

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition for Determination of Need for Andytown-Oasis Transmission Lines Project in Broward and Miami-Dade Counties, by Florida Power & Light Company	DOCKET NO. 20260020-EI DATED: April 17, 2026
--	---

**THE ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND'S MOTION TO COMPEL
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY TO RESPOND TO DISCOVERY**

The Environmental Defense Fund, Inc. (“EDF”), by and through its undersigned counsel, pursuant Rule 28-106.204, Florida Administrative Code, hereby files this Motion to Compel to Florida Power & Light Company (“FPL”) to Respond to Discovery (“Motion”) propounded by EDF on FPL in this proceeding. In support thereof, EDF states:

BACKGROUND

1. On March 27, 2026, EDF served its First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-28) and First Request for Production of Documents (Nos. 1-19) to FPL.
2. On April 3, 2026, EDF served its Second Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 29-32) and Second Requests for Production of Documents (Nos. 20-23) to FPL.
3. On April 3, 2026, FPL served its Objections and Responses to EDF’s First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-28) and First Request for Production of Documents (Nos. 1-19) to FPL.
4. On April 6, 2026, FPL served its Objections and Responses to EDF’s Second Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 29-32) and Second Requests for Production of Documents (Nos. 20-23) to FPL.

5. On April 13, 2026, EDF sent FPL a conferral letter to try and work out a good faith resolution to the deficiencies in FPL’s discovery responses. FPL responded to the conferral letter on April 15, 2026, but the response was not satisfactory, mostly consisted of additional objections that were not present in the initial discovery responses, and did not offer any more than minor clarifications to FPL’s discovery responses.

6. On April 16, 2026, EDF sent FPL a second conferral letter regarding FPL’s discovery,

7. As discussed in greater detail below, FPL’s responses to many of the discovery requests were legally insufficient. Further, FPL did not even object to some discovery which it did not fully answer. And when it did provide objections, they were “boilerplate” objections that lacked sufficient specificity to ascertain the validity of the objection.

RELEVANT LAW

8. Rule 28-106.206, Florida Administrative Code (“F.A.C.”), states:

[P]arties may obtain discovery through the means and in the manner provided in Rules 1.280 through 1.400, Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. The presiding officer may issue appropriate orders to effectuate the purposes of discovery and to prevent delay, including the imposition of sanctions in accordance with the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, except contempt.

9. The purpose of discovery is to “eliminate surprise, to encourage settlement, and to assist in arriving at the truth.” *Spencer v. Beverly*, 307 So. 2d 461, 462 (Fla. 4th DCA 1975); *Binger v. King Pest Control*, 401 So. 2d 1310, 1313 (Fla. 1981); *Elkins v. Syken*, 672 So. 2d 517, 522 (Fla. 1996) (“Pretrial discovery was implemented to simplify

the issues in a case, to eliminate the element of surprise, to encourage the settlement of cases, to avoid costly litigation, and to achieve a balanced search for the truth to ensure a fair trial.”) The scope of discovery is broad under Florida law: “any matter that is relevant to the subject matter or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.” Rule 1.280(b)(1), Fla. R. Civ. Pro.; *Allstate Insurance Co. v. Langston*, 655 So.2d 91 (Fla. 1995). In deciding whether a party should be required to respond to a discovery request, the court must weigh the relevance of the information sought against the burdensomeness of the request. *Elkins*, 672 So. 2d at 522.

10. Boilerplate objections that discovery requests are “overly burdensome” and “not relevant, and not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence” are not adequate and do not comply with the requirements of Rule 1.280, Florida Rules of Civil Procedure. Objections must be tailored to a particular discovery request and must be sufficiently specific to ascertain the validity of the objection. *See Christie v. Hinson*, 358 So. 2d 859 (Fla. 4th DCA 1978). FPL has the burden of establishing the validity of its objections. *See Carson v. City of Fort Lauderdale*, 173 So. 2d 743, 744 (Fla. 2nd DCA 1965) (burden of proving objections is on the objecting party).

RESPONSES TO FPL’S OBJECTIONS TO EDF’S DISCOVERY REQUESTS

EDF’s Discovery is Relevant and Material

11. FPL argues that the information requested by EDF is irrelevant and immaterial to this proceeding and constitutes a “fishing expedition.” However, EDF’s discovery is directly relevant to the issues raised in this proceeding. The Prehearing Order at Page 8 and 9 include EDF’s Issues A and B related to FERC Orders 1000 and 1920,

respectively. Further, in the Prehearing Order at Page 28, the Prehearing Officer held that FERC Orders 1920 and 1000 are relevant to this proceeding and should be considered by the full Commission, denying FPL's motion in limine and motion to strike the EDF's Issues A and B and limit witness testimony on these issues.

