the term of the Settlement Agreement, and it may carry on beyond the term.

**CHAIRMAN BROWN:** But no greater than 1,200 megawatts of capacity can be added even later on.

MR. BALLINGER: Correct. Correct.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Thank you for that confirmation.

Moving on -- actually, the previous request for the three plants, the solar in the rate case, totaled 224 megawatts. Was that based on the -- what kilowatt -- kwatt was that based on?

MR. BALLINGER: The cost of those were roughly 1,850, I believe.

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: And is that -- those are -those projects are included in this Settlement Agreement, in the revenue requirements for the Settlement Agreement?

MR. BALLINGER: They are part of the 2017 revenue requirement.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: And they're going to be based on those amounts, not the 1,750 per kwatt.

MR. BALLINGER: Correct. As Mr. Maurey said, they're part of the projects that they went forward with. They're part of the 400 million that you had for the 2017 increase. They are covered there. They are not part of the ongoing SoBRAs.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: On a separate note, though, in the rate case the company proposed to build 26 new and expanded natural gas combustion turbines. Are those also included in the revenue requirements in the Settlement Agreement?

MR. BALLINGER: Yes.

**CHAIRMAN BROWN:** Okay. And the additional storm hardening, et cetera, measures.

MR. BALLINGER: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Moving on to

paragraph -- oh, 18, the storage, the battery storage project. I really hope that we get to see more investments like this from utilities, and I'm really excited about this provision. I'm happy it was included in the Settlement Agreement.

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

I'm curious about when and if the Commission will get updates on these projects annually and in what docket we would see these, because I'd love to see the results and benefit of this project.

MR. BALLINGER: I don't know. The settlement doesn't call for any annual reports. Staff can always ask for information through our discovery process or data requests typically at the ten-year site plan. We can do it through that venue, if you'd like.

I forgot to mention that FPL will not seek recovery of this until its next general base rate proceeding, which may be in four years.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. But I think it's important to have that type of information so we can learn from it and see how it's progressing.

And I'm sorry to go back to paragraph 16, which is the hedging. So with our decision this past month on the hedging for the IOUs, we're going to have a workshop soon; right?

MR. MAUREY: That is correct.

**CHAIRMAN BROWN:** Can you -- and FPL intends to participate in it pursuant to the agreement -- I mean, the decision in that proceeding.

MR. MAUREY: Yes. It will be bound -- if this is approved, it'll be bound by the provisions of this agreement. However, it will participate in any workshops that involve the other IOUs.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: So what if there is a global Settlement Agreement or some type of agreement among the parties, including all the parties, the signatories to this agreement, that comes out of that workshop? Will FPL still be bound and tied to the terms of this? Yes. I know the answer is yes.

MR. MAUREY: It will -- our understanding is it's bound to the terms of the Settlement Agreement. However, as we've seen in other Settlement Agreements with similar parties, it's possible for the agreement to be revised and restated in the future to take in a development like that, a change in how hedging is done going forward.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. I mean, I think I said this during the hearing, this is just an area of concern for me. I think it's an extreme. But I understand it's part of an overall compromise and I otherwise wouldn't have even considered it. Natural gas prices are rising

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

even today, so it's an area of concern I have.

Last, there's one other question I have on page 23, which is -- it's paragraph 20. And, again, we talked about this in our multiple briefings, but I still would love some clarification on that on the record, that I don't know what that means. "Offer a new tariff for customers who interconnect with an FPL distribution substation." What -- do you have an idea of what that is -- what scenario that is contemplating?

MR. BALLINGER: We're a little befuddled by this one as well. I'm not sure what it means. It doesn't have any reporting requirements, when they'll come to the Commission, what they'll do with the results. It just says FPL will explore it as a new tariff. I guess we'll know it when we see it if it comes in as a new tariff offering at a distribution level.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: But then again it's also not -- it's just an evaluation. It's not binding the Commission to approving it.

MR. BALLINGER: Correct.

