

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition for increase in Rates by
Gulf Power Company

DOCKET NO. 130140-EI
FILED: November 8, 2013

_____ /

**THE FLORIDA INDUSTRIAL POWER USERS GROUP'S
PREHEARING STATEMENT**

The Florida Industrial Power Users Group (FIPUG), pursuant to Order No. PSC-13-0342-PCO-EI, files its Prehearing Statement.

A. APPEARANCES:

JON MOYLE, JR.
KAREN PUTNAL
Moyle Law Firm, P.A.
118 North Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32312
Representing the Florida Industrial Power Users Group (FIPUG)

B. WITNESSES:

All witnesses listed by other parties in this case.

C. EXHIBITS

None at this time.

D. STATEMENT OF BASIC POSITION

FIPUG's Statement of Basic Position:

In this case, Gulf Power seeks to increase its base rates by approximately \$75 million dollars. A significant portion of this increase is due to Gulf Power's request for an 11.50% return on equity (ROE). Gulf Power's request is over-stated and should not be granted as requested. Given the favorable regulatory treatment given Florida utilities, as well as the fact that Gulf Power collects hundreds of millions of dollars outside of base rates through guaranteed cost recovery clauses, a ROE of 11.50% is excessive. Further, Gulf Power, in contrast to businesses which must compete in the open market, is a monopoly with a captive customer base. Additionally, Gulf Power does not

have nuclear assets which tend to increase utility risk. All these things and more greatly reduce Gulf Power's risk and suggest that an ROE of greater than 10% should not be awarded. Finally, just last year, this Commission ordered consumers to pay Gulf an additional \$64.1 million dollars in base rates. Gulf is back again now seeking another \$75 million dollars from these same businesses and families. The Commission should deny or cut Gulf's inflated request.

E. STATEMENT OF ISSUES AND POSITIONS:

TEST PERIOD AND FORECASTING

Issue 1: Is Gulf's projected test period of the 12 months ending December 31, 2014 appropriate?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 2: Are Gulf's forecasts of Customers, kWh, and kW by rate class, for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what adjustments should be made?

FIPUG: No. Gulf has understated for the test year the usage per residential customer and the level of residential customers.

Issue 3: Are Gulf's forecasts of billing determinants by rate schedule for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what adjustments should be made?

FIPUG: No. Residential revenues should be increased.

Issue 4: Are Gulf's estimated revenues from sales of electricity by rate class at present rates for the projected 2014 test year appropriate? If not, what adjustments should be made?

FIPUG: No. Residential revenues should be increased.

Issue 5: What are the appropriate inflation, customer growth, and other trend factors for use in forecasting the 2014 projected test year budget?

FIPUG: No. Residential revenues should be increased.

Issue 6: Is Gulf's proposed separation of costs and revenues between the wholesale and retail jurisdictions appropriate? If not, what adjustments should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

QUALITY OF SERVICE

Issue 7: Is the quality and reliability of electric service provided by Gulf adequate?

FIPUG: Yes.

DEPRECIATION AND DISMANTLEMENT

Issue 8: Are the depreciation parameters for production plant posed by Gulf appropriate? If not, what adjustments should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 8A: Is Gulf's level of estimated interim retirements appropriate? If not, what adjustments should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

(INSTEAD OF ISSUE 8A ABOVE, OPC WOULD LIKE TO SUBSTITUTE THE FOLLOWING TWO SEPARATE ISSUES AS 8A AND 8B AND RENUMBER ISSUES 8B AND 8C BELOW:)

OPC ISSUE: Is Gulf's quantification of the level of interim requirements for Account 312-Steam Production Boiler Plant appropriate? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

OPC ISSUE: Is Gulf's quantification of the level of interim requirements for Account 343-Other Production Prime Movers appropriate? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 8B: What is the appropriate level of interim retirement-related production net salvage?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 8C: Based on the decisions made in Issues 8A and 8B, what are the appropriate depreciation rates for production plant?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 9: Are Gulf's proposed depreciation parameters and resulting rates for transmission, distribution, general and intangible plant accounts appropriate? If not, what adjustments should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

OPC ISSUE 9A: What are the appropriate average service lives for the following mass property accounts?

- Account 350.2 – Transmission Easements and Rights-of-Way

- Account 353- Transmission Station Equipment
- Account 356 – Transmission Overhead Conductors
- Account 364- Distribution Poles and Fixtures
- Account 365 – Distribution Overhead Conductors
- Account 367 – Distribution Underground Conductors and Devices
- Account 368- Distribution Line Transformers
- Account 369.1 - Distribution Overhead Services
- Account 370.1 – Distribution Meters – AMR
- Account 373- Distribution Street Lights
- Account 390- General Plant Structures and Improvements
- Account 303 – Intangible Plant- Software

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

OPC ISSUE 9B: What is the appropriate net salvage for the following mass property accounts?

- Account 356- Transmission Overhead Conductors and Devices
- Account 362 – Distribution Station Equipment
- Account 368- Distribution Line Transformers
- Account 390- General Plant Structures and Improvements
- Account 392.3 – General Plant Heavy Trucks

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 10: Is Gulf’s base cost of dismantlement appropriate? If not, what adjustments should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 10A: Is Gulf’s 10% contingency component for dismantlement appropriate?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 10B: Did Gulf properly apply the Commission’s methodology as set forth in Rule 25-6.04364, F.A.C., for escalating future costs and discounting those costs to net present value?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 10C: Based on the decisions in Issues 10 through 10B, what is the appropriate annual accrual for dismantlement?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 11: What should the implementation date for the recommended depreciation rates, amortizations and dismantlement provisions be?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 12: What, if any, corrective reserve allocations should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

TRANSMISSION PROJECTS

GULF/STAFF ISSUE: Are the following transmission projects related to Plant Crist appropriate and prudent for cost recovery?

- a. Pensacola SVC (Alligator Swamp)(in-service date 2015)
- b. Alligator Swamp Capacitor Bank (in-service date 2015)
- c. North Brewton – Alligator Swamp 230 kV line (in-service date 2015)
- d. Alligator Swamp Substation (in-service date 2015)
- e. West Pensacola Capacitor Bank (Bellview) (in-service date 2015)
- f. Brentwood – Scenic Hills 115 kV Transmission Line Reconductor (in-service date 2017)
- g. West Pensacola +/- 100 MVAR Static VAR Compensator (SVC) (in-service date 2018)

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

GULF/STAFF ISSUE: If the Commission approves Gulf’s request to recover the costs of transmission upgrades for Plant Crist listed in Issue _____ above, should those costs be recovered through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC)?

FIPUG: No. The costs of these transmission projects, if prudent, should not be recovered in the environmental cost recovery clause (“ECRC”) since these capital items do not, as a factual matter, meet the legal requirements to be properly recovered through the ECRC clause.

GULF/STAFF ISSUE: Are the following transmission projects related to Plant Smith appropriate and prudent for cost recovery?

- a. Rebuild Holmes Creek – Bonifay Tap Section Double Circuit (in-service date 2014)
- b. Holmes Creek – Highland City Capacitor New 230 kV – Autobank (in-service date 2014)
- c. Holmes Creek – Highland City new 230 kV – Cap Bank (in-service date 2014)
- d. Holmes Creek – Highland City New 230 kV Transmission Line (in-service date 2015)
- e. Panama City SVC (Highland City) (in-service date 2015)

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

GULF/STAFF ISSUE: If the Commission approves Gulf’s request to recover the costs of transmission upgrades for Plant Smith listed in Issue _____ above, should those costs be recovered through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC)?

FIPUG: No. The costs of these transmission projects, if prudent, should not be recovered in the environmental cost recovery clause (“ECRC”) since these capital items do not, as a factual matter, meet the legal requirements to be properly recovered through the ECRC clause.

GULF/STAFF ISSUE: Should the Commission approve Gulf’s request to recover \$637,000 in revenue requirements for the following transmission projects that are projected to go into service during the 2014 projected test year?

- a. Rebuild Holmes Creek – Bonifay Tap Section Double Circuit
- b. Holmes Creek – Highland City Capacitor new 230 kV – Autobank
- c. Holmes Creek – Highland City New 230 kV – Cap Bank

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

OPC ISSUE: With respect to the Plant Crist transmission upgrade project that Gulf has identified, which includes the following components, projected in-service dates, and projected expenditures (“PE”):

- a. Pensacola SVC (Alligator Swamp)(in-service date 2015)(PE _____)
- b. Alligator Swamp Capacitor Bank (in-service date 2015) (PE _____)
- c. North Brewton–Alligator Swamp 230 kV line (in-service date 2015)(PE _____)
- d. Alligator Swamp Substation (in-service date 2015) (PE _____)
- e. West Pensacola Capacitor Bank (Bellview) (in-service date 2015) (PE _____)

A. Has Gulf Power demonstrated that the above Plant Crist transmission upgrade project components satisfy the eligibility criteria of the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) established in Order No. PSC-94-0044-FOF-EI, such that the Commission should grant Gulf’s request for authority to recover the costs of the project through the ECRC as they are incurred?

FIPUG: No. The costs of these transmission projects, if prudent, should not be recovered in the environmental cost recovery clause (“ECRC”) since these capital items do not, as a factual matter, meet the legal requirements to be properly recovered through the ECRC clause.

B. (If the answer to A above is in the negative) In the alternative, has Gulf demonstrated that any portions of the transmission upgrade project for Plant Crist identified in (A) above are reasonable, prudent and will enter into service in 2014, such that the Commission should authorize Gulf to include said portions in rate base and recover related costs through the 2014 base rates established in this proceeding? If the answer is in the affirmative, what is the amount of the project costs that should be included in test year revenue requirements?

FIPUG: No.

C. (If the answer to A is in the negative): Has Gulf demonstrated that any portions of the Plant Crist transmission upgrade project are reasonable, prudent, and will be in service as of June 30, 2015? If the answer is in the affirmative, should the Commission approve now any portion of the \$16,392,000 (total) “step increase” sought by Gulf to become effective on July 1, 2015 that is associated with Plant Crist transmission upgrade costs?

FIPUG: No.

OPC ISSUE: With respect to the Plant Smith transmission upgrade project that Gulf has identified, which includes the following components:

- a. Rebuild Holmes Creek – Bonifay Tap Section Double Circuit (in-service date 2014) (PE ____)
- b. Holmes Creek – Highland City Capacitor New 230 kV – Autobank (in-service date 2014) (PE ____)
- c. Holmes Creek – Highland City new 230 kV – Cap Bank (in-service date 2014) (PE ____)
- d. Holmes Creek – Highland City New 230 kV Transmission Line (in-service date 2015) (PE ____)
- e. Panama City SVC (Highland City) (in-service date 2015) (PE ____)

A. Has Gulf Power demonstrated that the above Plant Smith transmission upgrade project components satisfy the eligibility requirements of the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) established in Order No. PSC-94-0044-FOF-EI, such that the Commission should grant Gulf’s request for authority to recover the costs of the project through the ECRC as they are incurred?

FIPUG: No. The costs of these transmission projects, if prudent, should not be recovered in the environmental cost recovery clause (“ECRC”) since these capital items do not, as a factual matter, meet the legal requirements to be properly recovered through the ECRC clause.

B. (If the answer to (A) is in the negative) In the alternative, has Gulf demonstrated that portions of the Plant Smith transmission upgrade project identified in (A) above are reasonable, prudent and will enter into service in 2014, such that the Commission should authorize Gulf to include said portions scheduled for completion in 2014 in rate base and recover the related costs through the 2014 base rates established in this proceeding? If the answer to (B) is yes, what is the amount of project costs that should be included in test year revenue requirements?

FIPUG: No.

C. (If the answer to (A) is in the negative): Has Gulf demonstrated that portions of the Plant Smith transmission upgrade project are reasonable, prudent, and will be in service as of June 30, 2015? If the answer is in the affirmative, should the Commission approve now any portion of the \$16,392,000 (total) “step increase” sought by Gulf to become effective on July 1, 2015 that is associated with the Plant Smith transmission upgrade project costs?

FIPUG: No.

RATE BASE

Issue 13: Should capital items currently approved for recovery through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause be included in rate base for Gulf? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 14: Has the Company removed all non-utility activities from rate base? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 15: Is Gulf's requested level of Plant in Service in the amount of \$2,944,168,000 (\$2,999,897,000 system) for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what is the appropriate amount?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 16: Is Gulf's requested level of Accumulated Depreciation in the amount of \$1,243,319,000 (\$1,268,049,000 system) for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what is the appropriate amount?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 17: Is Gulf's requested level of Construction Work in Progress in the amount of \$26,656,000 (\$27,290,000 system) for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what is the appropriate amount?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 18: Is Gulf's requested level of Property Held for Future Use in the amount of \$5,276,000 (\$5,435,000 system) for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what is the appropriate amount?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 19: Should any adjustments be made to Gulf's fuel inventories for the projected 2014 test year?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 20: Should any adjustments be made to the net Prepaid Pension Assets included in the Working Capital Allowance?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 21: Is Gulf's proposed level of Working Capital for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what is the appropriate amount?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 22: Is Gulf's requested rate base in the amount of \$1,883,901,000 (\$1,919,769 system) for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what is the appropriate amount?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

COST OF CAPITAL

Issue 23: What is the appropriate amount of accumulated deferred taxes to include in the capital structure for the 2014 projected test year?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 24: What is the appropriate amount and cost rate of the unamortized investment tax credits to include in the capital structure for the 2014 projected test year?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 25: What is the appropriate cost rate for customer deposits for the 2014 projected test year?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 26: What is the appropriate cost rate for short-term debt for the 2014 projected test year?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 27: What is the appropriate cost rate for long-term debt for the 2014 projected test year?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 28: What is the appropriate cost rate for preference stock for the 2014 projected test year?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 29: What is the appropriate return on equity (ROE) to use in establishing Gulf's revenue requirement?

FIPUG: Less than 10%, which upon information and belief would be in accord with the adjusted national average of commission awarded returns on equity during 2013.

Issue 30: What is the appropriate weighted average cost of capital including the proper components, amounts and cost rates associated with the capital structure for the 2014 projected test year?

FIPUG: 4.74%.

NET OPERATING INCOME

Issue 31: Is Gulf's projected level of Total Operating Revenues in the amount of \$528,651,000 (\$544,999,000 system) for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what is the appropriate amount?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 32: Has Gulf made the appropriate test year adjustments to remove fuel revenues and fuel expenses recoverable through the Fuel Cost Recovery Clause?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 33: Has Gulf made the appropriate test year adjustments to remove conservation revenues and conservation expenses recoverable through the Energy Conservation Cost Recovery Clause?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 34: Has Gulf made the appropriate test year adjustments to remove capacity revenues and capacity expenses recoverable through the Capacity Cost Recovery Clause?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 35: Has Gulf made the appropriate test year adjustments to remove environmental revenues and environmental expenses recoverable through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 36: Is Gulf's proposed advertising expense for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 37: Is Gulf's proposed tree trimming expense for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 38: Is Gulf's proposed pole inspection expense for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 39: Is Gulf's proposed production plant O&M expense for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: No. A downward adjustment should be made.

Issue 40: Is Gulf's proposed transmission O&M expense for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: No. A downward adjustment should be made.

Issue 41: Is Gulf's proposed amount of distribution O&M expense for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: No. A downward adjustment should be made.

Issue 42: Is Gulf's proposed Incentive Compensation included in the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: No. A downward adjustment should be made.

Issue 43: Is Gulf's proposed hiring lag adjustment for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 44: Is Gulf's proposed total Payroll Expense for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 45: Is Gulf's proposed Supplemental Executive Pension Expense for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 46: Is Gulf's proposed Pension Expense for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 47: Is Gulf's proposed Other Post Employment Benefits Expense for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

OPC ISSUE: Is Gulf's proposed Employee Medical Expense for the 2014 projected test year for current employees appropriate? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 48: Is Gulf's proposed reserve target level and annual storm damage accrual of \$8,860,586 (\$9,000,000 system) for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what is the appropriate amount?

FIPUG: No. The Commission should reject Gulf's proposed reserve target level and annual storm damage account.

Issue 49: Is Gulf's proposed accrual for the Injuries & Damages reserve for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 50: Are Gulf's proposed expenses related to company-owned or affiliate company-owned aircraft and related travel appropriate? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 51: Is Gulf's proposed expense related to Directors and Officers Liability Insurance appropriate? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 52: Is Gulf's proposed Rate Case Expense for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 53: Is Gulf's proposed Bad Debt Expense for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 54: What adjustment, if any, should be made to account for affiliated activities/transactions for the 2014 projected test year?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 55: Is Gulf's requested level of O&M Expense in the amount of \$290,199,000 (\$295,916,000 system) for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what is the appropriate amount?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 56: What is the appropriate amount of depreciation and fossil dismantlement expense for the 2014 projected test year?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 57: Should an adjustment be made to Taxes Other Than Income Taxes for the 2014 projected test year?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 58: Should the current amortization of investment tax credits (ITCs) and flow back of excess deferred income taxes (EDITs) be revised to reflect the approved depreciation rates and amortizations?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 59: Is it appropriate to make a parent debt adjustment per Rule 25-14.004, Florida Administrative Code? If so, what adjustment should be made?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 60: Should an adjustment be made to Income Tax expense for the 2014 projected test year?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 61: Is Gulf's requested level of Total Operating Expenses in the amount of \$452,292,000 (\$463,445,000 system) for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what is the appropriate amount?

FIPUG: No. A downward adjustment should be made.

Issue 62: Is Gulf's projected Net Operating Income in the amount of \$76,359,000 (\$81,554,000 system) for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what is the appropriate amount?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

REVENUE REQUIREMENTS

Issue 63: What is the appropriate revenue expansion factor and the appropriate net operating income multiplier, including the appropriate elements and rates for Gulf?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 64: Is Gulf's requested annual operating revenue increase of \$74,393,000 for the 2014 projected test year appropriate? If not, what is the appropriate amount?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 65: Should the Commission approve Gulf's request to recover a step increase of \$16,392,000, effective July 1, 2015, for the Plant Crist and Plant Smith transmission upgrade projects listed in Issues Nos. _____ and _____ above?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

OPC'S "C" ISSUES IN THE TRANSMISSION SECTION ARE RESTATEMENTS OF THIS ISSUE.

COST OF SERVICE AND RATE DESIGN

Issue 66: What is the appropriate treatment of distribution costs within the cost of service study?

FIPUG: Minimum Distribution System Methodology.

Issue 67: What is the appropriate Cost of Service Methodology?

FIPUG: Minimum Distribution System Methodology coupled with the 12 Coincident Peak and 1/13th Average Demand Methodology.

Issue 68: How should any change in the revenue requirement approved by the Commission be allocated among the customer classes?

FIPUG: No. Position at this time.

Issue 69: Is Gulf's proposal to restate the residential Base Charge as a daily amount rather than a monthly amount appropriate?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 70: Should Gulf's proposed new experimental Small Business Incentive Rider (SBIR) be approved?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 71: Should Gulf's proposed new experimental Large Business Incentive Rider (LBIR) be approved?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 72: Is Gulf's proposed change in designation of revenues received under the Real Time Pricing (RTP) rate schedule appropriate?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 73: Are Gulf's proposed modifications to Form 4 which contains the Lighting Pricing Methodology appropriate?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 74: What are the appropriate service charges (Non-residential connection of initial and existing service, Restoration Charge, Premise Visit Charge)?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 75: What are the appropriate base charges?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 76: What are the appropriate demand charges?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 77: What are the appropriate energy charges?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 78: What are the appropriate Standby Charges?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 79: What are the appropriate lighting charges?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 80: What are the appropriate transformer ownership credits?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 81: If approved, how should the step increase in revenue requirement effective July 1, 2015, be allocated to the various rate classes?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

Issue 82: What is the appropriate effective date for Gulf's revised rates and charges?

FIPUG: Agree with OPC.

OTHER ISSUES

Issue 83: Should Gulf 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 which will be required as a result of the Commissions findings in this rate case?

FIPUG: Yes.

Issue 84: Should this docket be closed?

FIPUG: Yes, after a final order is entered.

F. STIPULATED ISSUES

FIPUG: None at this time.

G. PENDING MOTIONS

FIPUG: None at this time.

H. PENDING REQUEST OR CLAIMS FOR CONFIDENTIALITY

FIPUG: None at this time.

I. OBJECTIONS TO A WITNESS' QUALIFICATION AS AN EXPERT.

FIPUG: FIPUG does not object to the witness being deemed an expert able to offer opinion testimony if such witness is clearly designated as an expert witness in pre-filed

testimony. To the extent that no such expert witness designation was made, FIPUG reserves the right to object to expert testimony or an undesignated expert witness' qualifications.

K. REQUIREMENTS THAT CANNOT BE COMPLIED WITH.

FIPUG: None at this time.

I. OTHER

FIPUG: None at this time.

/s/ Jon C. Moyle
Jon C. Moyle, Jr.
Karen A. Putnal
Moyle Law Firm, P.A.
118 North Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
Telephone: (850)681-3828
Facsimile: (850)681-8788
jmoyle@moylelaw.com
kputnal@moylelaw.com

Attorneys for Florida Industrial Power Users Group

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I **HEREBY CERTIFY** that a true and correct copy of the foregoing The Florida Industrial Power Users Group's Prehearing Statement has been furnished by electronic mail on this 8th day of November, 2013 to the following:

J. R. Kelly
Joseph McGlothlin
Office of Public Counsel
c/o The Florida Legislature
111 West Madison Street, Room 812
Tallahassee, Florida 32399
Mcglathlin.joseph@leg.state.fl.us

Suzanne Brownless
Martha Brown
Office of the General Counsel
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd
Tallahassee, FL 32399
sbrownie@psc.state.fl.us
mbarrera@psc.state.fl.us
mbrown@psc.state.fl.us

Robert Scheffel Wright
John T. La Via, III
c/o Gardner Law Firm
1300 Thomaswood Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32308
Federal Executive Agencies
Lt. Col. Gregory J. Fike
schef@gbwlegal.com

Attn.: Greg Meyer
16690 Swingley Ridge Road
Suite 140
Chesterfield, MO 63017
gregory.fike@us.af.mil
thomas.jernigan@us.af.mil
Christopher.Thompson.5@us.af.mil

Jeffrey A. Stone
Russell A. Badders
Steven R. Griffin
Beggs & Lane
P.O. Box 12950
501 Commendencia Street
Pensacola, FL 32576-2950
jas@beggslane.com
rab@beggslane.com
srg@beggslane.com

Charles A. Guyton
Gunster, Yoakley & Stewart, P.A.
215 South Monroe Street, Suite 618
Tallahassee, FL 32301
cguyton@gunster.com

/s/ Jon. C. Moyle

Jon C. Moyle, Jr.