1 BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 2 3 DOCKET NO. 120015-EI 4 In the Matter of: 5 PETITION FOR INCREASE IN RATES BY FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY. 6 7 8 9 PROCEEDINGS: PREHEARING CONFERENCE 10 COMMISSIONERS PARTICIPATING: COMMISSIONER RONALD A. BRISÉ PREHEARING OFFICER 11 Thursday, November 15, 2012 12 DATE: 13 TIME: Commenced at 1:05 p.m. Concluded at 1:40 p.m. 14 Betty Easley Conference Center PLACE: 15 Room 148 4075 Esplanade Way 16 Tallahassee, Florida 17 REPORTED BY: LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6734 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OCCUMENT NUMBER - TATE

1 APPEARANCES:

R. WADE LITCHFIELD, JOHN T. BUTLER, JORDAN A. WHITE, and MARIA J. MONCADA, ESQUIRES, Florida Power & Light Company, 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, Florida 33408, appearing on behalf of Florida Power & Light Company.

KENNETH L. WISEMAN, MARK F. SUNDBACK, LISA M.

PURDY, WILLIAM M. RAPPOLT, J. PETER RIPLEY, and

BLAKE R. URBAN, ESQUIRES, Andrews Kurth, LLP, 1350 I

Street NW, Suite 110, Washington, DC 20005, appearing on behalf of South Florida Hospital and Healthcare

Association.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL GREGORY FIKE, CHIEF; KAREN WHITE; and CAPTAIN SAMUEL MILLER, ESQUIRES, Utility Law Field Support Center, Air Force Legal Operations Agency, 139 Barnes Drive, Suite 1, Tyndall AFB, Florida 32403, appearing on behalf of the Federal Executive Agencies.

JON C. MOYLE, JR., and SERENA MOYLE,
ESQUIRES, Moyle Law Firm, P.A., 118 North Gadsden
Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, appearing on behalf
of Florida Power Users Group.

APPEARANCES (Continued)

ROBERT SCHEFFEL WRIGHT and JOHN T. LAVIA, III, ESQUIRES, Gardner, Bist, Wiener, Wadsworth, Bowden, Bush, Dee, LaVia & Wright Law Firm, P.A., 1300
Thomaswood Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32308, appearing on behalf of the Florida Retail Federation.

J. R. KELLY, PUBLIC COUNSEL; CHARLES J.

REHWINKEL; PATRICIA A. CHRISTENSEN; and JOSEPH A.

MCGLOTHLIN, ESQUIRES, Office of Public Counsel, c/o The

Florida Legislature, 111 West Madison Street, Room 812,

Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400, appearing on behalf of

the Citizens of the State of Florida.

WILLIAM C. GARDNER, ESQUIRE, Nabors, Giblin & Nickerson, P.A., 1500 Mahan Drive, Suite 200, Tallahassee, Florida 32308, appearing on behalf of the Village of Pinecrest.

THOMAS SAPORITO, 6701 Mallards Cove Road,

Apartment 28H, Jupiter, Florida 33458, appearing pro se.

JOHN W. HENDRICKS, 367 South Shore Drive,

Sarasota, Florida 34234, appearing pro se.

KEINO YOUNG, MARTHA CARTER BROWN, LARRY D.

HARRIS, and CAROLINE M. KLANCKE, ESQUIRES, Florida

Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard,

Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, appearing on behalf of
the Florida Public Service Commission (Staff).

APPEARANCES (Continued):

Service Commission.

CURT KISER, GENERAL COUNSEL, and MARY ANNE

HELTON, DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL, Florida Public Service

Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee,

Florida 32399-0850, Advisors to the Florida Public

1

PROCEEDINGS

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Good afternoon. Today is November 15th, 2012, it is 1:05, and this is a Prehearing Conference, Docket Number 120015-EI. we'll call this hearing to -- Prehearing Conference to order. Mr. Young, would you read the notice, please?

MR. YOUNG: Good afternoon. By notice issued on November 7th, 2012, by the Commission Clerk, this time and place has been set for a Prehearing Conference in Docket Number 120015-EI, petition for rate increase by Florida Power & Light.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you very much. At this time we'll take appearances. We'll start on my left going towards my right.

MR. LITCHFIELD: Thank you, Chairman Brisé. Wade Litchfield, John Butler, and Maria Moncada here on behalf Florida Power & Light Company.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL FIKE: Lieutenant Colonel Greg Fike for the Federal Executive Agencies. Also entering appearances for Ms. Karen White and Captain Sam Miller.

> CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay.

MS. MOYLE: Serena Moyle from Moyle law firm on behalf of FIPUG, and making an appearance for Jon

1	Moyle as well.
2	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay.
3	MR. WISEMAN: Kenneth Wiseman from Andrews
4	Kurth for the South Florida Hospital and Healthcare
5	Association. And I also would like to enter the
6	appearances of Mark Sundback, Lisa Purdy, Bill Rappolt,
7	Peter Ripley, and Blake Urban.
8	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay.
9	MR. HENDRICKS: Yes. John Hendricks appearing
10	pro se.
11	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you.
12	COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Bill Garner from Nabors,
13	Giblin & Nickerson appearing on behalf of the Village of
14	Pinecrest.
15	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right.
16	MR. SAPORITO: Thomas Saporito appearing pro
17	se.
18	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right.
19	MR. WRIGHT: Robert Scheffel Wright and
20	John T. Lavia, III, of the Gardner, Bist, Wiener law
21	firm, appearing on behalf of the Florida Retail
22	Federation. Thank you.
23	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you.
24	MR. REHWINKEL: Charles Rehwinkel appearing on
25	behalf of the citizens of the State of Florida. I also

would like to enter an appearance for Joe McGlothlin, 1 2 Patty Christensen, and J. R. Kelly. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you. 3 MR. YOUNG: Keino Young, Caroline Klancke, 4 Martha Carter Brown, and Larry Harris on behalf of 5 Commission staff. 6 7 MS. HELTON: And Mary Anne Helton, advisor to the Commission. I'd also like to make an appearance for 8 9 our General Counsel, Curt Kiser. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you. 10 we miss anyone in terms of appearances? Okay. 11 12 none. All right. 13 Are there any preliminary matters? MR. YOUNG: Yes, sir. Staff would note that 14 15 Algenol Biofuels has withdrawn from these proceedings. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Thank you. 16 MR. YOUNG: Also, staff has prepared a cover 17 sheet that can be used for exhibits at the hearing if a 18 party has not already prepared its cover sheet for an 19 2.0 exhibit, and that's the one page. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. I'm going to put 21 emphasis on the use of the cover sheet. It makes it a 22 lot easier for us to, to deal with it. It's more 23 efficient and effective for us if all the parties use a 24 25 cover sheet that looks like this. Okay?

1

Anything else, Mr. Young?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21 22

23

24

25

MR. YOUNG: Yes, sir. Staff recommends that if the, if the presiding officer wishes to hear oral arguments on any particular issue, said arguments be taken up during the issues and positions section of the Prehearing Conference.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you. if there, just to let you know, if there are any issues that, that require any oral argument, we'll limit those to five minutes apiece. Okay. I mean five minutes per side on, on the issue.

All right. I think we'll proceed through the draft Prehearing Order now. We'll sort of go through this by section, and I want the parties to let me know if there are any corrections or changes to be made. may go through this a bit quickly, so speak up if you have a change or any corrections that you need to have made.

Section I, case background.

Section II, conduct of proceedings.

Section III, jurisdiction.

MR. REHWINKEL: Commissioner, I, I don't know where the right place to say this, and I'm not going to do it at this procedural process, proceeding here, but I just wanted to advise the Commission that I will make

objections without arguments at the beginning of the 1 hearing on Monday, as I have done in several other of 2 the processes. It's -- I don't think it's unexpected. 3 I'm not objecting to this process here today but the 4 overall process, and I just wanted to alert the 5 Commission for planning. 6 7 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure. Understood. MR. YOUNG: I think Mr. Saporito has the same 8 9 objection. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Mr. Saporito? 10 MR. SAPORITO: That's correct, I do. 11

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. WRIGHT: Just to be clear, we do too.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Understood.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WRIGHT: But we won't burden the Commissioner with timely argument.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Understood. Understood. So those objections, if they're more appropriate for Monday, then you can go ahead and we'll deal with that on Monday. All right? Thank you.

And just for, for efficiency purposes, recognizing the posture where we're at and so forth, if you need to make the objection so that it's part of the record, you know, we understand that and we can move forward with the process as, as laid out.

MR. REHWINKEL: That's all my intent is to 1 2 state it. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: I'm just saying that for all 3 the parties to be clear on that. Okay? 4 So Section IV, procedure for handling 5 confidential information. 6 7 Okay. Section V, prefiled testimony and exhibits and witnesses. Staff? 8 9 MR. YOUNG: Staff recommends that witnesses' summaries be limited to no more than five minutes per 10 witness. If the witness has filed both direct and 11 rebuttal testimony, staff recommends that he or she 12 receive five minutes for direct and five minutes for 13 rebuttal. 14 If both direct and rebuttal testimonies are 15 taken up together, staff recommends that the witness be 16 given ten minutes total. 17 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you. 18 MR. REHWINKEL: Mr. Chairman, the Public 19 Counsel would ask that due to the unusual nature of this 2.0 proceeding and the limited number of witnesses, that 21 the, that our witnesses be allowed seven minutes instead 22 of five. 23 24 Most of the company witnesses, they will be either -- if taken, not taken together, they will have a 25

1	cumulative amount of ten, ten minutes together. And,
2	and we think that we, we can do with less than seven for
3	some, but we would, we would ask leave to be given
4	seven minutes for this unusual circumstance.
5	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. And you're suggesting
6	just for the OPC witnesses?
7	MR. REHWINKEL: Yes, sir.
8	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. All right. Any
9	comments, anybody else?
10	MR. LITCHFIELD: FPL really has no objection
11	to that. We're comfortable with five. We think five is
12	frankly sufficient. But if it's the Commission's will
13	that OPC be given additional minutes, we have no
14	objection.
15	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. I'm just trying to
16	make sure I understand the request properly. So for OPC
17	witnesses only
18	MR. REHWINKEL: Yes.
19	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: seven minutes would be
20	provided for
21	MR. REHWINKEL: Each.
22	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: for each. And are your
23	witnesses providing your witnesses are only providing
24	direct?
25	MR. REHWINKEL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. And so you're suggesting because your witnesses are only providing direct and not rebuttal, that they should be provided an additional two minutes.

MR. REHWINKEL: It's, it's really more -- this is going to be a rather compact hearing, and it's more the unusual nature, it's almost an ad hoc process that's been rather accelerated, testimony was prepared on a fairly short turnaround, and, and we believe that these circumstances would call for that.

We would not seek to use this as a precedent for future proceedings to say, well, you gave us seven minutes there, we'd like seven minutes in future proceedings. It's just because of the very unusual nature of this.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Understood.

MR. LITCHFIELD: Mr. Chairman, actually now I do have a question or a comment. I -- honestly, seven minutes in the case of some witnesses would be sufficient virtually to read through their entire prefiled direct testimony. But if that's what the Chairman would be inclined to do, we're not going to object. What we would object to, and now I'm a little concerned based on some things that I just heard from Mr. Rehwinkel, that, that his witnesses may be prepared

to go beyond the four corners of their prefiled direct 1 2 testimony. And that we --MR. REHWINKEL: Absolutely not. 3 MR. LITCHFIELD: -- that we would object to. 4 Okay. I just wanted to clarify that. 5 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. I'll just tell 6 7 you my, my general inclination and I'll, and I'll rule in a second. My general inclination would be if I were 8 9 to move that time frame to seven, I would do it across the board rather than just for one particular party. So 10 I think we're going to go ahead and keep it at the five 11 and just avoid that altogether. Okay. 12 13 MR. REHWINKEL: Thank you. 14

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Yes, Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say this is a multibillion dollar case.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Understood.

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WRIGHT: And even if you did it across the board, you're talking about adding maybe 30 minutes to the totality. If you gave all the FPL witnesses, you know, seven minutes apiece for each testimony, they'd have 14. If you gave Mr. Hendricks seven minutes and if you gave OPC's four witnesses two extra minutes, that's eight minutes, two for Hendricks and whatever it is. Frankly, I think an extra half hour at the outside for

y'all to hear from, from witnesses in a, in a
multibillion dollar case is a reasonable request. But
your call, of course.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you.

All right. Order of witnesses.

2.0

MR. YOUNG: Staff would note that FIPUG and South Florida Hospital requests that each of their respective witnesses' direct and rebuttal testimony be taken up together.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Any objections to that?

MR. REHWINKEL: Public Counsel doesn't object.

We would assume that -- are these to be taken up in the,

at the rebuttal time frame?

MR. WISEMAN: Mr. Chairman? No, the order of the witnesses is set forth -- we intend to present them in the order set forth in the Prehearing Order. So as it's currently structured, Mr. Pollock would come up number four, Mr. Kollen would come up number six. And so it would be in the, in the direct phase, if you will, of the cross-examination.

And I don't know if this is the appropriate time to raise it, you may want to have this taken up separately, at a separate time, but I also had an inquiry about the extent to which any party intended to

1	cross-examine Mr. Kollen and some timing issues of when
2	they would expect to get to him just so we, so we can
3	make appropriate travel arrangements.
4	MR. REHWINKEL: The reason I asked is that
5	there was an e-mail sent out about Mr. Pollock's
6	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Right.
7	MR. REHWINKEL: ability to not be here
8	sooner, and I was willing to agree to have him go kind
9	of in his rebuttal slot and do those two pieces of
10	testimony together so there would be no issue about it.
11	But that was kind of what my thinking was along that
12	line.
13	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure. FIPUG?
14	MS. MOYLE: It's my understanding that he's
15	just going to go at the time that he gets here. He'll
16	remain in the same order that is through the prefiled
17	testimony, and he's going to have his direct and
18	rebuttal together, if that's okay.
19	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: So you're suggesting that he
20	would just go at the time that he gets here?
21	MR. LITCHFIELD: And, Mr. Chairman
22	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Let's say we get to him
23	before, before that time.
24	MS. MOYLE: Then we ask if we can just slip
25	him in at the time that he does get here in the direct

listing.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Mr. Rehwinkel.

MR. REHWINKEL: Well, I have a problem with Mr. Pous. He can be here -- he'll be traveling from Montana on Monday.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure.

MR. REHWINKEL: And he's available any time after the start of business on Tuesday. So I just thought it would be rational for, if Mr. Pollock had travel constraints, to be taken up in his rebuttal slot with those two pieces of testimony taken together. But I really don't care where he does it together, just I think it could be awkward to just put him in whenever he got here.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Right.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Yes, Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: We don't care, except that we would sure like to know today preferably how it's going to work, you know. And I would just --

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure. You'll get that today.

MR. WRIGHT: I would offer that we would have no problem with, with Jeff going during the pro-settlement parties' direct, even if he comes not fourth, but, let's say, sixth after Mr. Forrest or

somebody on Monday. But all we need to know is is he going to testify before the OPC witnesses.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Right. Understood.

Understood.

I think that if that is the sentiment as well, I think I agree with that. If he is testifying for the pro-settlement side, I think if we could put him in as time becomes available, then we will do so. Okay? Does that, does that work for everybody? Okay. I see heads nodding yes, so I think that works.

MR. WISEMAN: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Yes, sir.

MR. WISEMAN: That works for me as well. But I just, on that question, I still have the question regarding timing, whether the parties opposing the settlement think that they are -- if they could give us some estimate of the cross that they have for these witnesses, it would allow us to better determine when Mr. Pollock will likely take the stand, when Mr. Kollen would take the stand, if at all. We've got -- and they just mentioned that I think Mr. Pous wouldn't be available until Tuesday morning. I don't see that as a -- I don't see that as a problem. I assume we wouldn't get to Mr. Pous until Tuesday at the earliest. But I don't know, maybe -- I mean, obviously the parties

opposing the settlement have a much better idea of how 1 much cross they intend for these witnesses, and at some 2 point in this, during this Prehearing Conference I'd 3 like to explore that. 4 MR. REHWINKEL: I can, I can kind of cut to 5 the chase on that. 6 7 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure. MR. REHWINKEL: We have cross for all the 8 9 witnesses and I don't know that we have an estimate. And I just -- we're not in that position today. 10 won't be before the end of this session. 11

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Understood.

Colonel.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

follow-up to that, I guess. I was going to propose or request that -- FEA has one witness, Mr. Ryan Allen, four and a half pages of direct testimony in a very limited matter regarding the impact to Patrick Air Force Base in Cape Canaveral of the utility rates. I was going to request if there were not any questions for him, that he would be excused and his testimony would be offered into the case as though read. You know, but I just didn't know if anybody had any questions for him and maybe that would just answer it for me.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Well, I think we'll

get to, to excusing witnesses. 1 MR. YOUNG: That's next. 2 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. 3 MR. REHWINKEL: We have questions for him, so 4 that's a moot point. 5 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. There will be 6 7 questions for him, so. LIEUTENANT COLONEL FIKE: All right. 8 9 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. On, on, on this issue of the timing, I think all witnesses need to be 10 prepared to, to be here, and for the, at least for maybe 11 a day after they're up. So if, if the assumption is 12 13 that a witness would be timed to be up on Monday, then they need to be prepared to be here on Tuesday as well 14 so that --15 MR. LITCHFIELD: Until kickoff on Thursday; 16 17 right? CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Until what? 18 19 MR. LITCHFIELD: Kickoff on Thursday. CHAIRMAN BRISE: Hopefully not. But they need 2.0 to be prepared for at least the next day. And I think 21 22 that that at least covers that, Mr. Wiseman. MR. WISEMAN: My, my concern was not so much 23 with them staying over in the event that we don't get to 24 25 them. My concern was more at the front end. But I

wouldn't want to have them travel needlessly on a day 1 2 when they're simply not, we won't get to them. know, we've worked with all the parties cooperatively in 3 the past to try to schedule witnesses to give us some 4 idea and that's all I was trying to find out. 5 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure. Sure. And you all can 6 7 do that. You all can do that on your own. We're not going to -- I'm not going to get involved in, in trying 8 9 to micromanage that. 10 MR. WISEMAN: That's -- thank you. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. So --11 MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, just to clarify, the 12 13 witnesses, FIPUG, FIPUG and South Florida Hospital's direct and rebuttal will be taken up together. 14 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Yes. Okay. Are we done with 15 order of witnesses? I believe so. 16 17 Moving on to basic positions. Okay. Any changes to basic positions? 18 19 All right. Issues and positions. I will go 2.0 through the issues. If there are any issues within the section that I wish to hear oral argument about, I will 21 ask for oral argument. Otherwise, I just want to know 22 whether there are any changes to your position. 23 24 Staff, anything that you need to --25 MR. YOUNG: Yes, sir. Staff would note that

Mr. Saporito has proposed a new issue, Issue 6. The issue states: Is the settlement agreement which increases the customer late fee amount in the public interest?

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. All right.
Mr. Saporito.

2.0

MR. SAPORITO: I have no objection to that.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. That's fair. That's fair that you wouldn't have an objection to your own issue. That's good. That's a good place to start.

Does anyone else have any objections to, to that particular issue?

MR. LITCHFIELD: Mr. Chairman, we do in the respect that we thought that everyone had been very clear with regard to the issues that were going to be specifically addressed for purposes of resolving this settlement agreement. And as I recall, in fact, Mr. Saporito pitched this issue during that debate and the Commission decided at that time not to include it. It is an element of the settlement agreement. I think our impression at the time was that, that staff and the Commission and others felt that the issue and the record evidence in the first phase of the technical proceeding was adequate and/or the discovery that had, had been

1 asl

asked was adequate. So that's, that's my only concern is that if we let this issue in, are we then going to identify a seventh and an eighth and an 18th?

But it is an issue in the settlement agreement. We would defer to the Commission, recommendation of staff as to whether it deserves at this point a separate standalone issue. We do have a little bit of incremental testimony on it. I would note that in fairness.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you.
Mr. Saporito.

MR. SAPORITO: Mr. Chairman, the attorney for FPL is certainly correct; it's, it's definitely a part, a distinct part of the settlement agreement. It affects a significant amount of revenue for the company, and I think it should be a standalone issue because I don't feel it was sufficiently addressed in the original rate case. And now we're having a -- I guess this is a supplemental rate case where there's going to be witness testimony as to the terms and conditions of this proposed settlement and it's part of that settlement agreement. I think that issue needs to be addressed at this, at this time going forward.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you. I agree with you, it's an important issue, but I think it

falls under the umbrella of public interest. Okay? And so I think that it can be addressed through that issue, so my ruling is that it's subsumed in that issue.

MR. SAPORITO: All right. Mr. Chairman, I just want to go on the record with a strenuous objection.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure.

2.0

MR. SAPORITO: Because all these issues are under that umbrella, every single issue that's in this Prehearing Order.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you. Duly noted.

Section IX, exhibit list.

MR. YOUNG: Staff would note for the record that it's prepared a Comprehensive Exhibit List that consists of all prefiled exhibits for the purpose of numbering, identifying the exhibits at the hearing.

Staff has provided the exhibit list to the parties along with a CD. Staff has prepared a proposed stipulated exhibit list, which was provided to the parties in advance of the hearing. An additional stipulated exhibit list containing discovery responses may be added during the course of the hearing, if the parties agree.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. All right. So we can move on to the next issue. Are there issues with the

exhibit list? 1 All right. Section X, proposed stipulation. 2 MR. YOUNG: Staff is not aware of any proposed 3 stipulations at this time. 4 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Are there any proposed 5 stipulations at this time? All right. Seeing none. 6 7 Section XI, pending motions. MR. YOUNG: Staff is not aware of any other 8 pending motion at this time. 9 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Section XII, pending 10 confidentiality motions. 11 There are two pending 12 MR. YOUNG: Yes. motions for temporary protective order and three pending 13 motions for intent to seek confidential treatment, which 14 will be addressed by separate order. 15 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Right. We're going to 16 17 address those issues separately. Okay? MR. LITCHFIELD: Mr. Chairman, we -- it's come 18 to my attention that the Prehearing Order did not pick 19 up a couple of changes that, that FPL had submitted 2.0 relative to a description of the, the exhibits offered 21 22 by a couple of its witnesses. And if it's appropriate, we could go through those at this time. 23 24 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. All right. What was 25 not picked up?

MR. LITCHFIELD: On Mr. Barrett's testimony, 1 2 this would be in, we're back in Section IX on page 33, Mr. Barrett's testimony, his Exhibit REB-13 would be --3 it's now page 32. I'm sorry. Striking ROE calculation 4 reflecting proposed settlement agreement and inserting 5 instead expanded OPC Witness Ramas' Exhibit DR-8-6 7 adjusted earned ROE for REB-14, adding in the third line to the existing description the term, the words 8 9 "excluding new generation." And then a little bit further down the page 10 with regard to Mr. Dewhurst's exhibit MD-11, adding a 11 left parentheses in front of the last word there, 12 "note," and it would read Exhibits A and B to proposed 13 settlement agreement cosponsored by FPL Witness Renae 14 15 Deaton, close paren. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Is there anything 16 17 else? MR. LITCHFIELD: No, sir. 18 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Mr. Rehwinkel. 19 2.0 MR. REHWINKEL: I was just wondering, what we're talking about here is just making sure the order 21 22 reflects the way he presented his exhibits? MR. LITCHFIELD: Right. 23 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: That's correct. 24 25 Okay. All right. Back to Section XII, we've

dealt with the, the idea of the pending confidentiality 1 There's some outstanding motions that we're 2 motions. going to deal with by separate order. 3 Post-hearing procedures. 4 MR. REHWINKEL: Mr. Chairman, the Public 5 Counsel would ask that again since there are only five 6 7 issues, that the 75-word position statement be, that we be allowed to use 180 for that. It didn't seem to 8 9 present a problem in the prior part of the case. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: 180? 10 MR. REHWINKEL: Just for the position 11 statement, yes. I think we were given seven to select 12 13 in the last round, but we only have five total here. It doesn't seem like that would add a lot of length to the, 14 15 to the process. MR. YOUNG: No objection from staff. 16 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. All right. Staff has 17 to really go through it. So, yeah, we'll accommodate on 18 19 that. 2.0 Okay. Mr. Young, any --MR. YOUNG: With that, Mr. Chairman, 21 post-hearing positions will be limited to 180 words. 22 Also, staff recommends that post-hearing briefs be 23 24 limited to 40 pages. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. All right. 25 Section

2.0

XIV.

MR. REHWINKEL: Mr. Chairman, the, we would

ask that the Public Counsel be allocated 15 minutes for

our presentation. I don't know -- it says ten minutes

per side. I don't know if that's the pro and the con

and the expectation is that all of us share just ten

minutes.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Yes, that's the expectation. It would be that each side share ten minutes. So the pro side shares ten. So if they split it 2.5 minutes per, per, per entity, and on the opposing side the same thing.

What I, what I -- I gave that some thought, and we'll make it 20 minutes per side and the sides will determine how to manage that time. Okay?

MR. REHWINKEL: Assuming we can work things out the way we did last time, because I think we have four witnesses and I think we have the lion's share of the conversation to have on that.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Understood. And that is -you will manage that with, with, with your side. Okay?
So we'll work that -- you all will work that out. Okay?
So that one I can accommodate you on.

Mr. Young.

MR. YOUNG: With that, 20 minutes per side. A

summary of each position on each issue shall generally be limited to no more than 180 words. If a party has, if a party's position has not changed since the issuance of the Prehearing Order, the post-hearing statements may simply restate the prehearing position.

2.0

However, if the prehearing position is longer than 180 words, it must be reduced to no more than 180. If a party has failed to file post-hearing briefs, statements of that party shall be waived on all issues and may be dismissed from the proceeding. Staff notes that the failure of a party to adhere to the word limitation will result in a reduction of the words in their post -- in their, in their position statements to the first 180 words.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you. Any other matters?

MR. REHWINKEL: Mr. Chairman, there were two additional matters that Public Counsel would like to raise. I don't think there is any controversy about the first one that I would like to raise, and this would be -- I think as a corollary to the friendly cross prohibition, because of the posture of this case, I think that even though there are joint signatories that kind of have a side, that each party, individual party should be responsible for redirect of their witness and

that there would be no additional -- there absolutely should be no cross-examination or questioning from any attorney on the signatory side other than by the attorney for that witness. And I don't think that's --

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: On redirect.

2.0

MR. REHWINKEL: Yes, on redirect.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Yeah. I think we, we did that in the, in the last part of the hearing.

MR. REHWINKEL: That was a little muddled because of the -- yes, but I agree. And I think that process should, should carry over here.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Sure.

MR. REHWINKEL: The other is -- and this is not related to the witness summaries -- Mr. Pollock filed some corrections to his testimony and there was two types of corrections: Ones that, that kind of fix some numbering issues that was ministerial, and there was a correction made on his rebuttal that amended an exhibit to his direct, JP, what's now numbered JP-15. And we would ask that Witness Ramas, who did not have an opportunity to file testimony in response to that amended exhibit of the direct testimony, be allowed a very brief opportunity to address that on the stand.

I'm not even sure she's going to need to do that, but we would like to put the Commission on note that we may ask

for that at the time that she comes on to the stand. 1 don't know that it necessarily has to be taken care of 2 right here. We would be glad to advise the staff and 3 the parties if we intend to ask for that leave prior to 4 the beginning of the hearing. 5 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. So in essence what 6 7 you're saying is that you will ask -- if that is the inclination, that you would ask for Witness Ramas to 8 9 address Exhibit J-13. MR. REHWINKEL: JP-15. 10 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: JP-13. 11 MR. REHWINKEL: 15. 12 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: 15. 13 MR. REHWINKEL: It's what's now 15. 14 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. 15 MR. REHWINKEL: Yeah. 16 MR. LITCHFIELD: And, Mr. Chairman, I, then I 17 assume that we would simply reserve our objections for 18 now until Public Counsel decides whether that's 19 2.0 something they would like to request. MR. REHWINKEL: Yeah. 21 22 MR. LITCHFIELD: Okay. MR. REHWINKEL: Yeah. I don't think we need 23 24 to go and spin our wheels if we're not ultimately going 25 to do that.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Perfect. 1 Thank 2 you for, for the heads-up. Okay. Anything else in other matters? 3 MR. SAPORITO: Mr. Chairman. 4 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Mr. Saporito, sorry. Go 5 ahead. 6 7 MR. SAPORITO: That's all right. Yes, I want to take this opportunity to exercise my right under the 8 9 rules to engage the full panel members on the new, introduction of the new issue in this matter. 10 And the second point I wanted to put on the 11 record is I strenuously object to all the exhibits 12 introduced by staff into this proceeding on the grounds 13 that I don't consider this proceeding to be legal, and I 14 would like to have that as a standing objection going 15 forward. 16 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Understood. Thank you. 17 So on Monday you can, you can address the, the 18 19 full panel on that issue. Okay. All right. Are there anything -- are there 2.0 any other things on other matters? 21 22 All right. Mr. Young. MR. YOUNG: Staff would request that to the 23 extent the parties' positions change or are added due to 24 discussion at this Prehearing Conference, that they 25

provide any such changes by 10:00 a.m. tomorrow, Friday, November 16th, 2012, with no exceptions or extensions. This is necessary for the Prehearing Order to be completed before the hearing. MR. REHWINKEL: Mr. Chairman, to the extent that Mr. Saporito's issue is accepted by the full Commission, our position would be no. I just want to state that for the record. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Understood. Thank you. All right. Seeing no additional issues, thank you for your participation today. We stand adjourned. (Proceeding adjourned at 1:40 p.m.)

1	STATE OF FLORIDA) : CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	COUNTY OF LEON)
3	
4	I, LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR, Official Commission Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing
5	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	attorneys or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.
12	DATED THIS day of November, 2012.
13	<u> </u>
14	
15	Sinda Bolos
16	LINDA BOLES, RPR, CRR FPSC Official Commission Reporter
17	(850) 413-6734
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	