FILED OCT 12, 2016 DOCUMENT NO. 08178-16 FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

000001

		000001
1	FIORIT	BEFORE THE A PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2	FIONED	A TODDIC SERVICE COMMISSION
3	In the Matter of:	
4		DOCKET NO. 160001-EI
5	FUEL AND PURCHASE	
6	RECOVERY CLAUSE W GENERATING PERFOR	MANCE
7	INCENTIVE FACTOR.	/
8		
9		
10		
11		
12	PROCEEDINGS:	PREHEARING CONFERENCE
13	COMMISSIONER	
14	PARTICIPATING:	COMMISSIONER ART GRAHAM PREHEARING OFFICER
15	DATE:	Tuesday, October 11, 2016
16	TIME:	Commenced at 1:48 p.m. Concluded at 2:37 p.m.
17	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center
18		Room 148 4075 Esplanade Way
19		Tallahassee, Florida
20	REPORTED BY:	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR
21		Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6734
22		
23		
24		
25		

APPEARANCES:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

R. WADE LITCHFIELD, JOHN T. BUTLER,

and MARIA MONCADA, ESQUIRES, 700 Universe Boulevard,

Juno Beach, Florida 33408-0420, on behalf of Florida

Power & Light Company.

JAMES D. BEASLEY, J. JEFFRY WAHLEN, and ASHLEY

M. DANIELS, ESQUIRES, Ausley & McMullen, Post Office Box

391, Tallahassee, Florida 32302, appearing on behalf of

Tampa Electric Company.

JEFFREY A. STONE, RUSSELL A. BADDERS, and

STEVEN R. GRIFFIN, ESQUIRES, Beggs & Lane, P.O. Box

12950, Pensacola, Florida 32591-2950, appearing on

behalf of Gulf Power Company.

MATTHEW R. BERNIER, ESQUIRE, 106 East College

Avenue, Suite 800, Tallahassee, Florida 32301-7740; and

JOHN BURNETT and DIANNE TRIPLETT, ESQUIRES, 299 First

Avenue North, St. Petersburg, Florida 33701, appearing

on behalf of Duke Energy Florida, Inc.

JON C. MOYLE, JR., and KAREN PUTNAL, ESQUIRES,

Moyle Law Firm, P.A., 118 North Gadsden Street,

Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf of

Florida Industrial Power Users Group.

APPEARANCES:

BETH KEATING, ESQUIRE, Gunster Law Firm, 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 601, Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1839, appearing on behalf of Florida Public Utilities Company.

ROBERT SCHEFFEL WRIGHT and JOHN T. LaVIA,
III, ESQUIRES, Gardner Law Firm, 1300 Thomaswood Drive,
Tallahassee, Florida 32308, appearing on behalf of the
Florida Retail Federation

J. R. KELLY, PUBLIC COUNSEL, CHARLES

REHWINKEL, ERIK L. SAYLER, PATRICIA A. CHRISTENSEN, and

STEPHANIE MORRIS, ESQUIRES, Office of Public Counsel,

c/o the Florida Legislature, 111 W. Madison Street, Room

812, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400, appearing on

behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida.

JAMES W. BREW, ESQUIRE, Stone, Mattheis,
Xenopoulos & Brew, P.C., 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street,
NW, Eight Floor, West Tower, Washington, DC 20007,
appearing on behalf of White Springs Agricultural
Chemicals, Inc. d/b/a PCS Phosphate - White Springs.

DANIJELA JANJIC and SUZANNE BROWNLESS,
ESQUIRES, FPSC General Counsel's Office, 2540 Shumard
Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850,
appearing on behalf of the Florida Public Service
Commission Staff.

APPEARANCES:

KEITH HETRICK, GENERAL COUNSEL; MARY ANNE HELTON, DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL, Advisor to the Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850.

PROCEEDINGS

MS. TAN: By notice issued September 27th,
2016, this time and place was set for a prehearing in
the following dockets: 160001-EI, 160002-EG, 160003-GU,
160004-GU, and 160007-EI. The purpose of the prehearing
is set out in the notice.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Thank you. Staff.

We're going to take appearances, and if I could have

you, when you give your names or give your company, you

don't have to do it each individual, but when you give

the company and the names, also give the dockets that

you're being a part of all at one time. And I guess we

can start right up here with Florida Power & Light.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Commissioner Graham. For the 01 docket I have R. Wade Litchfield, John Butler, and Maria Moncada. We also would be making appearances in Docket 160007, the ECRC. And then for the 02 docket, R. Wade Litchfield, John Butler, and Kenneth Rubin. Thank you.

MR. BADDERS: Good afternoon. Russell Badders on behalf of Gulf Power. I'll be appearing in 01 and 02 and 07 dockets along with Steven R. Griffin and Jeffrey A. Stone.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.

MR. BEASLEY: Good afternoon. James D.

1	Beasley with the Ausley McMullen law firm. Appearing
2	with me are J. Jeffry Wahlen and Ashley M. Daniels of
3	the same firm in the 01, 02, and 07 dockets.
4	MR. WATSON: Ansley Watson, Jr., Macfarlane,
5	Ferguson & McMullen in the 03 and 04 dockets.
6	MS. KEATING: Good afternoon, Commissioner.
7	Beth Keating with the Gunster law firm. I'm here today
8	for FPUC in the 01, 02, 03, and 04 dockets; FPU-Fort
9	Meade in the 03 docket; and Fort Meade, the Indiantown
10	Division, and Chesapeake in the 04 docket.
11	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.
12	MR. MUNSON: Good afternoon, Commissioner. My
13	name is Greg Munson also with the Gunster law firm on
14	behalf of Florida City Gas in dockets 03 and 04.
15	MR. BREW: Good afternoon, Commissioner.
16	James Brew with the firm of Stone, Mattheis, Xenopoulos
17	& Brew appearing in the 01, 02, and 07 dockets for White
18	Springs Agricultural Chemicals/PCS Phosphate.
19	MR. WRIGHT: Good afternoon, Commissioner.
20	Robert Scheffel Wright and John T. Lavia, III, of the
21	Gardner law firm appearing on behalf of the Florida
22	Retail Federation in Docket 160001, the fuel docket.
23	Thank you.
24	MR. MOYLE: Good afternoon. Jon Moyle with
25	the Moyle Law Firm appearing on behalf of the Florida

1	Industrial Power Users Group in the 01, 02, and
2	07 dockets. And Karen Putnal with the firm should also
3	be noted as entering an appearance. Thank you.
4	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Patricia Christensen with
5	the Office of Public Counsel. And I'd also like to put
6	in an appearance for J. R. Kelly, Public Counsel;
7	Charles Rehwinkel; and Erik Sayler with the Office of
8	Public Counsel in the 01, 02, 03, 04, and 07 dockets.
9	MS. LEITMAN: Melanie Leitman appearing on
10	behalf of my co-counsel, Paula Sparkman, out of Messer,
11	Caparello representing Sebring Gas of the 04 docket.
12	MR. BERNIER: Good afternoon, Commissioner.
13	Matt Bernier with Duke Energy and entering an appearance
14	in the 01, 02, and 07 dockets. And I'd like to enter an
15	appearance for Dianne Triplett in those same dockets and
16	for John Burnett in the 01 docket. Thank you.
17	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Anybody else before I go
18	to staff for appearances?
19	MS. CHRISTENSEN: Can I also add this is
20	Patty Christensen with the Office of Public Counsel
21	an appearance for Stephanie Morris in all of the dockets
22	as well.
23	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Anybody else before I go
24	to staff?
25	Staff.

MS. TAN: Lee Eng Tan on behalf of the 02 docket, and making an appearance for Stephanie Cuello in the 02 and 04 docket, and Margo Leathers and Wesley Taylor in the 03 docket, Kelley Corbari in the 04 docket, Bianca Lherrison and Charlie Murphy in the 07 docket, and Danijela Janjic and Suzanne Brownless in the 01 docket.

MS. HELTON: And finally, Mary Anne Helton.

I'm here as your advisor. I'd also like to make an appearance for your General Counsel, Keith Hetrick.

* * * * *

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Staff, preliminary matters.

MS. JANJIC: On October 6th, 2016, FPL, the Office of Public Counsel, the South Florida Hospital, and the Healthcare Association, and the Florida Retail Federation jointly moved for approval of a proposed stipulation and settlement of FPL's rate case in Docket No. 160021-EI and consolidated dockets. The proposed settlement agreement provides for FPL to terminate natural gas financial hedging for the four-year minimum term of the agreement; however, it is not clear whether the Commission will be in a position to decide on approval of the proposed settlement agreement before the hearing in this docket. Therefore, FPL is presenting

alternative positions on hedging and would like to submit supplemental testimony on those positions.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Florida Power & Light.

MR. BUTLER: That is an accurate statement.

We will end up filing -- propose to file very brief

testimony probably by Mr. Yupp that would simply sponsor
an alternative, I guess is the best term to use, 2017

risk management plan that would have zero percent as the
hedging levels in it. And, you know, this would be
presented as what should be approved by the Commission
if the stipulation in the rate case and consolidated
dockets is approved by the Commission.

As Ms. Janjic indicated, we've got kind of a timing, sequencing issue of when decisions are going to be made, so we think the most appropriate thing is to have both positions presented in the fuel docket, and the decision on which is appropriate can be made by the Commission based on its ruling on the settlement agreement.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Staff, when are we supposed to be ruling on the settlement agreement?

MS. HELTON: There has not been an Order Establishing Procedure to deal with the issues that are outside the scope of what the company filed in its petition back in March. I'm hopeful that that will

happen in the next 24 hours, but we don't know yet.

But I think the dates that I have seen, there's a very good chance that the ruling may not happen until after the hearing in November.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: After the clause hearings in November.

MS. HELTON: Yes. I'm sorry. After the clause hearing in November.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: And you can't just

pull -- let me know if I'm going down the wrong path

here -- pull Florida Power & Light outside of the clause
hearings until after that?

MS. HELTON: Well, I guess that's a question for Florida Power & Light. But it's my understanding, you know -- what I understand about the clause docket is that they need a ruling by the end of November to have the factors in place so that they can implement new rates the beginning of the year, and I'm not sure timing wise how that would happen.

MR. BUTLER: I think that's an accurate characterization. And, in addition, as I noted, I mean, we have a position on hedging that if the stipulation -- I mean, I'm sorry, the settlement agreement were not approved, we would continue to take the position we filed in September, which is that, you know, we should

continue to hedge, and we have various other subordinate related positions that we would be supporting. So unless there's some way to have our -- well, I just -- it's hard for me to see how it would because the hedging issue is one that is going to be addressed by all of the utilities, by Public Counsel, by FIPUG, by staff witnesses, and I don't see how we could be participating to protect the position we have in advance of approval of the settlement in any forum other than the hearing you plan to have in early November on -- you know, for all of the other parties.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: So you would take -- you will take your current position on hedging as we go into the clause hearings. And then if the settlement were to be brought up and pass, they you would just basically step down from those positions?

MR. BUTLER: That's right.

MS. HELTON: And while that may be a little bit awkward, I do think it would be more awkward to try to split Florida Power & Light off, especially because hedging is a major part of this proceeding in the beginning of November, as I understand it. And the other companies have filed testimony concerning that and staff has also filed testimony.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: And so when we bring up

the settlement, part of that settlement is also -- it's also, I guess, allowing them to step back from the decision that was made during the clauses.

MR. BUTLER: That's right. I mean, I think that when you consider our settlement, one of the elements of that you need to consider is obviously the provision that the parties to the settlement have agreed to where we will terminate for the four-year term of the agreement our hedging, and you'll have to decide, you know, whether to approve the settlement with that included. If you do, at that point I think it's just ministerial that whatever we presented, whatever we were otherwise taking as a position in this docket would get sort of overridden by the approval of the settlement agreement. And we would, of course, provide the appropriate revised risk management plan and would support having that approved as sort of implementation of the settlement agreement.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. The danger of me thinking out loud is I don't want to go down the wrong path, but thanks.

MR. SAYLER: Mr.-- Commissioner Graham.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Yes.

MR. SAYLER: As far as the -- how these -- the fuel clause and the settlement are running on somewhat

dual tracks, does staff have any dates for any of the decision points or anything? Because in my conversation with Mr. Butler, there was a potential for something to be done on the settlement before the actual fuel clause hearing. Then you would have the fuel clause hearing, followed by post-hearing briefs on the fuel clause hearing, and potentially a decision on the settlement before the actual decision on the fuel clause, post-hearing briefs, and staff's recommendation sometime in early December. So I'm just wondering about the timing.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Actually I think you'll probably have a better -- they can give you a better idea, as Mary Anne says, in 24 hours when the order comes out. So --

MS. HELTON: I'm very -- I can't speak for the Chairman. We have -- we are working fast and furiously on an order and fast and furiously pinning down dates. That has not been finalized, and I would hate to release anything that's not final. But we are working as hard as we can.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I know the Chairwoman is working on that this entire week, so I'd give it 48 hours or so and ask that same question to somebody on staff.

MR. SAYLER: Yes, sir, that makes total sense 1 2 to us. And then at the appropriate time when it comes 3 to discussing the exhibits, like was done in the 07 docket, maybe having the settlement as an exhibit to 4 that docket as well. 5 MS. HELTON: Certainly. 6 7 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Mr. Moyle. MR. MOYLE: Yeah. I was going to ask that. 8 9 And just for the record, we would have no objection to any of the utilities entering into a Type B stipulation 10 with FIPUG's position of no more hedging, if there was 11 12 any interest. COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I'll let them address 13 14 that, if they choose to. Okay. So we're in the 01 docket, preliminary 15 16 matters. Florida Power & Light, you're going to submit 17 your supplemental testimony? MR. BUTLER: Yes. Our intention is to submit 18 19 that by the middle of next week. COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Any other 2.0 21 comments about Florida Power & Light doing that? Okay. 22 MR. MOYLE: Do we have a chance to ask some 23 questions about it, if we have any? 24 MR. BUTLER: Yes. 25 MS. HELTON: At the hearing.

MR. BUTLER: Right, at the hearing. And I will -- I say yes, but, again, our view of it is that in this proceeding, this isn't where we will be presenting and defending the position of terminating hedging. I mean, that is an issue in the -- you know, part of the comprehensive settlement agreement that we are proposing in the rate case docket. If it's approved in that setting, then I think in this docket it becomes just kind of ministerial to apply that decision and, therefore, we terminate our hedging. But we will be in this proceeding, if we go down the time sequence we've been talking about, you know, our witnesses will be essentially defending the position that we filed in September.

MR. MOYLE: This is the issue -- this is the proceeding where the hedging issue is keyed up substantively. We have all the testimony in this proceeding, so.

MR. BUTLER: Right. But the distinction,
Mr. Moyle, is that, you know, our agreement to terminate
hedging is only in connection with a -- you know, as an
element in a comprehensive settlement. And so obviously
you can ask Mr. Yupp about that settlement, I suppose,
but, you know, the discussion in this docket is not
going to be of that as sort of our preferred position.

It's going to be as something that is what we have 1 agreed to in a settlement. And if the settlement is 2 approved, that's what we'll do. 3 MR. MOYLE: Okay. It's just unusual. I mean, 4 5 testimony is coming in. It was supposed to be filed many -- a long time ago. It's coming in supplemental 6 7 testimony. I was just curious as to whether there would be an opportunity to see what the testimony says and do 8 9 any discovery on it. 10 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: If every day was as 11 usual, you wouldn't need attorneys. 12 (Laughter.) Okay. Any other preliminary matters? 13 14 MR. BUTLER: I have one just on the front --15 first page of the prehearing order that inadvertently Mr. Hoffman's name instead of Mr. Litchfield is listed 16 17 as the first appearance for FPL. 18 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Any other 19 preliminary matters? Well, let's go through the draft prehearing 20 21 order. Section I, Section II, Section III, and Section 22 IV. Staff. 23 MS. JANJIC: Staff would like to review the 24 process for confidential exhibits. 25 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Can you pull your mic

around? Sorry.

MS. JANJIC: Okay. Staff would like to review the process for confidential exhibits to be admitted at hearing with the parties. Commissioners will be provided with copies of all confidential materials contained in all prefiled testimony and exhibits.

Two, Commissioners will be provided with copies of all confidential materials contained in staff exhibits. Each party is responsible for preparing copies of any exhibit they want to introduce into evidence that is not prefiled that contains confidential materials and placing it in a red folder. Each party is responsible for preparing copies of any cross-examination or impeachment exhibit that contains confidential information and placing it in a red folder for use at hearing. In order to provide copies of its exhibits to the Commissioners, staff, and parties, each party shall make 30 copies of each non-prefiled document it seeks to introduce or use for impeachment or cross-examination purposes.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Just in case you guys haven't caught on, whenever the staff has it in bold, that means they're serious this time.

(Laughter.)

Any other questions from -- or comments on

Section IV? Section V.

minutes.

anywhere between three and five minutes.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Yeah. As much as it

will pain for me to say five minutes, we'll go with five

need to be set for witness summaries. It is usually set

MS. JANJIC: Commissioner Graham, a time will

MR. SAYLER: All right. Commissioner Graham, depending upon your ruling on FIPUG's disputed issue, we would need to update the issues that witnesses Noriega and Lawton testify to it. But that will be contingent

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Is there anything else before we start dealing with FIPUG? Okay, staff.

on your decision on the FIPUG disputed issues.

MS. HELTON: On the witnesses and FIPUG's statement in its prehearing statement, and I think FRF made a similar statement in their prehearing statement, I just want to confirm, you're just making your standard objection there with respect to witnesses' expertise.

We're not doing anything more than that.

MR. MOYLE: That's right, on the expertise issue.

MR. WRIGHT: It's not even an objection. It's a reservation of rights to address qualifications.

MS. HELTON: Okay. I think we're good there,

1	Mr. Chairman.
2	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. What is this
3	about 5:00 on Friday? Oh, we don't
4	MS. HELTON: Oh, I think we can skip that.
5	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. So Section VI.
6	MR. BEASLEY: I have one brief comment,
7	Commissioner Graham.
8	On page 5, the fifth witness from the bottom,
9	Brian S. Buckley for Tampa Electric, we would need to
10	add Issue 19 as one of the issues that he addresses.
11	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. So 17, 18, and
12	19?
13	MR. BEASLEY: Yes, sir.
14	MR. BERNIER: I have a comment as well on
15	that, Commissioner Graham.
16	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Sure.
17	MR. BERNIER: On page 6 as a rebuttal witness,
18	Joseph McCallister should be shown as a rebuttal witness
19	for DEF, and he will address Issues 1A, 1B, and 2B.
20	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: McCallister?
21	MR. BERNIER: Yes.
22	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: And which issues?
23	MS. JANJIC: I was going to do them all, but
24	thank you, guys.
25	MR. BERNIER: Oh, I'm sorry.

	MB. UANDIC. It's going to be issues in, ib,
2	and 2B for Joseph McCallister for DEF.
3	MR. BERNIER: That's correct. Thanks.
4	MS. JANJIC: And we also need to add Mr. Yupp
5	for FPL, and those issues
6	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Under the rebuttal?
7	MS. JANJIC: Under Mr. Joseph McCallister.
8	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: No, no, no. Mr. Yupp
9	is
10	MS. JANJIC: FPL's witness for the rebuttal.
11	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. In rebuttal?
12	MS. JANJIC: Yes, sir.
13	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.
14	MS. JANJIC: And those issues will be 1A, 1B,
15	and 3B.
16	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Anything
17	MS. JANJIC: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.
18	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Please go ahead.
19	MS. JANJIC: We wanted to ask staff would
20	like to ask the parties if they are willing to stipulate
21	to any of staff's witnesses at this time.
22	MR. SAYLER: Erik for Public Counsel. I think
23	so, but let me get back to you.
24	MS. JANJIC: Tomorrow? Okay.
25	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Erik?

1	MR. SAYLER: Excuse me. I mean, you're
2	talking about the audit witnesses or are you talking
3	about Mr. Gettings and Cicchetti?
4	MS. JANJIC: All of our staff witnesses.
5	MR. SAYLER: Okay. Potentially the audit
6	witnesses.
7	MS. JANJIC: Okay. Scratch that. Just the
8	audit witnesses. We will be putting forth the hedging
9	witnesses.
10	MR. SAYLER: Okay. Thank you. Yes. And we
11	will look at that and get back to you by hopefully close
12	of business tomorrow.
13	MS. JANJIC: Okay.
14	MR. BUTLER: FPL would be willing to stipulate
15	to the audit, staff audit witness for FPL.
16	MR. BREW: PCS is willing to stipulate to
17	Witness Ojada.
18	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Just the one witness?
19	MR. BREW: That's the one that deals with
20	Duke.
21	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.
22	MR. BERNIER: We will stipulate to the same
23	witness.
24	MR. BADDERS: And Gulf can stipulate to
25	Witness Brown.

1	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.
2	MR. BEASLEY: And Tampa Electric as well for
3	the audit witnesses for Tampa Electric witness for
4	Tampa Electric.
5	MR. WRIGHT: The Retail Federation will
6	stipulate to the entry of the audit witnesses'
7	testimonies and exhibits. Thank you.
8	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Both audit witnesses;
9	correct?
10	MR. WRIGHT: Pardon?
11	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Both audit witnesses;
12	correct?
13	MR. WRIGHT: All four.
14	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: All four.
15	MR. WRIGHT: Yeah.
16	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: All four. I'll follow
17	this.
18	MR. WRIGHT: Yes, sir.
19	MR. MOYLE: Similar to OPC, FIPUG would like
20	to take a look and follow back up.
21	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: By the end of the day
22	tomorrow?
23	MR. MOYLE: If we're able to stipulate. We'll
24	shoot to do that.
25	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.

MS. JANJIC: So just for clarification, anyone else other than Jon and OPC getting back to me tomorrow? Everybody else is okay with our audit witnesses; correct?

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: That is correct.

MS. JANJIC: Okay. Thank you. Any other witnesses suggested by the parties at this time for stipulation?

I would just like to note that staff will confirm with each Commissioner that any identified witness can be excused. If other Commissioners don't have questions of these witnesses, the witnesses may be excused from the hearing and his or her testimony and exhibits entered into the record at the hearing as though read. Parties are working on stipulation and -- which may result in other witnesses being excused.

Nothing further from us.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Is that it for Section VI? Section VII, Section --

MR. BUTLER: Commissioner Graham, I'm sorry, before you leave Section VII, we may be revising slightly the final sentence in our statement of basic position there about the supplemental filing. It's not clear if we're going to need to file a revised 2016 risk management plan. Definitely will be the alternative

2017 plan. But I'll provide, by tomorrow, any change, if we have it, to the language for the statement of basic position.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.

MR. SAYLER: Chairman Graham, with regard to OPC's position related to the hedging in light of the settlement filed and in light of FPL, we may be tweaking our language. But I will -- if we have any tweaks, we will certainly let staff know by close of business tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.

MR. MOYLE: Ditto for FIPUG. I mean, I think my understanding was when you said 5:00 tomorrow is the time to get changes in positions that include basic statement, basic positions too. So we'll probably be changing our position with respect to hedging.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Anybody else?

All right. Let's go on to Section VIII. Staff.

MS. JANJIC: The OEP requires that each party take a position at the prehearing conference unless good cause can be shown why they cannot do so. If a party's position in the draft prehearing order is listed as "No position at this time" or "No position provided," that party must change it today or show good cause why you cannot take a position. Absent a showing of good cause,

a prehearing order will reflect "No position" for that party on that issue. If a party wishes to change a position today, please submit your position in writing by the end of the business day tomorrow, October 12th.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: By the end of the day tomorrow; correct?

MS. JANJIC: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.

MS. JANJIC: And now if you want us to go through the issues, we were going to do it by chunks, not --

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. I'll let you do your chunks.

MS. JANJIC: Okay. Thank you. Under the fuel issues, we have the hedging issues, which are specifically Issues 1A and 1B. Are there any changes or comments on those?

MR. BUTLER: For FPL, just for clarity, we're going to add in our position on 1A and 1B where it says, "In the event that the proposed settlement agreement is approved," to revise that to say, "In the event that the proposed settlement agreement in Docket No. 160021-EI and consolidated dockets is approved." It doesn't change the positions. It's just clarifying what the settlement being referenced is.

_
1
_

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. B?

MS. JANJIC: Okay. Company-specific fuel adjustment issues. We have Issues 2A through 6B. I would just like to note that 5C was dropped at an earlier Issue ID conference but somehow got onto this list. So I would like to see if everybody is in agreement to continue to drop that Issue 5C.

MR. BADDERS: Gulf agrees.

MR. BUTLER: And I would note that that same clarification I just read for Issues 1A and 1B would apply to Issue 3B. Thanks.

MS. JANJIC: Any other issues for 2A through 6B?

MR. BREW: Commissioner, as to Issue 2B, the PCS Phosphate position was "No position at this time." It should be changed to read "Deny" for the reasons stated in PCS's statement of basic position, and I'll forward that to staff.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.

MS. JANJIC: Okay. Moving on to generic fuel adjustment issues, which are Issues 7 through 12. Any changes or comments in those?

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.

MS. JANJIC: Company-specific generating performance incentive factor issues, which are 13A

through 16A.

Seeing none, I'm going to go to the next one, generic generating performance incentive factor, Issues 17 through 18.

Fuel factor calculation, Issues 19 through 23.

Moving to the next chunk, which are the capacity issues, we have the company-specific capacity cost recovery factor issues, 24A to 25. I would like to note at this time that it looks like Issue 24A can be stipulated to. A Type 1 stipulation, in fact, because the order was issued yesterday and -- related to that issue.

MR. BERNIER: DEF certainly agrees with that.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. So I take it
everybody else agrees with 24A being stipulated?

MR. WRIGHT: As a Type 2.

MR. BREW: Yes.

MS. JANJIC: It doesn't matter what type. I just thought because there was -- so the Type 2 is fine.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.

MR. WRIGHT: There's so much in there that --

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: No, I understand.

MR. WRIGHT: Yeah.

MR. MOYLE: Same for FIPUG. We're not going 1 to stand in the way, but we're not affirmatively 2 3 stipulating. **COMMISSIONER GRAHAM:** Got you. 4 5 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah. I think in totality ours needs to be a Type 2. Thanks. 6 7 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Staff. MS. JANJIC: I guess that's it for those. 8 9 Generic capacity cost recovery factor, Issues 10 28 to 34. Anything on those? 11 The effective date, Issue 35. 12 Tariff approval and close the docket issues, 13 which are Issues 36 and 37. MR. BUTLER: It seems like we could have 14 15 stipulations on those. COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Comments on stipulating 16 17 36 and 37. MR. MOYLE: I am not clear on FPL's idea where 18 19 they're going to stop hedging. And, I mean, if that takes place on January 1, 2017 -- is that what's 20 21 contemplated if the settlement's approved? 22 MR. BUTLER: I'm sorry. Yes. How did -- are 23 you relating that to one of these issues, Jon? 24 MR. MOYLE: Well, my recollection from past 25 hedging discussions was there was time needed for hedges