22 CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Those are all the23 questions I have.

Commissioners, any further questions or discussion? If there are no further questions, we can

get into discussion at this time.

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.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Madam Chair. You know, it's -- for this case, and not unexpectedly, it's kind of been a long year.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Hasn't it?

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: It has. As you mentioned, for any rate case, but particularly for one of our largest service providers, a comprehensive rate case takes a lot of time, a lot of effort, a lot of trees, a lot of computer pages, many, many, many hours. I either thank you or not for the honor and the opportunity to serve as prehearing officer in this case. Actually I do thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to do so for what was either my fourth or fifth FPL comprehensive rate case.

And looking back over the last year, I can tell you all that when I look at where a lot of my time was spent professionally, a lot of it was spent on getting ready for this case and working with staff and looking at the issues and getting ready for hearing.

And I will say, taking just a moment of personal privilege, that it did start a little bumpy -thank you Public Counsel, Mr. J.R. Kelly -- but I think ultimately the process worked as it should and as it is

designed to. And an evidentiary proceeding is, by its nature, especially from the beginning, adversarial. That is the process. But it is also part of the process that while we, on this side of the bench, are looking at the testimony and hearing from the witnesses and questioning and discussing matters with our staff, that perhaps on the other side out there that the parties are talking and discussing and trying to figure out other ways within the process to reach consensus in the public interest on -- and on behalf of the ratepayers.

It's always interesting with a proposed settlement how some items sort of pop up there at the end, and we do have a couple here. As you've mentioned, the battery storage item, the -- and I learned a new acronym: SoBra. I didn't know that we needed a new acronym. We did have GBRA -- we do have GBRA, but apparently now we have SoBRA as well. And as you've mentioned, addressing or having further discussion about hedging and also potentially having further discussion about the DSM opt-out request, and I do hit "request" on that, and also the potential transfer for the Martin-Riviera pipeline transfer, all of which are items that were not really a part initially of this case even though we had four dockets that we had consolidated. And we purposely, purposely procedurally tried to make

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

1

2

good use of everybody's time effectively and efficiently by combining related items and related issues that would ideally be more efficient for discovery and for parties and for witnesses.

So with all of that, I also am intrigued and interested in the battery storage item. I do hope, as additional information comes forward on that, that, you know, if indeed there is subsidization in that, that it is transparent. If there isn't, that that is clear as well as my colleagues continue to look at that issue and others.

But looking at the entire almost year that has been spent on this, the coordination of the parties and also the great work of our staff and of my fellow colleagues, at the appropriate time, Madam Chair, I'd like to make a motion in support of approving the Settlement Agreement.

**CHAIRMAN BROWN:** Thank you, Commissioner Edgar, for those comments.

> Commissioners, any further comments? Commissioner Brisé.

COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Thank you, Madam Chair. You know, in recognition of this long, tedious process, we want to -- I personally want to thank all the parties for getting together, even those who are not in

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

22

23

24

25

agreement with the terms as arrived by those who are signators.

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 know, as we traveled within the service territory, there was a couple of things that stood out to me. One is that the quality of the service is good. People were concerned about their pockets. And I think ultimately this settlement handles all of those things. It allows for the service to continue in a way that people will continue to receive the satisfaction that they're looking for and that their pockets won't be injured in the process, while allowing the growth that is necessary to occur. And ultimately that's what I heard throughout the process.

Beyond that, there's a couple of other things that I heard from customers as we were listening to them. They wanted to see more innovation in terms of renewables and all of that, so it creates -- there is space for that to happen within this settlement.

There was also concern about, in certain places, hedging -- right? -- and so the settlement addresses that. Not the way I would like for it to be resolved, but this is a comprehensive settlement where you have parties who have come together and addressed the concerns that they have and they've come to an agreement that makes sense and that they can live with

for a period of time.

So at the appropriate time when the motion is made, I will either second it or support it, depending upon who hits the lights first.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Commissioner Patronis.

