

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition for determination of need for
Citrus County combined cycle power plant, by
Duke Energy Florida, Inc.

DOCKET NO. 140110-EI

In re: Petition for determination of cost
effective generation alternative to meet need
prior to 2018, by Duke Energy Florida, Inc.

DOCKET NO. 140111-EI
ORDER NO. PSC-14-0341-PCO-EI
ISSUED: July 3, 2014

THIRD ORDER ESTABLISHING PROCEDURE AND
ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR ALTERNATE TESTIMONY FILING DATES

On June 24 2014, Calpine Construction Finance Company, L.P. (Calpine) filed a Second Unopposed Motion for Alternate Testimony Filing Dates. The dates for filing testimony were established in this docket by the Order Establishing Procedure, Order No. PSC-14-0274-PCO-EI, issued May 29, 2014. The dates were subsequently modified by the Second Order Establishing Procedure and Order Granting Motion for Alternate Testimony Filing Dates, Order No. PSC-14-0307-PCO-EI filed on June 12, 2014. Calpine asks that the dates for filing intervenor testimony, staff testimony, and Duke Energy Florida, Inc.'s (DEF) rebuttal testimony be extended by an additional week each due to the substantial volume of information involved in this case. Calpine represents that DEF concurs with this request while the Office of Public Counsel, PCS Phosphate and the Florida Industrial Power Users Group do not object to the extension.

Upon consideration, the motion for extension of time is granted, and the dates established by Order Nos. PSC-14-0274-PCO-EI and PSC-14-0307-PCO-EI shall be revised as follows:

	<u>Current Due Date</u>	<u>Extended Due Date</u>
Intervenor Testimony	July 7, 2014	July 14, 2014
Staff Testimony	July 22, 2014	July 29, 2014
Rebuttal testimony and exhibits	July 29, 2014	August 5, 2014

Furthermore, a list of the issues identified and agreed to by all parties thus far in this proceeding is attached hereto as Appendix A. The scope of the proceeding in Docket Nos. 114110-EI and 114111-EI will be based upon these issues as well as other issues raised by the parties up to and during the Prehearing Conference, unless modified by the Commission.

Based upon the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by Commissioner Ronald A. Brisé, as Prehearing Officer, that the Second Unopposed Motion for Alternate Testimony Filing Dates filed by Calpine Construction Finance Company, L.P. is granted. It is further

ORDERED that Order No. PSC-14-0274-PCO-EI and PSC-14-0307-PCO-EI shall be revised as indicated above. It is further

ORDERED that all other provisions of Order No. PSC-14-0274-PCO-EI remain in effect, and they, and the provisions of this Order, shall govern this proceeding unless modified by the Commission.

By ORDER of Commissioner Ronald A. Brisé, as Prehearing Officer, this 3rd day of July, 2014.



RONALD A. BRISE
Commissioner and Prehearing Officer
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399
(850) 413-6770
www.floridapsc.com

Copies furnished: A copy of this document is provided to the parties of record at the time of issuance and, if applicable, interested persons.

MTL

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.569(1), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

Mediation may be available on a case-by-case basis. If mediation is conducted, it does not affect a substantially interested person's right to a hearing.

Any party adversely affected by this order, which is preliminary, procedural or intermediate in nature, may request: (1) reconsideration within 10 days pursuant to Rule 25-22.0376, Florida Administrative Code; or (2) judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court, in

ORDER NO. PSC-14-0341-PCO-EI
DOCKET NOS. 140110-EI, 140111-EI
PAGE 3

the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility, or the First District Court of Appeal, in the case of a water or wastewater utility. A motion for reconsideration shall be filed with the Office of Commission Clerk, in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.0376, Florida Administrative Code. Judicial review of a preliminary, procedural or intermediate ruling or order is available if review of the final action will not provide an adequate remedy. Such review may be requested from the appropriate court, as described above, pursuant to Rule 9.100, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.

Appendix A

Docket No. 140110-EI

- Issue 1:** Is the proposed Citrus County combined cycle plant needed, taking into account the need for electric system reliability and integrity?
- Issue 2:** Is the proposed Citrus County combined cycle plant needed, taking into account the need for adequate electricity at a reasonable cost?
- Issue 3:** Is the proposed Citrus County combined cycle plant needed, taking into account the need for fuel diversity and supply reliability?
- Issue 4:** Are there any renewable energy sources and technologies or conservation measures taken by or reasonably available to Duke Energy Florida that might mitigate the need for the proposed Citrus County combined cycle plant?
- Issue 5:** Is the proposed Citrus County combined cycle plant the most cost-effective alternative available to meet the needs of Duke Energy Florida and its customers?
- Issue 6:** Did Duke Energy Florida reasonably evaluate all alternative scenarios for cost effectively meeting the needs of its customers over the relevant planning horizon?
- Issue 7:** Based on the resolution of the foregoing issues, should the Commission grant the requested determination of need for the proposed Citrus County combined cycle plant?
- Issue 8:** Should this docket be closed?

Docket No. 140111-EI

- Issue 9:** Are the proposed Suwannee Simple Cycle Project and Hines Chillers Power Uprate Project needed, taking into account the need for electric system reliability and integrity
- Issue 10:** Are the proposed Suwannee Simple Cycle Project and Hines Chillers Power Uprate Project needed, taking into account the need for adequate electricity at a reasonable cost?
- Issue 11:** Are the proposed Suwannee Simple Cycle Project and Hines Chillers Power Uprate Project needed, taking into account the need for fuel diversity and supply reliability?

- Issue 12:** Are there any renewable energy sources and technologies or conservation measures taken by or reasonably available to Duke Energy Florida, Inc. that might mitigate the need for the proposed Suwannee Simple Cycle Project and Hines Chillers Power Uprate Project?
- Issue 13:** Are the proposed Suwannee Simple Cycle Project in 2016 and Hines Chillers Power Uprate Project in 2017 the most cost-effective alternatives available to meet the needs of Duke Energy Florida, Inc. and its customers?
- Issue 14:** Did Duke Energy Florida, Inc. reasonably evaluate all alternative scenarios for cost effectively meeting the needs of its customers over the relevant planning horizon?
- Issue 15:** Based on the resolution of the foregoing issues, should the Commission grant the requested determination that the proposed Suwannee Simple Cycle Project and Hines Chillers Power Uprate Project are the most cost-effective generation alternatives to meet Duke's needs prior to 2018?
- Issue 16:** Should this docket be closed?