I		DOCUMENT NO. 05955-13 FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK 000001
1		BEFORE THE
	FLORIDA	PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2		
3	In the Matter c	f: DOCKET NO. 130009-EI
4	NUCLEAR COST RE	COVERY CLAUSE.
5		/
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12	PROCEEDINGS:	SPECIAL AGENDA
13	COMMISSIONERS	CHAIRMAN RONALD A. BRISÉ COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR COMMISSIONER ART GRAHAM
14	PARTICIPATING:	
15		COMMISSIONER EDUARDO E. BALBIS COMMISSIONER JULIE I. BROWN
16	DATE:	Tuesday, October 1, 2013
17		-
18	TIME:	Commenced at 9:30 a.m. Concluded at 9:53 a.m.
19	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148
20		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida
21		
22	REPORTED BY:	JANE FAUROT, RPR Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6732
23		(050) 415-0752
24		
25		
		FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

PROCEEDINGS CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Good morning. Today is October 1, 2013, and we are going to call this special agenda to order. Unlike our counterparts, we are still in business today. All right. So with that, I'm going to see if we have any preliminary matters. Mr. Lawson? MR. LAWSON: No preliminary matters. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. All right. We have about -- we have a few issues to take up today, I think 14 of them. And so I'm going to ask Ms. Lewis to walk us through some of those things at this point. MS. LEWIS: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, Chairman and Commissioners. Kathy Lewis with Commission staff. Today's item is staff's post-hearing recommendation in Docket 130009, the nuclear

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

cost-recovery proceeding. This docket addresses petitions filed by Duke Energy Florida and Florida Power and Light for the recovery of costs related to nuclear construction projects pursuant to Section 366.93, Florida Statutes.

As described in the case background, Duke Energy filed a petition for deferral of all Duke

issues in this docket. It was supported by the Office of Public Counsel and other intervenors. The Commission approved the motion at hearing on August the 5th. Consequently, the recommendation before you today does not address the Duke issues.

The Commission also approved a stipulation among the parties on some of the FPL issues. This resulted in a more streamlined hearing where parties briefed only those issues they disputed. In addition, the legal issues, Issues 1 through 3, were rendered moot by the stipulation, so staff's recommendation begins with Issue 4.

Depending on your preference, staff is ready to answer your questions or to proceed with our presentation of the recommendation now.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Thank you.

For ease, we have grouped some of these issues together. And so, therefore, unless there are questions, and I'm looking around to see if there are any questions, if there are no particular questions in advance, we are going to go ahead and go through the items as grouped, and you may proceed with the presentation.

4 **MS. LEWIS:** Thank you, Chairman. I'll 5 begin with Issue 4.

000004 Issue 4 addresses whether FPL's 2012 1 licensing and permitting activities qualify for 2 cost-recovery under the statute. SACE was the only 3 party to contest this issue. They did not file 4 testimony, but argued in their brief that because 5 FPL had not made a final decision to construct that 6 7 they should not be entitled to cost-recovery. Staff's recommendation is based on the hearing 8 record and on the Commission's 2011 order which set 9 the standard of review and which was affirmed by 10 this year's Supreme Court decision. 11 Staff is recommending that the Commission 12 find FPL's activities since January of 2012 do 13 qualify for cost-recovery pursuant to the statute. 14 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. 15 Commissioners, any questions or comments 16 on Issue Number 4? 17 Commissioner Brown. 18 COMMISSIONER BROWN: 19 Thank you, Mr. 20 Chairman. This is a question for Legal. I want to just acknowledge that I welcome 21 2.2 SACE's participation in our proceedings, and I appreciate their advocacy and their position. 23 Acknowledging that, though, looking at this year's 24 25 filing with respect to this issue, that I understand

this is a similar argument that they raised in the last year's NCRC proceeding that was addressed by the Supreme Court, is there anything in this year's filing with respect to this issue that gives rise to additional merit to SACE's arguments here?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LAWSON: We're not aware of anything that was in the record that would -- that would have contributed to SACE's argument this year. We believe that the 2011 order, coupled with the Supreme Court decision, gives us the finality needed to make the decision in this case. And there was no testimony, none of the discovery requests uncovered any information or facts or evidence that would suggest otherwise.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Lawson.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Any further questions or comments on Issue Number 4?

Okay. Commissioner Edgar.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

To follow along that line, I would just say, having reviewed the information and met with staff, I do believe that the argument advocated by SACE on this issue at hearing was the same argument

000006 that did not prevail at the Supreme Court. 1 I do believe that from the evidence in the 2 record that the activities before us under this 3 issue are appropriate under the very clear language 4 5 of the statute, and I would move approval of Issue Number 4. 6 7 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Second. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. It has been moved 8 9 and seconded. Any further comments? 10 All right. Seeing none, all in favor say 11 12 aye. (Vote taken.) 13 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you 14 very much. 15 Moving on to Items 5, 5A, and 5B. 16 MR. GARL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 17 Commissioners, I'm Steve Garl with 18 19 Commission staff. I will be introducing Issues 5, 20 5A, and 5B. Issue 5 is the review of FPL's analysis of 21 22 the feasibility of completing the Turkey Point 6 and 23 7 project. The evidence demonstrated that FPL fully 24 considered the economic, regulatory, technical, 25 funding, and joint ownership considerations

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

impacting the feasibility of the project.

In addition, fuel diversity, reliability, renewables, and conservation considerations provided support for continuation of the Turkey Point project. While continuing uncertainty exists in many areas, staff recommends that the Commission accept FPL's analysis and find that completion of the Turkey Point 6 and 7 project appears feasible at this time.

Issues 5A and 5B are informational issues on the cost and in-service dates respectively. Both topics are addressed in Issue 5. Staff recommends that the Commission should accept FPL's cost estimate and projected in-service dates.

> **CHAIRMAN BRISÉ:** Thank you. Commissioners, questions? Commissioner Balbis.

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a few comments on this issue.

Obviously, the long-term feasibility of these projects is an important issue and that it is always discussed, and it was thoroughly discussed and examined and cross-examined during the hearing. Additionally, the Legislature, with Senate Bill 1472, provided additional protections for customers

in that prior to commencing construction that the utilities have to come before us before engaging in those expensive activities.

The long-term feasibility shows that customers will save \$78 billion over the life of the project, and they also assumed additional demand-side management plans of 100 megawatts, which is on par with their current demand-side management programs, so they are essentially doubling it. And even with that, customers are getting that savings.

So I'm glad to see that Florida Power and Light is proceeding with this project, because one of the things we have to consider is fuel diversity. And with recent actions by President Obama basically eliminating any future coal plants, nuclear is our only other baseload generation option other than natural gas. So I'm glad to see this project is cost-effective, and we still have protections in place for us to decide whether or not to move forward.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you, Commissioner Balbis.

Commissioner Brown.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

25

And I agree with a lot of the comments Commissioner Balbis said. I appreciate the company's step-wise approach to pursuing the combined operating license for TP 6 and 7, while also controlling the cost risks. I think this is a very important project for a lot of the reasons that Commissioner Balbis said, and I think the record evidence shows that it still remains to be cost-effective.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

000009

But with that said, based on the record, I was trying to find when Florida Power and Light is expected to receive the combined operating license from NRC. Is it 2015?

MR. GARL: Yes, Commissioner, that's what's projected at the moment.

COMMISSIONER BROWN: With the looming federal government shutdown and the somewhat uncertainty of the NRC, what happens if the NRC, if their review schedule comes out and it pushes out the dates even further? How far does that affect, I guess, the cost-effectiveness of the project?

MR. GARL: One of staff's informational requests to FPL during the discovery portion of this proceeding was to tell us what the cost-effectiveness numbers would look like if the

000010 in-service dates were extended five or ten years. 1 There was basically no difference. It still showed 2 cost-effective, even delaying that long. So I 3 wouldn't anticipate that the government shutdown was 4 going to last five years, even five weeks might be a 5 stretch. 6 7 COMMISSIONER BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Garl. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. 8 9 Any further questions or comments on Items 5, 5A, and 5B? 10 Okay. Commissioner Balbis. 11 12 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 13 For the reasons that I stated and the 14 information in the record and staff's 15 recommendation, I move approval of staff's 16 recommendation for Issue 5, and also 5A and 5B, 17 which are essentially fallout issues. 18 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Is there a 19 20 second? 21 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Second. 22 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. It has been moved 23 and seconded. 24 Any further comments? 25 Okay. Seeing none, all in favor say aye.

(Vote taken.) 1 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you 2 very much. 3 Moving on to Item Number 6. 4 MR. LAUX: Commissioners, Issue 6 is 5 similar to Issue 5A and 5B in that it's a factual 6 7 issue identifying the actual and estimated jurisdictional costs for project activities related 8 9 to obtaining an NRC combined operating license for Turkey Point 6 and 7. The amounts for these 10 activities are presented in staff's recommendation 11 for the years 2013 and 2014. 12 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. 13 Commissioners? 14 Commissioner Balbis. 15 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you. Just a 16 17 question for staff. 18 You know, I mentioned it previously, Senate Bill 1472, and one of the other provisions of 19 it was that companies can only recover costs 20 associated with obtaining the license or license 21 22 activities. And I just want to confirm that this 23 issue and other issues throughout this docket, 24 Florida Power and Light will only be collecting

dollars associated with those activities.

25

i	n de la constante de	
		000012
1	MR. LAUX: That's correct.	
2	COMMISSIONER BALBIS: That's the only	
3	question I had.	
4	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Any further	
5	questions or comments on Issue Number 6?	
6	COMMISSIONER BROWN: Move staff on Issue	
7	6.	
8	COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Second.	
9	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. It has been moved	
10	and seconded.	
11	Any further comments?	
12	Okay. Seeing none, all in favor say aye.	
13	(Vote taken.)	
14	CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you.	
15	Moving on to Issue Number 7.	
16	MR. BREMAN: Commissioners, I'm Jim	
17	Breman. I'll be addressing Issues 7 through 10,	
18	which are FPL's remaining issues addressing the	
19	Turkey Point 6 and 7 project.	
20	In Issue 7 you are being asked to find	
21	whether or not FPL was prudent regarding its 2012	
22	management of the Turkey Point 6 and 7 project.	
23	Staff did its review of the record and filed	
24	testimony. There was no testimony opposing FPL's	
25	assertion that it prudently managed the project.	

Staff recommends approval.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Any questions or comments on Issues 7 through 10?

Commissioner Balbis.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you. Just one quick comment.

I noted that in these issues the only party that questioned the dollars associated with it was SACE. And, again, they seemed to refer back to their previous argument that these activities were not associated with the siting, design, licensing, and construction which, as Commissioner Brown indicated, our decision last year was affirmed by the Supreme Court.

So with that, I move approval of staff's recommendation on Issues 7, 8, 9, and 10, if appropriate.

COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Second.

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. It has been moved and seconded.

Any further discussion?

All right. Seeing none, all in favor say aye.

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Thank you.

Moving on to Issue Number 13. 1 MR. BREMAN: Thank you, Commissioner. 2 Issue 13 is you're asking -- you're being 3 asked to make a similar finding, but this time with 4 respect to FPL's Uprate project. Staff reviewed the 5 record and finds that there is no evidence that FPL 6 7 imprudently managed the project. Staff recommends approving FPL's requested amounts as modified by 8 9 their errata. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Thank you very 10 11 much. Any questions or comments on Issue 13? 12 Commissioner Balbis. 13 14 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. 15 Chairman. And this is something -- these issues and 16 17 the topics associated with them is something that I 18 know we looked at closely during the hearing. There 19 were concerns brought up the year before that there 20 may be issues associated with FPL's management of their contractor. I personally, and I know others 21 22 cross-examined FPL's witness as to what actions they took to deal with that, and FPL got additional 23 concessions, I believe up to \$80 million from the 24 25 contractor. The delegation of the work to other