1	to play out and roll off, and you couldn't just, you
2	know, turn off a switch kind of thing and have it be
3	effective. And so if it's going to be effective 1/1/17,
4	then I just need to know that and can probably stipulate
5	to it. But I just didn't know that that was something
6	that could be done.
7	MR. BUTLER: It will be I mean, our 2017
8	risk management plan is that's the thing that we said
9	earlier that we'd be submitting an alternative one that
10	would, you know, go into effect. That would apply to
11	any hedges executed in 2017, starting on January 1.
12	MR. MOYLE: So we could do a Type B or, you
13	know, no opposition to stipulating effective dates.
14	MS. JANJIC: Just to be clear, that's for
15	Issue 36, correct, Type 2?
16	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: 36 and 37? 36?
17	MS. JANJIC: 37, there seems to be a
18	disagreement because we're "Should the docket be
19	closed?" It's an ongoing docket, so we do not think it
20	should be closed. But there are several positions that
21	say, "Yes," so I don't see an agreement there.
22	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. So we're just
23	dealing with 36.
24	MR. BUTLER: And what about 35?
25	MR. MOYLE: Yeah, that would be in the same

000030

category, not an affirmative stipulation but not

MS. JANJIC: Type 2. Okay.

MR. BADDERS: And forward to Issue 37, staff, just when you said that, that we had taken the position of "Yes," which would make it difficult to stipulate, we won't stand in the way of that. The intent there was that basically it's an ongoing docket, we close it for the year, and open it up for the next year. I mean, that was our position, so we can withdraw what we said

MR. BUTLER: As could FPL. And we're trying to express -- I guess it kind of depends on timing, but what we understand will happen is that the 160001 docket will stay open until the end of 2016, and then a new one will be started 170001 thereafter. And if that's what you intend, then certainly we're definitely in agreement

MS. JANJIC: Yeah, that is --

MR. BEASLEY: Tampa Electric can agree as

MR. BERNIER: As can Duke.

MS. KEATING: As does FPUC.

MS. JANJIC: Are we going to do a Type 2,

Type 1?

23

24

25

MR. SAYLER: Public Counsel took the position,
"No," not because we're not -- we know it's a continuing
docket. It's just that should there be any issues that
someone wants to appeal, then wouldn't this docket stay
open during the pendency of the appeal? We're
not thinking -- we're not envisioning anything to be
appealed, but I'm just -- that's why we put the
position, "No."

MS. HELTON: I think that's a purely administrative function that the Clerk deals with, and I don't think that whether the docket stays open or not really matters for purposes of the appeal.

MR. SAYLER: Okay. Then the other question would be is everything that we're rolling out of this docket to next year, that just continues; is that correct?

MS. HELTON: I'm sorry, Mr. Sayler. Would you say that one more time? I'm not sure I understood what you said.

MR. SAYLER: Let me defer to my co-counsel.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: We've deferred a few issues for this year's docket relating -- and we have some issues that may impact into next year's docket with the stipulation and whether or not it will be resolved by the end of this year or roll into next year. I assume

until the 17th.

it'll be resolved by the end of this year, but we may have to have an updated risk management plan, and that may or may not get done by December 31st. So I guess for clarification, as long as that -- if it remains a live issue, will be rolled into next year's docket, then we can close it at the end of December 31st and open it until the 17th. That's really what we're asking.

MS. HELTON: Yeah, that's correct.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Okay. So that any live issues roll into next year's docket.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.

MS. JANJIC: So with those clarifications, can we reach a stipulation on 37? I don't see any objections.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I think everybody is nodding their head.

MS. JANJIC: Okay. Now, and lastly we have the contested issues, which are actually hedging issues, and they have been identified as 1C and 1D. They were proposed by FIPUG. Issue 1C reads, "What were the financial results for each IOU's natural gas hedging activities for 2015?" And 1D, also proposed by FIPUG, reads, "What were the financial results for each IOU's natural gas hedging activities for 2016 as of July 31st, 2016?"

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

1112

13

15

14

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: So what do we have to do with these two issues?

MS. JANJIC: It is up to your discretion to decide whether these should be included or excluded from the issues and open it up to discussion to the parties, if you prefer, wish.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: FIPUG.

MR. MOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the chance to bring this up with you.

By way of background, we've gone through all of the issues in this case. I think all of them have been resolved with the exception of the hedging issues. In the last couple of years, the hedging issues have been the primary focus of the fuel docket, and that's because FIPUG and OPC and other consumer groups think that hedging should cease and that it has not been a good deal for consumers. We've been getting -suffering big losses from the hedging activities. So as an issue, just like in the nuclear cost recovery docket, as a factual matter for information for you all and others who are looking to try to understand what's the deal, you had an issue to say when will the nuclear plant be built and how much will it cost? We would suggest that the issues that FIPUG proposes, which are, "What are the financial results of the hedging

activities for 2015?" and the corollary "What are the results for 2016?" are the same type of issues where you have an issue, so you have information that you

understand what the results were.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I'll point out that in this docket, you know, I could go through and flag all kinds of issues where it doesn't sound like people are necessarily having factual debates about, no, that's the wrong number. For example, you know, 28 under the generic capacity cost recovery factor issues, "What are the appropriate final capacity cost recovery true-up amounts for the period January 15th through December 15th?" mean, it's a very similar question where it asks a question, there's answers, and it lays it out. And the prehearing order is replete with those types of questions: What is this, what is that? And we think it's wholly appropriate to ask what are the results of the hedging? Because just like this generic capacity cost recovery factor issue, it's a pertinent number that goes into figuring out what the ratepayers have to pay. And so, therefore, we think it should be included as issues in this case for the purposes of clearly identifying it. And, you know, I don't know that there will be a dispute. You have the staff witnesses, staff audit witnesses. I presume they go in and look and come

up and say, "Here's kind of what we found," and they 1 have witnesses on hedging. So we think it should be 2 3 included, both those issues, which essentially are how much money was either made to the good for the 4 ratepayers or how much was to the bad for the ratepayers 5 in hedging for '15 and '16? That's what the two issues 6 7 ask for, and we would ask that they be included. It's not burdensome on the utilities. They can, you know, 8 provide that information and they should be included 9 10 respectfully.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Mr. Sayler.

MR. SAYLER: Thank you, Commissioner Graham.

The hedging losses are what they are. I don't think the utilities dispute the amounts, so this is potentially something that could be a stipulation that just gets placed to the back of the prehearing order as something that all the parties agree these are the actual amounts of the losses or gains for '15 and '16. And we don't need to litigate it because these numbers came directly from the discovery that the utility has provided to the Public Counsel's office and are in our testimony.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Commissioner Graham.

Very briefly, I agree with Mr. Moyle and with

Mr. Sayler. I think Mr. Sayler is completely correct

that if there's no dispute as to these numbers, they can
be included as a stipulation. In brief, I think

customers of Florida's investor-owned utilities have a

right to have their Public Service Commission make a

determination as to what these values are, good or bad.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Mr. Brew.

MR. BREW: First, as an administrative matter,
PCS's position on 1C and D should change from "No
position at this time" to "PCS agrees with the Office of
Public Counsel." I agreed with what the earlier
intervenor said, and I'm not going to elaborate on it.
I think it's an appropriate foundational issue for
Issues 1A and B.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Utilities, who wants to go first?

MR. BUTLER: Oh, why not?

Thank you, Commissioner Graham. Issues almost identical to these were raised and then excluded last year as unnecessary. I think they remain unnecessary. It's basically just evidence that would be presented in support of a party's position on primarily Issue 1A and perhaps other of the hedging-specific issues.

Mr. Moyle pointed to the many instances in which particular dollar amounts are determined by issues

in the, you know, fuel clause dockets, prehearing order, and that's right. But those issues, you know, determine dollars that actually then end up flowing into a determination of what the factors are that we collect, and that's very different here. These numbers are simply a sort of calculated position relative to what, you know, market prices were. It doesn't have anything to do with calculating what we recover from customers. So we don't think they're necessary, and we would urge you again this year to exclude them.

If you were to include them, I think that the idea that Mr. Sayler had presented of having them simply as a stipulation and noting them in the prehearing order would be better than having them as live issues because there's really nothing to discuss. I mean, the numbers are what they are. As he pointed out, they're something that is reported by each utility in the hedging activity reports twice a year. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Anyone else?

MR. BADDERS: I agree with Mr. Butler.

MR. BEASLEY: As do I.

MR. BERNIER: As do I.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Staff, comments.

MS. JANJIC: Can I have a minute, please?

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Sure.

1
Τ

(Pause.)

4	

MS. JANJIC: Okay. I think we have our answer. They are not necessary to set the factor, and if they want to stipulate it in, we're fine with that, the numbers themselves.

MR. MOYLE: If Mr. Butler is saying that we don't have to pay the money because they're not part of the factor, I think we'd be good with that.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Mary Anne.

MS. HELTON: Mr. Chairman, I would recommend that they be excluded as an issue from the prehearing order. They are not -- that information is not necessary to set the factors, as I understand it.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: So excluded but put it
in just as part of the -- just completely scratch it.

MS. HELTON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I understand that.

MR. BUTLER: And to be clear, that is our primary recommendation as well, that I don't think they're necessary.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Anybody else want to comment?

MR. SAYLER: Commissioner Graham, last year the posture of the case was different. Office of Public Counsel had factual testimony that disputed the actual

IX?

amounts of the hedging gains and losses on a year-to-year basis. This year we're not disputing that amount. We agree with the utility. That's why last year wasn't ripe for stipulation and why we wanted to litigate it, and this year, because we don't dispute it, we think it's ripe for stipulation. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I understand. For me, my position normally is I'm going to go with the staff recommendation unless for some reason I think that they are of error or wrong or I just disagree with them. So I'm going to go with the staff recommendation. We're just going to scratch Issue 1A and -- I'm sorry -- 1C and 1D.

Okay. So we're going to Section IX now?

MS. JANJIC: Correct.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay.

MS. JANJIC: With the exhibit list, staff will note that it has prepared a Comprehensive Exhibit List which includes all prefiled exhibits and exhibits staff wishes to introduce into the record. Staff will work with the parties and the Chairman if there are any objections to the Comprehensive Exhibit List or to any of the staff's exhibits being entered into the record.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Anything else on Section

MR. MOYLE: As was done in the rate case, staff was very helpful in putting together the list and the documents in advance of the hearing. I assume that would be done in this case as well. We'd have the exhibits and the list of the exhibits before the hearing.

MS. JANJIC: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I'm sure, yeah.

MR. SAYLER: And with regard to staff's hearing exhibits, will those be associated by witness to facilitate being able to review and be able to find grounds for stipulation?

MS. JANJIC: It is my understanding that it's witness and issue number.

MR. SAYLER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. Anybody else for Section IX?

Let's go on to X.

