

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Fuel and purchased power) DOCKET NO. 970001-EI
cost recovery clause and) ORDER NO. PSC-97-0180-PHO-EI
generating performance incentive) ISSUED: February 18, 1997
factor.)
_____)

Pursuant to Notice, a Prehearing Conference was held on Wednesday, February 5, 1997, in Tallahassee, Florida, before Commissioner J. Terry Deason, as Prehearing Officer.

APPEARANCES:

JAMES A. MCGEE, Esquire, Post Office Box 14042, St. Petersburg, Florida 33733-4042
On behalf of Florida Power Corporation.

MATTHEW M. CHILDS, Esquire, P.A., Steel Hector & Davis, LLP, 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 601, Tallahassee, Florida 32301
On behalf of Florida Power & Light Company.

WILLIAM B. WILLINGHAM, Esquire, Rutledge, Ecenia, Underwood, Purnell & Hoffman, P.A., P.O. Box 551, Tallahassee, Florida 32302-0551
On behalf of Florida Public Utilities Company.

JEFFREY A. STONE, Esquire, and RUSSELL A. BADDERS, Esquire, Beggs & Lane, 700 Bount Building, 3 West Garden street, P.O. Box 12950, Pensacola, Florida 32576-2950
On behalf of Gulf Power Company.

LEE L. WILLIS, Esquire, and JAMES D. BEASLEY, Esquire, Ausley & McMullen, Post Office Box 391, Tallahassee, Florida 32302
On behalf of Tampa Electric Company.

JOSEPH A. MCGLOTHLIN, Esquire, and VICKI GORDON KAUFMAN, Esquire, McWhirter Reeves McGlothlin Davidson Rief and Bakas, P.A., 117 South Gadsden Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301
On behalf of Florida Industrial Power Users Group.

JOHN ROGER HOWE, Esquire, Deputy Public Counsel, Office of Public Counsel, c/o The Florida Legislature, 111 West Madison Street, Room 812, Tallahassee, Florida 32399.
On behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

01745 FEB 18 97

FFSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

VICKI D. JOHNSON, Esquire, Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850
On behalf of the Commission Staff.

PREHEARING ORDER

I. CASE BACKGROUND

As part of the Commission's continuing fuel and energy conservation cost, purchased gas cost, and environmental cost recovery proceedings, a hearing is set for February 19 - 21, 1997, in this docket and in Docket Nos. 970002-EG, 970003-GU and 970007-EI. The hearing will address the issues set out in the body of this prehearing order. As noted in Section VIII of this Prehearing Order, the parties have proposed stipulations to several issues.

II. PROCEDURE FOR HANDLING CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

A. Any information provided pursuant to a discovery request for which proprietary confidential business information status is requested shall be treated by the Commission and the parties as confidential. The information shall be exempt from Section 119.07(1), Florida Statutes, pending a formal ruling on such request by the Commission, or upon the return of the information to the person providing the information. If no determination of confidentiality has been made and the information has not been used in the proceeding, it shall be returned expeditiously to the person providing the information. If a determination of confidentiality has been made and the information was not entered into the record of the proceeding, it shall be returned to the person providing the information within the time periods set forth in Section 366.093(2), Florida Statutes.

B. It is the policy of the Florida Public Service Commission that all Commission hearings be open to the public at all times. The Commission also recognizes its obligation pursuant to Section 366.093, Florida Statutes, to protect proprietary confidential business information from disclosure outside the proceeding.

In the event it becomes necessary to use confidential information during the hearing, the following procedures will be observed:

- 1) Any party wishing to use any proprietary confidential business information, as that term is defined in Section 366.093, Florida Statutes, shall notify the Prehearing Officer and all parties of record by the time of the Prehearing Conference, or if not known at that time, no later than seven (7) days prior to the beginning of the hearing. The notice shall include a procedure to assure that the confidential nature of the information is preserved as required by statute.
- 2) Failure of any party to comply with 1) above shall be grounds to deny the party the opportunity to present evidence which is proprietary confidential business information.
- 3) When confidential information is used in the hearing, parties must have copies for the Commissioners, necessary staff, and the Court Reporter, in envelopes clearly marked with the nature of the contents. Any party wishing to examine the confidential material that is not subject to an order granting confidentiality shall be provided a copy in the same fashion as provided to the Commissioners, subject to execution of any appropriate protective agreement with the owner of the material.
- 4) Counsel and witnesses are cautioned to avoid verbalizing confidential information in such a way that would compromise the confidential information. Therefore, confidential information should be presented by written exhibit when reasonably possible to do so.
- 5) At the conclusion of that portion of the hearing that involves confidential information, all copies of confidential exhibits shall be returned to the proffering party. If a confidential exhibit has been admitted into evidence, the copy provided to the Court Reporter shall be retained in the Division of Records and Reporting's confidential files.

Post-hearing procedures

Rule 25-22.056(3), Florida Administrative Code, requires each party to file a post-hearing statement of issues and positions. A summary of each position of no more than 50 words, set off with asterisks, shall be included in that statement. If a party's position has not changed since the issuance of the prehearing order, the post-hearing statement may simply restate the prehearing

position; however, if the prehearing position is longer than 50 words, it must be reduced to no more than 50 words. The rule also provides that if a party fails to file a post-hearing statement in conformance with the rule, that party shall have waived all issues and may be dismissed from the proceeding.

A party's proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, if any, statement of issues and positions, and brief, shall together total no more than 60 pages, and shall be filed at the same time. The prehearing officer may modify the page limit for good cause shown. Please see Rule 25-22.056, Florida Administrative Code, for other requirements pertaining to post-hearing filings.

III. PREFILED TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS; WITNESSES

Testimony of all witnesses to be sponsored by the parties has been prefiled. All testimony which has been prefiled in this case will be inserted into the record as though read after the witness has taken the stand and affirmed the correctness of the testimony and associated exhibits. All testimony remains subject to appropriate objections. Each witness will have the opportunity to orally summarize his or her testimony at the time he or she takes the stand. Upon insertion of a witness' testimony, exhibits appended thereto may be marked for identification. After all parties and staff have had the opportunity to object and cross-examine, the exhibit may be moved into the record. All other exhibits may be similarly identified and entered into the record at the appropriate time during the hearing.

Witnesses are reminded that, on cross-examination, responses to questions calling for a simple yes or no answer shall be so answered first, after which the witness may explain his or her answer.

The Commission frequently administers the testimonial oath to more than one witness at a time. Therefore, when a witness takes the stand to testify, the attorney calling the witness is directed to ask the witness to affirm whether he or she has been sworn.

IV. ORDER OF WITNESSES

* Witnesses whose names are preceded by an asterisk (*) have been excused. The parties have stipulated that the testimony of those witnesses will be inserted into the record as though read, and cross-examination will be waived. The parties have also stipulated that all exhibits submitted with those

witnesses' testimony shall be identified as shown in Section VII of this Prehearing Order and admitted into the record.

<u>Witness</u>	<u>Appearing For</u>	<u>Issue #</u>
<u>Direct</u>		
* John Scardino, Jr.	FPC	1, 19
Karl H. Wieland	FPC	2 - 8, 14A - 14C, 14E, 20 - 23, 24A, 24B
* Dario B. Zuloaga	FPC	14D, 17, 18A, 18B
* R. Silva	FPL	1 - 8, 15A, 15B
* R. Wade	FPL	1 - 8
* R. Morley	FPL	1 - 9, 15A, 15B, 25,
* G. Bachman	FPUC	1 - 8
* M. F. Oaks	Gulf	1, 2, 4
* S. D. Cranmer	Gulf	1 - 8
* G. D. Fontaine	Gulf	17, 18
* M. W. Howell	Gulf	1, 2, 4
* K. A. Branick	TECO	1 - 8, 16A, 16B, 19 - 23
* G. A. Keselowsky	TECO	17, 18

V. BASIC POSITIONS

FPC: None necessary.

FPL: None necessary.

FPUC: FPU has properly projected its costs and calculated its true-up amounts and purchased power cost recovery factors. Those amounts and factors should be approved by the Commission.

GULF: It is the basic position of Gulf Power Company that the proposed fuel factors present the best estimate of Gulf's fuel expense for the period April 1997 through September 1997 including the true-up calculations, GPIF and other adjustments allowed by the Commission.

TECO: The Commission should approve Tampa Electric's calculation of its fuel adjustment, capacity cost recovery and GPIF true-up calculations, including the proposed fuel adjustment factor of 2.415 cents per KWH before application of factors which adjust for variation in line losses; the proposed capacity cost recovery factor of .139 cents per KWH before applying the 12 CP and 1/13 allocation methodology; and a GPIF penalty of \$298,369.

FIPUG: None at this time.

OPC: None necessary.

STAFF: Staff takes no position pending the evidence developed at hearing.

Staff's positions are preliminary and based on materials filed by the parties and on discovery. The preliminary positions are offered to assist the parties in preparing for the hearing. Staff's final positions will be based upon all the evidence in the record and may differ from the preliminary positions.

VI. ISSUES AND POSITIONS

Generic Fuel Adjustment Issues

STIPULATED (EXCEPT AS TO FPC)

ISSUE 1: What are the appropriate final fuel adjustment true-up amounts for the period April, 1996 through September, 1996?

POSITIONS:

FPC: Agree with staff.

FPL: Agree with staff.

FPUC: Marianna: Agree with staff.
Fernandina Beach: Agree with staff.

GULF: Agree with staff.

TECO: Agree with staff.

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

OPC: FPC: FPC's replacement fuel costs associated with the ongoing extended outage at the Crystal River #3 nuclear unit should be excluded from fuel cost recovery.
FPL: No position.
FPUC: Marianna: No position.
Fernandina: No position.
GPC: No position.
TECO: No position.

STAFF: FPC: \$59,049,902 underrecovery.
FPL: \$13,513,839 underrecovery.
FPUC: Marianna: \$459,638 overrecovery.
Fernandina Beach: \$56,002 underrecovery.
GULF: \$3,892,089 overrecovery.
TECO: \$3,401,136 underrecovery.

STIPULATED
(EXCEPT AS TO FPC)

ISSUE 2: What are the estimated fuel adjustment true-up amounts for the period October, 1996 through March, 1997?

POSITIONS:

FPC: Agree with staff.

FPL: Agree with staff.

FPUC: Marianna: Agree with staff.
Fernandina Beach: Agree with staff.

GULF: Agree with staff.

TECO: Agree with staff.

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

OPC: FPC: FPC's replacement fuel costs associated with the ongoing extended outage at the Crystal River #3 nuclear unit should be excluded from fuel cost recovery.
FPL: No position.
FPUC: Marianna: No position.
Fernandina: No position.
GPC: No position.
TECO: No position.

STAFF: FPC: \$43,124,413 underrecovery.
FPL: \$63,591,152 underrecovery.
FPUC: Marianna: \$32,276 overrecovery.
Fernandina Beach: \$247,915 overrecovery.
GULF: \$2,698,394 underrecovery.
TECO: \$4,991,759 overrecovery.

STIPULATED
(EXCEPT AS TO FPC)

ISSUE 3: What are the total fuel adjustment true-up amounts to be collected during the period April, 1997 through September, 1997?

POSITIONS:

FPC: Agree with staff.

FPL: Agree with staff.

FPUC: Marianna: Agree with staff.
Fernandina Beach: Agree with staff.

GULF: Agree with staff.

TECO: Agree with staff.

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

OPC: FPC: FPC's replacement fuel costs associated with the ongoing extended outage at the Crystal River #3 nuclear unit should be excluded from fuel cost recovery.
FPL: No position.
FPUC: Marianna: No position.
Fernandina: No position.
GPC: No position.
TECO: No position.

STAFF: FPC: \$54,288,997 underrecovery.
(See Company-Specific Issue 14E)
FPL: \$77,104,991 underrecovery.
FPUC: Marianna: \$491,914 overrecovery.
Fernandina Beach: \$191,913 overrecovery.
GULF: \$1,193,695 overrecovery.
TECO: \$1,590,623 overrecovery.

STIPULATED
(EXCEPT AS TO FPC)

ISSUE 4: What are the appropriate levelized fuel cost recovery factors for the period April, 1997 through September, 1997?

POSITIONS:

FPC: Agree with staff.

FPL: Agree with staff.

FPUC: Marianna: Agree with staff.
Fernandina Beach: Agree with staff.

GULF: Agree with staff.

TECO: Agree with staff.

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

OPC: FPC: FPC's replacement fuel costs associated with the ongoing extended outage at the Crystal River #3 nuclear unit should be excluded from fuel cost recovery.
FPL: No position.
FPUC: Marianna: No position.
Fernandina: No position.
GPC: No position.
TECO: No position.

STAFF: FPC: 2.385 cents/kwh
FPL: 2.192 cents/kwh
FPUC: Marianna: 2.179 cents/kwh
Fernandina Beach: 2.859 cents/kwh
GULF: 2.154 cents/kwh
TECO: 2.415 cents/kwh

STIPULATED

ISSUE 5: What should be the effective date of the new fuel adjustment charge and capacity cost recovery charge for billing purposes?

POSITION: The new factors should be effective beginning with the first billing cycle for April, 1997, and thereafter through the last billing cycle for September, 1997. The first billing cycle may start before April 1, 1997, and the last billing cycle may end after September 30, 1997, so long as each customer is billed for six months regardless of when the factors became effective.

STIPULATED

ISSUE 6: What are the appropriate fuel recovery line loss multipliers to be used in calculating the fuel cost recovery factors charged to each rate class?

POSITION:

FPC:		Delivery	Line Loss
	<u>Group</u>	<u>Voltage Level</u>	<u>Multiplier</u>
	A.	Transmission	0.9800
	B.	Distribution Primary	0.9900
	C.	Distribution Secondary	1.0000
	D.	Lighting Service	1.0000

FPL: The appropriate Fuel Cost Recovery Loss Multipliers are provided in response to Issue No. 7.

FPUC:	Marianna:	All Rate Schedules	1.0000
	Fernandina Beach:	All Rate Schedules	1.0000

GULF:

Group	Rate Schedules	Line Loss Multipliers
A	RS, GS, GSD, SBS OSIII, OSIV	1.01228
B	LP, SBS	0.98106
C	PX, PXT, RTP, SBS	0.96230
D	OSI, OSII	1.01228

<u>TECO:</u>	<u>Group</u>	<u>Multiplier</u>
	Group A	1.0072
	Group A1	n/a*
	Group B	1.0013
	Group C	0.9687

*Group A1 is based on Group A, 15% of On-Peak and 85% of Off-Peak.

STIPULATED
(EXCEPT AS TO FPC)

ISSUE 7: What are the appropriate Fuel Cost Recovery Factors for each rate group adjusted for line losses?

POSITIONS:

FPC: Agree with staff.

FPL: Agree with staff.

FPUC: Agree with staff.

GULF: Agree with staff.

TECO: Agree with staff.

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

OPC: FPC: FPC's replacement fuel costs associated with the ongoing extended outage at the Crystal River #3 nuclear unit should be excluded from fuel cost recovery.

FPL: No position.

FPUC: Marianna: No position.

Fernandina: No position.

GPC: No position.

TECO: No position.

<u>STAFF:</u> Group	<u>FPC:</u> Delivery Voltage Level	Fuel Cost Factors (cents/kWh)		
		<u>Time Of Use</u>		<u>O f f -</u>
		<u>Standard</u>	<u>On-Peak</u>	<u>Peak</u>
A.	Transmission	2.342	3.031	1.967
B.	Distribution Primary	2.366	3.062	1.987
C.	Distribution Secondary	2.390	3.093	2.008
D.	Lighting Service	2.210		

GROUP	RATE SCHEDULE	AVERAGE FACTOR	<u>FPL:</u>	
			FUEL RECOVERY LOSS MULTIPLIER	FUEL RECOVERY FACTOR
A	RS-1,GS-1,SL-2	2.192	1.00201	2.196
A-1	SL-1,OL-1	2.135	1.00201	2.139
B	GSD-1	2.192	1.00200	2.196
C	GSLD-1 & CS-1	2.192	1.00173	2.196
D	GSLD-2,CS-2, OS-2 & MET	2.192	0.99640	2.184
E	GSLD-3 & CS-3	2.192	0.96159	2.108
A	RST-1,GST-1 ON-PEAK	2.418	1.00201	2.423
	OFF-PEAK	2.081	1.00201	2.085
B	GSDT-1 ON-PEAK CILC-1 (G)	2.418	1.00200	2.423
	OFF-PEAK	2.081	1.00200	2.085
C	GSLDT-1 & ON-PEAK	2.418	1.00173	2.422
	CST-1 OFF-PEAK	2.081	1.00173	2.084
D	GSLDT-2 & ON-PEAK	2.418	0.99640	2.409
	CST-2 OFF-PEAK	2.081	0.99640	2.073

GROUP	RATE SCHEDULE	AVERAGE FACTOR	FUEL RECOVERY LOSS MULTIPLIER	FUEL RECOVERY FACTOR
E	GSLDT-3, CST-3			
	ON-PEAK	2.418	0.96159	2.325
	CILC-1 (T) & ISST-1 (T)			
	OFF-PEAK	2.081	0.96159	2.001
F	CILC-1 (D) &			
	ON-PEAK	2.418	0.99814	2.413
	ISST-1 (D)			
	OFF-PEAK	2.081	0.99814	2.077

FPUC:

Marianna

<u>Rate Schedule</u>	<u>Adjustment</u>
RS	\$0.04184
GS	\$0.04114
GSD	\$0.03630
GSLD	\$0.03494
OL	\$0.02681
SL	\$0.02660

Fernandina Beach

<u>Rate Schedule</u>	<u>Adjustment</u>
RS	\$0.04470
GS	\$0.04319
GSD	\$0.04033
CSL	\$0.03117
OL	\$0.03117
SL	\$0.03117

GULF:

Group	Rate Schedules*	Fuel Cost Factors ¢/KWH		
		Standard	Time of Use	
			On-Peak	Off-Peak
A	RS, GS, GSD, SBS, OSIII, OSIV	2.180	2.662	1.952
B	LP, SBS	2.113	2.580	1.892
C	PX, RTP, SBS	2.073	2.531	1.856
D	OSI, OSII	2.014	N/A	N/A

*The recovery factor applicable to customers taking service under Rate Schedule SBS is determined as follows: customers with a Contract Demand in the range of 100 to 499 KW will use the recovery factor applicable to Rate Schedule GSD; customers with a Contract Demand in the range of 500 to 7,499 KW will use the recovery factor applicable to Rate Schedule LP; and customers with a Contract Demand over 7,499 KW will use the recovery factor applicable to Rate Schedule PX.

<u>TECO:</u>	<u>Standard</u>	<u>On-Peak</u>	<u>Off-Peak</u>
Group A	2.432	2.941	2.190
Group A1	2.303	n/a	n/a
Group B	2.418	2.924	2.177
Group C	2.339	2.829	2.106

STIPULATED

ISSUE 8: What is the appropriate revenue tax factor to be applied in calculating each company's levelized fuel factor for the projection period of April, 1997, through September, 1997?

POSITION:

FPC:	1.00083	
FPL:	1.01609	
FPUC:	Marianna:	1.00083
	Fernandina Beach:	1.01609
GULF:	1.01609	
TECO:	1.00083	

STIPULATED

ISSUE 9: What accounting procedures should be used by the investor-owned utilities to book adjustments due to differences between the "per books" inventory quantities and the semi-annual coal inventory survey quantities.

POSITION: The following accounting procedures should be used:

1. Surveys of the coal inventory shall be conducted semiannually.
2. The coal inventory at each plant site shall be considered separately and adjusted according to the procedures in this order.

3. All adjustments booked shall be made to both the quantity and dollars as recorded on the utility's books. These adjustments shall be booked to the inventory account prior to the calculation of the total available tons and dollars for that month.
4. If the difference between the book inventory quantity and the semiannual survey results is less than or equal to $\pm 3\%$ of the semiannual survey results (based on tons), no adjustment shall be made.
5. If the difference between the book inventory quantity and the semiannual survey results is greater than $\pm 3\%$ of the semiannual survey results (based on tons), an adjustment shall be made to the book inventory equal to the difference between $\pm 3\%$ of the semiannual survey results and the total difference.
6. The quantity to be adjusted shall be priced at the weighted average cost of the sum of the total available book inventory dollars (before consumption) divided by the sum of the total available book inventory quantity (before consumption) for the most recent six (6) month period preceding the month during which the survey is conducted.
7. The entire adjustment, both tons and dollars, shall be either debited or credited, whichever is appropriate, to the book inventory account for the month during which the survey is conducted. The offsetting entry shall be made to fuel expense for the same month.
8. Adjustment, greater than 2% ($\pm 5\%$ less $\pm 3\%$) of the semiannual survey results (based on tons), that may significantly affect either the utility or its customers if booked entirely in one month, may be amortized to fuel expense over an appropriate time period. The appropriate time period selected by the utility shall be subject to the review and approval of the Commission.

9. The utility shall notify the Division of Electric and Gas and the appropriate District Field Office of the results of any semiannual surveys regardless of whether any adjustments are made. The notification shall be made by the 15th day of the month subsequent to the month during which the surveys are conducted and shall include, as a minimum, the "per books" quantities, the survey quantities, and the calculation of any adjustments on a per plant basis.

STIPULATED

ISSUE 10: How should transmission costs be accounted for when determining the transaction price of an economy, Schedule C, broker transaction between two directly interconnected utilities?

POSITION: This issue should be deferred until the August 1997 hearing to allow parties an opportunity to file testimony regarding this issue.

STIPULATED

ISSUE 11: If the cost of transmission is used to determine the transaction price of an economy, Schedule C, broker transaction between two directly interconnected utilities, how should the costs of this transmission be recovered?

POSITION: This issue should be deferred until the August 1997 hearing to allow parties an opportunity to file testimony regarding this issue.

STIPULATED

ISSUE 12: How should transmission costs be accounted for when determining the transaction price of an economy, Schedule C, broker transaction that requires wheeling between two non-directly interconnected utilities?

POSITION: This issue should be deferred until the August 1997 hearing to allow parties an opportunity to file testimony regarding this issue.

STIPULATED

ISSUE 13: If the cost of transmission is used to determine the transaction price of an economy, Schedule C, broker transaction that requires wheeling between two non-directly interconnected utilities, how should the costs of this transmission be recovered?

POSITION: This issue should be deferred until the August 1997 hearing to allow parties an opportunity to file testimony regarding this issue.

Company-Specific Fuel Adjustment Issues

Florida Power Corporation

STIPULATED

ISSUE 14A: Should the Commission approve Florida Power Corporation's request to recover the cost of converting Debary Unit 7, Bartow Units 3 and 4, and Suwannee Unit 1 to burn natural gas?

POSITION: Yes. Florida Power Corporation's conversion of the Debary Unit 7, Bartow Units 3 and 4, and Suwannee Unit 1 to burn natural gas is estimated to save FPC's ratepayers more than \$22 million over the next 5 years at a cost of approximately \$7.5 million. Order No. 14546, issued July 8, 1985 allows a utility to recover fossil-fuel related costs which result in fuel savings when those costs were not previously addressed in determining base rates. FPC should be allowed to recover the projected cost of conversion through its fuel clause beginning April 1, 1997 to be depreciated over the next five years using straight line depreciation. FPC should also be allowed to recover a return on average investment at the rate authorized in Docket 910890-EI, 8.37%, as well as applicable taxes. Staff will request an audit of actual costs once the conversion is complete to true-up original projections and to verify the prudence of the individual cost components included for recovery.

ISSUE 14B: Should the costs associated with the settlement agreement between Florida Power Corporation and Lake Cogen, Ltd. be approved for recovery through the Fuel and Purchased Power Cost Recovery Clause for the period April, 1997 through September, 1997?

POSITIONS:

FPC: Yes, the Lake Cogen settlement costs should be included in the Fuel and Purchased Power Cost Recovery Clause for the upcoming April - September period, subject to the Commission's ultimate approval of the settlement agreement in Docket No. 961477-EQ.

FIPUG: FIPUG expresses its concern in regard to allowing FPC to recover costs from ratepayers for a settlement not approved by the Commission. However, FIPUG will not object at this time subject to its understanding that: 1) if the settlement is not approved, the costs will be removed (with interest) in the August fuel adjustment proceeding; and 2) FIPUG retains the right to challenge the methodology by which any approved costs will be recovered and any changes in methodology will apply back to the February, 1997 proceeding.

OPC: No.

STAFF: The energy costs associated with the Lake Cogen, Ltd. settlement are appropriate fuel costs for recovery through the fuel and purchased power cost recovery clause. FPC should include all anticipated fuel expenses when determining projected fuel costs. The final determination of whether or not those energy settlement costs are recoverable will be based on the Commission's decision in Docket No. 961477-EQ. If the Commission denies recovery of these energy costs, the utility should include the appropriate adjustments in its next fuel filings.

ISSUE 14C: Should the costs associated with the settlement agreement between Florida Power Corporation and Pasco Cogen, Ltd. be approved for recovery through the Fuel and Purchased Power Cost Recovery Clause for the period April, 1997 through September, 1997?

POSITIONS:

FPC: Yes, the Pasco Cogen settlement costs should be included in the Fuel and Purchased Power Cost Recovery Clause for the upcoming April - September period, subject to the Commission's ultimate approval of the settlement agreement in Docket No. 961407-EQ.

FIPUG: FIPUG expresses its concern in regard to allowing FPC to recover costs from ratepayers for a settlement not approved by the Commission. However, FIPUG will not object at this time subject to its understanding that: 1) if the settlement is not approved, the costs will be removed (with interest) in the August fuel adjustment proceeding; and 2) FIPUG retains the right to challenge the methodology by which any approved costs will be recovered and any changes in methodology will apply back to the February, 1997 proceeding.

OPC: No.

STAFF: The energy costs associated with the Pasco Cogen, Ltd. settlement are appropriate fuel costs for recovery through the fuel and purchased power cost recovery clause. FPC should include all anticipated fuel expenses when determining projected fuel costs. The final determination of whether or not those energy settlement costs are recoverable will be based on the Commission's decision in Docket No. 961407-EQ. If the Commission denies recovery of these energy costs, the utility should include the appropriate adjustments in its next fuel filings.

ISSUE 14D: Should Florida Power Corporation be permitted to recover the replacement fuel costs associated with the extended outage at its Crystal River No. 3 nuclear unit?

POSITIONS:

FPC: Yes, the replacement power costs associated with the outage at Crystal River 3 should be included in the Fuel

and Purchased Power Cost Recovery Clause, subject to the Commission's ultimate review and approval when the unit has been returned to service. For purposes of rate impact mitigation, FPC has not revised its projections for the April - September 1997 period which currently show Crystal River 3 in service throughout the summer period, thus deferring the recovery of any replacement power costs incurred during the period to future recovery periods. (Zuloaga)

FIPUG: Agree with Public Counsel

OPC: No.

STAFF: This issue should be deferred until a review of the nuclear outage can be conducted.

ISSUE 14E: Should the Commission approve Florida Power Corporation's proposal to collect the March-ending true-up under-recovery over a 12-month period beginning in April 1997?

POSITIONS:

FPC: Yes. Spreading the collection of the true-up under-recovery over a 12-month period will lessen the rate impact on customers. (Wieland)

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

OPC: FPC's replacement fuel costs associated with the ongoing extended outage at the Crystal River #3 nuclear unit should be excluded from fuel cost recovery.

STAFF: Yes. The Commission should approve FPC's request to recover its March-ending true-up underrecovery over a 12-month period. This extended collection period will lessen the rate impact on FPC's ratepayers.

Florida Power and Light Company

STIPULATED

ISSUE 15A:

Should the Commission approve Florida Power and Light Company's request to recover depreciation expense and return on investment for rail cars purchased to deliver coal to Scherer Plant?

POSITION: Yes. Pursuant to Order No. 14546, issued July 8, 1985, unanticipated fuel-related costs not included in the computation of base rates may be considered for recovery through a utility's fuel clause. When economically beneficial to a utility's ratepayers, the cost of purchasing or leasing rail cars is considered to be a fuel-related expense that should be recovered through the fuel clause. FPL's proposal is consistent with the approval by the Commission in Order No. PSC-95-1089-FOF-EI for the previous purchase of 462 Scherer rail cars.

STIPULATED

ISSUE 15B:

Should the Commission approve Florida Power and Light Company's request to recover the costs of implementing certain equipment modifications and additions at some of its generating plants and fuel storage facilities to use "low gravity" fuel oil?

POSITION: Yes. These modifications will allow FPL to operate these plants using a heavier more economic grade of residual fuel oil called "low gravity" fuel oil. These modifications are estimated to save FPL's ratepayers more than \$19 million over the next three years at a cost of approximately \$2 million. Order No. 14546, issued July 8, 1985 allows a utility to recover fossil-fuel related costs which result in fuel savings when those costs were not previously addressed in determining base rates. FPL should be allowed to recover the projected cost of the modifications through its fuel clause beginning April, 1997. Staff will request an audit of actual costs once the modifications are complete to true-up original projections and to verify the prudence of the individual costs components included for recovery.

Tampa Electric Company

STIPULATED

ISSUE 16A:

Has Tampa Electric Company appropriately calculated its proposed refund factors for refunding the \$25 million in excess earnings as required by Order No. PSC-96-0670-S-EI?

POSITION: Yes.

ISSUE 16B:

How should the results of the Commission's scheduled vote at the February 18, 1997 Agenda Conference in Docket No. 970001-EI in the February 19 - 21, 1997 fuel hearing be treated?

TECO:

Tampa Electric does not believe that a vote of the Commission at an Agenda Conference on February 18, 1997 should cause a change in the proposed fuel adjustment factor to be considered at the fuel hearing scheduled to commence the next day, February 19, 1997, for the following reasons:

- ▶ The Commission's vote on the generic issue on February 18 will not determine that any adjustment is required for any specific wholesale contract but, instead, if Staff's recommendation is approved, will provide a process by which the proper treatment may be determined on a prospective basis.
- ▶ The appropriate treatment of Tampa Electric's recently negotiated wholesale transactions with the Florida Municipal Power Agency and the City of Lakeland will be the subject of a hearing tentatively scheduled in June of 1997 in Docket No. 970171-EU.
- ▶ The Commission's vote on February 18 will be subject to reconsideration and/or appeal and clarification of the Commission's vote may be required.
- ▶ Premature implementation of a non-final vote could cause confusion and multiple fuel adjustment changes depending upon how the issue is finally resolved.

- ▶ The fuel adjustment clause has a true-up mechanism specifically designed to protect customers including a provision for interest. This process expressly contemplates adjustments being made after the fact based on known facts once they are final.
- ▶ Rate stability is an acknowledged goal of the Commission which would be jeopardized by premature implementation of non-final Commission votes.

FIPUG: TECO should incorporate the Commission's February 18th decision into its factors for the upcoming projection period.

OPC: If the Commission reaches a decision on February 18, 1997, which, if implemented for the next projection period, would provide immediate benefits to retail customers and is not dependent upon the outcome of future hearings addressing Issue 26, then any affected utility should be required to modify its fuel cost recovery factor for the projection period to reflect the Commission's vote.

STAFF: No adjustment should be made at the February 1997 fuel hearing. Staff believes that this issue should be considered in two separate proceedings. The treatment of wholesale fuel revenues will be decided in an issue arising in Docket No. 970001-EI which will be voted upon the Commission at its February 18, 1997 Agenda Conference. This issue is also related to Issue No. 26, a Company-Specific Tampa Electric Company Capacity Cost Recovery issue dealing with the treatment of non-fuel revenues from wholesale sales to Lakeland and Florida Municipal Power Agency. The parties are proposing a stipulation to Issue No. 26 which would allow hearing at a later time in Docket No. 970171-EU, to allow the parties the opportunity to file testimony. Staff believes that the treatment of fuel revenues is closely linked with the decision regarding non-fuel revenues. Based upon the Commission's decisions at the February 18 Agenda Conference and the hearing to address Issue No. 26, the Company should make the appropriate adjustment in its August 1997 fuel filing.

Generic Generating Performance Incentive Factor Issues

STIPULATED

ISSUE 17: What is the appropriate GPIF reward or penalty for performance achieved during the period April, 1996 through September, 1996?

POSITION: FPC: See Staff Attachment 1, page 1 of 2.
GULF: See Staff Attachment 1, page 1 of 2.
TECO: See Staff Attachment 1, page 1 of 2.

STIPULATED

(EXCEPT AS TO FPC)

ISSUE 18A: What should the GPIF targets/ranges be for the period April, 1997 through September, 1997?

POSITIONS:

FPC: Agree with staff.

GULF: Agree with staff.

TECO: Agree with staff.

FIPUG: No position.

OPC: FPC: The GPIF targets and ranges should be those as reflected in the originally filed testimony the Company submitted on January 13, 1997, not as revised on January 31, 1997.
FPL: No position.
GPC: No position.
TECO: No position.

STAFF: FPC: See Staff Attachment 1, page 2 of 2.
GULF: See Staff Attachment 1, page 2 of 2.
TECO: See Staff Attachment 1, page 2 of 2.

ISSUE 18B: How should FPC's Crystal River No. 3 nuclear unit be treated in the GPIF for April - September 1997 period in view of the unit's extended outage?

POSITIONS:

FPC: Consistent with past Commission practice, Crystal River 3 should be removed from FPC's GPIF calculation for the upcoming period. A revised GPIF filing reflecting the

exclusion of Crystal River 3 will be submitted shortly.
(Zuloaga)

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

OPC: Florida Power should not be allowed to revise its GPIF projections. The company has not offered any explanation for its failure to file the revised assumptions by the original January 13, 1997, filing date. Furthermore, it is inconsistent to project Crystal River # 3 will be on-line throughout the April - September, 1997, projection period for fuel cost recovery purposes while maintaining the unit will be off-line throughout the period for GPIF purposes.

STAFF: Crystal River No. 3 should be removed from FPC's GPIF calculation for the April 1997 through September 1997 period.

Generic Capacity Cost Recovery Issues

STIPULATED

ISSUE 19: What is the appropriate final capacity cost recovery true-up amount for the period April, 1996 through September 1996?

POSITION: FPC: \$3,700,279 overrecovery.
TECO: \$12,560 overrecovery.

STIPULATED

ISSUE 20: What is the estimated capacity cost recovery true-up amount for the period October, 1996 through April, 1997?

POSITION: FPC: \$8,476,789 underrecovery.
TECO: \$228,378 overrecovery.

STIPULATED

ISSUE 21: What is the total capacity cost recovery true-up amount to be collected during the period April, 1997 through September, 1997?

POSITION: FPC: \$4,776,510 underrecovery.
TECO: \$240,938 overrecovery.

STIPULATED

ISSUE 22: What is the appropriate projected net purchased power capacity cost recovery amount to be included in the recovery factor for the period April, 1997 through September, 1997?

POSITION: FPC: \$146,689,671
TECO: \$11,422,680

STIPULATED

ISSUE 23: What are the projected capacity cost recovery factors for the period April, 1997 through September 1997?

POSITION:

<u>FPC:</u>	<u>Rate Class</u>	<u>CCR Factor</u>
	Residential	1.068 cents/kWh
	General Service Non-Demand	.845 cents/kWh
	@ Primary Voltage	.837 cents/kWh
	@ Transmission Voltage	.829 cents/kWh
	General Service 100% Load Factor	.583 cents/kWh
	General Service Demand	.704 cents/kWh
	@ Primary Voltage	.697 cents/kWh
	@ Transmission Voltage	.689 cents/kWh
	Curtailable	.590 cents/kWh
	@ Primary Voltage	.585 cents/kWh
	@ Transmission Voltage	.579 cents/kWh
	Interruptible	.553 cents/kWh
	@ Primary Voltage	.547 cents/kWh
	@ Transmission Voltage	.542 cents/kWh
	Lighting	.204 cents/kWh
<u>TECO:</u>	<u>Rate Schedules</u>	<u>Factor</u>
	RS	.179 cents per KWH
	GS, TS	.173 cents per KWH
	GSD, EV-X	.132 cents per KWH
	GSLD, SBF	.118 cents per KWH
	IS-1 & 3, SBI-1 & 3	.010 cents per KWH
	SL/OL	.021 cents per KWH

Company Specific Capacity Cost Recovery Issues

Florida Power Corporation

ISSUE 24A: Should the costs associated with the settlement agreement between Florida Power Corporation and Lake Cogen, Ltd. be approved for recovery through the Capacity Cost Recovery Clause for the period April, 1997 through September, 1997?

POSITIONS:

FPC: Yes, the Lake Cogen settlement costs should be included in the Fuel and Purchased Power Cost Recovery Clause for the upcoming April - September period, subject to the Commission's ultimate approval of the settlement agreement in Docket NO. 961477-EQ.

FIPUG: FIPUG expresses its concern in regard to allowing FPC to recover costs from ratepayers for a settlement not approved by the Commission. However, FIPUG will not object at this time subject to its understanding that: 1) if the settlement is not approved, the costs will be removed (with interest) in the August fuel adjustment proceeding; and 2) FIPUG retains the right to challenge the methodology by which any approved costs will be recovered and any changes in methodology will apply back to the February, 1997 proceeding.

OPC: No.

STAFF: The capacity costs associated with the Lake Cogen, Ltd. settlement are appropriate costs for recovery through the capacity cost recovery clause. FPC should include all anticipated capacity expenses when determining projected capacity costs. The final determination of whether or not those settlement costs are recoverable will be based on the Commission's decision in Docket No. 961477-EQ. If the Commission denies recovery of these capacity costs, the utility should include the appropriate adjustments in its next capacity filings.

ISSUE 24B: Should the costs associated with the settlement agreement between Florida Power Corporation and Pasco Cogen, Ltd. be approved for recovery through the Capacity Cost Recovery Clause for the period April, 1997 through September, 1997?

POSITIONS:

FPC: Yes, the Pasco Cogen settlement costs should be included in the Fuel and Purchased Power Cost Recovery Clause for the upcoming April - September period, subject to the Commission's ultimate approval of the settlement agreement in Docket No. 961407-EQ.

FIPUG: FIPUG expresses its concern in regard to allowing FPC to recover costs from ratepayers for a settlement not approved by the Commission. However, FIPUG will not object at this time subject to its understanding that: 1) if the settlement is not approved, the costs will be removed (with interest) in the August fuel adjustment proceeding; and 2) FIPUG retains the right to challenge the methodology by which any approved costs will be recovered and any changes in methodology will apply back to the February, 1997 proceeding.

OPC: No.

STAFF: The capacity costs associated with the Pasco Cogen, Ltd. settlement are appropriate costs for recovery through the capacity cost recovery clause. FPC should include all anticipated capacity expenses when determining projected capacity costs. The final determination of whether or not those settlement costs are recoverable will be based on the Commission's decision in Docket No. 961407-EQ. If the Commission denies recovery of these capacity costs, the utility should include the appropriate adjustments in its next capacity filings.

Florida Power & Light Company

STIPULATED

ISSUE 25: Should the Commission approve Florida Power & Light Company's request for a mid-course correction to reduce its Capacity Cost Recovery Clause factors effective April, 1997?

POSITION: Yes. The CCRC factors now in effect for FPL were originally established to be effective for the period

October, 1996 through September, 1997. However, because FPL has experienced an over recovery of approximately \$28.8 million, staff believes that it is appropriate to reduce the factors effective in April, 1997. The over recovery is primarily due to the fact that payments to two cogenerators (Okeelanta and Osceola), which were projected to be made during the period June, 1996 through December, 1996; did not occur. The appropriate factors are:

RATE CLASS	CAPACITY RECOVERY FACTOR (\$/KW)	CAPACITY RECOVERY FACTOR (\$/KWH)
RS1	-	0.00503
GS1	-	0.00456
GSD1	1.74	-
OS2	-	0.00330
GSLD1/CS1	1.74	-
GSLD2/CS2	1.78	-
GSLD3/CS3	1.74	-
CILCD/CILCG	1.79	-
CILCT	1.79	-
MET	1.87	-
OL1/SL1	-	0.00083
SL2	-	0.00320

RATE CLASS	CAPACITY RECOVERY FACTOR (RESERVATION DEMAND CHARGE) (\$/KW)	CAPACITY RECOVERY FACTOR (SUM OF DAILY DEMAND CHARGE) (\$/KW)
ISST1D	.23	.11
SST1T	.21	.10
SST1D	.22	.11

Tampa Electric Company

STIPULATED

ISSUE 26: How should the non-fuel revenues associated with Tampa Electric Company's wholesale sales to the Florida Municipal Power Agency and the City of Lakeland be treated for cost recovery purposes?

POSITION: This issue will be considered in a separate docket (Docket No. 970171-EU) in order to afford the parties an opportunity to submit testimony, with the understanding that when this issue is ultimately resolved, Tampa Electric's surveillance reporting results will be adjusted to the extent necessary to reflect the treatment ultimately approved, going back to the time when Tampa Electric began receiving revenues under the two wholesale contracts in question.

VII. EXHIBIT LIST

* Witnesses whose names are preceded by an asterisk (*) have been excused. All exhibits submitted with those witnesses' testimony shall be admitted into the record.

<u>Witness</u>	<u>Proffered By</u>	<u>I.D. No.</u>	<u>Description</u>
* Scardino	FPC	_____ (JS - 1)	True-up Variance Analysis
* Scardino	FPC	_____ (JS - 2)	Schedules A1 through A13
Wieland	FPC	_____ (KHW - 1)	Forecast Assumptions (Parts A-C), and capacity Cost Recovery Factors (Part D)
Wieland	FPC	_____ (KHW - 2)	Schedules E1 through E10 and H1
* Zuloaga	FPC	_____ (DBZ - 1)	Standard Form GPIF Schedules (Reward/Penalty)
* Zuloaga	FPC	_____ (DBZ - 2)	Standard Form GPIF Schedules (Targets/Ranges)

<u>Witness</u>	<u>Proffered By</u>	<u>I.D. No.</u>	<u>Description</u>
* Morley	FPL	<u>(RM - 1)</u>	Appendix I/Fuel Cost-Recovery True-Up Calculation
* Morley	FPL	<u>(RS - 2)</u>	Appendix II/Fuel Cost Recovery E-Schedules
* Morley	FPL	<u>(RM - 3)</u>	A p p e n d i x III/Capacity Cost Recovery Midcourse Correction
* Silva	FPL	<u>(RS - 1)</u>	Appendix I/Fuel Cost Recovery Forecast Assumptions
* Bachman	FPUC	<u>(GMB - 1)</u>	Composite - Schedules E1, E1-A, E1-B, E-1B-1, E2, E7, E10 and M1 (Marianna Division)
			Schedules E1, E1-A, E1-B, E-1B-1, E2, E7, E8, E10 and F1 (Fernandina Beach Division)
* Cranmer	Gulf	<u>(SDC - 1)</u>	Calculation of fuel cost recovery final true-up 4/96 through 9/96
* Cranmer	Gulf	<u>(SDC - 2)</u>	Schedules E-1 through E-11, H-1; A-1 through A-9 for June '96 - Nov. '96.
* Fontaine	Gulf	<u>(GDF - 1)</u>	Gulf Power Company GPIF Results Oct. '96 - March '97
* Fontaine	Gulf	<u>(GDF - 2)</u>	Gulf Power Company GPIF Targets and Ranges April '97 - Sept. '97

<u>Witness</u>	<u>Proffered By</u>	<u>I.D. No.</u>	<u>Description</u>
* Oaks	Gulf	<u>(MFO - 1)</u>	Gulf Power Company Coal Suppliers April 1996 - September 1996
* Oaks	Gulf	<u>(MFO - 2)</u>	Projected vs. actual fuel cost of generated power March '88 - September '97
* Branick	TECO	<u>(KAB - 1)</u>	Fuel cost recovery and capacity cost recovery final true-up April 1996 - September 1996
* Branick	TECO	<u>(KAB - 2)</u>	Fuel adjustment projection, April 1997 - September 1997
* Branick	TECO	<u>(KAB - 3)</u>	Capacity cost recovery projection, April 1997 - September 1997
* Branick	TECO	<u>(KAB - 4)</u>	Deferred Revenue Plan \$25 million refund - October 1996 - September 1997
* Keselowsky	TECO	<u>(GAK - 1)</u>	Generating Performance Incentive Factor Results, April 1996 - September 1996
* Keselowsky	TECO	<u>(GAK - 2)</u>	GPIF Targets and Ranges Estimated for April 1997 - September 1997
* Keselowsky	TECO	<u>(GAK - 3)</u>	Estimated Unit Performance Data, April 1997 - September 1997

Parties and Staff reserve the right to identify additional exhibits for the purpose of cross-examination.

VIII. PROPOSED STIPULATIONS

All issues have been stipulated except the following: Generic Issues 1 - 4, 7 and 18A for FPC; FPC Company Specific Issues 14B, 14C, 14D, 14E, 18B, 24A and 24B; and TECO Company Specific Issue 16B.

IX. PENDING MOTIONS

On February 3, 1997, Office of Public Counsel filed a Motion for Order Precluding Florida Power Corporation from Supplementing its Prefiled Direct Testimony Addressing the Fuel Cost Effects of the Extended Outage at the Crystal River #3 Nuclear Unit.

X. RULINGS

Oral argument shall be permitted on Issue Numbers 14D, 14E, and 18B which address the recovery of costs associated with the outage of FPC's Crystal River Unit 3. Oral argument shall be limited to 15 minutes to each party. Depending upon the Commission's ruling on these issues, the Company may be required to submit a revised filing for this fuel hearing.

XI. OTHER MATTERS

The resolution of Issue Number 16B is related to the Commission's decision on a staff recommendation to be considered at the February 18, 1997, Agenda Conference. Depending upon the Commission's decision on this Agenda item, TECO may be required to submit a revised filing for this fuel hearing.

FPC filed an original and revised version of the testimony and exhibits of witness Zuloaga. The determination of which version of the testimony and exhibits should be admitted into the record is dependent upon the Commission's resolution of Issue Numbers 18A and 18B.

ORDER NO. PSC-97-0180-PHO-EI
DOCKET NO. 970001-EI
PAGE 34

It is therefore,

ORDERED by Commissioner J. Terry Deason, as Prehearing Officer, that this Prehearing Order shall govern the conduct of these proceedings as set forth above unless modified by the Commission.

By ORDER of Commissioner J. Terry Deason, as Prehearing Officer, this 18th day of February, 1997.



J. PERRY DEASON, Commissioner and
Prehearing Officer

(S E A L)

VDJ

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

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

Any party adversely affected by this order, which is preliminary, procedural or intermediate in nature, may request: (1) reconsideration within 10 days pursuant to Rule 25-22.0376, Florida Administrative Code, if issued by a Prehearing Officer; (2) reconsideration within 15 days pursuant to Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code, if issued by the Commission; or (3) judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court, in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility, or the First District Court of Appeal, in

ORDER NO. PSC-97-0180-PHO-EI
DOCKET NO. 970001-EI
PAGE 35

the case of a water or wastewater utility. A motion for reconsideration shall be filed with the Director, Division of Records and Reporting, in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code. Judicial review of a preliminary, procedural or intermediate ruling or order is available if review of the final action will not provide an adequate remedy. Such review may be requested from the appropriate court, as described above, pursuant to Rule 9.100, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.

GPIF REWARDS/PENALTIES
April 1996 to September 1996

Utility	Amount	Reward/Penalty
Florida Power Corporation	\$ 431,674	Reward
Gulf Power Company	\$ 82,198	Reward
Tampa Electric Company	(\$ 298,369)	Penalty

Utility/ Plant/Unit	EAJ	Adjusted Actual	Heat Rate Target	Adjusted Actual
<u>FPC</u>	<u>Target</u>			
Anclote 1	96.1	94.9	9.665	9.617
Anclote 2	97.1	94.9	9.784	9.717
Crystal River 1	86.9	84.8	10.046	9.961
Crystal River 2	80.5	92.3	9.940	9.871
Crystal River 3	90.0	61.4	10.492	10.452
Crystal River 4	70.4	63.7	9.368	9.397
Crystal River 5	94.9	95.4	9.279	9.329
<u>Gulf</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Adjusted Actual</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Adjusted Actual</u>
Crist 6	82.2	89.9	10.597	10.219
Crist 7	71.6	76.4	10.500	10.166
Smith 1	87.3	91.0	10.219	10.271
Smith 2	91.7	97.0	10.422	10.448
Daniel 1	92.8	94.9	10.493	10.715
Daniel 2	96.7	92.4	10.280	10.751
<u>TECO</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Adjusted Actual</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Adjusted Actual</u>
Big Bend 1	86.7	84.8	10.077	10.104
Big Bend 2	85.9	87.2	10.020	10.144
Big Bend 3	87.1	84.2	9.746	9.883
Big Bend 4	89.7	92.7	10.149	10.107
Gannon 5	90.4	87.2	10.343	10.636
Gannon 6	64.8	67.3	10.443	11.025

GPIF TARGETS
 April 1997 to September 1997

<u>Utility/ Plant/Unit</u>	<u>EA</u>			<u>Staff</u>	<u>Heat Rate</u>	
	<u>Company</u>	<u>POF</u>	<u>EUOF</u>		<u>Company</u>	<u>Staff</u>
<u>FPC</u>	<u>EA</u>	<u>POF</u>	<u>EUOF</u>			
Anclote 1	91.3	3.8	4.9	Agree	9.719	Agree
Anclote 2	95.3	0.0	4.7	Agree	9.669	Agree
Crystal River 1	88.7	2.2	9.1	Agree	9.766	Agree
Crystal River 2	83.5	2.2	14.3	Agree	9.763	Agree
Crystal River 4	94.1	0.0	5.9	Agree	9.289	Agree
Crystal River 5	75.5	21.3	3.2	Agree	9.267	Agree
<u>Gulf</u>	<u>EA</u>	<u>POF</u>	<u>EUOF</u>			Agree
Crist 6	84.4	8.7	6.9	Agree	10.833	Agree
Crist 7	80.0	8.7	11.3	Agree	10.499	Agree
Smith 1	96.2	0.0	3.8	Agree	10.244	Agree
Smith 2	82.6	10.4	7.0	Agree	10.406	Agree
Daniel 1	87.8	4.9	7.3	Agree	10.253	Agree
Daniel 2	91.9	4.9	3.2	Agree	10.062	Agree
<u>TECO</u>	<u>EA</u>	<u>POF</u>	<u>EUOF</u>			Agree
Big Bend 1	67.8	22.4	9.8	Agree	9.968	Agree
Big Bend 2	84.9	0.0	15.1	Agree	10.079	Agree
Big Bend 3	84.3	0.0	15.7	Agree	9.969	Agree
Big Bend 4	91.5	0.0	8.5	Agree	9.992	Agree
Gannon 5	90.0	0.0	10.0	Agree	10.448	Agree
Gannon 6	86.3	3.8	9.9	Agree	10.471	Agree