**COMMISSIONER PATRONIS:** Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I just wanted to echo the sentiments and comments of my colleagues, but especially give staff a big attaboy. That's a meat grinder that y'all dealt with over the last year. And for my first time being able to listen and learn, please appreciate how much I gained out of seeing the process at work and how much you brought me along in understanding greater the full obligations that this Commission has in our duties.

And like Commissioner Brisé said, I know not everybody is pleased, but, you know, it was nice to see accommodations of flexibility when storms did threaten during the hearing in the case. It's a reality. And I remind folks -- they get frustrated with their job, their obligations, their responsibilities -- that this state will run every day, every morning whether you want to show up for work or not, and this group, you know, really stepped up and ensured that the obligations and needs of the state were met every single day whether

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

23

24

there was a storm or not. And, anyway, I just appreciate the opportunity I've gotten to be able to participate with y'all today.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: 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

One thing -- I'd like to echo what Commissioner Brisé said -- was throughout this process we have heard one thing consistently from the intervenors but also from the customers, and that is definitely FPL's excellent quality of service, which I think is attributed to the smart, prudent decisions that FPL has made over the years. It's improved reliability while also managing to have the lowest rates in the state.

This Commission specifically has supported decisions in the past to invest in cleaner, more efficient energy, and I believe Florida utilities like FPL must continue to do that and -- while also improving the grid reliability. I think the settlement strives to accomplish much of that.

It's a challenging time in an industry that is continuing to evolve. Utilities need to be at the forefront of this, and they work hard for its customers as well in delivering the services that the customers want and need. So there are a great deal of customer protections in this agreement that I want to just

highlight. I don't know if we actually got to hear those, but I'd like to highlight that for the record.

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

I mean, obviously having a specific four-year term establishes base rates that are limited to those identified in the Settlement Agreement, which does provide, as OPC and the other signatories provided in a brief, provides the customers with greater price and planning predictability; the SoBRA and the solar investment, which is definitely an aggressive rollout from what was presented in the rate case, and it's exciting. But there are protections behind that, too, that all projects must be approved by the Commission with a cost-effectiveness test, and I think that clearly benefits customers. The hedging, which OPC and others have expressed concerns over the years, eliminates that risk entirely under the term. So I think there's -- and there's a great deal of other customer protections. So taken as a whole and given the amount of broad support across the customer groups that signed on, the settlement, I do believe, produces rates that are fair, just, and reasonable, and are clearly in the public interest. And seeing no other lights, I think now we are ripe for a motion.

Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Madam Chair,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and thank you for the opportunity.

As I mentioned earlier, we did have initially -- what started this all off basically procedurally is a petition that was filed for a comprehensive rate case, comprehensive review. That is very much in the public eye. It is a process that is built for transparency. And having gone through, as the parties did, the discovery process and then the process that all parties -- we at the bench and our staff went through for the evidentiary hearing, a lot of information in the public interest, and I do believe that, again, this shows that the process ultimately works. I am very pleased with the ultimate result, as I mentioned, other things that make the settlement, if anything, even more comprehensive.

And so with that, in keeping with the spirit of the Settlement Agreement and the good, inquisitive, and hard-charging work that was done by all parties on this case, I would move approval of the Settlement Agreement today in its entirety.

> CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you. Is there a second? COMMISSIONER BRISÉ: Second.

**CHAIRMAN BROWN:** All right. Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor, say aye.

(Vote taken.) Opposed? (No response.) The motion passes unanimously. Thank you, all parties here, for working and participating in this very long proceeding. We appreciate all the work again that you've -- that everyone has done here. And with that, we will adjourn the special agenda and reconvene our -- convene our internal affairs in the next ten minutes. Thank you. (Special agenda adjourned at 10:15 a.m.) FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

	000034		
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		
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,		
11	nor 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 1st day of December, 2016.		
14			
15			
16	Jinda Boles		
17	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR Official FPSC Hearings Reporter Office of Commission Clerk		
18	(850) 413-6734		
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION		