

FILE COPY

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Environmental Cost Recovery Clause.

DOCKET NO. 97007-EI

FILED: JULY 22, 1997

STAFF'S PRELIMINARY LIST OF ISSUES

Pursuant to Order No. PSC-97-0001-PCO-EI, issued January 2, 1997, establishing the prehearing procedure in this docket, the Staff of the Florida Public Service Commission hereby files its Preliminary List of Issues and Positions.

Generic Environmental Cost Recovery Issues

ISSUE 1: What are the appropriate final environmental cost recovery true-up amounts for the period ending September 30, 1996?

STAFF: FPL: \$69,606 overrecovery.

GULF: \$525,673 overrecovery.

ISSUE 1A: What are the appropriate final environmental cost recovery true-up amounts for the period ending March 31, 1997?

STAFF: TECO: \$156,449 overrecovery.

ISSUE 2: What are the estimated environmental cost recovery true-up amounts for the period October 1996 through September 1997?

STAFF: FPL: No position at this time pending resolution of a company-specific issue.

GULF: No position at this time.

- ACK _____
- AFA _____
- APP _____
- CAF _____
- CMU _____
- CTR _____
- EAG _____
- LEG _____
- LI 3 _____
- CI _____
- R _____
- S 1 _____
- WTH _____
- OTH _____

DOCUMENT NUMBER DATE

07372 JUL 22 97

FPSO RECORDS/REPORTING

STAFF'S PRELIMINARY LIST OF ISSUES
DOCKET NO. 970007-EI
PAGE 2

ISSUE 2A: What are the estimated environmental cost recovery true-up amounts for the period April 1997 through September 1997?

STAFF: TECO: \$843,546 underrecovery.

ISSUE 3: What are the total environmental cost recovery true-up amounts to be collected during the period October 1997 through September 1998?

STAFF: FPL: No position at this time pending resolution of other issues.

GULF: No position at this time.

ISSUE 3A: What are the total environmental cost recovery true-up amounts to be collected during the period October 1997 through March 1998?

STAFF: TECO: \$687,097 net underrecovery.

ISSUE 4: What are the appropriate projected environmental cost recovery amounts for the period October 1997 through September 1998?

STAFF: FPL: No position at this time pending resolution of a company-specific issue.

GULF: No position at this time pending resolution of other issues.

ISSUE 4A: What are the appropriate projected environmental cost recovery amounts for the period October 1997 through March 1998?

STAFF: TECO: \$3,837,658.

ISSUE 5: What should be the effective date of the new environmental cost recovery factors for billing purposes?

STAFF: FPL: The factor should be effective beginning with the specified environmental cost recovery cycle and thereafter for the period October 1997 through September 1998. Billing cycles may start before October 1, 1997, and the last cycle may be read after September 30, 1998, so that each customer is billed for twelve months regardless of when the adjustment factor became effective.

GULF: The factor should be effective beginning with the specified environmental cost recovery cycle and thereafter for the period October 1997 through September 1998. Billing cycles may start before October 1, 1997, and the last cycle may be read after September 30, 1998, so that each customer is billed for twelve months regardless of when the adjustment factor became effective.

TECO: The factor should be effective beginning with the specified environmental cost recovery cycle and thereafter for the period October 1997 through March 1998. Billing cycles may start before October 1, 1997, and the last cycle may be read after March 31, 1998, so that each customer is billed for six months regardless of when the adjustment factor became effective.

ISSUE 6: What depreciation rates should be used to develop the depreciation expense included in the total environmental cost recovery true-up amounts to be collected during the period beginning October 1997?

STAFF: The depreciation rates used to calculate the depreciation expense should be the rates that are in effect during the period the allowed capital investment is in service.

ISSUE 7: How should the newly proposed environmental costs be allocated to the rate classes?

STAFF: FPL: No position at this time.

GULF: The costs of the Above Ground Storage Tank Integrity Inspections and Secondary Containment Upgrades should be allocated on a 100% demand basis.

ISSUE 8: What are the appropriate Environmental Cost Recovery Factors for the period beginning October 1997 for each rate group?

STAFF: FPL: No position at this time pending resolution of a company-specific issue.

GULF: No position at this time pending resolution of other issues.

TECO:

Rate Class	Environmental Cost Recovery Factors ¢/KWH
RS, RST	.054
GS, GST, TS	.054
GSD, GSDT	.054
GSLD, GSLDT, SBF, SBFT	.053
IS1, IST1, SBI1, IS3, IS3T, SBI3	.052
SL/OL	.054

Company - Specific Environmental Cost Recovery Issues

Florida Power & Light Company

ISSUE 9: Should the Commission approve Florida Power & Light Company's request for recovery of costs of the Substation Pollutant Discharge Prevention and Removal Project through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause?

STAFF: No position at this time pending outstanding discovery.

Gulf Power Company

ISSUE 10: Should the Commission approve Gulf Power Company's request to recover the cost of Above Ground Storage Tank Integrity Inspections and Secondary Containment Upgrades through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause?

STAFF: No position at this time pending outstanding discovery.

ISSUE 10A: Is it appropriate for Gulf Power to earn a return through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause on the 10% retainage on invoices from construction vendors to ensure contract performance?

STAFF: Yes, to the extent that the company practices retainage of 10% on specific projects in the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause.

ISSUE 10B: Should an adjustment be made for the recording error made in SO₂ Allowances as reported in Audit Disclosure No. 2 of the Florida Public Service Commission's Environmental Compliance Cost Adjustment Audit Report for the Period Ended September 30, 1996?

STAFF: No. The error was due to inappropriate allocation of Plant Daniel's SO₂ Allowances. The company has already made correcting entries for the error.

ISSUE 10C: Should legal expenses incurred to assure compliance with revisions to Clean Air Act Amendment Title V provisions be recovered through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause?

STAFF: Yes. Legal expenses directly associated with environmental compliance activities approved by the Commission that are incurred in order to comply with "environmental laws or regulations," as defined by Florida Statutes, Chapter 366.8255, should be recovered through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause. As stated in Order No. PSC-96-1171-FOF-EI dated September 18, 1996, "However, the Commission will continue to examine each such expenditure on a case-by-case basis in order to determine the prudence of its recovery through the clause."

ISSUE 10D: Should an adjustment be made for the O&M expenses reported in Audit Disclosure No. 4 of the Florida Public Service Commission's Environmental Compliance Cost Adjustment Audit Report for the Period Ended September 30, 1996?

STAFF: No. It is staff's understanding that the company has made correcting entries, including any applicable interest, for these O&M expense items in June 1997.

In Order No PSC-95-0384-FOF-EI dated March 21, 1995, the Commission approved "...only the meal costs incurred for an employee's own consumption while traveling on environmental cost recovery clause business" for recovery through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause. In addition, the company agreed in a letter dated February 2, 1995 (EXH. XX) to establish a policy not to recover these types of costs through the clause. Audit Disclosure No. 4 shows that meal costs were among the O&M items included for recovery and later adjusted by the company.

Tampa Electric Company

ISSUE 11: What adjustment for SO₂ Allowances, if any, should be made to Tampa Electric Company's Environmental Cost Recovery Factor as a result of the Commission's decision in Docket No. 970171-EU?

STAFF: If a true-up amount is determined to be necessary as a result of the Commission's decision in Docket No. 970171-EU, this issue should be deferred to the Spring 1998 Environmental Cost Recovery Clause hearing. This will give staff and the company ample time to resolve the appropriate determination of these expenses and the necessary adjustment.

ISSUE 11A: Should an adjustment be made for the expensing of a packing tower through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause in 1996 which was purchased and charged to an inventory account in 1992 as reported in Audit Disclosure No. 1 of the Florida Public Service Commission's Environmental Compliance Cost Adjustment Audit Report for the period ended March 31, 1997?

STAFF: No. The packing tower is a consumable item that is held in inventory until used. It should be treated in the same manner as fuel inventory and expense. Fuel is placed in an inventory account until it is consumed, at which time the fuel costs are expensed through the fuel cost recovery clause. Therefore,

as packing towers are consumed, the cost of that packing tower is appropriately expensed through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause.

ISSUE 11B: Should a portion of gypsum sales revenue be allocated to the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause based on the allocated cost of limestone?

STAFF: No. As stated in Audit Disclosure No. 2 of the Florida Public Service Commission's Environmental Compliance Cost Adjustment Audit Report for the period ended March 31, 1997, gypsum sales revenues are not currently allocated to the ECRC. Gypsum is a by-product of the limestone used in the scrubbing operation for SO₂ removal. Revenues generated from the sale of gypsum, as well as the corresponding O&M costs of the scrubbing process, have historically been included in the calculation of base rates. Provided these O&M costs (with the exception of consumables) associated with the scrubbing process are not recovered through the ECRC, the corresponding revenues likewise should not be recovered through the ECRC.

ISSUE 11C: Should Tampa Electric Company be allowed to recover payroll charges associated with modifications and expansions to employee workload due to the Big Bend Unit 3 Flue Gas Desulfurization Integration Project through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause?

STAFF: No. As stated in Audit Disclosure No. 3 of the Florida Public Service Commission's Environmental Compliance Cost Adjustment Audit Report for the period ended March 31, 1997, most of the employees whose payrolls are included in the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause were employed by the utility as of the last rate case in substantially the same capacity as their current position. The company stated that no new positions were created for this project. Allowing these payroll charges to be included in the ECRC constitutes double recovery. Therefore, TECO should remove these payroll

STAFF'S PRELIMINARY LIST OF ISSUES
DOCKET NO. 970007-EI
PAGE 9

charges, including any applicable interest, from
the Big Bend Unit 3 Flue Gas Desulfurization
Integration Project cost recovery request.

Dated this 22nd day of July, 1997.

Respectfully submitted,



LESLIE J. PAUGH
Staff Counsel

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Gerald L. Gunter Building, Room 370
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850
(850)413-6199

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Environmental Cost
Recovery Clause.

DOCKET NO. 970007-EI

FILED: JULY 22, 1997

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that one true and correct copy of Staff's Preliminary List of Issues and Positions has been furnished by U.S. Mail this 22nd day of July, 1997, to the following:

Ausley & McMullen
James Beasley
P.O. Box 391
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Florida Power Corporation
James McGee
P.O. Box 14042
St. Petersburg, FL 33733

Beggs & Lane
Russell Badders
P.O. Box 12950
Pensacola, FL 32576

Florida Public Utilities Co.
Frank C. Cressman
P.O. Box 3395
West Palm Beach, FL 33402

Florida Industrial Power Users
Group
McWhirter Reeves McGlothlin
Vicki Gordon Kaufman
117 South Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Gulf Power Company
Susan D. Cranmer
P.O. Box 13470
Pensacola, FL 32591

Florida Power & Light Co.
Bill Feaster
215 South Monroe Street
Suite 810
Tallahassee, FL 32301

McWhirter Reeves McGlothlin
John McWhirter
P.O. Box 3350
Tampa, FL 33601

Certificate of Service
Docket No. 970007-EI

Florida Power & Light Company
Bill Walker
215 South Monroe Street
Suite 810
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Steel Hector & Davis
Matthew Childs
215 South Monroe Street
Suite 601
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Tampa Electric Company
Angela Llewellyn
Regulatory & Business Strategy
P.O. Box 111
Tampa, FL 33601



LESLIE J. PAUGH
Staff Counsel

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Gerald L. Gunter Building, Room 370
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850
(850) 413-6199