



John T. Butler
Assistant General Counsel -
Regulatory
Florida Power & Light Company
700 Universe Boulevard
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420
(561) 304-5639
(561) 691-7135 (Facsimile)

June 10, 2014

-VIA ELECTRONIC FILING-

Carlotta Stauffer, Director
Division of Commission Clerk
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

**Re: Docket No. 130199-EI; Florida Power & Light Company's Petition for Approval of
Numeric Conservation Goals**

Dear Ms. Stauffer:

Please find enclosed for filing in the above referenced docket the Prehearing Statement of Florida Power & Light Company ("FPL").

Please contact me if there are any questions regarding this filing.

Sincerely,

s/ John T. Butler
John T. Butler
Fla. Bar No. 283479

Enclosures
cc: Counsel for Parties of Record (w/encl.)

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Petition for Approval of)
 Numeric Conservation Goals by)
Florida Power & Light Company)

Docket No. 130199-EI
 Filed: June 10, 2014

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY'S PREHEARING STATEMENT

Florida Power & Light Company ("FPL" or the "Company"), pursuant to Order No. PSC-13-0386-PCO-EU, hereby files with the Florida Public Service Commission ("FPSC" or "Commission") its Prehearing Statement in connection with its Petition For Approval of Numeric Conservation Goals, and states:

I. FPL WITNESSES

A. Direct Testimony

Witness	Subject Matter	Issues
Terry Deason Radey Law Firm	Discusses the history and rationale used by the Commission in implementing the Florida Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act ("FEECA") in a manner that works to minimize rate impacts on all customers, does not ask customers to pay incentives to "free rider" participants, and does not ask customers to pay for more Demand Side Management ("DSM") than can be used beneficially within each utility's resource planning process; based on results of the last DSM goal-setting and plan-approval dockets, recommends that the Commission return to the successful principles and approaches used in prior proceedings, including relying primarily on the Rate Impact Measure ("RIM") test; emphasizes that DSM levels will and should change as considerations of cost-effectiveness, technology, and other economic factors change with time.	3, 6-11
Tom Koch, FPL Senior Manager, Demand Side Management Strategy, Cost & Performance	Describes FPL's historical DSM achievements; discusses impacts of significant market forces on utility-sponsored DSM, particularly energy efficiency delivered by federal and state codes and standards, which benefit all customers but also reduce the cost-effective opportunities for utility-sponsored DSM; explains the development of the Technical Potential ("TP") and Achievable Potential ("AP"), which are each used as inputs into Dr. Sim's analyses of	1, 4, 7-11

	appropriate, cost-effective DSM goals for FPL; presents the results of the Solar Pilot Programs directed by the Commission in the 2009 DSM Goals order, which show the pilots to be demonstrably uneconomic for FPL's customers.	
Steven Sim, FPL Senior Manager of Integrated Resource Planning	Explains that the application of FPL's resource planning process, using current forecasts and assumptions, supports DSM Goals of 337 MW; explains that FPL's proposed goals meet the requirements of Rule 25-17.0021, F.A.C., reflect FPL's specific resource needs, and reflect the individual characteristics and economics of FPL's utility system, including its high efficiency, which reduces the cost-effectiveness of DSM measures; describes the six steps undertaken to analyze DSM measures and various resource portfolios, including four different "With DSM" portfolios, and the results of those analyses; demonstrates that the RIM 337 MW plan will result in the lowest levelized system average electric rates for all of FPL's customers.	2-11

B. Rebuttal Testimony

Witness	Subject Matter	Issues
Terry Deason Radey Law Firm	Responds to the criticisms of witnesses Mims and Woolf, finding that they are unfounded, and determines that their recommendations are inappropriate, unnecessary, contrary to Florida statutes and rules, and not adequately substantiated by the evidence presented; finds that a goal of zero for demand-side renewable energy systems can be appropriate and consistent with FEECA when no cost-effective program to promote such measures has been identified.	3-4, 6-10
Tom Koch, FPL Senior Manager, Demand Side Management Strategy, Cost & Performance	Describes a proposal for a solar Research and Development ("R&D") project that could replace the current Solar Pilot Programs; rebuts assertions that FPL's DSM program costs are high relative to other jurisdictions and/or are not adequately controlled; rebuts assertions regarding the appropriateness and completeness of the utilities' 2009 Technical Potential Study and 2014 update.	1, 8-11

