MEMORANDUM

July 12, 2005

TO:

DIVISION OF THE COMMISSION CLERK AND ADMINISTRATIVE

SERVICES

FROM:

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL (FLEMING)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 050045-EI Petition for rate increase by Florida Power & Light

Company.

DOCKET NO. 050188-EI 2005 comprehensive depreciation study by Florida

Power & Light Company.

Attached is <u>STAFF'S PRELIMINARY LIST OF ISSUES AND POSITIONS</u>, to be filed in the above-referenced docket.

DATE ORDER SENT ELECTRONICALLY TO CCA ______.

KEF/pz

Attachment

I:2005/050045-PRELIMINARY LIST.kef.doc

DOCUMENT NUMBER -DATE

06547 JUL 12 8

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition for rate increase by Florida | DOCKET NO. 050045-EI

Power & Light Company.

In re: 2005 comprehensive depreciation study

by Florida Power & Light Company.

DOCKET NO. 050188-EI

FILED: JULY 12, 2005

STAFF'S PRELIMINARY LIST OF ISSUES AND POSITIONS

Pursuant to Order No. PSC-05-0347-PCO-EI, issued March 31, 2005, and Order No. PSC-05-0518-PCO-EI, issued May 11, 2005, establishing the prehearing procedures in this docket, the Staff of the Florida Public Service Commission hereby files its Preliminary List of Issues and Positions.

TEST YEAR AND FORECASTING

ISSUE 1: Is FPL's projected test period of the twelve months ending December 31, 2006

appropriate?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 2: Are FPL's forecasts of customer growth, kWh by revenue class, and system KW

for the projected test year appropriate?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

Are FPL's forecasts of billing determinants by rate class for the projected test ISSUE 3:

year appropriate?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

QUALITY OF SERVICE

ISSUE 4: Is the quality and reliability of electric service provided by FPL adequate?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 5: Is FPL's pole inspection, repair, and replacement program sufficient for the

purpose of providing reasonable transmission and distribution system protection?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

06547 JUL 128

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

ISSUE 6: Is FPL's vegetation management program sufficient for the purpose of providing

reasonable transmission and distribution system protection?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

DEPRECIATION STUDY

ISSUE 7: Is FPL's \$329.75 million accrued unassigned discretionary balance allocation

appropriate based upon the approved settlement agreement in Order No. PSC-02-

0502-AS-EI?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 8: Is FPL's \$1.2 billion depreciation reserve excess appropriate and should there be

any other corrective reserve allocations?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 9: What are the appropriate depreciation rates and recovery/amortization schedules?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 10: Should the current amortization of investment tax credits and flow back of excess

deferred income taxes be revised to reflect the approved depreciation rates and

recovery schedules?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 11: What should be the implementation date for FPL's depreciation rates and

recovery/amortization schedules?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

RATE BASE

ISSUE 12: Should adjustments be made for the rate base effects of FPL's transactions with

affiliated companies?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 13: Should the capitalized items currently approved for recovery through the

Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) be included in rate base?

PAGE 3

ISSUE 14: Should any portion of capital and expense items requested in the storm docket be included in base rates?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 15: Is FPL's requested level of Plant in Service in the amount of \$23,394,793,000 (\$23,591,644,000 system) for the projected test year appropriate? This is a calculation based upon the decisions in preceding issues.

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 16: What adjustments, if any, should be made to Accumulated Depreciation to reflect the Depreciation Study filed by FPL?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

Is FPL's requested level of Accumulated Depreciation and Accumulated Amortization in the amount of \$11,700,179,000 (\$11,803,581,000 system) for the projected test year appropriate? This is a calculation based upon the decisions in preceding issues.

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 18: Is FPL's requested level of Construction Work in Progress (CWIP) in the amount of \$522,642,000 (\$525,110,000 system) for the projected test year appropriate?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 19: Is FPL's requested level of Property Held for Future Use in the amount of \$135,593,000 (\$136,585,000 system) for the projected test year appropriate?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 20: Has FPL properly estimated its accumulated provision for uncollectibles?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 21: What adjustments, if any, should be made to FPL's fuel inventories?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 22: Should unamortized rate case expense be included in working capital?

PAGE 4

ISSUE 23: Is \$500,000,000 an appropriate reserve goal for Account 228.1, Accumulated

Provision for Property Insurance - Storm Damage?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 24: Has FPL properly estimated the amount of storm damage reserve that will be

available for the projected test year?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 25: Should the net overrecovery/underrecovery of fuel, capacity, conservation, and

environmental cost recovery clause expenses for the test year be included in the

calculation of working capital allowance for FPL?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 26: Is FPL's requested level of Working Capital Allowance in the amount of

\$57,673,000 (61,429,000 system) for the projected test year appropriate? This is

a calculation based upon the decisions in preceding issues.

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 27: Is FPL's requested level of rate base in the amount of \$12,410,522,000

(\$12,511,188,000 system) for the projected test year appropriate? This is a

calculation based upon the decisions in preceding issues.

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

COST OF CAPITAL

ISSUE 28: What is the appropriate amount of accumulated deferred taxes to include in the

capital structure?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 29: What is the appropriate amount and cost rate of the unamortized investment tax

credits to include in the capital structure?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 30: What is the appropriate cost rate for short-term debt for the projected test year?

ISSUE 31: What is the appropriate cost rate for long-term debt for the projected test year?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 32: In setting FPL's return on equity (ROE) for use in establishing FPL's revenue

requirements and authorized range, should the Commission make an adjustment

to reflect FPL's performance?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 33: What is the appropriate cost rate for common equity to use in establishing FPL's

revenue requirement for the projected test year?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 34: What is the appropriate capital structure for FPL?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 35: What is the appropriate weighted average cost of capital including the proper

components, amounts and cost rates associated with the capital structure? This is

a calculation based upon the decisions in preceding issues.

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 36: Are FPL's estimated revenues for sales of electricity by rate class appropriate?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

NET OPERATING INCOME

ISSUE 37: Is FPL's requested level of Total Operating Revenues in the amount of

\$3,888,233,000 (\$3,931,068,000 system) for the projected test year appropriate?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 38: Should an adjustment be made to FPL's requested level of security expenses

related to the increased threat of terrorist attacks since September 11, 2001?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 39: Should adjustments be made for the net operating income effects of FPL's

transactions with affiliated companies?

ISSUE 40: Is it appropriate to include \$104 million of costs related to GridFlorida RTO in

the projected test year?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 41: What is the appropriate amount and method to recover the RTO start-up costs

incurred before the Commission makes a final decision regarding implementation

of GridFlorida RTO?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 42: Is the amount of postage projected in the 2006 test year in Account 903, Customer

Records and Collection Expenses, appropriate? If not, what are the appropriate

system and jurisdictional adjustments?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 43: Should an adjustment be made to Account 904, Uncollectible Accounts, for the

projected test year and what is the appropriate factor in include in the revenue

expansion factor?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 44: Should an adjustment be made to remove image building or other inappropriate

advertising expenses?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 45: Is FPL's requested \$120,000,000 annual accrual for storm damage for the

projected test year appropriate?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 46: Should an adjustment be made to Account 928, Regulatory Commission Expense,

for rate case expense for the projected test year and what is the appropriate amortization period?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 47: Has FPL made the appropriate adjustments to remove charitable contributions?

ISSUE 48: Should the O&M expense items currently approved for recovery through the

Environmental Cost Recovery Clause be included in base rates?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 49: Is FPL's O&M Expense of \$1,591,191,000 (\$1,608,896,000 system) for the

projected test year appropriate? This is a calculation based upon the decisions in

preceding issues.

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 50: What adjustments, if any, should be made to the fossil dismantlement accrual?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 51: Is FPL's Depreciation and Amortization Expense of \$924,323,000 (\$931,335,000

system) for the projected test year appropriate? This is a calculation based upon

the decisions in preceding issues.

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 52: Should the total amount of Gross Receipts tax be removed from base rates and

shown as a separate line item on the bill?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 53: Is FPL's Taxes Other Than Income of \$299,798,000 (\$300,496,000 system) for

the projected test year appropriate?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 54: Should a Parent Debt Adjustment be made for the projected test year and if so,

what is the appropriate amount of the adjustment?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 55: Has FPL appropriately calculated the adjustment to taxable income to reflect the

domestic manufacturer's tax deduction which was attributable to the American

Jobs Creation Act?

ISSUE 56: Is FPL's Income Tax Expense of \$291,326,000 (\$286,729,000 system) which

includes current and deferred income taxes and interest reconciliation for the

projected test year appropriate?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 57: Is FPL's projected Total Operating Expenses of \$3,105,671,000 (\$3,140,480,000

system) for the projected test year appropriate? This is a calculation based upon

the decisions in preceding issues.

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 58: Is FPL's Net Operating Income (NOI) of \$782,562,000 (\$777,212,000 system)

for the projected test year appropriate? This is a calculation based upon the

decisions in preceding issues.

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

REVENUE REQUIREMENTS

ISSUE 59: What is the appropriate projected test year revenue expansion factor and the

appropriate net operating income multiplier, including the appropriate elements

and rates for FPL?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 60: Is FPL's requested annual operating revenue increase of \$384,580,000 for the

projected test year appropriate? This is a calculation based upon the decisions in

preceding issues.

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 61: Should the Commission approve the limited scope adjustment in base rates to

produce additional annual revenue of \$122,757,000 beginning 30 days following

the commercial in-service date of Turkey Point Unit 5 projected to occur in June

2007?

COST OF SERVICE AND RATE DESIGN

ISSUE 62: Is FPL's proposed separation of costs and revenues between the wholesale and

retail jurisdictions appropriate?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 63: What is the appropriate cost of service study to be used in designing FPL's rates?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 64: If a revenue increase is approved, how should it be allocated among the customer

classes?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 65: What is the appropriate adjustment to account for the increase in unbilled revenue

due to any recommended rate increase?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 66: Is FPL's proposed method for the recovery of the costs of Turkey Point Unit 5

appropriate?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 67: What are the appropriate demand charges?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 68: What are the appropriate energy charges?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 69: How should FPL's time-of-use rates be designed?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 70: What are the appropriate customer charges?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 71: What are the appropriate service charges?

ISSUE 72: What are the appropriate lighting rate schedule charges?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 73: Is FPL's proposal to eliminate the option allowing lump-sum payment for time of

use metering equipment appropriate?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 74: What is the appropriate monthly fixed charge carrying rate to be applied to the

installed cost of customer-requested distribution equipment for which there are no

tariffed charges?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 75: What is the appropriate Monthly Rental Factor to be applied to the in-place value

of customer-rented distribution substations to determine the monthly rental fee for

such facilities?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 76: What are the appropriate termination factors to be applied to the in-place value of

customer-rented distribution substations to calculate the termination fee?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 77: What are the appropriate termination factors to be applied to the total installed

cost of facilities when customers terminate their lighting agreement prior to the

expiration of the contract term?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 78: What is the appropriate Present Value Revenue Requirement multiplier to be

applied to the installed cost of lighting facilities to determine the lump sum

advance payment amount for such facilities?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 79: What are the appropriate per-month facilities charges under FPL's PL-1 and SL-3

rate schedules?

ISSUE 80: What is the appropriate monthly per kW credit to be provided customers who own

their own transformers pursuant to the Transformation Rider?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 81: What is the appropriate level and design of the charges under the Standby and

Supplemental Service (SST-1) rate schedule?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 82: What is the appropriate level and design of the charges under the Interruptible

Standby and Supplemental Service (ISST-1) rate schedule?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 83: What are the appropriate curtailment credits?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 84: What are the appropriate administrative charges under the Commercial/Industrial

Demand Reduction rider?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 85: Should the Commission approve FPL's proposal to change the breakpoint

applicable to its inverted residential rate from 750 to 1,000 kilowatt hours?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 86: Should the Commission approve FPL's proposal to establish a single set of

demand and energy charges for its GSD-1, GSLD-1, GSLD-2, CS-1 and CS-2

rate schedules?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 87: Should the Commission approve FPL's proposal to eliminate the provision in its

GSD-1 rate schedule that exempts from billing the first 10 kW of demand?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 88: Should the Commission approve FPL's proposal to close its Wireless Internet

Electric Service (WIES) rate schedule be approved?

ISSUE 89: Should FPL's proposal to close its Premium Lighting rate schedule to new

customers and replace it with a new Decorative Lighting rate schedule be

approved?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 90: Should the Commission approve FPL's proposed new General Service Constant

Use rate schedule?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 91: Should the Commission approve FPL's proposed new High Load Factor Time-of-

Use rate schedule?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 92: Should the Commission approve FPL's proposed new Seasonal Demand Time-of-

Use rider?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 93: What is the appropriate effective date for FPL's revised rates and charges?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

OTHER ISSUES

ISSUE 94: How should the Commission address FPL's nuclear decommissioning accrual in

this case?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 95: Should the Commission approve FPL's request to move into base rates the

security costs that result from heightened security requirements since September

11, 2001, from the Capacity Cost Recovery Clause?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 96: Should FPL continue to seek recovery of incremental security costs above the

amount included in base rates through the Capacity Cost Recovery Clause? If so,

what mechanism should be used to determine the incremental security costs?

Should the Commission approve FPL's request to transfer to the Capacity Clause certain St. Johns River Power Park capacity costs and certain capacity revenues

that are currently embedded in base rates?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 98: Should the Commission approve FPL's request to transfer its 2006 projected

incremental hedging costs from Fuel Clause recovery to base rate recovery?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 99: Should FPL be allowed to recover incremental hedging costs in excess of its base

rate amount through the Fuel and Purchased Power Cost Recovery Clause, and if

so, should netting be required in the clause for these costs?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 100: Should the unrecovered Allowance for Funds Used During Construction

(AFUDC) associated with Turkey Point Unit 5 be recovered through the Fuel

Cost Recovery Clause?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 101: Should FPL be required to file, within 90 days after the date of the final order in

this docket, a description of all entries or adjustments to its annual report, rate of return reports, and books and records that will be required as a result of the

Commission's findings in this rate case?

POSITION: Staff has no position at this time.

ISSUE 102: Should this docket be closed?

Dated this 12th day of July, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,

KATHERINE E. FLEMING

Senior Attorney

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.

Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

(850) 413-6218

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition for rate increase by Florida | DOCKET NO. 050045-EI Power & Light Company.

In re: 2005 comprehensive depreciation study by Florida Power & Light Company.

DOCKET NO. 050188-EI

DATED: JULY 12, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of STAFF'S PRELIMINARY LIST OF ISSUES AND POSITIONS has been furnished by U. S. Mail and electronic mail this 12th day of July, 2005, to the following:

Florida Industrial Power Users Group c/o John W. McWhirter, Jr. McWhirter Reeves Law Firm 400 North Tampa Street, Suite 2450 Tampa, FL 33601-3350

Florida Power & Light Company R. Wade Litchfield/Natalie F. Smith 700 Universe Blvd. Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

McWhirter Reeves Law Firm Timothy J. Perry 117 South Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301

The Commercial Group Alan R. Jenkins c/o McKenna Long & Aldridge, LLP 303 Peachtree Street, N. E., Suite 5300 Atlanta, GA 30308

Florida Power & Light Company Bill Walker 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 810 Tallahassee, FL 32301-1859

Office of Public Counsel Harold McLean/Charles Beck/Joe McGlothlin c/o The Florida Legislature 111 West Madison Street, Room 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400

Landers & Parsons, P. A. Robert Scheffel Wright/John T. LaVia, III P. O. Box 271 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Federal Executive Agencies Major Craig Paulson AFCESA/ULT 139 Barnes Drive Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida 32403 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE DOCKET NOS. 050045-EI, 050188-EI PAGE 2

South Florida Hospital and Healthcare Assn. Mark F. Sundback/Kenneth L. Wiseman/ Gloria J. Halstead/Jennifer L. Spina Andrews & Kurth LLP 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W., Suite 300 Washington, D. C. 20006

AARP c/o Michael Twomey P. O. Box 5256 Tallahassee, FL 32314-5256 J. Kennedy Associates, Inc. Stephen Baron/Lane Kollen 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305 Roswell, GA 30075

KATHERINE E. FLEMING

Senior Attorney

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

the Clemins

2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.

Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

(850) 413-6218