12. FPL's attempt to block discovery concerning regional planning issues completely ignores the Commission's express statutory mandate under the Florida Grid Bill. Section 366.04(5), Florida Statutes, explicitly grants this Commission jurisdiction over "the planning, development, and maintenance of a coordinated electric power grid throughout Florida... and the avoidance of further uneconomic duplication of generation, transmission, and distribution facilities." The Commission cannot evaluate whether the AOP represents an "uneconomic duplication" of facilities without first examining the regional planning apparatus (the FRCC) that is supposed to prevent such duplication. If FPL and the FRCC are operating in silos—or if FPL exercises undue influence over FRCC governance to ensure its localized projects are never superseded by more efficient regional alternatives—then FPL is actively circumventing the Grid Bill. EDF is entitled to discover information concerning the internal communications, governance, and coordination strategies between FPL and the FRCC to demonstrate to the Commission exactly how (and if) this statutorily mandated "coordination" is actually occurring.

13. Under the Transmission Line Siting Act ("TLSA"), FPL must consider whether the AOP will deliver "abundant, low-cost electrical energy" for the economic well-being of the state. § 403.537(1)(c), Fla. Stat. EDF contends that the localized needs driving the AOP were never effectively presented, modeled, or considered during the FRCC

regional planning process. FPL cannot claim to have conducted a prudent alternatives assessment if it deliberately restricted its search to its own service territory while ignoring adjacent regional efficiencies. The requested information is essential to determine whether FPL genuinely evaluated regional projects that address multiple needs, as an alternative to the AOP, or whether it structured its local planning process to intentionally bypass regional evaluation.

14. FERC Order 1000 also expressly requires transmission providers to participate in a regional transmission planning process that evaluates transmission solutions that might meet the needs of the region more efficiently or cost-effectively than solutions identified by individual utilities. FPL holds up its participation in the FRCC as evidence that it complies with this regional planning mandate. However, EDF's contention in response to FPL's Petition is that the FRCC process as presented appears structurally deficient and serves as a box to check under regional planning, but does not lead to good faith planning. As evidence, FRCC has not produced a single regional transmission project in over a decade. If the information obtained through discovery reveals that the FRCC is not effectively conducting the independent regional planning mandated by Order 1000—whether due to flawed governance, lack of independent personnel, or coordinated voting by incumbent utilities like FPL—then FPL cannot use the FRCC as a shield. If the FRCC is failing to conduct rigorous regional planning, prudent utility planning practices require that FPL itself must conduct that rigorous regional alternatives assessment before committing hundreds of millions of ratepayer dollars to the AOP.

EDF's Motion to Compel is not Untimely

15. FPL argues that EDF's Motion to Compel is untimely because it comes after discovery was closed. However, neither the Uniform Rules of Procedure or the Order Establishing Procedure contains no restriction on the timing of a motion to compel discovery. And under Rule 28-28-106.206, Florida Administrative Code, the presiding officer has broad latitude to issue appropriate orders to effectuate the purposes of discovery and to prevent delay, including the imposition of sanctions. This case is on extremely short timeframes and it is not practicable to receive discovery responses, review them, confer with FPL in good faith, and file a motion to compel prior to the discovery deadline as FPL suggests should occur. Rather, the burden is on FPL to fully and completely respond to discovery to ensure that the purposes of discovery — to “eliminate surprise, to encourage settlement, and to assist in arriving at the truth” — are achieved without the need for a motion to compel. *See Spencer v. Beverly*, 307 So. 2d 461, 462 (Fla. 4th DCA 1975); *Binger v. King Pest Control*, 401 So. 2d 1310, 1313 (Fla. 1981); *Elkins v. Syken*, 672 So. 2d 517, 522 (Fla. 1996). FPL should not be allowed to serve insufficient discovery responses and then utilize the tight deadlines in this case as a shield against compliance with its discovery obligations.

EDF has Conferred in Good Faith

16. Prior to filing this motion EDF conferred with FPL in good faith on multiple occasions. FPL's discovery recalcitrance goes far beyond what is detailed below. But in an attempt to expedite and resolve these discovery issues, EDF agreed to limit the outstanding discovery requests that require a response from FPL. However, FPL was

nevertheless unwilling to supplement its discovery responses requiring EDF to file this Motion.

ARGUMENT REGARDING INDIVIDUAL DISCOVERY RESPONSES

Interrogatory No. 2(d)

17. EDF's Interrogatory No. 2(d) requests the following:

Describe in detail the procedural and analytical interplay and relationships between FPL's internal, local transmission planning process and its participation in regional planning processes, specifically including the Florida Reliability Coordinating Council's (FRCC) Biennial Transmission Planning Process (BTPP). In your response, please:

(d) Identify any specific data, studies, or determinations generated during the most recent FRCC BTPP that FPL affirmatively incorporated into its alternatives assessment and ultimate selection of the AOP.

18. FPL raised no specific objection to this interrogatory. FPL's response to this Interrogatory No. 2(d) was incomplete. FPL did not include any specific data, studies, or determinations generated during the most recent FRCC BTPP that FPL incorporated into its alternative assessment.

Interrogatory No. 20

19. EDF's Interrogatory No. 20 requests the following:

During FPL's 2025 base rate case, Vice President of Finance Scott Bores testified that "FPL's ability to supply power purchased from outside of Florida if there is a significant need or disruption due to extreme weather events is more constrained than utilities with more access to regional options." With respect to this stated constraint on interregional power transfers across the Florida state line, please provide the following data and operational details:

- (a) Quantify FPL’s current total interregional physical transfer capability (in Megawatts) to import power across the Florida state line.
- (b) Of the total interregional transfer capability identified in subpart (a), quantify how much is currently secured under firm, long-term contracts versus non-firm or spot-market availability.
- (c) Provide the total volume of electrical energy (in MWh) that FPL imported from outside the State of Florida for each year from 2021 through 2025.
- (d) Provide the average cost (\$/MWh) and the peak cost (\$/MWh) of the interregional power imported across the Florida state line for each year from 2021 through 2025, specifically noting the costs incurred during extreme weather events (e.g., Winter Storm Elliott, hurricanes).

20. FPL included only boilerplate objections asserting that the interrogatory is “outside of the Commission’s jurisdiction, not relevant, and is unlikely to result in the discovery of admissible evidence. . . .” Such boilerplate objections are legally insufficient as they are not sufficiently specific to ascertain the validity of the objection. *See Christie v. Hinson*, 358 So. 2d 859 (Fla. 4th DCA 1978). Further, the information requested is relevant for the reasons discussed in the Relevancy section above.

Interrogatory No. 22

21. EDF’s Interrogatory No. 22 requests the following:

With respect to all power procured from other balancing authorities within Florida, or wheeled through other balancing authorities within Florida, please provide the following data and operational details:

- (a) Provide the total volume of electrical energy (in MWh) that FPL imported from other Florida balancing authorities for each year from 2021 through 2025.
- (b) Provide the average cost (\$/MWh) and the peak cost (\$/MWh) of the power imported from other Florida balancing authorities for each year from 2021 through

2025, specifically noting the costs incurred during extreme weather events (e.g., Winter Storm Elliott, hurricanes).

- (c) Provide the wheeling rates paid by FPL for all power wheeled through other Florida balancing authorities for each year from 2021 through 2025, as well as the total volume of electrical energy (in MWh) wheeled under each rate.

22. FPL included only boilerplate objections asserting that the interrogatory is “overly burdensome, not relevant, and is unlikely to result in the discovery of admissible evidence. . . .” Such boilerplate objections are legally insufficient as they are not sufficiently specific to ascertain the validity of the objection. *See Christie v. Hinson*, 358 So. 2d 859 (Fla. 4th DCA 1978). Further, the information requested is relevant for the reasons discussed in the Relevancy section above. In addition, the information requested in this interrogatory is crucial to EDF’s understanding of the economic dispatch analysis at issue in this case. Please respond to the interrogatory.

Interrogatories Nos. 24 and 25

23. EDF’s Interrogatory Nos. 24 and 25 request the following:

24. Please identify every FPL employee, officer, or external consultant acting on FPL's behalf who currently serves, or has served at any point within the past five (5) years, in any official capacity within the FRCC. This request specifically includes, but is not limited to, membership on the Board of Directors, the Planning Committee, the Transmission Working Group, or any committee, subcommittee, or task force involved in the BTPP. For each individual identified, please provide:

- (a) Their current functional job title and department within FPL.
- (b) Their specific role, title, and committee assignment(s) within the FRCC.

- (c) A detailed description of their responsibilities and duties within their FRCC role.
- (d) Whether the individual possesses voting rights within their respective FRCC committee or working group.

25. For each individual identified in response to Interrogatory No. 25, please explicitly state whether that individual had any direct or supervisory role in the internal identification, load-flow modeling, alternatives assessment, or management approval of the localized AOP proposed in this docket.

24. FPL included only boilerplate objections asserting that these interrogatories are “overly burdensome, not relevant, and is unlikely to result in the discovery of admissible evidence. . . .” Such boilerplate objections are legally insufficient as they are not sufficiently specific to ascertain the validity of the objection. *See Christie v. Hinson*, 358 So. 2d 859 (Fla. 4th DCA 1978). Further, the information requested is relevant for the reasons discussed in the Relevancy section above. EDF also agrees to limit the scope of the interrogatories to the last two BTTP cycles.

Interrogatory No. 26

25. EDF’s Interrogatory No. 26 requests the following:

26. Please describe in detail the governance mechanisms, voting protocols, and consensus requirements utilized by the FRCC during the BTTP to evaluate localized utility plans and determine whether a CEERTS should be selected. Specifically, please address:

- (a) Does FPL, through its representatives on FRCC committees, hold veto power or the ability to block the selection of a CEERTS that would replace or modify an FPL-proposed localized transmission project?
- (b) Please describe any internal FPL protocols, ethical guidelines, or operational "firewalls" in place to ensure

that FPL employees serving on FRCC planning committees evaluate regional transmission alternatives independently and objectively, rather than strictly advancing FPL's internal capital expenditure plans.

26. FPL included only boilerplate objections asserting that the interrogatory is “overly burdensome, not relevant, and is unlikely to result in the discovery of admissible evidence. . . .” Such boilerplate objections are legally insufficient as they are not sufficiently specific to ascertain the validity of the objection. *See Christie v. Hinson*, 358 So. 2d 859 (Fla. 4th DCA 1978). Further, the information requested is relevant for the reasons discussed in the Relevancy section above. In addition, FPL’s answer to the interrogatory is incomplete because it does not describe the governance mechanisms, voting protocols, and consensus requirements utilized by the FRCC.

Interrogatories Nos. 27 and 28

27. EDF’s Interrogatory Nos. 27 and 28 request the following:

27. Identify and describe in detail the databases, tracking systems, asset management programs, and long-term planning documents utilized by FPL to monitor the condition, life expectancy, and planned replacement schedule of its existing transmission infrastructure. In your response, please explicitly detail:

- (a) The specific engineering criteria, condition assessments, or operational metrics (e.g., chronological age, physical deterioration, failure rates, thermal limits) FPL utilizes to flag a transmission facility for targeted replacement or rebuild.
- (b) The timeframe or planning horizon over which FPL projects its infrastructure replacement schedules (e.g., 5-year, 10-year, or 20-year capital plans).
- (c) The specific internal department(s) or committee(s) responsible for maintaining this data and authorizing the replacement schedules.

28. When an existing transmission facility is identified as aging, deteriorating, or requiring replacement, describe in detail the analytical process and economic modeling FPL utilizes to determine the optimal replacement solution.

Specifically, please address:

- (a) Whether FPL's internal planning criteria permit automatic "like-for-like" replacements, or whether a holistic needs assessment is required for each aging asset.
- (b) Whether FPL requires planners to affirmatively consider, model, and evaluate and GETs, including advanced conductors, as alternatives to defer the capital cost of a full infrastructure rebuild.
- (c) If FPL does not routinely evaluate GETs as alternatives to replacing aging infrastructure, please explain how FPL ensures that its replacement capital expenditures satisfy the statutory requirement to deliver "abundant, low-cost electrical energy."