000015 subcontractors did not cost the customers any 1 additional money. So I think FPL acted prudently in 2 managing this very difficult project, so I fully 3 support staff's recommendation on this issue. 4 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you, 5 Commissioner Balbis. 6 7 Any further questions on Item Number 13? Commissioner Balbis. 8 9 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move approval of staff's recommendation 10 on Issue 13. 11 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: Second. 12 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. It has been moved 13 and seconded. 14 Any further discussion? 15 Okay. Seeing none, all in favor. 16 17 (Vote taken.) CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you 18 19 very much. Moving on to Item Numbers 14, 15, and 16. 20 MR. BREMAN: Commissioners, that would be 21 22 Jim Breman again, myself. These issues address FPL's EPU project for the period 2012, 2013, and 23 24 2014. Now that we have dispensed with the prudence 25 issue, we can now address the actual fallout costs

000016 for 2012 and whether or not there is any 1 2 consequences in the subsequent issues. And consistent with staff's recommendation and your 3 approval of Issue 13, staff recommends that you 4 5 approve these three issues. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. 6 7 Commissioner Graham. COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I move approval of 8 9 14, 15, and 16. COMMISSIONER BROWN: Second. 10 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. It has been moved 11 and seconded. 12 Any further discussion? 13 All right. Seeing none, all in favor say 14 15 aye. (Vote taken.) 16 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. By your motion you 17 have approved Issues 14, 15, and 16. 18 Moving on to Issue Number 17. 19 MR. BREMAN: The final issue is the 20 21 wrap-up issue where we add up all the decisions that 22 you did in the prior issues. This also is where we 23 address the change, the statutory change to the 24 current AFUDC rate, and we show those items on the 25 table on Page 62.

000017 All right. Thank you. Any questions or 1 comments on Issue 17? 2 Commissioner Balbis. 3 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Thank you. 4 A question for staff. Looking at Table 5 17-1 on Page 68. 6 7 MR. BREMAN: 68. Sorry about that. COMMISSIONER BALBIS: And I don't know how 8 9 easy this will be to separate, but the costs associated with continuing to obtain the combined 10 operating license, how much will the rate impact be 11 for a residential customer using a thousand kilowatt 12 hours? 13 MR. BREMAN: If I understand the question, 14 I think it's what the company asked for this year, 15 it's 46 cents. 16 COMMISSIONER BALBIS: Okay. Thank you. 17 That's all I have. 18 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. Thank you. 19 Commissioner Graham. 20 21 COMMISSIONER GRAHAM: I move approval. 22 CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: Okay. It has been moved 23 and seconded. 24 Any further discussion? 25 Seeing none, all in favor? FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

000	01	8
-----	----	---

1 (Vote taken.) CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you. 2 By your motion you have approved Issue Number 17. 3 That concludes our discussion of the 4 individual issues. 5 Commissioners, do you have any additional 6 7 questions or comments? Staff, are there any other items that we 8 9 need to take up at this time? MR. LAWSON: No, I believe we are 10 11 complete. CHAIRMAN BRISÉ: All right. Thank you 12 very much. And thank you for your hard work on 13 this. We know that this is a lot of work to get to 14 15 this point. I also want to thank our Prehearing 16 17 Officer, again, for the work that was done prior to the hearing that eventually gets us to this point. 18 So with that, we stand adjourned. 19 (The Special Agenda concluded at 20 21 9:53 a.m.) 22 23 24 25 FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1	000019			
1				
2	STATE OF FLORIDA)			
3	: CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER			
4	COUNTY OF LEON)			
5				
6	I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, Hearing Reporter Services Section, FPSC Division of Commission Clerk, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard at the time and place herein stated.			
8	IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I			
9	stenographically reported the said proceedings; that			
10	the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a true transcription of my notes of said proceedings.			
11	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,			
12	employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties'			
13	attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.			
14	DATED THIS 4th day of October, 2013.			
15				
16	Jano Fund			
17	JANE FAUROT, RPR			
18	Official FPSC Hearings Reporter (850) 413-6732			
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION			