

**REDACTED**

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Progress Energy Florida, Inc's  
petition for approval of storm cost  
Recovery clause for extraordinary  
Expenditures related to Hurricanes  
Charley, Frances, Jeanne, and Ivan

---

Docket No. 041272-EI

Filed: January 31, 2005

**DIRECT TESTIMONY**

**OF**

**MICHAEL J. MAJOROS, JR.**

**ON BEHALF OF**

**THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE  
01807 FEB 22 05  
FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

1 DIRECT TESTIMONY

2 OF

3 MICHAEL J. MAJOROS, JR.

4 DOCKET NO. 041272-EI

5

6 I. Introduction

7 Q. Please state your name, position and business address.

8 A. My name is Michael J. Majoros, Jr. I am Vice President of Snavelly King Majoros  
9 O'Connor & Lee, Inc. ("Snavelly King"), an economic consulting firm located at  
10 1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 410, Washington, D.C. 20005.

11 Q. Please describe Snavelly King.

12 A. Snavelly King was founded in 1970 to conduct research on a consulting basis into  
13 the rates, revenues, costs and economic performance of regulated firms and  
14 industries. The firm has a professional staff of 15 economists, accountants,  
15 engineers and cost analysts. Most of its work involves the development,  
16 preparation and presentation of expert witness testimony before Federal and  
17 state regulatory agencies. Over the course of its 33-year history, members of the  
18 firm have participated in more than 1,000 proceedings before almost all of the  
19 state commissions and all Federal commissions that regulate utilities or  
20 transportation industries.

21 Q. Have you prepared a summary of your qualifications and experience?

22 A. Yes. Appendix A is a summary of my qualifications and experience. It also  
23 contains a tabulation of my appearances as an expert witness before state and  
24 Federal regulatory agencies.

- 1 **Q. At whose request are you appearing?**
- 2 A. I am appearing on behalf of the Florida Office of Public Counsel ("OPC").
- 3 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**
- 4 A. The Office of Public Counsel requested that I review Progress Energy Florida's  
5 ("Progress", "PEF" or "the Company") proposed storm cost recovery claims; to  
6 express an opinion regarding the reasonableness of Progress' claims; and, if  
7 warranted, make alternative recommendations.
- 8 **Q. Please summarize your testimony.**
- 9 A. Progress Energy has requested authority to collect \$252 million from customers  
10 as a Storm Cost Recovery Clause surcharge, over two years with interest. I will  
11 show that PEF's proposal seeks to require customers to pay, through the storm  
12 surcharge, O&M costs that are already covered through the base rates that  
13 customers pay. I will also discuss certain principles of capitalization, retirement  
14 and cost of removal accounting that should be applied to PEF's storm damage  
15 request. Finally, I will demonstrate that in its request PEF fails to take into  
16 account the 2002 stipulation that, OPC asserts, requires PEF to demonstrate  
17 that expenses (including storm-related expenses) have caused its earned rate of  
18 return on equity capital to fall to 10% before seeking to increase customers' rates  
19 for any reason. I will quantify the impact of that omission. I will show that, once  
20 adjustments have been made to recognize these considerations, the amount of  
21 the negative balance in PEF's storm reserve is reduced from \$252 million to  
22 approximately \$123 million.
- 23 **Q. Do you have an exhibit which summarizes PEF's basic estimates?**
- 24 A. Yes, Exhibit\_\_\_(MJM-1) summarizes PEF's basic estimates.

1 II. Approach to the Analysis

2 Q. Please describe the manner in which you approached your analysis of  
3 PEF's request.

4 A. My basic approach is based upon recognition of the fact that casualty losses,  
5 even catastrophic ones, are not a new phenomenon with respect to the proper  
6 accounting principles that should be applied. The basic accounting rules that  
7 govern the addition and subsequent depreciation of capital investments, as well  
8 as the proper accounting treatment to be afforded operations and maintenance  
9 expense, are not rendered inapplicable by the magnitude of the losses.  
10 Essentially, the issue is not whether PEF will be allowed to recover prudently  
11 incurred costs; rather, the questions are when PEF will recover those costs and  
12 whether and to what extent PEF should be allowed to increase rates for the  
13 purpose. While the nature of the catastrophe may well warrant the acceleration  
14 of the period of recovery, care must be taken to ensure that the special  
15 measures adopted to meet the circumstances do not require customers to pay  
16 twice for the same costs, whether they are expense or capital.

17 Q. Given the magnitude of the storms, how can "normal" accounting  
18 principles be applicable?

19 A. There is certainly no dispute regarding the extent of damage and the magnitude  
20 of the dollars involved in restoration efforts. However, the situation should be  
21 viewed in perspective. PEF contends the negative balance in its storm reserve  
22 is \$252 million. The net book value of PEF's plant in service is roughly \$8 billion.  
23 Over time, it has collected from customers at least \$528 million for the sole  
24 purpose of defraying the costs of removing transmission and distribution assets

1 as they are retired. This number is quantified in Exhibit \_\_\_(MJM-2), which  
2 summarizes information provided by the Company.

3 PEF's net income for the twelve months ending July 2004 was \$325  
4 million. As I will show later in my testimony, PEF could apply some \$100 million  
5 of calendar year 2004 earnings to reduce the negative storm reserve balance  
6 and still earn a healthy rate of return for the year. While the absolute damage  
7 figures are large, and while I do not wish to diminish either the disruptions  
8 caused by the storms or the tremendous efforts that were necessary to restore  
9 service, the Commission should view the situation in context and not lose sight  
10 of accounting principles applicable to casualty losses.

11 This objective is best met by reviewing PEF's proposal to ensure that only  
12 extraordinary expenses that are incremental to those the utility would incur under  
13 normal circumstances are charged to the storm reserve. I regard this as the  
14 "overarching objective" of the analysis of PEF's proposal.

15 **Q. How did you implement this approach in your analysis?**

16 **A.** Upon being engaged by the Office of Public Counsel, I was pleased to learn that  
17 OPC was already in the process of formulating, for purposes of its involvement in  
18 the docket, a set of specific criteria designed to ensure that only extraordinary  
19 expenses would be booked to the Storm Reserve. Having reviewed those  
20 guidelines, I endorse them. However, I do have some reservations concerning  
21 the expensing of any capital costs at all. Therefore, from my perspective, the  
22 OPC's criteria are very generous to PEF. Where the available data allows me to  
23 do so, I have recommended specific adjustments to the Commission. The OPC's  
24 guidelines are:

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

**OPC Storm Damage Guidelines**

**CAPITAL ADDITIONS:**

- A. All capital additions should be booked to plant in service at current book cost of materials and labor. Only additional, extraordinary capital-related expenses will be booked to the storm reserve.
- B. All retirements resulting from 2004 storms should be booked based on existing, approved depreciation/retirement procedures.
- C. The cost of removal expense related to the plant items that have been retired due to 2004 storm damage should be excluded from storm recovery expenses that are charged to the storm damage reserve account, and should instead be charged to the reserve for accumulated cost of removal.

**OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES:**

- D. All base salaries from all bargaining unit labor costs should be excluded from storm recovery expenses charged to the storm damage reserve account.
- E. Only those costs of materials and supplies that exceed the material and supplies expense anticipated under normal operations should be charged to the storm reserve.
- F. All insurance recoveries, less deductibles, should be eliminated from the storm recovery amounts.
- G. The amount charged to the storm damage reserve account should exclude all expenses associated with the following activities:
  - 1. Operating expenses and overheads for company-owned vehicles.
  - 2. Storeroom expense.
  - 3. Advertising expense.
  - 4. Employee training expense.
  - 5. Management overheads except for overtime when working on storms.
  - 6. All other allocated expenses included in normal operations and existing budgets.
  - 7. Labor costs associated with repairs and replacements that have been identified as job or work orders, but that have not yet been worked and that will be completed by existing, full time employees or regular, budgeted contract personnel.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

- 8. Labor costs associated with any work or activity related to the storm other than the jobs or work orders identified in (7) above that will be completed by any employees as part of their regular job duties.
- 9. Call center activities should be excluded except for non-budgeted overtime associated with the storm event.
- 10. No uncollectible expenses or lost revenues should be booked to the storm reserve.
- 11. No expenses associated with cash advances made to employees should be booked to the storm reserve.

11 **Q. Why are these principles important?**

12 A. First, the Commission has no rule in place that governs the matter. Next, the  
13 sheer size and magnitude of 2004 storm events require specific direction for  
14 accountants wading through thousands of bills. Ratepayers must be protected  
15 from “double billing.” The utility must not be allowed to make money from the  
16 storm events. It is therefore imperative that the Commission direct the company  
17 to follow specific accounting guidelines that it deems appropriate.

18 **III. Background**

19 **Q. Please explain the Storm Damage Reserve.**

20 A. In 1992 Florida suffered severe damage from Hurricane Andrew. As a result,  
21 utilities found it difficult to procure reasonably priced commercial insurance for  
22 storm damage to transmission and distribution facilities. They petitioned the  
23 Commission to authorize self-insurance programs. The Commission authorized  
24 PEF to self-insure for storm damage in Docket No. 930867-EI (Order No. PSC-  
25 93-1522-FOF-EI, Issued October 15, 1993).

26 **Q. How does the Storm Damage Reserve work?**

27 A. PEF’s Storm Damage Reserve is an unfunded account. It is increased by  
28 annual accruals in amounts approved by the Commission and reduced by actual

1 storm damage costs charged to it. The annual accrual to the Storm Reserve was  
2 initially set at \$3 million. The accrual was increased to \$6 million effective  
3 January 1, 1994. (Direct Testimony of Javier Portuondo ("Portuondo Direct"), p.  
4 5.) This accrual is debited to annual operating expense and credited to the  
5 Storm Damage Reserve.

6 PEF's base rates are set to collect the \$6 million annual accrual, and PEF  
7 does not transfer any of the resulting cash it collects into a separate physical  
8 account. In the event of a "withdrawal" from the Storm Damage Reserve due to  
9 actual storm damages, the Company uses cash on hand, or borrowed funds.  
10 (Portuondo Direct, p. 6) However, PEF has given no indication that it  
11 experienced any difficulty in paying storm damage-related bills as they came  
12 due.

13 **Q. What is the balance in the Storm Damage Reserve?**

14 **A.** As of December 31, 2004, the Storm Damage Reserve had a balance of \$46.9  
15 million. This is before any storm-related charges due to the four hurricanes in  
16 2004. (Portuondo Direct, p. 9) If all of PEF's estimated Storm Damage Costs  
17 were charged to the reserve, they would result in a negative balance of \$264.5  
18 million, as shown in my Exhibit\_\_\_(MJM-1) which is attached to my testimony.

19 **Q. How does PEF report and account for the Storm Damage Reserve?**

20 **A.** PEF accounts and reports the Storm Damage Reserve as a Regulatory Liability.

21 As stated in PEF's December 31, 2003 FERC Form 1:

22 7. Regulatory Matters

23 As a regulated entity, PEF is subject to the provisions  
24 of SFAS No. 71, "Accounting for the Effects of Certain  
25 Types of Regulation." Accordingly, PEF records  
26



1 certain assets and liabilities resulting from the effects  
2 of the ratemaking process, which would not be  
3 recorded under GAAP for nonregulated entities.  
4 (Florida Power Corporation, December 31, 2003 -  
5 FERC Form 1 Report, pages 123.12 -- 123.13.)  
6

7 Conceptually, a Regulatory Liability is an amount owed to ratepayers until it is  
8 spent on its intended purpose, as opposed to a Regulatory Asset which is an  
9 amount assumed to be recoverable from ratepayers. (Statement of Financial  
10 Accounting Standards No. 71, paragraphs 9 and 11.) Regulatory Liabilities are  
11 grouped with Regulatory Assets on PEF's balance sheet.

12 **Q. Will you please summarize PEF's storm cost recovery proposal?**

13 A. Yes. In August and September, 2004, four hurricanes struck Florida in rapid  
14 succession: Charley, Frances, Jeanne and Ivan. These hurricanes caused  
15 significant damage and left many residents without power, thus causing PEF to  
16 incur certain extraordinary costs.

17 On September 10, 2004 PEF filed a petition with the Commission,  
18 requesting that it be authorized to establish a regulatory asset for storm damage  
19 costs that exceed the \$44.4 million balance of the Storm Damage Reserve Fund.  
20 By Orders issued and consummated October 8, 2004 and November 9, 2004,  
21 the Commission found it unnecessary to create a separate regulatory asset  
22 because Rule 25-6.0143, Florida Administrative Code, by directing that all costs  
23 be charged to the storm reserve, enabled the utility to record a negative balance  
24 and thereby defer recognition of the expense pending consideration of its  
25 petition. (Docket No. 041272, November 18, 2004 Order Establishing Procedure  
26 ("Procedure Order"), p. 1.) PEF also sought future recovery of reasonable and

1 prudently incurred storm damage costs in excess of its Storm Damage Reserve  
2 Fund. (Procedure Order, p. 1.)

3 The Commission made its decision regarding PEF's request to establish a  
4 regulatory asset with the understanding that PEF will continue booking amounts  
5 consistent with its current accounting practice. The Commission noted that the  
6 amounts are subject to its review and approval in the event that a subsequent  
7 petition for recovery of storm-related damages was to be filed. (Procedure Order,  
8 p. 1, emphasis added.)

9 On November 2, 2004, PEF petitioned the Commission to establish a  
10 Storm Cost Recovery Clause to recover extraordinary hurricane related costs.  
11 Specifically:

12 ...PEF requests the Commission to establish a Storm  
13 Cost Recovery Clause that will allow PEF to recover  
14 from its ratepayers over two years its reasonable  
15 storm costs in excess of the balance in its storm  
16 reserve. The clause should provide for the recovery  
17 of the Company's storm-related Operation and  
18 Maintenance (O&M) costs, including in part its costs  
19 in excess of typical charges under normal operating  
20 conditions for capital expenditures. As allocated to  
21 the Company's retail jurisdiction, based on current  
22 estimates, the total amount to be recovered is \$251.9  
23 million. The \$251.9 million plus interest will be  
24 recovered over two years in equal amounts, resulting  
25 in the recovery of \$132.2 million in 2005 and \$128  
26 million in 2006, based on a January 1, 2005 start  
27 date. PEF's storm-related costs classified as capital  
28 expenditures will not be recovered directly from  
29 customers under the Storm Cost Recovery Clause.  
30 Rather, the \$50.1 million in storm-related capital  
31 expenditures allocated to the Company's retail  
32 jurisdiction will be reported in surveillance reports and  
33 absorbed in current rates until the Company's next  
34 base rate adjustment.  
35

1 Q. What is your opinion regarding PEF's proposed Storm Cost Recovery  
2 Clause?

3 A. PEF has violated the principles that I delineated above in several respects. First,  
4 PEF has improperly moved O&M expenses to the storm fund that customers  
5 already bear through the base rates they pay. Second, PEF maintains in its  
6 testimony that it will apply proper plant additions and cost of removal accounting  
7 to capital replacements made necessary by storm damage. As of the filing of this  
8 testimony PEF has failed to provide the necessary accounting documentation  
9 that demonstrates its procedures are consistent with its testimony.

10 The effect of each failure is to require customers to pay the same costs  
11 twice. Finally, and most significant in terms of the dollars involved, PEF has  
12 failed to recognize the impact of a stipulation and order that, I am advised,  
13 requires PEF's earnings to drop below 10 percent ROE before the Company  
14 seeks to increase base rates. The effect of these failures and departures is to  
15 overstate the costs that should be charged to the Storm Damage Reserve.

16 IV. Categories of Costs

17 Q. Does the Company describe the types of costs it proposes to transfer to  
18 storm recovery?

19 A. Yes, they are summarized in the Direct Testimony of Javier Portuondo (page 10,  
20 emphasis added):

21 The storm costs that would be recovered by the  
22 clause include the Company's storm-related O&M  
23 costs, net of the year-end balance in the Reserve,  
24 and its incremental costs above those typically  
25 incurred under normal operating conditions for capital  
26 expenditures.  
27

1 V. Operations and Maintenance Costs

2 Q. Turning first to PEF's proposed treatment of O&M expenses, what is your  
3 basic objection?

4 A. By moving all expenses associated with the storm repair effort to the storm  
5 reserve, without taking into account the normal level of expenditures funded by  
6 base rates that customers pay, PEF effectively requires customers to pay to pay  
7 twice for the same costs. I refer to the practice as "double dipping." The impact  
8 can be seen in the effect of the practice on PEF's net income during the months  
9 of the repair efforts. Again, base rates support a budgeted level of O&M  
10 expense. By moving *all* such expenses to the storm reserve, PEF creates more  
11 "head room" between budgeted expenses and budgeted base revenues than it  
12 would expect if there were no storms. Ironically, the practical effect is to *increase*  
13 PEF's net income for the period above the level it would have anticipated in the  
14 absence of the storms. That PEF's profit margins would be increased as a result  
15 of the storm-related accounting is the best evidence of the presence of "double  
16 dipping."

17 Q. Do you have any indication that the Company is under budget on any of the  
18 above costs?

19 A. Yes. The Company has provided several presentations and other documents  
20 which compare budgeted expenses with actual expenses, or compare current  
21 expenses with the previous year. Many of these indicate that O&M expenses are  
22 under budget for the months during and following the hurricanes. These  
23 documents actually indicate that this favorability of actual to budget is due to  
24 costs shifting to the storm reserve.

1 For example, in response to Staff 1<sup>st</sup> Interrogatory, Question No. 7,  
2 Progress provided a comparison of its non-recoverable O&M expenses for the  
3 periods January through October 2004, and January through December 2003.  
4 Exhibit (MJM-3) shows the totals on a monthly basis. It is apparent that the  
5 Company is averaging \$4.2 million less per month in non-recoverable O&M for  
6 2004, than it did in 2003.

7 Furthermore, in a draft of the October 2004 presentation to the Monthly  
8 Financial Review Meeting, [REDACTED] over budget is shown for  
9 CMR O&M Total for the October 2004 year-to-date. With additional O&M costs,  
10 this [REDACTED] (Response to OPC's 1<sup>st</sup> Production of  
11 Documents Request, Question No. <sup>5</sup>2, bates page PEF-SR-01118.) That same  
12 document explains the [REDACTED] amount as [REDACTED]  
13 [REDACTED]  
14 [REDACTED]  
15 [REDACTED] (bates page PEF-SR-01157.)

16 Q. Why does Mr. Portuondo's O&M proposal result in a double-dip?

17 A. When one carefully reads Mr. Portuondo's statement one realizes that he is  
18 proposing that all of PEF's costs relating to the storms be charged to the  
19 Reserve. This fails to recognize that PEF already budgeted for a certain amount  
20 of costs and these "normal" cost levels are already being charged to ratepayers.

21 The Company confirms that this is the case in its response to FIPUG's 1st  
22 Interrogatory, Question No. 7, which I have attached as Exhibit \_\_\_ (MJM-4).  
23 There, when asked about the amount of budgeted O&M that is included in its  
24 request for storm recovery, the Company stated: "PEF has not deducted its

1 budgeted O&M expenses from the extraordinary storm-related expenses it  
2 proposes to recover in this case.”

3 Thus, Mr. Portuondo’s proposal would collect twice; once through base  
4 rates and again through the Storm Damage Recovery Clause. This is not fair to  
5 ratepayers and would unjustly enrich PEF’s management and shareholders.

6 **Q. How has PEF responded to the suggestion that it is engaging in double  
7 recovery?**

8 A. As I understand it, based on responses during depositions, PEF’s position is that  
9 the budgeted work has simply been postponed, to be “caught up” during  
10 subsequent periods. (Portuondo Deposition, p. 19.)

11 **Q. Does this justify PEF’s proposal to shift all expenses to the storm fund?**

12 A. No. First, the rationale assumes the same projects that would have occupied  
13 employees remain to be performed. Given the changes wrought by the storms  
14 and the resulting repair/replacement projects, which may have either  
15 accomplished the tasks or obviated the need for them, this is in my opinion an  
16 unwarranted assumption. Even if some of the tasks have been shifted to future  
17 periods, the flexibility of the budgeting process may easily accommodate them.  
18 PEF should be required to demonstrate that it will incur financial harm as a  
19 consequence of “catch-up” tasks following the completion of storm repairs. It has  
20 failed to do so in this docket.

21 **Q. Why does PEF use this approach?**

22 A. PEF wants the customers to assume 100% of the risk of storm damage, a  
23 concept that the Commission has rejected in the past. While PEF’s “double  
24 dipping” approach might be appropriate for calculating tax losses and insurance

1 claims, it is absolutely wrong when seeking a rate increase from customers. The  
2 Commission should implement strict accounting procedures for PEF to follow to  
3 eliminate the increased rates that result when customer are required to pay twice  
4 for the same expense.

5 **Q. What types of operations and maintenance (“O&M”) costs does PEF**  
6 **propose to recover through the Storm Recovery Clause?**

7 **A.** The types of O&M costs the Company proposes to recover are listed on pages  
8 11-12 of Mr. Portuondo’s testimony. They include:

- 9 • “Labor costs - including overtime or premium pay for  
10 employees dedicated to repair activities such as line  
11 crews, storeroom, engineering, and transportation  
12 personnel, payroll loading for associated taxes,  
13 administrative costs, and employee benefits.”
- 14 • “Materials and supplies - all materials and supplies  
15 (M&S) used for the temporary or permanent repair or  
16 replacement of facilities, including a standard loading  
17 factor to cover the administration of M&S inventories  
18 and the cost of preparing, operating, and staffing  
19 temporary staging facilities for materials and supplies  
20 distribution.”
- 21 • “Outside Services - including reimbursement costs to  
22 other utilities and payment to subcontractors  
23 dedicated to restoration activities.”
- 24 • “Transportation costs - including operating costs, fuel  
25 expense, and repair and maintenance of Company  
26 fleet or rented vehicles.”
- 27 • “Damage assessment costs - including surveys,  
28 helicopter line patrols, and operation of assessment  
29 and control facilities.”
- 30 • “Costs associated with the rental or operation and  
31 maintenance of any equipment used in direct support  
32 of restoration activities such as communication  
33 equipment, office equipment, computer equipment,  
34 etc.”
- 35 • “Costs associated with injuries and damages to  
36 personnel or their property as a direct result of  
37 restoration activities.”

- “Costs of temporary housing for restoration crews and support personnel and their related subsistence costs.”
- “Storm preparation costs - including information costs and training for Company employees.”
- “Fuel and related costs for back-up generators.”
- “Costs of customer service personnel, phone center personnel, and other division personnel dedicated to customer service needs and locating and prioritizing areas of damage.”
- “Special advertising and media costs associated with customer information, public education or safety.”
- “Special employee assistance - including cost of cash advances, housing or subsistence for employees and families to expedite their return to work.”
- “Identifiable bad debt write-offs due to storm damage.”
- “Any other appropriate cost directly related to storm damage and restoration activities.”

Q. Does OPC propose to eliminate all of these expenses?

A. Absolutely not. Millions of dollars were spent for thousands of workers who cleared the storm damage, and replaced damaged plant. The labor costs, meals, and lodging for these outside crews and their vehicles are clearly extraordinary storm expenses and should be booked to the storm reserved. By the same token, the basic wages and vehicle cost of the company's employee work force and vehicle fleet have been paid for through basic rates and should be excluded from being charged to the storm reserve.

PEF readily admits that if an employee worked on the storm, the basic wages plus any overtime would be charged to the storm fund. No basic PEF salary or other expenses should be charged to the storm fund.

Mr. Portuondo, in his deposition clearly explained that if the President, a salaried employee, worked on the storm that part of his salary would be charged



1 to the storm fund. Ratepayers will pay \$21,000 toward his salary through the  
2 storm surcharge for doing work that we clearly expect to be included in his base  
3 salary. See Exhibit\_\_\_(MJM-6).

4 **Q. Doesn't the Company claim that its accounting procedures were approved**  
5 **by the Commission?**

6 A. The Company claims that the Commission approved its procedures in 1995, but  
7 a careful reading of the orders issued during that time frame shows that the  
8 Commission approved the establishment of the storm reserve itself and  
9 expressed its intent to engage in rulemaking and workshops regarding  
10 procedures. That never happened.

11 Progress admits that it has booked its expenses for all hurricanes since  
12 that time based on its "double dipping" procedures. The Company has never  
13 received approval for any of the expenses it has booked to the storm reserve  
14 since 1995.

15 **Q. Did the Commission specifically state in Order No. PSC-93-1522-FOF-EI**  
16 **that any and all direct costs relating to storm damage recovery were**  
17 **recoverable from customers via a surcharge?**

18 A. No. In response to the Company's request to create a regulatory asset for storm  
19 damage that exceeds the reserve, the Order states, "This Commission already  
20 has a rule in place to govern the use of Account 228.1, Accumulated Provision  
21 for Property Insurance. Rule 25-6.0143(4)(b), Florida Administrative Code,  
22 provides that "...each and every loss or cost which is covered by the account  
23 shall be charged to that account and shall not be charged directly to expenses.  
24 Charges shall be made to accumulated provision accounts regardless of the

1 balance in those accounts.” (Docket No. 930867-EI, Order No. PSC-93-1522-  
2 FOF-EI, Issued October 15, 1993, p. 4 and 5.) However, the Order then goes on  
3 to state the following:

4 If FPC experiences significant storm related damage,  
5 it can petition for appropriate regulatory action. In the  
6 past, this Commission has allowed recovery of  
7 prudent expenses and has allowed amortization of  
8 storm damage expense. Extraordinary events such  
9 as hurricanes have not caused utilities to earn less  
10 than a fair rate of return. FPC shall be allowed to  
11 defer storm damage loss over the amount in the  
12 reserve until we act on any petition filed by the  
13 Company.

14  
15 No prior approval will be given for the recovery of  
16 costs to repair and restore T&D facilities in excess of  
17 the Reserve balance. However, we will expeditiously  
18 review any petition for deferral, amortization or  
19 recovery of prudently incurred costs in excess of the  
20 reserve.  
21

22 While I am not offering a legal opinion, I believe this means that the Commission  
23 may disallow certain costs, it may adjust amortization amounts, and it is not  
24 required to approve any surcharges.

25 **Q. Why do you believe that the Company should not be allowed to recover**  
26 **“each and every cost” relating to storm damage recovery through a**  
27 **surcharge?**

28 **A.** The circumstances in this case are very different from those previously  
29 experienced. When Progress petitioned for self-insurance, the Company’s  
30 average annual storm loss had been \$1.4 million over the past 10 years. (Order  
31 No. PSC-93-1522-FOF-EI, p. 2) Progress has been accruing \$6 million per year  
32 in its Storm Damage Reserve Fund since 1994 and currently has a balance of

1 \$46.9 million, which the company has used for working capital for the past 10  
2 years. Customers have never been asked to pay more for storm expenses.  
3 Now, the Company is faced with \$252 million in storm-related O&M expenses,  
4 net of the reserve, and it wants ratepayers to pay for all of them, separately and  
5 above what ratepayers are already paying to cover the day-to-day operations of  
6 the Company. The Commission ruled that the Company could petition for  
7 recovery – but did not guarantee that it would provide recovery through means  
8 that would not affect earnings. Clearly, the Commission deliberately retained its  
9 ability to view a request in light of all relevant circumstances and tailor its  
10 response accordingly.

11 **Q. Do you believe that the past recoveries for Hurricanes Erin, Floyd, and**  
12 **Gabrielle should have bearing on this case?**

13 A. No. For those hurricanes, the balance in the storm reserve was not exceeded,  
14 ratepayers were not asked to pay additional amounts, and the Commission was  
15 not involved, so the Company was allowed to recover at will. (Response to  
16 FIPUG's 1st Interrogatory, Question No. 23.) See Exhibit\_\_\_(MJM-5). In this  
17 case, the Company is asking ratepayers to kick in \$252 million, plus interest,  
18 over two years, in addition to the \$6 million they are already paying per year for  
19 storm damage recovery.

20 **Q. Do you disagree with the recovery of all of PEF's proposed O&M costs?**

21 A. As I stated earlier many expenses identified by the Company are truly  
22 extraordinary in nature. I believe the amounts approved for recovery should not  
23 include normal levels of expenses as measured by the budget. I have the  
24 following specific disagreements:

- 1           •     Base Salaries – PEF proposes to charge the full labor costs associated  
2                     with storm recovery efforts to the Storm Damage Reserve. This includes  
3                     normal base salaries, which are already included in the Company’s annual  
4                     budget. The ratepayers are paying for these salaries through base rates.  
5                     They should not be required to pay for them twice. Based on the  
6                     Company’s response to Staff’s 1<sup>st</sup> Interrogatory, Question No. 11, I have  
7                     calculated this amount to be \$5.46 million. See Exhibit\_\_\_(MJM-6). This  
8                     amount includes regular pay for both Bargaining Unit and Non-Exempt  
9                     employees, both for PEF and the service company, and includes sweeps  
10                    work.
- 11           •     Salaries of Exempt Management – These salaries are also included in the  
12                    budget, and paid for through base rates. They should be removed from  
13                    the storm damage claim. Based on the Company’s response to Staff’s 1<sup>st</sup>  
14                    Interrogatory, Question No. 11, I have calculated this amount to be \$6.4  
15                    million. See Exhibit\_\_\_(MJM-6). This amount includes regular pay for  
16                    both PEF and the service company Exempt personnel.
- 17           •     Vehicle Expense – Progress has provided an itemization of the  
18                    \$3,393,913 in company-owned vehicle related expenses included in its  
19                    claim in its response to Staff’s 1st Interrogatory, Question No. 12. The  
20                    related expenses included \$909 thousand for depreciation, \$702 thousand  
21                    for fuel, \$1.6 million in maintenance and \$222 thousand in overhead.  
22                    Although Company vehicles have been used in the storm recovery effort,  
23                    these vehicles have already been included in the annual budget. The  
24                    depreciation of the vehicles would be the same, regardless of whether

1 they are used for storm damage recovery, or used in the regular course of  
2 business. The same is essentially true for vehicle overhead,  
3 maintenance, etc. Subsequently, all operating costs, repair and  
4 maintenance of the Company's fleet should be eliminated from the  
5 recovery claim. The only extraordinary cost that the Company has  
6 incurred relating to storm recovery is the incremental cost of fuel, due to  
7 longer daily operations. As such, I recommend that the PEF be allowed to  
8 recover one-half (1/2) of the fuel expense included in its storm damage  
9 claim, or \$350,898. This adjustment is based on the assumption that  
10 vehicles were in use 16 hours per day during storm restoration, rather  
11 than the normal 8 hours per day. The adjustment related to vehicle  
12 expense should be a removal of \$3,043,015 from the storm damage claim.  
13 See Exhibit\_\_\_(MJM-7).

- 14 • Tree Trimming – Tree trimming expense should be limited to the amounts  
15 which exceed PEF's normal budget. The tree trimming budget variance  
16 appears to be \$3.9 million. (January 24, 2005 Deposition of Mark V.  
17 Wimberly ("Wimberly Deposition"), p. 62.) This amount should be  
18 excluded from the Company's claim.
- 19 • Call Center Expense – Call center expenses for the storm recovery should  
20 be limited to the call overloads created by the storms. I do not have  
21 sufficient information to make an adjustment for call center expense at this  
22 time.
- 23 • Uncollectible Expense – PEF proposes to charge an estimated amount of  
24 "storm related" uncollectible expense to the storm damage reserve. This

1 amount is speculative, and unlike other types of expenses which will  
2 ultimately be trued-up, uncollectible expense is likely to remain  
3 speculative. There is no way to determine if a customer's account must  
4 be written off due specifically due to the storm, or for other reasons. Also,  
5 PEF has failed to demonstrate the actual amount of uncollectible expense  
6 it may have incurred due to the storms. Furthermore, the storm reserve  
7 should be limited to the costs of repairing damage to the system.  
8 Uncollectible expense is unrelated to repairing damage and restoring  
9 service, unlike the majority of the Company's other claimed storm-related  
10 costs. The uncollectible expense included in the Company's claim should  
11 be removed. This adjustment results in the removal of \$2.25 million from  
12 the storm damage claim. See Wimberly Exhibit\_\_(MVV-1), page 15.

13 **Q. Do you have an exhibit which summarizes the O&M expense adjustments**  
14 **you discuss above?**

15 A. Yes, these expense adjustments are summarized on Exhibit\_\_(MJM-8).

16 **Q. Now that the storms have passed and operations have returned to normal,**  
17 **does the Company plan to continue to charge costs in the Storm Reserve,**  
18 **related to these hurricanes?**

19 A. Yes, PEF plans to charge any work still remaining related to the storms to the  
20 Reserve. This is work that was identified during the "sweeps", but not yet  
21 complete. The Company has estimated that this work will be completed during  
22 the first quarter of 2005.

23 **Q. Do you agree with this practice?**

1 A. Once normal operations have resumed, outside contractors have been sent  
2 home, and employees are back to working a normal workweek, any remaining  
3 storm-recovery activities should be performed in the normal course of business  
4 and should not be booked to the storm account. PEF should be required to  
5 demonstrate that it has incurred extraordinary expense before it is allowed to  
6 receive extraordinary recovery.

7 VI. Capital Costs

8 Q. How does the Company plan to handle capital costs relating to storm  
9 damage repair?

10 A. According to Mr. Portuondo's testimony, "Only those capital expenditures above  
11 the level of what would have been incurred under normal operating conditions,  
12 whether related to labor or materials, will be classified as O&M and charged to  
13 the Storm Damage Reserve."

14 Q. How does the Company plan to handle plant replacements?

15 A. As Mr. Portuondo explains at page 13 of his Direct Testimony, "To explain further  
16 the accounting treatment for capital expenditures that are not charged to storm-  
17 related O&M costs, the book value of capital investments that have been retired  
18 due to storm damage will be charged against the accumulated depreciation  
19 reserve. New storm-related capital expenditures will be added to plant in service  
20 in an amount equal to the capital expenditure that would have been incurred  
21 using a standard cost approach under normal operating conditions."

22 Q. Has the Company stated the amount of capital costs it expects to incur?

23 A. Progress states that it has incurred \$54.9 million (system) in capital expenditures,  
24 or \$54.4 (retail). (Portuondo Testimony, p. 13.) In other words, this is the amount

1 of total capital costs which PEF has designated as storm-related, which it will  
2 record to its regulated rate base and depreciate.

3 **Q. Does the \$54 million include cost of removal?**

4 A. PEF claims that “the quantification of the \$54 million will include the cost of  
5 removal estimate for the investments being retired.” (January 24, 2005  
6 Deposition of Javier J. Portuondo (“Portuondo Deposition”), p. 46.) I am not  
7 certain that this is the case. The Commission should make certain by requiring  
8 the Company to produce its cost of removal accounting entries. The cost of  
9 removal reserve for transmission and distribution facilities is \$528 million (See  
10 Exhibit\_\_\_(MJM-2). The Commission needs to ensure, as a minimum, that the  
11 average cost of removal expense has been deducted from the storm expenses  
12 and credited to the large cost of removal reserve being held for that purpose.

13 **Q. What is the total amount of the capital costs that PEF designates as storm-  
14 related?**

15 A. PEF designates \$127.5 million (retail) as storm-related capital costs.

16 **Q. What is the source of that number?**

17 A. That is the amount that PEF estimates will be capitalized for income tax  
18 purposes as shown on Mr. Wimberly’s Exhibit\_\_\_(MVW-1).

19 **Q. How much of the \$127.5 million capital cost does PEF propose to charge to  
20 the Storm Damage Reserve as O&M expense?**

21 A. PEF proposes to charge \$73.1 million or 57 percent of what it designates as  
22 storm-related capital costs as O&M expense to the Storm Damage Reserve and  
23 collect it via the Storm Damage Recovery Clause.



1 Q. Can you determine, based on the information provided, whether the  
2 Company has followed the appropriate accounting procedures with respect  
3 to capital items?

4 A. With the reservation as discussed earlier about expensing capital, it appears that  
5 PEF and I may agree conceptually as to the appropriate accounting treatment.  
6 However, to ensure that PEF is implementing the correct procedure, it will be  
7 necessary to review the actual accounting entries. At the time this testimony is  
8 being finalized, PEF has not provided those entries. Therefore, I wish to reserve  
9 the opportunity to supplement this testimony if warranted by additional  
10 information.

11 Q. Do you have any additional comments about PEF's depreciation rates and  
12 cost of removal?

13 A. Yes, the Commission should consider whether or not it is appropriate to continue  
14 to charge ratepayers for future cost of removal if those funds are not available  
15 when needed.

16 VII. PEF's Failure to Apply 2004 Earnings Above 10% ROE to Reduce the  
17 Negative Balance in its Storm Reserve

18  
19 Q. Are PEF's service rates subject to a "rate plan"?

20 A. Yes. PEF's service rates are subject to a rate plan established as the result of a  
21 settlement in 2002. The rate plan contains a 10 percent return on equity  
22 threshold that PEF must satisfy before seeking to increase rates.

23 Q. What is OPC's position regarding this rate plan and the interplay with the  
24 Storm Damage Reserve?

1 A. I am advised that OPC's position is that the stipulation effectively requires PEF to  
2 apply 2004 earnings above 10 percent ROE to reduce the negative balance  
3 before seeking to increase customers' rates for the purpose.

4 **Q. Does any other OPC witness address this issue?**

5 A. Yes. While OPC's primary position is based on a legal argument, in his  
6 testimony Mr. James A. Rothschild explains that, in view of the risk appropriately  
7 borne by PEF and in view of current economic factors, in his opinion the 10  
8 percent criterion would be a reasonable way to share the risk even if there were  
9 no stipulation. Given what I have been advised is the legal effect of the  
10 stipulation, and in light of Mr. Rothschild's opinion, I will identify the size of the  
11 adjustment that would be needed to apply the 10 percent criterion.

12 **Q. Do you expect PEF to earn more than 10 percent ROE in 2004?**

13 A. Yes.

14 **Q. Has the Company performed any calculations demonstrating this?**

15 A. Yes. Progress performed this calculation in response to FIPUG's 1st  
16 Interrogatory, Question No. 5. The Company determined that it could absorb  
17 \$113.9 million of the system storm expenses, and still earn a 10 percent return  
18 on equity. This translates to \$108.4 million in retail jurisdiction storm expenses.

19 **Q. What do you recommend?**

20 A. As shown on Exhibit\_\_\_\_(MJM-8), I recommend that PEF reduce the double-  
21 dipping expenses charged to the Storm Damage Reserve by \$21 million and  
22 then implement the 10% threshold. In other words, once the correct Storm  
23 Damage expenses are determined, the first \$113.9 million (system) of those  
24 expenses should be retained as 2004 expenses, rather than being charged to the

1 Storm Damage Reserve. Ultimately, PEF's retail storm charges are reduced to  
2 \$123.3 million retail. I recommend the Commission emphasize its approval of a  
3 surcharge is limited to the specific 2004 events, and does not authorize PEF to  
4 charge future amounts of storm-related costs to the reserve without specific  
5 Commission approval.

6 **VIII. Summary**

7 **Q. Please summarize your recommendations.**

8 A. In this case, PEF has claimed that storm-related costs have resulted in a  
9 negative storm reserve balance of \$252 million, which PEF wants to collect from  
10 customers over a period of two years. However, this amount should be reduced  
11 to remove O&M and potential capital costs that should not have been charged to  
12 the storm reserve to begin with. To date I have estimated about \$21 million  
13 (system) of those types of expenses. In addition to these reductions, PEF should  
14 apply 2004 earnings of \$113.9 million (system), whether to satisfy the legal  
15 requirement of the 2002 ratemaking stipulation or to implement the  
16 recommendation of James Rothschild to reflect an appropriate sharing of storm-  
17 related risks.

18 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

19 A. Yes, it does.

**Experience****Snavely King Majoros O'Connor & Lee, Inc.**

**Vice President and Treasurer (1988 to Present)**  
**Senior Consultant (1981-1987)**

Mr. Majoros provides consultation specializing in accounting, financial, and management issues. He has testified as an expert witness or negotiated on behalf of clients in more than one hundred thirty regulatory proceedings involving telephone, electric, gas, water, and sewerage companies. Mr. Majoros has appeared before Federal and state agencies. His testimony has encompassed a wide variety of complex issues including taxation, divestiture accounting, revenue requirements, rate base, nuclear decommissioning, plant lives, and capital recovery. Mr. Majoros has also provided consultation to the U.S. Department of Justice.

Mr. Majoros has been responsible for developing the firm's consulting services on depreciation and other capital recovery issues into a major area of practice. He has also developed the firm's capabilities in the management audit area.

**Van Scoyoc & Wiskup, Inc., Consultant (1978-1981)**

Mr. Majoros performed various management and regulatory consulting projects in the public utility field, including preparation of electric system load projections for a group of municipally and cooperatively owned electric systems; preparation of a system of accounts and reporting of gas and oil pipelines to be used by a state regulatory commission; accounting system analysis and design for rate proceedings involving electric, gas, and telephone utilities. Mr. Majoros also assisted in an antitrust proceeding involving a major electric utility. He submitted expert testimony in FERC Docket No. RP79-12 (El Paso Natural Gas Company). In addition, he co-authored a study entitled Analysis of Staff Study on Comprehensive Tax Normalization that was submitted to FERC in Docket No. RM 80-42.

**Handling Equipment Sales Company, Inc.  
Treasurer (1976-1978)**

Mr. Majoros' responsibilities included financial management, general accounting and reporting, and income taxes.

**Ernst & Ernst, Auditor (1973-1976)**

Mr. Majoros was a member of the audit staff where his responsibilities included auditing, supervision, business

systems analysis, report preparation, and corporate income taxes.

**University of Baltimore - (1971-1973)**

Mr. Majoros was a full-time student in the School of Business.

During this period Mr. Majoros worked consistently on a part-time basis in the following positions: Assistant Legislative Auditor – State of Maryland, Staff Accountant – Robert M. Carney & Co., CPA's, Staff Accountant – Naron & Wegad, CPA's, Credit Clerk – Montgomery Wards.

**Central Savings Bank, (1969-1971)**

Mr. Majoros was an Assistant Branch Manager at the time he left the bank to attend college as a full-time student. During his tenure at the bank, Mr. Majoros gained experience in each department of the bank. In addition, he attended night school at the University of Baltimore.

**Education**

University of Baltimore, School of Business, B.S. –  
Concentration in Accounting

**Professional Affiliations**

American Institute of Certified Public Accountants  
Maryland Association of C.P.A.s  
Society of Depreciation Professionals

**Publications, Papers, and Panels**

*"Analysis of Staff Study on Comprehensive Tax Normalization," FERC Docket No. RM 80-42, 1980.*

*"Telephone Company Deferred Taxes and Investment Tax Credits – A Capital Loss for Ratepayers," Public Utility Fortnightly, September 27, 1984.*

*"The Use of Customer Discount Rates in Revenue Requirement Comparisons," Proceedings of the 25th Annual Iowa State Regulatory Conference, 1986*

*"The Regulatory Dilemma Created By Emerging Revenue Streams of Independent Telephone Companies," Proceedings of NARUC 101st Annual Convention and Regulatory Symposium, 1989.*

*"BOC Depreciation Issues in the States," National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, 1990 Mid-Year Meeting, 1990.*

*"Current Issues in Capital Recovery" 30<sup>th</sup> Annual Iowa State Regulatory Conference, 1991.*

*"Impaired Assets Under SFAS No. 121," National Association of State Utility consumer Advocates, 1996 Mid-Year Meeting, 1996.*

*"What's 'Sunk' Ain't Stranded: Why Excessive Utility Depreciation is Avoidable," with James Campbell, Public Utilities Fortnightly, April 1, 1999.*

*"Local Exchange Carrier Depreciation Reserve Percents," with Richard B. Lee, Journal of the Society of Depreciation Professionals, Volume 10, Number 1, 2000-2001*

**Michael J. Majoros, Jr.**

Federal Regulatory Agencies

Date	Agency	Docket	Utility
1979	FERC-US 19/	RR79-12	El Paso Natural Gas Co.
1980	FERC-US 19/	RM80-42	Generic Tax Normalization
1996	CRTC-Canada 30/	97-9	All Canadian Telecoms
1997	CRTC-Canada 31/	97-11	All Canadian Telecoms
1999	FCC 32/	98-137 (Ex Parte)	All LECs
1999	FCC 32/	98-91 (Ex Parte)	All LECs
1999	FCC 32/	98-177 (Ex Parte)	All LECs
1999	FCC 32/	98-45 (Ex Parte)	All LECs
2000	EPA 35/	CAA-00-6	Tennessee Valley Authority
2003	FERC 48/	RM02-7	All Utilities
2003	FCC 52/	03-173	All LECs
2003	FERC	ER03-409-000, ER03-666-000	Pacific Gas and Electric Co.

State Regulatory Agencies

1982	Massachusetts 17/	DPU 557/558	Western Mass Elec. Co.
1982	Illinois 16/	ICC81-8115	Illinois Bell Telephone Co.
1983	Maryland 8/	7574-Direct	Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.
1983	Maryland 8/	7574-Surrebuttal	Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.
1983	Connecticut 15/	810911	Woodlake Water Co.
1983	New Jersey 1/	815-458	New Jersey Bell Tel. Co.
1983	New Jersey 14/	8011-827	Atlantic City Sewerage Co.
1984	Dist. Of Columbia 7/	785	Potomac Electric Power Co.
1984	Maryland 8/	7689	Washington Gas Light Co.
1984	Dist. Of Columbia 7/	798	C&P Tel. Co.
1984	Pennsylvania 13/	R-832316	Bell Telephone Co. of PA
1984	New Mexico 12/	1032	Mt. States Tel. & Telegraph
1984	Idaho 18/	U-1000-70	Mt. States Tel. & Telegraph
1984	Colorado 11/	1655	Mt. States Tel. & Telegraph
1984	Dist. Of Columbia 7/	813	Potomac Electric Power Co.
1984	Pennsylvania 3/	R842621-R842625	Western Pa. Water Co.
1985	Maryland 8/	7743	Potomac Electric Power Co.
1985	New Jersey 1/	848-856	New Jersey Bell Tel. Co.
1985	Maryland 8/	7851	C&P Tel. Co.
1985	California 10/	I-85-03-78	Pacific Bell Telephone Co.
1985	Pennsylvania 3/	R-850174	Phila. Suburban Water Co.
1985	Pennsylvania 3/	R850178	Pennsylvania Gas & Water Co.
1985	Pennsylvania 3/	R-850299	General Tel. Co. of PA
1986	Maryland 8/	7899	Delmarva Power & Light Co.
1986	Maryland 8/	7754	Chesapeake Utilities Corp.

Michael J. Majoros, Jr.

1986	Pennsylvania 3/	R-850268	York Water Co.
1986	Maryland 8/	7953	Southern Md. Electric Corp.
1986	Idaho 9/	U-1002-59	General Tel. Of the Northwest
1986	Maryland 8/	7973	Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.
1987	Pennsylvania 3/	R-860350	Dauphin Cons. Water Supply
1987	Pennsylvania 3/	C-860923	Bell Telephone Co. of PA
1987	Iowa 6/	DPU-86-2	Northwestern Bell Tel. Co.
1987	Dist. Of Columbia 7/	842	Washington Gas Light Co.
1988	Florida 4/	880069-TL	Southern Bell Telephone
1988	Iowa 6/	RPU-87-3	Iowa Public Service Company
1988	Iowa 6/	RPU-87-6	Northwestern Bell Tel. Co.
1988	Dist. Of Columbia 7/	869	Potomac Electric Power Co.
1989	Iowa 6/	RPU-88-6	Northwestern Bell Tel. Co.
1990	New Jersey 1/	1487-88	Morris City Transfer Station
1990	New Jersey 5/	WR 88-80967	Toms River Water Company
1990	Florida 4/	890256-TL	Southern Bell Company
1990	New Jersey 1/	ER89110912J	Jersey Central Power & Light
1990	New Jersey 1/	WR90050497J	Elizabethtown Water Co.
1991	Pennsylvania 3/	P900465	United Tel. Co. of Pa.
1991	West Virginia 2/	90-564-T-D	C&P Telephone Co.
1991	New Jersey 1/	90080792J	Hackensack Water Co.
1991	New Jersey 1/	WR90080884J	Middlesex Water Co.
1991	Pennsylvania 3/	R-911892	Phil. Suburban Water Co.
1991	Kansas 20/	176, 716-U	Kansas Power & Light Co.
1991	Indiana 29/	39017	Indiana Bell Telephone
1991	Nevada 21/	91-5054	Central Tele. Co. - Nevada
1992	New Jersey 1/	EE91081428	Public Service Electric & Gas
1992	Maryland 8/	8462	C&P Telephone Co.
1992	West Virginia 2/	91-1037-E-D	Appalachian Power Co.
1993	Maryland 8/	8464	Potomac Electric Power Co.
1993	South Carolina 22/	92-227-C	Southern Bell Telephone
1993	Maryland 8/	8485	Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.
1993	Georgia 23/	4451-U	Atlanta Gas Light Co.
1993	New Jersey 1/	GR93040114	New Jersey Natural Gas. Co.
1994	Iowa 6/	RPU-93-9	U.S. West - Iowa
1994	Iowa 6/	RPU-94-3	Midwest Gas
1995	Delaware 24/	94-149	Wilm. Suburban Water Corp.
1995	Connecticut 25/	95-03-01	So. New England Telephone
1995	Pennsylvania 3/	R-00953300	Citizens Utilities Company
1995	Georgia 23/	5503-0	Southern Bell
1996	Maryland 8/	8715	Bell Atlantic
1996	Arizona 26/	E-1032-95-417	Citizens Utilities Company
1996	New Hampshire 27/	DE 96-252	New England Telephone
1997	Iowa 6/	DPU-96-1	U S West - Iowa

Michael J. Majoros, Jr.

1997	Ohio 28/	96-922-TP-UNC	Ameritech – Ohio
1997	Michigan 28/	U-11280	Ameritech – Michigan
1997	Michigan 28/	U-112 81	GTE North
1997	Wyoming 27/	7000-ztr-96-323	US West – Wyoming
1997	Iowa 6/	RPU-96-9	US West – Iowa
1997	Illinois 28/	96-0486-0569	Ameritech – Illinois
1997	Indiana 28/	40611	Ameritech – Indiana
1997	Indiana 27/	40734	GTE North
1997	Utah 27/	97-049-08	US West – Utah
1997	Georgia 28/	7061-U	BellSouth – Georgia
1997	Connecticut 25/	96-04-07	So. New England Telephone
1998	Florida 28/	960833-TP et. al.	BellSouth – Florida
1998	Illinois 27/	97-0355	GTE North/South
1998	Michigan 33/	U-11726	Detroit Edison
1999	Maryland 8/	8794	Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.
1999	Maryland 8/	8795	Delmarva Power & Light Co.
1999	Maryland 8/	8797	Potomac Edison Company
1999	West Virginia 2/	98-0452-E-GI	Electric Restructuring
1999	Delaware 24/	98-98	United Water Company
1999	Pennsylvania 3/	R-00994638	Pennsylvania American Water
1999	West Virginia 2/	98-0985-W-D	West Virginia American Water
1999	Michigan 33/	U-11495	Detroit Edison
2000	Delaware 24/	99-466	Tidewater Utilities
2000	New Mexico 34/	3008	US WEST Communications, Inc.
2000	Florida 28/	990649-TP	BellSouth -Florida
2000	New Jersey 1/	WR30174	Consumer New Jersey Water
2000	Pennsylvania 3/	R-00994868	Philadelphia Suburban Water
2000	Pennsylvania 3/	R-0005212	Pennsylvania American Sewerage
2000	Connecticut 25/	00-07-17	Southern New England Telephone
2001	Kentucky 36/	2000-373	Jackson Energy Cooperative
2001	Kansas 38/39/40/	01-WSRE-436-RTS	Western Resources
2001	South Carolina 22/	2001-93-E	Carolina Power & Light Co.
2001	North Dakota 37/	PU-400-00-521	Northern States Power/Xcel Energy
2001	Indiana 29/41/	41746	Northern Indiana Power Company
2001	New Jersey 1/	GR01050328	Public Service Electric and Gas
2001	Pennsylvania 3/	R-00016236	York Water Company
2001	Pennsylvania 3/	R-00016339	Pennsylvania America Water
2001	Pennsylvania 3/	R-00016356	Wellsboro Electric Coop.
2001	Florida 4/	010949-EL	Gulf Power Company
2001	Hawaii 42/	00-309	The Gas Company
2002	Pennsylvania 3/	R-00016750	Philadelphia Suburban
2002	Nevada 43/	01-10001 & 10002	Nevada Power Company
2002	Kentucky 36/	2001-244	Fleming Mason Electric Coop.
2002	Nevada 43/	01-11031	Sierra Pacific Power Company
2002	Georgia 27/	14361-U	BellSouth-Georgia

Michael J. Majoros, Jr.

2002	Alaska 44/	U-01-34,82-87,66	Alaska Communications Systems
2002	Wisconsin 45/	2055-TR-102	CenturyTel
2002	Wisconsin 45/	5846-TR-102	TelUSA
2002	Vermont 46/	6596	Citizen's Energy Services
2002	North Dakota 37/	PU-399-02-183	Montana Dakota Utilities
2002	Kansas 38/	02-MDWG-922-RTS	Midwest Energy
2002	Kentucky 36/	2002-00145	Columbia Gas
2002	Oklahoma 47/	200200166	Reliant Energy ARKLA
2002	New Jersey 1/	GR02040245	Elizabethtown Gas Company
2003	New Jersey 1/	ER02050303	Public Service Electric and Gas Co.
2003	Hawaii 42/	01-0255	Young Brothers Tug & Barge
2003	New Jersey 1/	ER02080506	Jersey Central Power & Light
2003	New Jersey 1/	ER02100724	Rockland Electric Co.
2003	Pennsylvania 3/	R-00027975	The York Water Co.
2003	Pennsylvania 13	R-00038304	Pennsylvania-American Water Co.
2003	Kansas 20/ 40/	03-KGSG-602-RTS	Kansas Gas Service
2003	Nova Scotia, CN 49/	EMO NSPI	Nova Scotia Power, Inc.
2003	Kentucky 36/	2003-00252	Union Light Heat & Power
2003	Alaska 44/	U-96-89	ACS Communications, Inc.
2003	Indiana 29/	42359	PSI Energy, Inc.
2003	Kansas 20/ 40/	03-ATMG-1036-RTS	Atmos Energy
2003	Florida 50/	030001-E1	Tampa Electric Company
2003	Maryland 51/	8960	Washington Gas Light
2003	Hawaii 42/	02-0391	Hawaiian Electric Company
2003	Illinois 28/	02-0864	SBC Illinois
2003	Indiana 28/	42393	SBC Indiana
2004	New Jersey 1/	ER03020110	Atlantic City Electric Co.
2004	Arizona 26/	E-01345A-03-0437	Arizona Public Service Company
2004	Michigan 27/	U-13531	SBC Michigan
2004	New Jersey 1/	GR03080683	South Jersey Gas Company
2004	Kentucky 36/	2003-00434,00433	Kentucky Utilities, Louisville Gas & Electric
2004	Florida 50/ 54/	031033-EI	Tampa Electric Company
2004	Kentucky 36/	2004-00067	Delta Natural Gas Company
2004	Georgia 23/	18300, 15392, 15393	Georgia Power Company
2004	Vermont 46/	6946, 6988	Central Vermont Public Service Corporation



Michael J. Majoros, Jr.

**PARTICIPATION AS NEGOTIATOR IN FCC TELEPHONE DEPRECIATION  
RATE REPRESENTATION CONFERENCES**

<u>COMPANY</u>	<u>YEARS</u>	<u>CLIENT</u>
Diamond State Telephone Co. <u>24/</u>	1985 + 1988	Delaware Public Service Comm
Bell Telephone of Pennsylvania <u>3/</u>	1986 + 1989	PA Consumer Advocate
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. - Md. <u>8/</u>	1986	Maryland People's Counsel
Southwestern Bell Telephone - Kansas <u>20/</u>	1986	Kansas Corp. Commission
Southern Bell - Florida <u>4/</u>	1986	Florida Consumer Advocate
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.-W.Va. <u>2/</u>	1987 + 1990	West VA Consumer Advocate
New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. <u>1/</u>	1985 + 1988	New Jersey Rate Counsel
Southern Bell - South Carolina <u>22/</u>	1986 + 1989 + 1992	S. Carolina Consumer Advocate
GTE-North - Pennsylvania <u>3/</u>	1989	PA Consumer Advocate

Michael J. Majoros, Jr.

**PARTICIPATION IN PROCEEDINGS WHICH WERE  
SETTLED BEFORE TESTIMONY WAS SUBMITTED**

<u>STATE</u>	<u>DOCKET NO.</u>	<u>UTILITY</u>
Maryland <u>8/</u>	7878	Potomac Edison
Nevada <u>21/</u>	88-728	Southwest Gas
New Jersey <u>1/</u>	WR90090950J	New Jersey American Water
New Jersey <u>1/</u>	WR900050497J	Elizabethtown Water
New Jersey <u>1/</u>	WR91091483	Garden State Water
West Virginia <u>2/</u>	91-1037-E	Appalachian Power Co.
Nevada <u>21/</u>	92-7002	Central Telephone - Nevada
Pennsylvania <u>3/</u>	R-00932873	Blue Mountain Water
West Virginia <u>2/</u>	93-1165-E-D	Potomac Edison
West Virginia <u>2/</u>	94-0013-E-D	Monongahela Power
New Jersey <u>1/</u>	WR94030059	New Jersey American Water
New Jersey <u>1/</u>	WR95080346	Elizabethtown Water
New Jersey <u>1/</u>	WR95050219	Toms River Water Co.
Maryland <u>8/</u>	8796	Potomac Electric Power Co.
South Carolina <u>22/</u>	1999-077-E	Carolina Power & Light Co.
South Carolina <u>22/</u>	1999-072-E	Carolina Power & Light Co.
Kentucky <u>36/</u>	2001-104 & 141	Kentucky Utilities, Louisville Gas and Electric
Kentucky <u>36/</u>	2002-485	Jackson Purchase Energy Corporation
Florida <u>50/ 54/</u>	030157-EI	Progress Energy Florida

Michael J. Majoros, Jr.

Clients

1/ New Jersey Rate Counsel/Advocate	33/ Michigan Attorney General
2/ West Virginia Consumer Advocate	34/ New Mexico Attorney General
3/ Pennsylvania OCA	35/ Environmental Protection Agency Enforcement Staff
4/ Florida Office of Public Advocate	36/ Kentucky Attorney General
5/ Toms River Fire Commissioner's	37/ North Dakota Public Service Commission
6/ Iowa Office of Consumer Advocate	38/ Kansas Industrial Group
7/ D.C. People's Counsel	39/ City of Wichita
8/ Maryland's People's Counsel	40/ Kansas Citizens' Utility Rate Board
9/ Idaho Public Service Commission	41/ NIPSCO Industrial Group
10/ Western Burglar and Fire Alarm	42/ Hawaii Division of Consumer Advocacy
11/ U.S. Dept. of Defense	43/ Nevada Bureau of Consumer Protection
12/ N.M. State Corporation Comm.	44/ GCI
13/ City of Philadelphia	45/ Wisc. Citizens' Utility Rate Board
14/ Resorts International	46/ Vermont Department of Public Service
15/ Woodlake Condominium Association	47/ Oklahoma Corporation Commission
16/ Illinois Attorney General	48/ National Association of Utility Consumer Advocates
17/ Mass Coalition of Municipalities	49/ Nova Scotia Utility and Review Board
18/ U.S. Department of Energy	50/ Florida Office of Public Counsel
19/ Arizona Electric Power Corp.	51/ Maryland Public Service Commission
20/ Kansas Corporation Commission	52/ MCI
21/ Public Service Comm. – Nevada	53/ Transmission Agency of Northern California
22/ SC Dept. of Consumer Affairs	54/ Florida Industrial Power Users Group
23/ Georgia Public Service Comm.	
24/ Delaware Public Service Comm.	
25/ Conn. Ofc. Of Consumer Counsel	
26/ Arizona Corp. Commission	
27/ AT&T	
28/ AT&T/MCI	
29/ IN Office of Utility Consumer Counselor	
30/ Unitel (AT&T – Canada)	
31/ Public Interest Advocacy Centre	
32/ U.S. General Services Administration	

**Snavelly King - Electric Plant Tours**

**Kansas**

Company: Western Resources, Inc.  
Plants: Jeffrey, Lawrence, LaCygne  
Docket No.: 01-WSRE-436-RTS  
Dates: February 24, 2001 – March 1, 2001  
SK Attendees: Michael J. Majoros, Jr., William M. Zaetz

**Indiana**

Company: Northern Indiana Public Service Company  
Plant: Schahfer, Michigan City, Bailly, Mitchell  
Cause No.: 41746  
Dates: August 23, 2001  
SK Attendees: Michael J. Majoros, Jr.

Company: PSI Energy, Inc.  
Plants: Noblesville, Cayuga, Wabash River, Edwardsport, Gibson,  
Gallagher, Markland  
Cause No.: 42359  
Date: 2003  
SK Attendees: Michael J. Majoros, Jr.

**Georgia**

Company: Georgia Power Company  
Plant: McIntosh  
Docket No.: 18300-U, 15392-U, 15393-U  
Dates: September 2004  
SK Attendees: Michael J. Majoros, Jr., William M. Zaetz

**Nevada**

Company: Nevada Power Company  
Plants: Reid Gardner, Clark, Sunrise  
Docket No.: 01-10001, 01-10002  
Dates: January 16, 2002  
SK Attendees: William M. Zaetz

**Snavelly King - Electric Plant Tours**

**Florida**

Company: Gulf Power Company  
Plant: Smith  
Docket No.: 010949-EL  
Date: 2002  
SK Attendees: William M. Zaetz

**Nova Scotia, CN**

Company: Nova Scotia Power Incorporated  
Plant: Tuff's Cove, Burnside, Onslow Substation, Trenton, Lingan, Glace  
Bay, Ragged Lake Energy Control Centre  
Docket No.: EMO NSPI  
Date: 2003  
SK Attendees: Michael J. Majoros, Jr.

**Progress Energy Florida, Inc.**  
**Docket No. 041272-EI**  
**Summary of PEF's Basic Estimates**  
(\$ Millions)

	<u>System</u>	<u>Retail</u>
1 Total Estimated Storm Related Costs	<u>\$ 366.3</u> 1/	<u>\$ 346.6</u> 1/
2 Estimated "Normal" Capital Costs	54.9 1/	50.1 1/
3 Estimated Storm Related O&M Costs	240.1 2/	228.6 2/
4 Estimated "Extraordinary" Capital Costs	<u>71.3</u> 3/	<u>67.9</u> 4/
5 Total Estimated Costs Included in Storm Recovery Claim	311.4 1/	296.5 1/
6 Less: December 31, 2004 Storm Reserve Balance	<u>46.9</u> 1/	<u>44.7</u> 1/
7 Total Storm Damage Cost Recovery Claim	<u><u>\$ 264.5</u></u>	<u><u>\$ 251.8</u></u>

1/ Response to Staff Interrogatory 1-5.

2/ Line 5 - Line 4

3/ Exhibit\_\_\_(MVW-1), page 1 of 15. Capital Tax less Capital Book.

4/ System estimate of \$71.3 million multiplied by Retail Separation Factor of 0.95220 shown in response to Staff Interrogatory 1-5, line 6.

**Progress Energy Florida, Inc.  
Docket No. 041272-EI  
Depreciation Cost of Reserve  
At September 2004**

	Cost of Removal <u>End Reserve</u>
Transmission	\$ 162,970,209
Distribution	<u>365,070,144</u>
Total Transmission & Distribution	\$ 528,040,353

Source: Depreciation COR Reserve Detail, bates pages PEF-SR-10630 to 10631.

Progress Energy Florida, Inc.  
Docket No. 041272-EI

Comparison of Non-Recoverable O&M

Classification	Sum of Jan - Oct 04		Sum of Jan - Dec 03		Monthly Avg. Difference
	Total	Monthly Avg.	Total	Monthly Avg.	
Steam Ops	26,406,395	2,640,640	30,771,231	2,564,269	76,370
Steam Maint	37,088,114	3,708,811	48,477,950	4,039,829	(331,018)
Nuclear Ops	33,532,550	3,353,255	43,390,087	3,615,841	(262,586)
Nuclear Maint	25,541,426	2,554,143	33,711,639	2,809,303	(255,161)
Oth Prod	31,792,683	3,179,268	43,695,736	3,641,311	(462,043)
Non-Red Pur Pwr-WH	14,327,815	1,432,782	16,747,901	1,395,658	37,123
Transmission	19,858,477	1,985,848	27,102,065	2,258,505	(272,658)
Distribution	57,253,377	5,725,338	79,124,709	6,593,726	(868,388)
Cust Accounts	40,023,344	4,002,334	47,569,877	3,964,156	38,178
Cust Service	5,557,528	555,753	8,765,832	730,486	(174,733)
A&G	<u>151,089,286</u>	<u>15,108,929</u>	<u>202,478,669</u>	<u>16,873,222</u>	<u>(1,764,294)</u>
Grand Total	442,470,995	44,247,100	581,835,696	48,486,308	(4,239,209)

Source: Company response to Staff 1st Set of Interrogatories, Question 7.



7. Please provide a schedule showing both jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional Operation and Maintenance Expense by month, by account, for the twenty four month period ending October 31, 2004.

Answer:

Please see Attachment C to these answers.

Classification	Total	Retail	WH
Steam Ops	26,406,395	24,993,950	1,412,445
Steam Maint	37,088,114	36,219,881	868,233
Nuclear Ops	33,532,550	32,176,829	1,355,721
Nuclear Maint	25,541,426	24,943,501	597,925
Oth Prod	31,792,683	23,705,260	8,087,423
Non-Rec Pur Pwr - WH	14,327,815		14,327,815
Transmission	19,858,477	14,320,941	5,537,536
Distribution	57,253,377	57,096,651	156,726
Cust Accts	40,023,344	39,837,175	186,169
Cust Svc	5,557,528	5,557,528	
A&G	151,089,286	142,164,823	8,924,462
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>442,470,994</b>	<b>401,016,539</b>	<b>41,454,455</b>

Sum of Jan-Dec 03			
Classification	Total	Retail	WH
Steam Ops	30,771,231	29,125,317	1,645,914
Steam Maint	48,477,950		1,134,869
Nuclear Ops	43,390,087		1,754,261
Nuclear Maint	33,711,639		789,189
Oth Prod	43,695,736		11,115,321
Non-Rec Purc Pwr -WH	16,747,901		16,747,901
Transmission			7,557,411
Distribution			216,597
Cust Accts			221,272
Cust Svc	8,765,832		-
A&G	202,478,669		11,959,903
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>581,835,697</b>		<b>53,142,640</b>

Sum of Nov-Dec02			
Classification	Total	Retail	WH
Steam Ops	4,678,050	4,427,827	250,223
Steam Maint	4,028,941	3,934,623	94,318
Nuclear Ops	6,175,657	5,925,975	249,682
Nuclear Maint	6,638,045	6,482,649	155,397
Oth Prod	10,285,036	7,668,728	2,616,307
Non-Rec Pur Pwr -WH	2,252,080	-	2,252,080
Transmission	4,363,161	3,146,494	1,216,668
Distribution	11,962,049	11,929,304	32,745
Cust Accts	8,760,519	8,719,769	40,750
Cust Svc	1,777,201	1,777,201	-
A&G	27,373,252	25,756,384	1,616,869
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>88,293,992</b>	<b>79,768,954</b>	<b>8,525,038</b>

Separation Factors:	Retail	WH
Steam Ops	94.651%	5.349%
Steam Maint	97.659%	2.341%
Nuclear Ops	95.957%	4.043%
Nuclear Maint	97.659%	2.341%
Oth Prod	74.562%	25.438%
Non-Rec Pur Pwr-WH	0.000%	100.000%
Trans	72.115%	27.885%
Distrib	99.726%	0.274%
Cust Accts	99.535%	0.465%
Cust Svc	100.000%	0.000%
A&G	94.093%	5.907%

Note: Non-recoverable O&M excludes all recoverable fuel, purchase power, capacity, ECCR and ECRC amounts.  
 Minor differences in retail amounts presented here compared to Surveillance Reports might occur due to the methods used to summarize categories and the use of composites in separation factors.

Prepared by: Holdstein 12/08/04  
 C:\Documents and Settings\sleon\Local Settings\Temporary Internet Files\OLKQ\Staff Interrog Q78.xls\Jurisd

7. Referring to witness Wimberly's direct testimony, page 7, lines 12-14, state the amount of budgeted monthly salary O&M expense plus budgeted overtime O&M expense for full-time, part-time and contract employees that was included in the 2004 and 2005 budget that is included in PEF's request for storm recovery.

Please see Attachment B for the budgeted monthly salary and overtime O&M expenses for 2004 and 2005. PEF has not deducted its budgeted O&M expenses from the extraordinary storm-related expenses it proposes to recover in this case. The extraordinary storm-related expenses that were incurred as a result of Hurricanes Charley, Frances, Ivan, and Jeanne were not anticipated, could not be anticipated, and were not budgeted. Non-catastrophic storm-related expenses were anticipated through the annual accrual to the Storm Damage Reserve but PEF deducted the accrued reserve from the storm-related expenses it seeks to recover and PEF does not seek to replenish the reserve in this case.

PEF seeks to recover only those storm-related expenses that exceed the reserve in accordance with the Commission's policy for accounting for such expenses under which the Company includes all actual repair activities and those activities directly associated with storm damage and restoration activities in expenses charged to the Storm Damage Reserve, as explained on page 10 of Javier Portuondo's testimony in Docket No. 041272-EI and as approved by the Commission in Docket 930867-EI.

Direct costs typically are payroll, transportation, materials and supplies, and other services necessary to locate and repair or replace damaged property. Payroll includes labor charges for those employees involved in actual repair activities as well as those in support roles such as customer service, engineering, storeroom, and transportation personnel. The following is a list of examples of the type of costs the Company charges to the storm damage reserve: (1) Labor costs – including overtime or premium pay for employees dedicated to repair activities such as line crews, storeroom, engineering, and transportation personnel, payroll loading for associated taxes, administrative costs, and employee benefits; (2) Materials and supplies – all materials and supplies (M&S) used for the temporary or permanent repair or replacement of facilities, including a standard loading factor to cover the administration of M&S inventories and the cost of preparing, operating, and staffing temporary staging facilities for materials and supplies distribution; (3) Outside Services – including reimbursement costs to other utilities and payment to subcontractors dedicated to restoration activities; (4) Transportation costs – including operating costs, fuel expense, and repair and maintenance of Company fleet and/or rented vehicles; (5) Damage assessment costs – including surveys, helicopter line patrols, and operation of assessment and control facilities; (6) Costs associated with the rental and/or operation and maintenance of any equipment used in direct support of restoration activities such as communication equipment, office equipment, computer equipment, etc.; (7) Costs associated with injuries and damages to personnel and/or their property as a direct result of restoration activities; (8) Costs of temporary housing for

restoration crews and support personnel and their related subsistence costs; (9) Storm preparation costs – including information costs and training for Company employees; (10) Fuel and related costs for back-up generators; (11) Costs of customer service personnel, phone center personnel, and other division personnel dedicated to customer service needs and locating and prioritizing areas of damage; (12) Special advertising and media costs associated with customer information, public education and/or safety; (13) Special employee assistance – including cost of cash advances, housing and/or subsistence for employees and families to expedite their return to work; (14) Identifiable bad debt write-offs due to storm damage; and (15) any other appropriate cost directly related to storm damage and restoration activities.

These direct costs represent the replacement cost method that was the basis for the Company's all risk coverage when transmission and distribution ("T&D") coverage was available, as explained in the testimony of John Scardino in Docket No. 930867-EI at pages 4 and 5. Mr. Scardino further explained at page 13 of his testimony that the self insurance program proposed by the Company and accepted by the Commission was a replacement of its current insurance program with the cost of the self insurance program to be borne by all customers. The Storm Damage Reserve under the Company's self insurance plan covered, according to Mr. Scardino at page 9, all losses incurred not otherwise covered by insurance for any destructive acts of nature. The Commission agreed in PSC Order No. PSC-93-1522-FOF-EI, at page 3, ruling that the Storm Damage Reserve would be used to cover storm damage experience for all losses not covered by insurance, including Transmission and Distribution lines and deductibles associated with other property insurance.

In Order No. PSC-93-1522-FOF-EI, at page 5, the Commission further required the Company to file a study to determine the appropriate storm damage expense to be accrued to the reserve. PEF filed its Study for Storm Damage Accrual, and at page 9, the Company made clear that it proposed to use a replacement cost methodology consistent with its prior coverage under traditional T&D all risk insurance. The Company explained, also at page 9, that the "replacement cost approach assumes that the total cost of restoration and related activities will be charged against the storm damage reserve." Only indirect costs would not be charged to the reserve but all direct costs, typically payroll, transportation, materials and supplies, and other services necessary to locate and repair or replace damaged property, would be charged to the reserve. At Exhibit 3 to its Study, the Company provided a detailed list of the types of costs the Company believed would be directly associated with storm damage and restoration activities. This list mirrors the list of costs identified above and in the testimony of Mr. Portuondo in this docket. PEF's Study was filed with the Commission on March 17, 1994, in accordance with the Commission's Order in Docket No. 930867-EI.

PEF's Study for Storm Damage Accrual was received without objection by the Commission and, in Order No. PSC-94-0852-FOF-EI in Docket No. 94061-EI dated July 13, 1994, the Commission approved an increase in the annual accrual to the Storm Damage Reserve based on PEF's Study. Consistent with Commission policy in Orders No. PSC-93-1522-FOF-EI and No. PSC-94-0852-FOF-EI regarding what costs can be

charged against the Storm Damage Reserve, the Company has charged all direct costs associated with Hurricanes Erin (1995), Floyd (1999), and Gabrielle (2001) against the Storm Damage Reserve.

The nature of the direct costs incurred by the Company as a result of Hurricanes Charley, Frances, Ivan, and Jeanne are no different from the direct costs identified in the testimony of John Scardino in Docket No. 930867-EI, the Company's Study filed with the Commission in accordance with the Commission's Order in Docket No. 930867-EI, and the costs incurred by the Company in Hurricanes Erin, Floyd, and Gabrielle and charged against the Storm Damage Reserve without question. Consistent with prior Commission policy, all costs directly associated with the Company's storm damage restoration and related activities for Hurricanes Charley, Frances, Ivan, and Jeanne have been and should be charged to the Storm Damage Reserve and recovered from the customers who benefited from the activities related to the Company's storm restoration efforts.

23. Referring to the direct testimony of witness Portuondo, Exhibit JP-1, state the FPSC order numbers that approved PEF's storm damage recovery expenses for Hurricanes Erin (1995), Floyd (1999) and Gabrielle (2001). If no such order exists, provide the basis for the recovery of such expenses.

In Docket 930867-EI, PSC Order No. PSC-93-1522-FOF-EI, the Commission authorized PEF to establish a Storm Damage Reserve on its books and to accrue funds annually to the Reserve from base rates to cover the Company's storm related costs. Since the costs of Hurricanes Erin, Floyd and Gabrielle did not exceed the storm recovery reserve balance, no further Commission action was required.

**Progress Energy Florida, Inc.  
Docket No. 041272-EI**

**Calculation of Base Salaries Included in Storm Damage Claim  
for Charley, Frances, Ivan, Jeanne and Final Sweeps  
Through November 2004**

<u>Legal Entity Florida</u>	
Bargaining Unit - Regular Pay	\$ 4,084,100
Non-Exempt - Regular Pay	1,026,331
<u>Service Company</u>	
Non-Exempt - Regular Pay	<u>347.737</u>
Total Base Salaries	<u>\$ 5,458,168</u>

<u>Legal Entity Florida</u>	
Exempt - Regular Pay	\$ 4,646,644
<u>Service Company</u>	
Exempt - Regular Pay	<u>1,753.655</u>
Total Exempt Base Salaries	<u>\$ 6,400,299</u>

Source: Staff Interrogatory 1-11, Attachment E.

11. Please provide separately the amount of regular pay and overtime pay of company personnel that was charged to the storm damage reserve for each named storm.

Answer:

Please see Attachment E to these answers.



CHARGE BY LEGAL ENTITY FLORIDA ONLY  
 LABOR TO CHARLEY, FRANCES, IVAN, JEANNE AND FINAL SWEEP  
 THROUGH NOVEMBER 2004

BARGAINING UNIT	Extended Pay		OVERTIME		DOUBLETIME		SPECIAL NO PAY		REGULAR PAY		PERCENTAGE	
	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours
CHARGE BY DEPARTMENT												
601855 - CORPORATE SVCS FLA	\$0	0	\$520,105	15,133	\$864,858	20,262	0	0	\$350,487	14,065	423.70%	251.70%
601875 - REAL ESTATE FLORIDA	\$0	0	\$2,092	54	\$209	4	0	0	\$1,466	57	154.80%	100.90%
603205 - NORTH CENTRAL REGION	\$0	0	\$679,641	19,770	\$2,857,104	61,138	0	0	\$484,828	20,134	714.80%	401.80%
604125 - SOUTH CENTRAL REGION	\$0	0	\$1,016,481	28,875	\$3,115,349	85,324	0	0	\$810,708	35,032	453.60%	288.50%
604255 - SOUTH COASTAL REGION	\$0	0	\$618,478	18,030	\$2,218,221	48,338	0	0	\$435,873	17,319	653.70%	383.20%
605015 - TRANSMISSION	\$0	0	\$724,680	20,262	\$2,134,728	45,440	0	0	\$838,273	33,514	341.10%	196.00%
607475 - FLA FGD	\$0	0	\$281,759	8,189	\$187,141	3,800	0	0	\$202,618	13,018	163.70%	12.00%
607565 - COMBUSTION TURBINE OPERATION	\$0	0	\$38,882	911	\$18,352	335	0	0	\$11,863	505	478.30%	260.50%
608345 - IT&T NETWORK SVCS - FLA	\$0	0	\$34,741	782	\$31,338	529	0	0	\$28,758	699	229.80%	135.30%
608675 - SYSTEMS PLANNING & OPS	\$0	0	\$40,254	773	\$18,452	281	0	0	\$1,517	82	389.60%	169.40%
608965 - DIST OPS & SUPPORT	\$0	0	\$787,571	25,375	\$1,570,439	38,341	0	0	\$822,571	15,822	730.10%	400.20%
608985 - CR3 NUCLEAR PLANT	\$0	0	\$281,177	6,516	\$148,637	2,671	0	0	\$130,437	5,788	314.20%	158.30%
609185 - NORTH COASTAL REGION	\$0	0	\$283,205	8,022	\$1,417,958	30,240	0	0	\$266,064	8,856	639.40%	304.30%
BARGAINING UNIT TOTAL	\$0	0	\$5,287,774	152,741	\$14,692,892	316,703	0	0	\$4,084,100	166,358	489.20%	222.20%

NON EXEMPT	Extended Pay		OVERTIME		DOUBLETIME		SPECIAL NO PAY		REGULAR PAY		PERCENTAGE	
	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours
CHARGE BY DEPARTMENT												
601210 - PRESIDENT-FLORIDA POWER	\$0	0	\$856	25	\$0	0	0	0	\$1,533	68	65.80%	37.20%
601855 - CORPORATE SVCS FLA	\$0	0	\$10,817	501	\$0	0	0	0	\$10,105	711	107.60%	70.50%
602285 - ENERGY DELIVERY SERVICES	\$0	0	\$143,469	5,585	\$34,477	1,838	10	10	\$131,856	7,872	134.80%	87.00%
603205 - NORTH CENTRAL REGION	\$0	0	\$110,036	4,109	\$23,042	1,159	0	0	\$86,054	5,089	149.40%	103.50%
603805 - FPC CUSTOMER SERVICE	\$0	0	\$445,201	20,083	\$0	0	0	0	\$317,529	21,158	140.20%	94.90%
604125 - SOUTH CENTRAL REGION	\$0	0	\$111,878	4,168	\$18,648	835	0	0	\$116,827	6,859	109.80%	77.80%
604255 - SOUTH COASTAL REGION	\$0	0	\$68,004	2,282	\$13,831	732	0	0	\$68,119	3,729	106.80%	78.70%
604400 - ENERGY DELIVERY ADMIN	\$0	0	\$114	4	\$0	0	0	0	\$1,418	66	8.00%	5.40%
605015 - TRANSMISSION	\$0	0	\$83,161	2,900	\$6,236	356	0	0	\$133,421	6,787	67.00%	47.80%
607285 - TSD EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	\$0	0	\$1,379	50	\$0	0	0	0	\$3,820	212	35.20%	23.60%
607475 - FLA FGD	\$0	0	\$8,147	236	\$54	3	0	0	\$19,545	519	77.00%	46.00%
607565 - COMBUSTION TURBINE OPERATION	\$0	0	\$1,175	38	\$0	0	0	0	\$2,598	118	45.30%	32.20%
608675 - SYSTEMS PLANNING & OPS	\$0	0	\$760	29	\$0	0	0	0	\$1,758	87	43.20%	30.10%
608965 - DIST OPS & SUPPORT	\$0	0	\$61,873	2,384	\$2,247	101	0	0	\$68,229	3,489	93.70%	66.40%
608985 - ENERGY SVCS-SALES & SVCS	\$0	0	\$7,093	268	\$909	51	0	0	\$6,693	399	121.40%	85.80%
608985 - CR3 NUCLEAR PLANT	\$0	0	\$5,386	176	\$0	0	0	0	\$12,850	589	42.60%	30.90%
609085 - ED MANAGER BUSINESS OPERATIO	\$0	0	\$1,905	70	\$0	0	0	0	\$1,663	88	121.90%	81.20%
60936 - CTE PROJECT MANAGEMENT	\$0	0	\$4,443	139	\$84	3	0	0	\$4,103	180	109.80%	78.80%
609185 - NORTH COASTAL REGION	\$0	0	\$80,004	2,406	\$3,281	156	0	0	\$44,208	2,638	143.20%	89.30%
NON EXEMPT TOTAL	\$0	0	\$1,716,500	45,381	\$100,780	5,384	10	10	\$1,026,331	60,448	118.80%	84.00%

EXEMPT	Extended Pay		OVERTIME		DOUBLETIME		SPECIAL NO PAY		REGULAR PAY		PERCENTAGE	
	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours
CHARGE BY DEPARTMENT												
600385 - TRANSMISSION-FPC	\$7,370	206	\$0	0	\$0	0	11	11	\$9,200	257	80.10%	84.50%
601210 - PRESIDENT-FLORIDA POWER	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	28	28	\$21,538	149	0.00%	20.00%
601855 - CORPORATE SVCS FLA	\$20,664	588	\$0	0	\$0	0	187	187	\$23,461	743	88.10%	104.30%
601875 - REAL ESTATE FLORIDA	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	0	0	\$893	42	0.00%	0.00%
602285 - ENERGY DELIVERY SERVICES	\$545,316	18,469	\$0	0	\$0	0	1,583	1,583	\$578,423	20,471	94.10%	102.70%
603035 - RCD ACCOUNT MGMT-SOUTH SECT	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	0	0	\$23,293	456	0.00%	0.00%
603205 - NORTH CENTRAL REGION	\$364,800	10,889	\$0	0	\$0	0	3,531	3,531	\$418,841	12,321	87.20%	117.00%
603805 - FPC CUSTOMER SERVICE	\$98,485	3,228	\$0	0	\$0	0	1,172	1,172	\$202,734	6,251	47.60%	69.20%
604125 - SOUTH CENTRAL REGION	\$445,001	13,618	\$0	0	\$0	0	3,471	3,471	\$588,569	18,722	76.30%	102.20%
604255 - SOUTH COASTAL REGION	\$328,102	10,057	\$0	0	\$0	0	3,118	3,118	\$387,830	11,186	84.80%	117.80%
605015 - TRANSMISSION	\$450,276	12,758	\$0	0	\$0	0	2,423	2,423	\$882,322	24,390	52.20%	82.20%
607285 - TSD EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	\$8,591	230	\$0	0	\$0	0	17	17	\$17,219	513	49.80%	41.30%
607475 - FLA FGD	\$15,523	412	\$0	0	\$0	0	258	258	\$79,096	2,054	19.60%	32.80%
607565 - COMBUSTION TURBINE OPERATION	\$9,253	215	\$0	0	\$0	0	135	135	\$14,028	235	86.00%	104.40%
608345 - IT&T NETWORK SVCS - FLA	\$5,871	147	\$0	0	\$0	0	140	140	\$10,225	234	57.40%	122.40%
608675 - SYSTEMS PLANNING & OPS	\$13,219	350	\$0	0	\$0	0	527	527	\$41,618	898	31.60%	67.50%
608965 - DIST OPS & SUPPORT	\$323,012	15,011	\$0	0	\$0	0	2,887	2,887	\$682,999	18,453	76.60%	87.00%
608985 - ENERGY SVCS-SALES & SVCS	\$66,224	2,018	\$0	0	\$0	0	212	212	\$64,403	1,885	102.80%	113.50%
608985 - CR3 NUCLEAR PLANT	\$120,712	3,020	\$0	0	\$0	0	619	619	\$230,362	5,891	32.40%	51.80%
609085 - ED MANAGER BUSINESS OPERATIO	\$44,395	1,316	\$0	0	\$0	0	583	583	\$104,568	2,868	42.50%	63.60%
60936 - CTE PROJECT MANAGEMENT	\$4,913	109	\$0	0	\$0	0	204	204	\$27,356	380	22.00%	82.40%
609185 - NORTH COASTAL REGION	\$237,573	7,385	\$0	0	\$0	0	2,381	2,381	\$281,895	7,736	84.30%	126.00%
EXEMPT TOTAL	\$3,308,381	101,003	\$0	0	\$0	0	22,479	22,479	\$4,646,644	134,527	71.20%	82.50%

GRAND TOTAL	\$3,308,381	101,003	\$6,404,273	198,132	\$14,793,672	322,087	23,489	\$5,767,076	361,343	261.2%	178.4%
-------------	-------------	---------	-------------	---------	--------------	---------	--------	-------------	---------	--------	--------

COLUMN HEADING	DEFINITION
REGULAR PAY	Standard pay for 40 hour workweek.
OVERTIME	Pay at one and one-half times regular hourly rate for hours worked over 40 hours per week.
DOUBLETIME	For Bargaining Unit and Non Exempt employees, hours worked in excess of 16 consecutive hours until a rest period of at least 8 hours is taken. For Bargaining Unit employees, paid at double employee's regular hourly rate. For Non Exempt employees, paid at employee's regular hourly rate and is in addition to the standard hours and overtime hours worked during the workweek.
EXTENDED PAY	For Exempt employees who have a job value equal to \$86,772 or lower, pay at regular hourly rate for hours worked over 40 hours per workweek during designated storm restoration periods as approved by senior management. First line supervisors who directly supervise craft/technical employees receive extended pay for time worked in excess of 45 hours per week.
SPECIAL NO PAY	For Exempt employees, hours worked in excess of 40 hours outside designated extended pay period. Also, the 5 hours between 40 and 45 for first line supervisors who receive extended pay for time worked in excess of 45 hours per week.
PERCENTAGE	Percentage of extended pay, overtime, doubletime and special no pay to regular dollars/hours.

NOTE: Detailed payroll reports by employee, FLSA status and storm available upon request.

SERVICE COMPANY BILLED LABOR FOR CHARLIE, FRANCES, IVAN AND JEANNE  
 THROUGH NOVEMBER 2004

NON EXEMPT CHARGE BY DEPARTMENT	Extended Pay		OVERTIME		DOUBLETIME		SPECIAL NO PAY	REGULAR PAY		PERCENTAGE	
	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours	Hours	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours
987895 - FL REG & PUBLIC AFFAIRS	\$0	0	\$1,289	42	\$0	0	0	\$2,405	123	\$3,694	34.80%
98A11D - PRES & CEO-PGN	\$0	0	\$21	1	\$0	0	0	\$234	11	\$255	5.80%
98A13D - PRESIDENT-SERVICE COMPANY	\$0	0	\$140	4	\$0	0	0	\$1,150	48	\$1,290	7.70%
98BD1D - FINANCIAL SERVICES SR VP - CHG	\$0	0	\$2	0	\$0	0	0	\$107	5	\$109	1.80%
98CP75 - EC ECONOMIC DEVEL ADMIN	\$0	0	\$623	25	\$0	0	0	\$959	62	\$1,582	42.80%
98CV55 - TX TAX DEPARTMENT	\$0	0	\$5,797	205	\$382	21	0	\$1,779	69	\$7,576	228.00%
98FO25 - PV FINANCE	\$0	0	\$1,859	70	\$270	15	0	\$240	14	\$2,369	812.20%
98GB45 - CORP ENVIRON HEALTH&SAFETY	\$0	0	\$4,283	154	\$2,553	140	0	\$2,112	115	\$9,448	254.10%
98GR65 - RE REAL ESTATE DEPARTMENT	\$0	0	\$8,643	208	\$1,495	77	0	\$8,936	333	\$10,634	85.60%
98GZ95 - FIN PLANNING AND REG SVCS	\$0	0	\$267	12	\$0	0	0	\$0	0	\$267	100.00%
98HR65 - RISK MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT	\$0	0	\$53	2	\$0	0	0	\$530	23	\$583	6.70%
98TB15 - AD ACCOUNTING DEPARTMENT	\$0	0	\$15,674	652	\$8,319	402	0	\$16,780	799	\$24,493	119.40%
98WB05 - AUDIT SERVICES	\$0	0	\$96	4	\$0	0	0	\$1,035	49	\$1,131	8.80%
98WC85 - CS CORPORATE SERVICES	\$0	0	\$372,611	10,327	\$215,744	8,502	0	\$230,059	9,825	\$818,114	189.70%
98WSD5 - IT & TELECOM DEPT	\$0	0	\$55,956	1,521	\$16,564	582	0	\$45,187	1,825	\$77,607	109.30%
98X105 - LD LEGAL	\$0	0	\$10,353	348	\$7,803	372	0	\$14,044	749	\$22,199	96.10%
98X185 - CC CORPORATE COMMUNICATIONS	\$0	0	\$4,865	208	\$540	33	0	\$9,861	700	\$15,206	34.50%
98X305 - PUBLIC AFFAIRS	\$0	0	\$394	16	\$0	0	0	\$1,321	79	\$1,715	23.40%
98X615 - HR HUMAN RESOURCES	\$0	0	\$7,010	258	\$1,211	66	0	\$12,820	730	\$20,041	44.50%
98XP85 - CS CORPORATE SECURITY	\$0	0	\$495	25	\$174	13	0	\$56	4	\$725	800.00%
NON EXEMPT TOTAL	\$0	0	\$485,454	13,984	\$255,854	10,222	0	\$347,737	15,793	\$1,189,328	153.30%

EXEMPT CHARGE BY DEPARTMENT	Extended Pay		OVERTIME		DOUBLETIME		SPECIAL NO PAY	REGULAR PAY		PERCENTAGE	
	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours	Hours	Dollars	Hours	Dollars	Hours
981415 - FL PWR FINANCIAL SVCS-ADMIN	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	102	\$8,422	105	\$8,422	86.90%
987895 - FL REG & PUBLIC AFFAIRS	\$3,998	135	\$0	0	\$0	0	142	\$34,334	653	\$38,332	41.70%
98A11D - PRES & CEO-PGN	\$430	15	\$0	0	\$0	0	6	\$6,789	16	\$7,219	132.30%
98A13D - PRESIDENT-SERVICE COMPANY	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	1	\$809	4	\$809	25.00%
98CP75 - EC ECONOMIC DEVEL ADMIN	\$18,598	476	\$0	0	\$0	0	37	\$17,651	556	\$36,249	92.20%
98CV55 - TX TAX DEPARTMENT	\$3,420	111	\$0	0	\$0	0	3	\$1,895	48	\$5,315	237.60%
98DWH5 - SP STRATEGIC PLANNING	\$278	7	\$0	0	\$0	0	58	\$4,708	88	\$5,286	73.70%
98FO25 - PV FINANCE	\$1,785	65	\$0	0	\$0	0	7	\$1,427	45	\$3,212	158.80%
98GB45 - CORP ENVIRON HEALTH&SAFETY	\$184,310	4,855	\$0	0	\$0	0	647	\$133,598	3,577	\$317,908	154.10%
98GR65 - RE REAL ESTATE DEPARTMENT	\$5,260	222	\$0	0	\$0	0	15	\$4,489	204	\$10,111	116.20%
98GZ95 - FIN PLANNING AND REG SVCS	\$18,715	484	\$0	0	\$0	0	31	\$20,853	609	\$39,568	84.50%
98HR65 - RISK MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT	\$4,346	125	\$0	0	\$0	0	67	\$8,439	211	\$12,785	80.80%
98TD15 - TR TREASURY DEPARTMENT	\$0	0	\$0	0	\$0	0	0	\$157	5	\$157	6.80%
98TB15 - AD ACCOUNTING DEPARTMENT	\$26,453	781	\$0	0	\$0	0	37	\$20,106	590	\$46,559	138.70%
98WB05 - AUDIT SERVICES	\$35,397	854	\$0	0	\$0	0	205	\$43,831	1,029	\$79,228	102.80%
98WC85 - CS CORPORATE SERVICES	\$230,895	6,337	\$0	0	\$0	0	1,830	\$336,756	8,440	\$567,651	86.80%
98WSD5 - IT & TELECOM DEPT	\$406,859	12,212	\$0	0	\$0	0	1,697	\$775,578	21,580	\$1,182,437	64.40%
98X105 - LD LEGAL	\$55,378	1,663	\$0	0	\$0	0	97	\$30,297	824	\$86,675	180.50%
98X185 - CC CORPORATE COMMUNICATIONS	\$77,213	2,344	\$0	0	\$0	0	1,059	\$162,883	4,249	\$240,096	80.10%
98X305 - PUBLIC AFFAIRS	\$2,395	88	\$0	0	\$0	0	259	\$36,234	829	\$38,629	41.80%
98X615 - HR HUMAN RESOURCES	\$84,250	2,533	\$0	0	\$0	0	527	\$103,006	3,006	\$187,256	101.80%
98XP85 - CS CORPORATE SECURITY	\$47,900	1,476	\$0	0	\$0	0	30	\$573	157	\$630	85.60%
EXEMPT TOTAL	\$1,207,883	34,789	\$0	0	\$0	0	6,859	\$1,753,655	46,835	\$2,961,538	88.70%
GRAND TOTAL	\$1,207,883	34,789	\$485,454	13,984	\$255,854	10,222	6,859	\$3,101,392	62,728	\$2,150,866	105.0%

COLUMN HEADING	DEFINITION
REGULAR PAY	Standard pay for 40 hour workweek.
OVERTIME	Pay at one and one-half times regular hourly rate for hours worked over 40 hours per week.
DOUBLETIME	For Non Exempt employees, hours worked in excess of 16 consecutive hours until a rest period of at least 8 hours is taken. For Non Exempt employees, paid at employee's regular hourly rate and is in addition to the standard hours and overtime hours worked during the
EXTENDED PAY	For Exempt employees who have a job value equal to \$85,772 or lower, pay at regular hourly rate for hours worked over 40 hours per workweek during designated storm restoration periods as approved by senior management. First line supervisors who directly supervise craft/technical employees receive extended pay for time worked in excess of 45 hours per week.
SPECIAL NO PAY	For Exempt employees, hours worked in excess of 40 hours outside designated extended pay period. Also, the 5 hours between 40 and 45 for first line supervisors who receive extended pay for time worked in excess of 45 hours per week.
PERCENTAGE	Percentage of extended pay, overtime, doubletime and special no pay to regular dollars/hours.

NOTE: Detailed payroll reports by employee, FLSA status and storm available upon request.

Progress Energy Florida, Inc.  
Docket No. 041272-EI

Transportation Costs To Be Excluded From Storm Recovery Claim

Depreciation	\$	909,352
Fuel		701,796
MTC		1,560,600
Overhead		<u>222,164</u>
Total Included in Storm Recovery Claim	\$	3,393,912
Less:		
1/2 Fuel		<u>350,898</u>
Total To Exclude From Claim	\$	<u><u>3,043,014</u></u>

Source: Response to Staff Interrogatory 1-12.

12. Please provide the amount of costs by type, such as depreciation, O&M, overhead, etc., for company-owned vehicles that was charged to the storm damage reserve for each named storm.

Progress Energy							
OVE Charges for Hurricanes							
Rate Analysts							
Hurricane	Project #	OVE Charges	Deprecation	Fuel	MTC	Overhead	Total
Charlie	20045183	1,200,342	320,764	249,324	550,349	79,904	1,200,342
Frances	20045534	1,047,616	281,053	216,156	482,391	68,015	1,047,616
Ivan	20045850	51,357	13,989	10,320	24,043	3,005	51,357
Jeanne	20046082	1,094,598	293,546	225,996	503,817	71,240	1,094,598
		3,393,913	909,352	701,796	1,560,600	222,164	3,393,913

**Progress Energy Florida, Inc.**  
**Docket No. 041272-EI**  
**Summary of Recommended Adjustments**  
 (\$ Millions)

1	Company Requested Storm Costs (System)	\$ 311.41	
	Less:		
2	Base Salaries	5.46	Exhibit__(MJM-6)
3	Salaries of Exempt Management	6.40	Exhibit__(MJM-6)
4	Vehicle Expense (except 1/2 of Fuel)	3.04	Exhibit__(MJM-7)
5	Tree Trimming	3.90	Wimberly Deposition, p. 62.
6	Call Center Expense		Unknown
7	Uncollectibles	2.25	Exhibit__(MVW-1), page 15.
8	Total Disallowed Expenses	<u>21.05</u>	
9	Adjusted Storm Costs	290.36	
	Less:		
10	Reserve Balance	(46.92)	
11	Pre-Tax System Expense that would produce 10% ROE	<u>-113.88</u>	
12	Storm Reserve Deficiency (System)	129.56	
13	Jurisdictional Factor	<u>95.2%</u>	
14	Retail Storm Reserve Deficiency	<u>\$ 123.34</u>	