

State of Florida



Public Service Commission

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER • 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-0850

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: July 11, 2016
TO: All Parties of Record and Interested Persons
FROM: Suzanne S. Brownless, Senior Attorney, Office of the General Counsel *SMB*
RE: Docket No. 160021-EI - Petition for increase in rates by Florida Power & Light Company.

Please note that an informal meeting between Commission staff and interested persons to the above-captioned docket has been scheduled for the following time and place:

Monday, July 18, 2016
9:30 to 5:00 pm
Gerald L. Gunter Building, Room G-105
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

RECEIVED-FPSC
2016 JUL 11 AM 10:30
COMMISSION
CLERK

The purpose of the meeting is to discuss issues in the FPL rate case. Attendance is not required; however, all interested persons are encouraged to attend.

Interested persons may participate telephonically in this meeting by dialing **1-888-670-3525**, Passcode **3498283979 then #**. If you have any questions about the meeting, please call Suzanne Brownless at (850) 413-6218.

If settlement of the case or a named storm or other disaster requires cancellation of the meeting, Commission staff will attempt to give timely direct notice to the parties. Notice of cancellation will also be provided on the Commission's website (<http://www.psc.state.fl.us/>) under the Hot Topics link found on the home page. Cancellation can also be confirmed by calling the Office of the General Counsel at 850-413-6199.

SBr
cc: Office of Commission Clerk

DOCKET NO. 160021-EI
FPL RATE CASE
PRELIMINARY ISSUE LIST – 07/18/2016

LEGAL ISSUES

ISSUE 1: Does the Commission possess the authority to grant FPL’s proposal to continue utilizing the storm cost recovery mechanism that was part of the settlement agreements approved in Order Nos. PSC-11-0089-S-EI and PSC-13-0023-S-EI?

***ISSUE :** Does the Commission have the authority to approve rate base adjustments based upon a test year subsequent to the period ending December 31, 2017?

This legal issue has been decided by order PSC-10-0153, issued on March 17, 2010 (Docket No. 080677-EI) and the Florida Supreme Court in Floridians United For Safe Energy, Inc. v. PSC, 475 So.2d 241 (Fla. 1985) and Citizens v. Florida Public Service Commission, 146 So.3d 1143, 1157 (Fla. 2014) (Docket No. 120051-EI)(reaffirms Commission authority to adopt rules which allow “for adjustments of rates based on revenues and costs during the period new rates are to be in effect and for incremental adjustments in rates for subsequent periods”). We don’t need to relitigate it here. If the real issue is whether FPL has proven that the circumstances in this case justify the use of subsequent test years, that is a policy and factual issue which should be included as an issue in the Test Period and Forecasting section.

ISSUE 2: Does the Commission have the authority to approve FPL’s requested limited scope adjustment for the new Okeechobee Energy Center in June of 2019?

ISSUE 3: Does the Commission possess the authority to grant a 50 basis point performance incentive to FPL?

STORM HARDENING ISSUES

ISSUE 4: Does the Company’s Storm Hardening Plan (Plan) comply with the National Electric Safety Code (ANSI C-2) (NESC) as required by Rule 25-6.0345, F.A.C.?

ISSUE 5: Does the Company’s Plan address the extreme wind loading standards specified in Figure 250-2(d) of the 2012 edition of the NESC for new distribution facility construction as required by Rule 25-6.0342(3)(b)1, F.A.C.?

ISSUE 6: Does the Company’s Plan address the extreme wind loading standards specified by Figure 250-2(d) of the 2012 edition of the NESC for major planned work on the distribution system, including expansion, rebuild, or relocation of existing facilities, assigned on or after the effective date of this rule distribution facility construction as required by Rule 25-6.0342(3)(b)2, F.A.C.?

- ISSUE 7:** Does the Company's Plan address the extreme wind loading standards specified by Figure 250-2(d) of the 2012 edition of the NESC for distribution facilities serving critical infrastructure facilities and along major thoroughfares taking into account political and geographical boundaries and other applicable operational considerations as required by Rule 25-6.0342(3)(b)3, F.A.C.?
- ISSUE 8:** Is the Company's Plan designed to mitigate damages to underground and supporting overhead transmission and distribution facilities due to flooding and storm surges as required by Rule 25-6.0342(3)(c), F.A.C.?
- ISSUE 9:** Does the Company's Plan address the extent to which the placement of new and replacement distribution facilities facilitate safe and efficient access for installation and maintenance as required by Rule 25-6.0342(3)(d), F.A.C.?
- ISSUE 10:** Does the Company's Plan provide a detailed description of its deployment strategy including a description of the facilities affected; including technical design specifications, construction standards, and construction methodologies employed as required by Rules 25-6.0341 and 25-6.0342(4)(a), F.A.C.?
- ISSUE 11:** Does the Company's Plan provide a detailed description of its deployment strategy as it relates to the communities and areas within the utility's service area where the electric infrastructure improvements, including facilities identified by the utility as critical infrastructure and along major thoroughfares are to be made as required by Rules 25-6.0342(3)(b)3 and 25-6.0342(4)(b), F.A.C.?
- ISSUE 12:** Does the Company's Plan provide a detailed description of its deployment strategy to the extent that the electric infrastructure improvements involve joint use facilities on which third-party attachments exist as required by Rule 25-6.0342(4)(c), F.A.C.?
- ISSUE 13:** Does the Company's Plan provide a reasonable estimate of the costs and benefits to the utility of making the electric infrastructure improvements, including the effect on reducing storm restoration costs and customer outages as required by Rule 25-6.0342(4)(d), F.A.C.?
- ISSUE 14:** Does the Company's plan provide an estimate of the costs and benefits to third-party attachers affected by the electric infrastructure improvements, including the effect on reducing storm restoration costs and customers outages realized by the third-party attachers as required by Rule 25-6.0342(4)(e), F.A.C.?
- ISSUE 15:** Does the Company's Plan include a written Attachment Standards and Procedures addressing safety, reliability, pole loading capacity, and engineering standards and procedure for attachments by others to the utility's electric transmission and distribution poles that meet or exceed the edition of the National Electrical Safety Code (ANSI C-2) that is applicable as required by Rule 25-6.0342(5), F.A.C.?

WOODEN POLE INSPECTION PROGRAM

ISSUE 16: Does the Company's eight-year wooden pole inspection program comply with Order No. PSC-06-0144-PAA-EI, issued on February 27, 2006, in Docket No. 060078-EI, and Order No. PSC-06-0778-PAA-EU, issued on September 18, 2006, in Docket No. 060531-EU?

10 POINT STORM PREPAREDNESS INITIATIVES

ISSUE 17: Does the Company's 10-point initiatives plan comply with Order No. PSC-06-0351-PAA-EI, issued on April 25, 2006; Order No. PSC-06-0781-PAA-EI, issued on September 19, 2006; and Order No. PSC-07-0468-FOF-EI, issued on May 30, 2007, in Docket No. 060198-EI?

APPROVAL OF STORM HARDENING PLAN

ISSUE 18: Should the Company's Storm Hardening Plan for the period 2016 through 2018 be approved?

COSTS FOR STORM HARDENING AND 10 POINT INITIATIVES

ISSUE 19: What adjustments, if any, should be made to rate base associated with the storm hardening Rule 25-6.0342, F.A.C., and 10 point initiatives requirements?

ISSUE 20: What adjustments, if any, should be made to operating expenses associated with the storm hardening Rule 25-6.0342, F.A.C., and 10 point initiatives requirements?

TEST PERIOD AND FORECASTING

ISSUE 21: Is FPL's projected test period of the 12 months ending December 31, 2017, appropriate?

ISSUE 22: Do the facts of this case support the use of a subsequent test year ending December 31, 2018 to adjust base rates?

ISSUE 23: Is FPL's projected subsequent test period of the 12 months ending December 31, 2018, appropriate?

ISSUE 24: Are FPL's forecasts of Customers, KWH, and KW by Rate Class and Revenue Class, for the 2017 projected test year appropriate?

ISSUE 25: Are FPL's forecasts of Customers, KWH, and KW by Rate Class and Revenue Class, for the 2018 projected test year appropriate?

ISSUE 26: Are FPL's forecasts of Customers, KWH, and KW by Rate Class and Revenue Class, for the period June 2019 to May 2020, appropriate?

ISSUE 27: Are FPL's projected revenues from sales of electricity by rate class at present rates for the 2016 prior year and projected 2017 test year appropriate?

ISSUE 28: Are FPL's projected revenues from sales of electricity by rate class at present rates for the projected 2018 test year appropriate?

ISSUE 29: What are the appropriate inflation, customer growth, and other trend factors for use in forecasting the 2017 test year budget?

ISSUE 30: What are the appropriate inflation, customer growth, and other trend factors for use in forecasting the 2018 test year budget?

QUALITY OF SERVICE

ISSUE 31: Is the quality of the electric service provided by FPL adequate taking into consideration: a) the efficiency, sufficiency and adequacy of FPL's facilities provided and the services rendered; b) the cost of providing such services; c) the value of such service to the public; d) the ability of the utility to improve such service and facilities; e) energy conservation and the efficient use of alternative energy resources; and f) any other factors the Commission deems relevant.

DEPRECIATION STUDY

ISSUE 32: What, if any, are the appropriate capital recovery schedules?

ISSUE 33: Should accounts 343 and 364 be separated into subaccounts and different depreciation rates be set for the subaccounts using separate parameters? If so, how should the accumulated depreciation reserves be allocated and what parameters should be applied to each subaccount?

ISSUE 34: What are the appropriate depreciation parameters (e.g., service lives, remaining lives, net salvage percentages, and reserve percentages) and resulting depreciation rates for the accounts and subaccounts related to each production unit?

ISSUE 35: What are the appropriate depreciation parameters (e.g., service lives, remaining lives, and net salvage percentages) and resulting depreciation rates for each transmission, distribution, and general plant account, and subaccounts, if any?

ISSUE 36: Based on the application of the depreciation parameters and resulting depreciation rates that the Commission deems appropriate, and a comparison of the theoretical reserves to the book reserves, what are the resulting imbalances?

ISSUE 37: What, if any, corrective reserve measures should be taken with respect to the imbalances identified in Issue 36?

ISSUE 38: What should be the implementation date for revised depreciation rates, capital recovery schedules, and amortization schedules?

ISSUE 39: Should FPL's currently approved annual dismantlement accrual be revised?

ISSUE 40: What, if any, corrective dismantlement reserve measures should be approved?

ISSUE 41: What is the appropriate annual accrual for dismantlement?

RATE BASE

ISSUE 42: Should the revenue requirement associated with West County Energy Center Unit 3 currently collected through the Capacity Cost Recovery Clause be included in base rates?

ISSUE 43: Has FPL appropriately accounted for the impact of the Cedar Bay settlement agreement

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 44: Has FPL made the appropriate adjustments to remove all non-utility activities from Plant in Service, Accumulated Depreciation and Working Capital

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 45: What is the appropriate amount of Plant in Service for FPL's Large Scale Solar Projects?