28. FPL included only boilerplate objections asserting that these interrogatories are "not relevant, and unlikely to result in the discovery of admissible evidence. . . ." Such boilerplate objections are legally insufficient as they are not sufficiently specific to ascertain the validity of the objection. *See Christie v. Hinson*, 358 So. 2d 859 (Fla. 4th DCA 1978). Further, the information requested is relevant for the reasons discussed in the Relevancy section above. In addition, information concerning the condition, life expectancy, and planned replacement schedules for FPL's existing transmission infrastructure, and the analytical process and economic modeling used by FPL to determine the optimal replacement solutions are important facts that EDF needs to analyze the issues in this need determination proceeding; moreover, this is relevant information to evaluating whether the AOP is the best option available to satisfy the criteria in section 403.537(1)(c),

Florida Statutes, as well as whether the AOP is the most appropriate alternative when the Commission considers its mandate under Section 366.04(5), Florida Statutes.

Interrogatories Nos. 29-30

29. EDF's Interrogatory Nos. 29 and 30 request the following:

29. Identify every communication, meeting, or discussion—whether internal to FPL or external—in which the proposed Andytown-Oasis Project (AOP), or the reliability needs that FPL has identified in support of the AOP project, was discussed in relation to the Florida Reliability Coordinating Council (FRCC), the Biennial Transmission Planning Process (BTPP), or any potential regional transmission alternative. In your response, explicitly identify:

- a. Any communications between FPL personnel and FRCC staff, committee members, or external consultants regarding whether the AOP (or the constraints it resolves) should be modeled, evaluated, or designated as a regional project.
- b. Any communications between FPL personnel and representatives of other Florida electric utilities regarding the AOP and its potential impacts on the regional grid.
- c. Any internal communications or strategy discussions among FPL management, planners, or regulatory staff regarding how to present, or whether to present, the AOP to the FRCC.

30. Identify every communication, meeting, or discussion—whether internal or external—regarding FPL's strategic posture, voting directives, or policy objectives within the FRCC's regional transmission planning processes over the last five (5) years. In your response, explicitly identify:

- a. Any internal FPL directives, talking points, or guidelines provided to FPL employees serving on FRCC committees regarding how to evaluate, vote on, or respond to proposed regional transmission projects.
- b. Any communications between FPL and other Florida utilities coordinating votes, policy positions, or responses to stakeholder proposals within the FRCC.

30. FPL included only boilerplate objections asserting that these interrogatories are “overly burdensome and without reasonable limits, not relevant, and unlikely to result in the discovery of admissible evidence. . . .” Such boilerplate objections are legally insufficient as they are not sufficiently specific to ascertain the validity of the objection. *See Christie v. Hinson*, 358 So. 2d 859 (Fla. 4th DCA 1978). Further, the information requested is relevant for the reasons discussed in the Relevancy section above. In addition, EDF will accept responses by FPL to the subparts only. Accordingly, FPL should provide responses to Interrogatory No. 29, subparts (a), (b), and (c); and Interrogatory No. 30, subparts (a) and (b).

Interrogatories Nos. 31-32

31. EDF’s Interrogatory Nos. 31 and 32 request the following:

31. Identify every internal or external communication, analysis, or strategic evaluation conducted by or on behalf of FPL regarding FERC Order 1000 and its mandate to identify Cost Effective or Efficient Regional Transmission Solutions (CEERTS). This includes, but is not limited to, communications explaining, questioning, or analyzing why the FRCC BTTP has consistently failed to identify or mandate regional transmission solutions in lieu of localized utility projects within FPL's service territory.

32. Identify every internal or external communication, analysis, or strategic evaluation conducted by or on behalf of FPL regarding FERC Order 1920. In your response, explicitly identify:

- a. Any communications, internal memoranda, or consultant reports evaluating how Order 1920’s mandate for long-term regional planning and "right-sizing" of local projects will impact FPL’s capital expenditure plans or local transmission projects.
- b. Any communications between FPL and FRCC staff, or between FPL and other Florida utilities, regarding the

strategy for drafting the FRCC's compliance filing for Order 1920.

- c. Any internal communications discussing whether the timing, scope, or necessity of the AOP is influenced by the impending implementation of Order 1920.

32. FPL included only boilerplate objections asserting that these interrogatories are “overly burdensome and without reasonable limits, not relevant, and unlikely to result in the discovery of admissible evidence. . . .” Such boilerplate objections are legally insufficient as they are not sufficiently specific to ascertain the validity of the objection. *See Christie v. Hinson*, 358 So. 2d 859 (Fla. 4th DCA 1978). Further, the information requested is relevant for the reasons discussed in the Relevancy section above. In addition, EDF can agree to narrow the scope of its interrogatory to limit it only to “analyses and strategic evaluations” instead of “every internal or external communication, analysis, or strategic evaluation.”

Request for Production No. 1

33. EDF's Request for Production No. 1 seeks the following documents:

1. Please produce all data, input files, output files, workpapers, and underlying assumptions utilized in any and all modeling performed by or on behalf of FPL in the planning, development, alternatives assessment, and justification of the proposed AOP. For clarity, the scope of this production request explicitly includes, but is not limited to:

(a) Power flow, contingency, and reliability modeling (e.g., PSS/E, PSLF) explicitly including the "Base Case" models, "Change Case" models, and specific contingency outputs demonstrating the NERC TPL-001-5.1 violations relied upon to justify the AOP.

(b) Production cost and economic dispatch modeling (e.g., PROMOD, PLEXOS) utilized to calculate system

fuel savings, renewable curtailment impacts, economic benefits, and the dispatch of specific generation facilities projected to supply power across the AOP during Summer and Winter peaks in each of the first five years following the year in which the AOP is completed.

(c) Any specific sensitivity models run by FPL (e.g., high/low load growth, extreme weather, high/low natural gas prices).

(d) Load forecasting and spatial load allocation models.

(e) All spreadsheets and quantitative analyses used to calculate project capital costs, revenue requirements, or ratepayer impacts.

34. FPL raised no specific objections to this request for production. Further, the information requested is relevant for the reasons discussed in the Relevancy section above. In addition, FPL's response was incomplete. FPL produced documents in response to subparts (a)-(e) of the request, but did not respond to the main body of the request. FPL should be required to provide all data, input files, output files, workpapers, and underlying assumptions utilized in any and all modeling performed by or on behalf of FPL in the planning, development, alternatives assessment, and justification of the proposed AOP.

Request for Production No. 5(d)

35. Request for Production No. 5(d) seeks “[i]nternal documents generated by FPL employees serving in roles at FRCC related to most recent BTPP and FERC Order 1920 compliance development process.”

36. FPL included only boilerplate objections asserting that the request is “not relevant, and is unlikely to result in the discovery of admissible evidence. . . .” Such boilerplate objections are legally insufficient as they are not sufficiently specific to

ascertain the validity of the objection. *See Christie v. Hinson*, 358 So. 2d 859 (Fla. 4th DCA 1978). Further, the information requested is relevant for the reasons discussed in the Relevancy section above. In addition, FPL provided contradictory statements during its conferral stating that there were no responsive documents and then saying that any such documents are subject to confidentiality agreements with third parties. FPL should be required to fully respond to the request for production and provide a privilege log for any confidential information.

Request for Production No. 6

37. Request for Production No. 6 seeks the following:

Please produce the complete final study reports, appendices, and all associated native electronic modeling files for every FRCC BTTP conducted over the past ten (10) years (i.e., planning cycles from 2016 through the present). For clarity, this production request explicitly includes, but is not limited to:

(a) The final, approved BTTP reports detailing the system needs and approved regional or local transmission plans.

(b) All "Base Case" and "Change Case" power flow models (in native, executable formats such as PSS/E or PSLF) utilized to evaluate Florida's transmission constraints during each respective BTTP cycle.

(c) All economic dispatch models or production cost simulations utilized during each respective cycle to evaluate the economic impact of transmission congestion or the benefits of proposed solutions.

38. FPL included only boilerplate objections asserting that the request is “overly burdensome, not relevant, and is unlikely to result in the discovery of admissible evidence. . . .” Such boilerplate objections are legally insufficient as they are not sufficiently specific

to ascertain the validity of the objection. *See Christie v. Hinson*, 358 So. 2d 859 (Fla. 4th DCA 1978). Further, the information requested is relevant for the reasons discussed in the Relevancy section above.

Request for Production No. 8

39. Request for Production No. 8 asks for “all internal memoranda, email correspondence, presentation decks, engineering models, and cost-benefit analyses generated within the last 36 months that discuss, evaluate, compare, or dismiss any alternative to the AOP that was *not* formally presented as an alternative in the Petition. This explicitly includes documents evaluating the cost and efficacy of the AOP against Non-Wires Alternatives (NWAs) such as battery storage, Advanced Transmission Technologies (ATTs), or Grid-Enhancing Technologies (GETs).”

40. FPL raised no specific objections to this request for production.

41. This request specifically asks FPL to produce materials evaluating the cost and efficacy of the AOP as compared to NWAs, ATTs, and GETs. FPL evaluated NWAs, ATTs, or GETs as alternatives to the AOP as indicated by Mr. Yanes in his deposition. FPL should produce documents such as work papers or internal emails documenting that evaluation process.

Request for Production No. 12

42. Request for Production No. 12 asks FPL to “produce all internal load forecasting models, load-flow studies, and regional resource adequacy assessments that calculate or project the generation deficit, import requirements, and transmission transfer

limits for the combined Miami-Dade and Broward County geographic region for the period of 2026 through 2036.”

43. FPL raised no specific objections to this request.

44. FPL’s response included documents that contain summary information only.

This is only partially responsive to the request. FPL should be required to provide all the materials supporting the summary information in the documents provided, including calculations and work papers.

Request for Production No. 13

45. Request for Production No. 13 asks for “all internal manuals, guidelines, planning criteria documents, standard operating procedures, and flowcharts utilized by FPL transmission planners that govern or prescribe how FPL considers and evaluates alternatives to proposed transmission projects are identified, modeled, and evaluated for the purposes of local planning and Need Determinations.”

46. FPL raised no specific objections to this request.

47. FPL’s response included only a reference to certain documents included as attachments to FPL’s Petition, and stated that it provided additional data and detail in response to “other discovery in this document” without specifying the other discovery. This response is incomplete. FPL should produce any document that its transmission planners use, including internal manuals, guidelines, planning criteria documents, SOPs and flow charts.

Request for Production Nos. 14 and 15

48. Request for Production Nos. 14 and 15 ask for production of the following:

14. Please produce all data, load-flow studies, economic analyses, or internal memoranda that FPL management or Scott Bores relied upon in his testimony in Florida PSC Docket No. 20250011-EI (the 2025 FPL rate case) to conclude that FPL's ability to supply power from outside of Florida is "more constrained than utilities with more access to regional options."

15. Please produce all current interregional power purchase agreements, firm transmission service agreements, and pricing term sheets governing the importation of wholesale power from outside the State of Florida into the FPL balancing authority.

49. FPL included only boilerplate objections asserting that these requests are "not relevant, and unlikely to result in the discovery of admissible evidence. . . ." Such boilerplate objections are legally insufficient as they are not sufficiently specific to ascertain the validity of the objection. *See Christie v. Hinson*, 358 So. 2d 859 (Fla. 4th DCA 1978). Further, the information requested is relevant for the reasons discussed in the Relevancy section above.

50. These requests seek materials related to alleged constraints in FPL's access to regional power supply options. These materials are directly relevant to the issues in this proceeding and crucial to EDF's ability to prepare its case.

Requests to Produce Nos. 17 and 18

17. Please produce the most current version of any capital replacement schedules, "aging infrastructure" watchlists, or asset condition assessment reports that detail planned transmission facility replacements or rebuilds over the next ten (10) years, specifically including any such facilities located within or serving the combined Miami-Dade and Broward County region.

18. Please produce all internal manuals, engineering guidelines, and standard operating procedures documents in any format that govern or prescribe how FPL evaluates,

prioritizes, and selects engineering solutions for aging or end-of-life transmission infrastructure.

51. FPL included only boilerplate objections asserting that these requests are “not relevant, and unlikely to result in the discovery of admissible evidence. . . .” Such boilerplate objections are legally insufficient as they are not sufficiently specific to ascertain the validity of the objection. *See Christie v. Hinson*, 358 So. 2d 859 (Fla. 4th DCA 1978). Further, the information requested is relevant for the reasons discussed in the Relevancy section above. FPL should be required to produce the requested documents.

Requests to Produce Nos. 20 and 21

20. Produce all documents, analyses, and communications identified in, relied upon, or relating to your response to Interrogatory No. 29. This request explicitly encompasses all internal emails, instant messages (e.g., Microsoft Teams, Slack), memoranda, and handwritten notes, as well as all external correspondence with FRCC staff, other utilities, and third-party consultants regarding the interplay between the AOP and the FRCC planning process.

21. Produce all documents, analyses, and communications identified in, relied upon, or relating to your response to Interrogatory No. 30. This includes all internal strategy documents, voting guides, and coordination emails between FPL and other FRCC member utilities designed to establish consensus, align voting, or dictate outcomes within the FRCC Biennial Transmission Planning Process.

52. FPL included only boilerplate objections asserting that these requests are “overly burdensome and without reasonable limits, not relevant, and unlikely to result in the discovery of admissible evidence. . . .” Such boilerplate objections are legally insufficient as they are not sufficiently specific to ascertain the validity of the objection. *See Christie v. Hinson*, 358 So. 2d 859 (Fla. 4th DCA 1978). Further, the information

requested is relevant for the reasons discussed in the Relevancy section above. These requests seek materials relied on in FPL's responses to Interrogatories Nos. 29 and 30. FPL should be required to produce the requested documents.

Requests to Produce Nos. 22 and 23

53. Request to Produce Nos. 22 and 23 seek the following:

22. Produce all internal and external communications, legal memoranda, white papers, consultant reports, and economic analyses relating to FPL's compliance with, interpretation of, or strategic response to FERC Order 1000's regional planning mandates. This explicitly includes any internal correspondence discussing the absence of CEERTS projects within the Florida peninsula.

23. Produce all internal and external communications, legal memoranda, white papers, consultant reports, and economic analyses relating to FERC Order 1920. This request specifically demands the production of:

- a. All internal emails and strategy documents discussing how the Order 1920 mandates for "right-sizing" and advanced technology evaluations will affect FPL's local transmission planning and future Need Determinations.
- b. All communications, draft redlines, and meeting notes between FPL, FRCC staff, and other Florida utilities regarding the development of the FRCC's regional compliance strategy for Order 1920.
- c. All internal correspondence or analyses discussing whether to accelerate, modify, or advance localized projects (including the AOP) prior to the full implementation of the Order 1920 regional planning framework.

54. FPL included only boilerplate objections asserting that these requests are "overly burdensome and without reasonable limits, not relevant, and unlikely to result in the discovery of admissible evidence. . . ." Such boilerplate objections are legally insufficient as they are not sufficiently specific to ascertain the validity of the objection.

See Christie v. Hinson, 358 So. 2d 859 (Fla. 4th DCA 1978). Further, the information requested is relevant for the reasons discussed in the Relevancy section above. FPL should be required to produce the requested documents.

STATEMENT OF CONFERRAL

55. EDF has conferred with FPL who opposes this Motion. EDF also conferred with Office of Public Counsel and Commission Staff, who take no position on this Motion.

WHEREFORE, the Environmental Defense Fund, Inc., respectfully requests the Florida Public Service Commission to enter an order GRANTING EDF's Motion to Compel and require:

- a. The production of the requested information at the start of the hearing; or
- b. Alternatively, the production of the requested information at least 5 days prior to the due date for the briefs in this case, coupled with entry of the information in the record.

Respectfully submitted this 17th day of April, 2026.

/s/Robert Scheffel Wright

Robert Scheffel Wright

schef@GBKWlaw.com

John T. LaVia, III

jlavia@GBKWlaw.com

Timothy J. Perry

tperry@GBKWlaw.com

Gardner Bist King & Wood

1300 Thomaswood Drive

Tallahassee, Florida 32308

Telephone (850) 385-0070

Facsimile (850) 385-5416

Attorneys for the Environmental Defense Fund, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished by electronic mail on this 17th day of April, 2026, to the following:

PSC – Office of General Counsel
Carlos Marquez / Shaw Stiller
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0830
cmarquez@psc.state.fl.us
sstiller@psc.state.fl.us
discovery-gcl@psc.state.fl.us

Office of Public Counsel
Walt Trierweiler/Charles Rehwinkel/
Bart Fletcher / Patty Christensen
c/o The Florida Legislature
111 W. Madison St., Rm 812
Tallahassee, FL 32399
Trierweiler.Walt@leg.state.fl.us
Rehwinkel.charles@leg.state.fl.us
Fletcher.bart@leg.state.fl.us
Christensen.patty@leg.state.fl.us

Florida Power & Light Company
Christopher Wright / Will Cox
700 Universe Boulevard
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420
Christopher.wright@fpl.com
Will.p.cox@fpl.com

Florida Power & Light Company
Kenneth A. Hoffman
134 W. Jefferson Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
ken.hoffman@fpl.com

South Florida Regional Planning Council
Samuel Goren / Michael Cirullo, Jr.
Goren, Cherof, Doody & Ezrol, P.A.
3099 East Commercial Blvd., Ste 200
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33308
SGoren@GorenCherof.com
MCirullo@GorenCherof.com

/s/Robert Scheffel Wright
ATTORNEY