MS. JANJIC: Proposed stipulations. They are, that we just worked on, 24A, 35, 36, and 37. Any stipulations entered into at this prehearing conference will be listed. They will be listed as either Type 1, all parties agree, or Type 2, the utility agrees with staff's position and all other parties take no position. Staff will continue to work with all parties

to reach stipulations on the outstanding issues. A list 1 of stipulations entered into after the prehearing order 2 3 will be provided to all Commissioners prior to the hearing. 4 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Anybody else for Section 5 X? 6 7 Section XI, pending motions. MS. JANJIC: There are no pending motions at 8 9 this time. COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Section XII. 10 11 MS. JANJIC: Staff will note that the pending 12 confidentiality requests are listed in the draft 13 prehearing order and we are working on them. 14 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Section XIII, briefs. Are we providing briefs for this docket? 15 MR. MOYLE: I'd like to have the right to on 16 17 the hedging issues. **COMMISSIONER GRAHAM:** OPC? 18 19 MR. SAYLER: Yes, sir, we will brief the hedging issues. 20 21 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Anybody not planning on 22 briefing? 23 MR. BUTLER: We will, if those guys briefs. 2.4 (Laughter.) 25 MR. SAYLER: Ditto.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. So it looks like 1 2 we're briefing. 3 MS. JANJIC: If parties agree to waive briefs, the Commission may make a bench decision for this 4 5 portion of the docket. But due to the complexity of the natural gas hedging issues, staff recommends that the 6 7 post-hearing briefs be 40 pages. **COMMISSIONER GRAHAM:** Okay. I think everybody 8 9 agrees with that. MS. JANJIC: And briefs will be due 10 November 14th for the December 6th, 2016, agenda 11 12 conference. 13 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Okay. And as before, 14 opening statements are going to be three minutes. Briefs are 40 pages. Now I'll note that on every single 15 one of these dockets except for the 03, it was 40 pages. 16 17 That one was 20 pages. I just want to make sure that 18 was noted by everybody. Is there any other matters that 19 come in -- to come before us for this --20 MS. HELTON: Mr. Chairman, I hate to do this, 21 but I need to circle back to Mr. Butler with a comment 22 that he made about his supplemental testimony. 23 When we started out the discussion, my

testimony on the hedging issues with respect to the

understanding was that the reason for any supplemental

24

25

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

settlement that's going to be coming before you was the purpose behind that was to put before you an alternative risk management plan. And I think Mr. Butler later said that, no, maybe we don't need to do that. So I'm a little bit confused.

MR. BUTLER: Sorry for the confusion. definitely will be an alternative 2017 risk management plan. It's not clear. We still are trying to decide whether we need to do a revision to the current 2016 risk management plan. And right now the basic position refers to both. And if we decide we don't need to do something on the 2016 plan, we would just remove reference to it in the statement of basic position.

MS. HELTON: Okay. I'm sorry. I misunderstood that, and that brings me to my second point. I do think you should set a date certain for when that supplemental testimony is due so everybody knows when to expect it. I don't think that that did happen.

MR. BUTLER: It did not. And I would propose next Wednesday. I think we can definitely file it by then, if that's good for the Commission. But obviously we will accommodate whatever date it is that you direct us to file.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Staff?

MS. HELTON: If there are no objections from 1 the parties, that works for me. I just think it works 2 3 better to know when to expect it. **COMMISSIONER GRAHAM:** I understand that. Does 4 anybody have a concern with that supplemental plan 5 coming in by the end of business day Wednesday? 6 7 MR. SAYLER: No. When is the discovery cutoff in this docket? I don't remember. 8 9 MS. JANJIC: It has already passed. The 19th, I believe. October 19th, 2016. 10 11 MR. SAYLER: Thank you. 12 MR. MOYLE: So the discovery cutoff date is 13 the 19th, and that's the date Mr. Butler is going to 14 file his testimony? MS. JANJIC: No. October 19th was the 15 discovery date, October. We're in November. 16 17 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: No, we're in October. 18 MS. JANJIC: Oh, sorry. We are in October. 19 (Laughter.) 2.0 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: It was September. 21 MS. JANJIC: Sorry, guys. 22 MR. MOYLE: No, I guess back to the point, I 23 mean, if the supplemental testimony is coming in, I don't know what it's going to say. But we would like to 24 25 have the opportunity, if it presents questions or

issues, to, you know, ask some questions of Mr. Butler's
witness about it before the hearing so we're not, you
know, disadvantaged.

2.0

MR. BUTLER: We could agree to a short turnaround with something, you know, like a week for people to ask us questions and us to respond to them. I will reiterate that it is our intention for this testimony to simply present what the Commission would approve as a ministerial matter if it approves the proposed settlement agreement. Not to argue pro or con about terminating hedging, but if there, for some reason, was something to ask about that simple exercise, I think something like a week, with us having maybe a five-day turnaround time for responding to whatever discovery came in, we wouldn't object to that.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Mr. Moyle.

MR. MOYLE: No, I appreciate the opportunity.

I mean, as sometimes happens, you got to adapt and
adjust.

COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: No, I understand.

MR. MOYLE: So whether it's a, you know, quick deposition or however we want to do it. But I just don't know what the testimony is going to look like. If it's three sentences that says, "If the settlement is approved, we're going to do X," there's probably not

going to be a huge need. But I appreciate the chance to 1 2 have the due process rights to ask some questions after the testimony is filed. 3 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Understandable. Are we 4 5 good? 6 MR. BUTLER: Yes. 7 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Any other matters for the 01 docket? 8 9 Seeing none, I do apologize for the lateness of all this. That was not my plan, but I no longer 10 11 control the schedule of the council -- or the 12 Commission. You all travel safe, and I look forward to seeing you later this month or next month. 13 14 MS. JANJIC: And I will make the revisions and send them out to everyone. Thank you. 15 16 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: We're adjourned. 17 (Proceeding adjourned at 2:37 p.m.) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

	00004
1	STATE OF FLORIDA)
2	: CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 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 stated.
6	
7	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision;
8	and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.
9	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,
10	employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties'
11	attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.
12	DATED THIS 12th day of October, 2016.
13	
14	
15	LINDA BOLES
16	LINDA BOLES, CRR, RPR
17	FPSC Official Hearings Reporter (850) 413-6734
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
20	