Steven Sim, FPL Senior Manager of Integrated Resource Planning	Responds to the recommendations that FPL’s solar pilot programs be continued despite the fact that they are not cost-effective; explains that the “value of solar” approach is not, and cannot properly be used as, a cost-effectiveness test, ignores well-known cost impacts thus overstating DSM PV benefits, and takes a one-sided view of DSM PV; responds to inaccurate or misleading statement of witnesses Mims and Woolf, concluding that they do not understand FPL’s resource planning process; calculates the substantial customer rate and bill impacts of witnesses Mims’ and Woolf’s proposed DSM goals; observes that the traditional IRP-based DSM approach used by FPL and the Commission has resulted in a high level of generating efficiency, low emission rates and low electric rates.	3, 6-11
---	---	---------

II. EXHIBITS

A. Direct Testimony Exhibits

Exhibits	Witness	Sponsor	Description
SRS-1	Steven R. Sim	FPL	FPL’s Resource Planning Process as Applied to DSM Goal-Setting
SRS-2	Steven R. Sim	FPL	Excerpt from FPL’s 2014 Site Plan Addressing FPL’s Need for a 10% Generation-Only Reserve Margin (GRM) Reliability Criterion
SRS-3	Steven R. Sim	FPL	Economic Elements Accounted for in DSM Preliminary Screening Tests: Benefits Only
SRS-4	Steven R. Sim	FPL	Economic Elements Accounted for in DSM Preliminary Screening Tests: Benefits & Cost
SRS-5	Steven R. Sim	FPL	Summary Results of the Preliminary Economic Screening of Individual DSM Measures (w/o and w/ CO2 Costs)
SRS-6	Steven R. Sim	FPL	Summary Results of Preliminary Economic Screening of Individual DSM Measures: Sensitivity Cases
SRS-7	Steven R. Sim	FPL	Forecasted Fuel and Environmental Compliance Costs
SRS-8	Steven R. Sim	FPL	Projection of FPL’s Resource Needs for 2015-2025 with No Incremental DSM Signups after 2014

SRS-9	Steven R. Sim	FPL	Comparison of DSM Achievable Potential Summer MW Values with FPL's Projected Summer Resource Needs (Assuming the Resource Needs are Met Solely by DSM)
SRS-10	Steven R. Sim	FPL	Overview of the Supply Only and With DSM Resource Plans
SRS-11	Steven R. Sim	FPL	Comparison of the Five Resource Plans: Economic Analyses Results and Consequences
SRS-12	Steven R. Sim	FPL	Example of Levelized System Average Electric Rate Calculation for One Resource Plan: RIM 337 MW
SRS-13	Steven R. Sim	FPL	Additional Cost Needed to be Added to RIM 337 MW Plan to Increase its Levelized System Average Electric Rate to That of TRC 337 MW Plan
SRS-14	Steven R. Sim	FPL	Comparison of the Five Resource Plans: Projection of System Average Electric Rates and Customer Bills (Assuming 1,200 kWh Usage)
SRS-15	Steven R. Sim	FPL	Comparison of the Five Resource Plans: Projection of System Emissions
SRS-16	Steven R. Sim	FPL	Comparison of the Five Resource Plans: Projection of System Oil and Natural Gas Usage
TRK-1	Thomas R. Koch	FPL	FPL's DSM National Performance Rankings
TRK-2	Thomas R. Koch	FPL	2014 Technical Potential Energy Efficiency Measures
TRK-3	Thomas R. Koch	FPL	2014 Technical Potential Update Methodology
TRK-4	Thomas R. Koch	FPL	2014 Technical Potential Results Summary
TRK-5	Thomas R. Koch	FPL	Technical Potential for Economic Screening Sensitivities
TRK-6	Thomas R. Koch	FPL	2015-2024 Achievable Potential - RIM & TRC
TRK-7	Thomas R. Koch	FPL	Proposed 2015-2024 DSM Goals
TRK-8	Thomas R. Koch	FPL	Solar Pilots Results
JTD-1	Terry Deason	FPL	Biographical Information for Terry Deason

JTD-2	Terry Deason	FPL	Economics of 2-Year Payback
-------	--------------	-----	-----------------------------

B. Rebuttal Testimony Exhibits

Exhibits	Witness	Sponsor	Description
SRS-17	Steven R. Sim	FPL	Benefits (Only) Calculation Comparison: Minnesota VOS vs. Florida Screening Tests
SRS-18	Steven R. Sim	FPL	Incorrect and/or Misleading Statements Made in the Testimonies of Witnesses Woolf and Mims
SRS-19	Steven R. Sim	FPL	A Look at a Typical Screening Curve Analysis: A Generation Option
SRS-20	Steven R. Sim	FPL	A Look at a Typical Screening Curve Analysis: A DSM Option
SRS-21	Steven R. Sim	FPL	ACEEE's LCOE Formula
SRS-22	Steven R. Sim	FPL	Table from NREL's Economic Evaluation Document
SRS-23	Steven R. Sim	FPL	SACE 1% GWh Goal Analysis: A Look at Resulting Electric Rates and Customer Bills
SRS-24	Steven R. Sim	FPL	Sierra Club 1% GWh Goal Analysis: A Look at Resulting Electric Rates and Customer Bills
JTD-3	Terry Deason	FPL	Residential Retail Rate Comparison

In addition to the above pre-filed exhibits, FPL reserves the right to utilize any exhibit introduced by any other party. FPL additionally reserves the right to introduce any additional exhibit necessary for cross-examination or impeachment at the final hearing.

II. STATEMENT OF BASIC POSITION

Pursuant to the FEECA and Rules 25-17.001 and 25-17.0021, F.A.C., FPL has proposed numeric conservation goals for reasonably achievable demand savings (kW) and annual energy savings (kWh) for the next ten years. These goals are based upon FPL's most recent planning process, as required by Rule 25-17.0021(3), F.A.C.

FPL followed a rigorous, six-step analytical process similar to the process it has used in past DSM goal-setting proceedings to develop its DSM goals. This process utilizes current forecasts and assumptions and appropriately reflects FPL's specific resource needs and system costs. Several factors have significantly affected the cost-effectiveness of DSM measures, and ultimately, FPL's proposed level of DSM goals since the last DSM goals proceeding. For example, current forecasted fuel costs are lower, current projected carbon dioxide emission compliance costs are lower, and FPL's generating system is more fuel-efficient. Additionally, the amount of energy efficiency projected to be delivered by federal and state codes and standards over the 10-year goals period has increased. Each of these factors greatly benefits customers, but at the same time reduces the cost-effectiveness and availability of DSM options.

FPL's analyses demonstrate that FPL's proposed goal of 337 MW (Summer) for the 2015-2024 DSM Goals period is the right level of DSM for FPL's customers. The resource plan that includes the RIM-based 337 MW portfolio of DSM is projected to result in the lowest levelized system average electric rates of all the resource plans analyzed and the lowest annual electric rates of any of the DSM-based resource plans analyzed. Additionally, the proposed goals avoid cross-subsidization of DSM program participants by customers who do not participate.

Intervenors' DSM proposals are contrary to Florida Law and the Commission's rules, and they would be outrageously expensive for FPL's customers. Neither of the intervenors that proposed alternative DSM goals (Southern Alliance for Clean Energy and the Sierra Club) performed Florida-specific economic evaluations that meet the criteria of Section 366.82, F.S., and Rule 25-17.0021, F.A.C. Rather, each recommends an arbitrary gigawatt-hour savings target of 1% of sales that would significantly increase electric rates for FPL's customers. To illustrate this point, FPL calculated the one-time additional cost that would be required in 2024 to bring

the levelized system average electric rate of FPL's proposed RIM 337 goals up to the levelized system average electric rate of the intervenors' proposed goals: for SACE's proposed goals that cost would be \$18.7 billion, and for Sierra Club's proposed goals the cost would be \$14.7 billion.

With respect to the current DSM Solar Pilot Programs, cost-effectiveness analyses demonstrate that these programs remain uneconomic and should be allowed to expire at the end of their current terms. Additionally, these rebate-based Pilot Programs constitute a large and concentrated cross-subsidy of a small number of customers who receive rebates to install their own DSM PV systems, by the vast majority of customers who do not. A research & development-based PV effort that evaluates and gathers data on different types of PV applications in Florida would be more valuable to FPL's customers than an extension of the current Pilot Programs.

For all the reasons discussed above, and as explained in more detail in the direct and rebuttal testimony provided by its witnesses, FPL's proposed DSM goals should be approved. FPL's proposed goals comply with the requirements of Section 366.82, F.S., comply with Rule 25-17.0021, F.A.C., and will result in the lowest levelized average electric rates for the benefit of all of FPL's customers – DSM program participants and non-participants alike.

IV. ISSUES AND POSITIONS

Issue 1: **Are the Company's proposed goals based on an adequate assessment of the full technical potential of all available demand-side and supply-side conservation and efficiency measures, including demand-side renewable energy systems, pursuant to Section 366.82(3), F.S.?**

FPL: Yes. The 2014 Technical Potential Study reflects an update to the 2009 Technical Potential Study that was approved by the Commission in the last DSM goals-setting docket. The FEECA Utilities worked jointly to develop the update methodology. It required extensive iterative analytical work and continuous collaboration to ensure that it was comprehensive and resulted in a thorough and wide-ranging reassessment of conservation and efficiency measures. (Koch)

Issue 2: Do the Company's proposed goals adequately reflect the costs and benefits to customers participating in the measure, pursuant to Section 366.82(3)(a), F.S.?

FPL: Yes. In developing its proposed DSM goals, FPL used the Participant screening test to analyze the potential cost-effectiveness of DSM measures. The Participant screening test fully accounts for all potential benefits and costs that are received and/or incurred by a potential participant in a DSM measure. Only those measures which pass the Participant screening test have been included in FPL's proposed goals. (Sim)

Issue 3: Do the Company's proposed goals adequately reflect the costs and benefits to the general body of rate payers as a whole, including utility incentives and participant contributions pursuant to Section 366.82(3)(b), F.S.?

FPL: Yes. FPL's proposed DSM goals reflect measures that passed the RIM screening test. The RIM screening test accounts for all of the benefits and costs that are received and/or incurred by all of a utility's customers, both participants and non-participants alike, that result from a specific DSM measure.

The TRC screening test, on the other hand, does not account for all of the relevant DSM-related cost impacts that will be incurred by the utility's customers. The TRC test omits incentive payments made to DSM program participants, which are costs that are recovered from all of the utility's customers. The TRC test also omits the impact of unrecovered revenue requirements on the utility's electric rates. Thus, the TRC screening test does not appropriately assess the cost impacts of DSM measures on the general body of customers as a whole. Use of the RIM test, in conjunction with the Participant test, appropriately satisfies the criteria in Section 366.82(3)(b) at the measure screening stage.

Importantly, the costs and benefits to the general body of customers is also assessed by FPL in the subsequent system analysis stage of its Integrated Resource Planning work and reflected in FPL's proposed goals. In that stage, various DSM portfolios and a supply-only portfolio were analyzed to determine which would be the best portfolio for FPL's customers. FPL's proposed goals reflect the RIM 337 MW portfolio, which results in the lowest levelized average electric system rate for all customers. (Sim, Deason)

Issue 4: Do the Company's proposed goals adequately reflect the need for incentives to promote both customer-owned and utility-owned energy efficiency and demand-side renewable energy systems, pursuant to Section 366.82, F.S.?

FPL: Yes. Incentives for participating customers are reflected in FPL's proposed goals because they are included and considered in the Participant and RIM screening tests. There is no need to establish incentives for utilities in this proceeding. (Koch, Sim)

Issue 5: Do the Company’s proposed goals adequately reflect the costs imposed by state and federal regulations on the emission of greenhouse gases, pursuant to Section 366.82(3)(d), F.S.?

FPL: Yes. FPL accounted for forecasted CO₂ compliance costs in a sensitivity screening analysis. The forecast is a “composite” CO₂ cost forecast based on separate forecasts from FPL and Duke Energy Florida, which allowed both utilities to utilize a single CO₂ compliance cost forecast in their analyses.

Forecasted CO₂ compliance costs currently are much lower than they were in 2009. FPL’s sensitivity screening analysis demonstrated that the number of measures passing changed only slightly when CO₂ compliance costs were included. Accordingly, FPL’s proposed goals adequately reflect these forecasted costs. (Sim)

Issue 6: What cost-effectiveness test or tests should the Commission use to set goals, pursuant to Section 366.82, F.S.?

FPL: The Commission should use the RIM preliminary economic screening test in setting DSM goals pursuant to Section 366.82, F.S., consistent with its historic policy decisions and rationale for doing so. The RIM test accounts both for the cost of incentives paid to program participants, which are paid for by the general body of customers through the ECCR, and unrecovered revenue requirements, which puts upward pressure on rates for the general body of customers. Both of these extremely important considerations are ignored by the TRC test. Relying on the TRC test results in cross subsidies between customers.

FPL’s proposed DSM goals minimize rate impacts to its customers and avoid cross subsidies between non-participants and participants because they are based on measures that passed the RIM economic screening test and because they reflect FPL’s resource planning process. FPL’s proposed goals are projected to result in the lowest levelized system average electric rates of all the resource plans analyzed, including a plan that includes all the RIM-based achievable potential. (Sim, Deason)

Issue 7: Do the Company’s proposed goals appropriately reflect consideration of free riders?

FPL: Yes. FPL’s proposed goals reflect consideration of free riders, as required by Rule 25-17.0021(3), F.A.C. For each DSM measure that survived the prior economic screening steps, a calculation was made to see if a participant’s incremental out-of-pocket costs will be fully recovered from bill savings and, if applicable, tax savings, in two years or less without any incentive payment from the utility. DSM measures for which the participant’s costs are not fully recovered in two years without an incentive payment pass this final step in the screening process. This process, applied to each individual measure at this screening step, helps protect FPL’s general body of customers from paying incentives to program participants

that would already be economically motivated to participate in the program without incentives (i.e., “free riders”). (Koch, Sim, Deason)

Issue 8: What residential summer and winter megawatt (MW) and annual Gigawatt-hour (GWh) goals should be established for the period 2015-2024?

FPL: The Commission should approve the following residential goals for the period 2015-2024:

FPL Proposed Goals – Residential						
Year	Summer MW		Winter MW		Annual GWh	
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative
2015	15.7	15.7	12.3	12.3	1.8	1.8
2016	15.9	31.6	12.3	24.6	2.2	3.9
2017	16.2	47.8	12.3	36.9	2.7	6.6
2018	16.5	64.3	12.3	49.1	3.3	9.9
2019	16.9	81.2	12.3	61.4	4.1	14.0
2020	17.4	98.6	12.3	73.7	5.0	19.0
2021	18.0	116.6	12.3	86.0	6.2	25.2
2022	18.7	135.4	12.3	98.3	7.7	32.8
2023	19.7	155.0	12.3	110.6	9.5	42.3
2024	20.8	175.8	12.3	122.8	11.7	54.0

(Koch, Sim, Deason)

Issue 9: What commercial/industrial summer and winter megawatt (MW) and annual Gigawatt hour (GWh) goals should be established for the period 2015-2024?

FPL: The Commission should approve the following commercial/industrial goals for the period 2015-2024:

FPL Proposed Goals – Commercial/Industrial						
	Summer MW		Winter MW		Annual GWh	
Year	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative
2015	10.5	10.5	4.1	4.1	0.6	0.6
2016	13.8	24.3	5.9	10.0	0.6	1.2
2017	15.0	39.3	6.4	16.4	0.5	1.7
2018	16.0	55.3	6.7	23.1	0.4	2.1
2019	17.5	72.8	7.1	30.2	0.1	2.2
2020	17.5	90.3	7.1	37.4	0.3	2.5
2021	17.6	107.9	7.2	44.6	0.5	2.9
2022	17.6	125.5	7.2	51.8	0.7	3.6
2023	17.7	143.2	7.2	59.0	0.8	4.4
2024	17.7	160.9	7.2	66.2	0.8	5.2

(Koch, Sim, Deason)

Issue 10: What goals, if any, should be established for increasing the development of demand-side renewable energy systems, pursuant to Section 366.82(2), F.S.?

FPL: Goals of zero should be established for demand-side renewable energy systems because such systems are not cost-effective for FPL’s customers in that they fail both the RIM and the TRC economic screening tests. Setting goals at zero for demand-side renewable energy systems would be consistent with past Commission practice of setting DSM goals at zero for FEECA utilities when no DSM measures are cost-effective. For example, as part of the 1999 and 2004 goals setting proceedings, the Commission set DSM goals at zero for both JEA and the Orlando Utilities Commission. A goal level of zero would best protect the general body of customers and minimize cross-subsidies between participants and non-participants. (Koch, Sim, Deason)

Issue 11: Should the Company’s existing Solar Pilot Programs be extended and, if so, should any modifications be made to them?

FPL: No, FPL’s existing Solar Pilot Programs should be allowed to expire at the end of 2014 consistent with their program terms. The cost-effectiveness of FPL’s programs was reviewed, and they continue to fail the RIM and TRC tests. In addition to being demonstrably cost-ineffective, they result in significant, concentrated cross subsidies for the relatively few customers who install solar systems by all of FPL’s 4.7 million customers. FPL believes that its customers can be better served by pursuing PV through other applications. FPL presents a proposal for a solar R&D program that would help gather information useful to determining the system impacts of different PV applications. (Koch, Sim, Deason)

V. STIPULATED ISSUES

There are no stipulated issues at this time.

VI. PENDING MOTIONS

FPL has no motions pending at this time.

VII. PENDING REQUESTS FOR CONFIDENTIAL CLASSIFICATION

FPL has no pending requests for confidential classification at this time.

VIII. OBJECTIONS TO WITNESSES' QUALIFICATIONS

FPL has no objections to the qualifications of any witness at this time.

IX. REQUIREMENTS OF THE PREHEARING ORDER THAT CANNOT BE MET

At this time, FPL is not aware of any requirements in the Order Establishing Procedure with which it cannot comply.

Respectfully submitted this 10th day of June, 2014.

John T. Butler
Assistant General Counsel – Regulatory
Fla. Bar No. 283479
Jessica A. Cano
Principal Attorney
Fla. Bar No. 37372
Kevin I.C. Donaldson
Principal Attorney
Fla. Bar No. 833401
Florida Power & Light Company
700 Universe Boulevard
Juno Beach, FL 33408
Telephone: (561) 304-5639
Facsimile: (561) 691-7135

By: s/ John T. Butler
John T. Butler
Fla. Bar No. 283479

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
DOCKET NO. 130199-EI**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of FPL's Rebuttal Testimony and Exhibits was served by electronic delivery this 10th day of June, 2014 to the following:

Charles Murphy, Esq.
Lee Eng Tan, Esq.
Division of Legal Services
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850
Cmurphy@psc.state.fl.us
Ltan@psc.state.fl.us

Steven L. Hall, Senior Attorney
Office of General Counsel
Florida Department of Agriculture & Consumer
Services
407 South Calhoun Street, Suite 520
Tallahassee, FL 32399
Steven.Hall@freshfromflorida.com
Attorney for DOACS

Diana A. Csank, Esq.
Sierra Club
50 F Street, N.W., 8th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001
Diana.Csank@Sierraclub.org
Attorney for Sierra Club

Jon C. Moyle, Jr., Esq.
Karen Putnal, Esq.
Moyle Law Firm, P.A.
118 N. Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
jmoyle@moylelaw.com
kputnal@moylelaw.com
Attorneys for FIPUG

George Cavros, Esq.
Southern Alliance for Clean Energy
120 E. Oakland Park Blvd., Suite 105
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33334
george@cavros-law.com
Attorney for SACE

Alisa Coe, Esq.
David G. Guest, Esq.
Earthjustice
111 S. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32301
acoe@earthjustice.org
dguest@earthjustice.org
Attorneys for SACE

James W. Brew, Esq.
F. Alvin Taylor, Esq.
Brickfield, Burchette, Ritts & Stone, P.C.
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW
Eighth Floor, West Tower
Washington, DC 20007-5201
jbrew@bbrslaw.com
ataylor@bbrslaw.com
Attorneys for PCS Phosphate-White Springs

J. Stone, Esq.
R. Badders, Esq.
S. Griffin, Esq.
Beggs & Lane
P.O. Box 12950
Pensacola, FL 32591-2950
jas@beggslane.com
rab@beggslane.com
srg@beggslane.com
Attorneys for Gulf Power Company

Dianne M. Triplett, Esq.
Matthew R. Bernier, Esq.
299 First Avenue North
St. Petersburg, Florida
dianne.triplett@duke-energy.com
matthew.bernier@duke-energy.com
Attorneys for Duke Energy

Mr. Paul Lewis, Jr.
106 East College Avenue, Suite 800
Tallahassee, FL 32301-7740
paul.lewisjr@duke-energy.com

Mr. W. Christopher Browder
P. O. Box 3193
Orlando, FL 32802-3193
cbrowder@ouc.com
Orlando Utilities Commission

Ms. Cheryl M. Martin
1641 Worthington Road, Suite 220
West Palm Beach, FL 33409-6703
cyoung@fpuc.com
Florida Public Utilities Company

Robert Scheffel Wright, Esq.
John T. LaVia, Esq.
Gardner, Bist, Wiener, Wadsworth,
Bowden, Bush, Dee, La Via & Wright, P.A.
1300 Thomaswood Drive
Tallahassee, Florida 32308
schef@gbwlegal.com
jlavia@gbwlegal.com
Attorneys for Walmart

J. Beasley, Esq./J. Wahlen, Esq./A. Daniels, Esq.
Ausley Law Firm
Post Office Box 391
Tallahassee, FL 32302
jbeasley@ausley.com
jwahlen@ausley.com
adaniel@ausley.com
Attorneys for Tampa Electric

Ms. Paula K. Brown
Regulatory Affairs
P. O. Box 111
Tampa, FL 33601-0111
Regdept@tecoenergy.com
Tampa Electric

Mr. P. G. Para
21 West Church Street, Tower 16
Jacksonville, FL 32202-3158
parapg@jea.com
JEA

Mr. Robert L. McGee, Jr.
One Energy Place
Pensacola, FL 32520-0780
rlmcgee@southernco.com

Gary V. Perko, Esq.
Brooke E. Lewis, Esq.
Hopping, Green & Sams, P.A.
P.O. Box 6526
119 S. Monroe Street, Suite 300
Tallahassee, FL 32314
gperko@hgslaw.com
blewis@hgslaw.com
Attorneys for JEA

J.R. Kelly, Esq.
Erik L. Saylor, Esq.
Office of Public Counsel
c/o The Florida Legislature
111 West Madison Street, Room 812
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400
kelly.jr@leg.state.fl.us
sayler.erik@leg.state.fl.us

John Finnigan
Environmental Defense Fund
128 Winding Brook Lane
Terrace Park, OH 45174
jfinnigan@edf.org

By: s/ John T. Butler
John T. Butler
Fla. Bar No. 283479