- ISSUE 46:** What is the appropriate level of Plant in Service (Fallout Issue)
- A. For the 2017 projected test year?
 - B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?
- ISSUE 47:** What is the appropriate level of Accumulated Depreciation (Fallout Issue)
- A. For the 2017 projected test year?
 - B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?
- ISSUE 48A:** Are FPL's proposed adjustments to move certain CWIP projects from base rates to the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause appropriate?
- ISSUE 48B:** Are FPL's proposed adjustments to move certain CWIP projects from base rates to the Energy Conservation Cost Recovery Clause appropriate?
- ISSUE 48C:** Is the company's proposed adjustment to remove Fukushima-related costs from the rate base and recover all Fukushima-related capital costs in the Capacity Cost Recovery Clause appropriate?
- ISSUE 49:** What is the appropriate level of Construction Work in Progress to be included in rate base
- A. For the 2017 projected test year?
 - B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?
- ISSUE 50:** Are FPL's proposed accruals of Nuclear End of Life Material and Supplies and Last Core Nuclear Fuel appropriate
- A. For the 2017 projected test year?
 - B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?
- ISSUE 51:** What is the appropriate level of Nuclear Fuel
- A. For the 2017 projected test year?
 - B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 52: What is the appropriate level of Property Held for Future Use

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 53: What is the appropriate level of fossil fuel inventories

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 54: Should the unamortized balance of Rate Case Expense be included in Working Capital and, if so, what is the appropriate amount to include

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year

ISSUE 55: Should the unbilled revenues be included in working capital

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 56: What is the appropriate methodology for calculating FPL's Working Capital

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 57: If FPL's balance sheet approach methodology for calculating its Working Capital is adopted, what adjustments, if any, should be made to FPL's proposed Working Capital

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 58: Should FPL's requested change in methodology for recovering nuclear maintenance outage costs from accrue-in-advance to defer-and-amortize be approved? If so, are any adjustments necessary

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 59: What is the appropriate level of Working Capital (Fallout Issue)

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 60: What is the appropriate level of rate base

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

COST OF CAPITAL

ISSUE 61: What is the appropriate amount of accumulated deferred taxes to include in the capital structure and should a proration adjustment to deferred taxes be included in capital structure

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 62: What is the appropriate amount and cost rate of the unamortized investment tax credits to include in the capital structure

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 63: What is the appropriate amount and cost rate for short-term debt to include in the capital structure

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 64: What is the appropriate amount and cost rate for long-term debt to include in the capital structure

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 65: What is the appropriate amount and cost rate for customer deposits to include in the capital structure

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 66: What is the appropriate equity ratio to use in the capital structure for ratemaking purposes

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 67: Should FPL's request for a 50 basis point performance adder to the authorized return on equity be approved?

ISSUE 68: What is the appropriate authorized return on equity (ROE) to use in establishing FPL's revenue requirement

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 69: What is the appropriate weighted average cost of capital to use in establishing FPL's revenue requirement?

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

NET OPERATING INCOME

ISSUE 70: What are the appropriate projected amounts of other operating revenues

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 71: What is the appropriate level of Total Operating Revenues

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 72: Has FPL made the appropriate test year adjustments to remove fuel revenues and fuel expenses recoverable through the Fuel Adjustment Clause

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 73: Has FPL made the appropriate test year adjustments to remove capacity revenues and capacity expenses recoverable through the Capacity Cost Recovery Clause

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 74: Has FPL made the appropriate test year adjustments to remove environmental revenues and environmental expenses recoverable through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 75: Has FPL made the appropriate test year adjustments to remove conservation revenues and conservation expenses recoverable through the Energy Conservation Cost Recovery Clause

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 76: Has FPL made the appropriate adjustments to remove all non-utility activities from operating revenues and operating expenses

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 77: What is the appropriate percentage value (or other assignment value or methodology basis) to allocate FPL shared corporate services costs and/or expenses to its affiliates

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 78: What is the appropriate amount of FPL shared corporate services costs and/or expenses (including executive compensation and benefits) to be allocated to affiliates

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 79: Should any adjustments be made to FPL's operating revenues or operating expenses for the effects of transactions with affiliated companies

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 80: What is the appropriate amount of FPL's tree trimming expense

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 81: What is the appropriate amount of FPL's production plant O&M expense

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 82: What is the appropriate amount of FPL's transmission O&M expense

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

- ISSUE 83:** What is the appropriate amount of FPL's distribution O&M expense
- A. For the 2017 projected test year?
 - B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?
- ISSUE 84:** Should the Commission approve FPL's proposal to continue the interim storm cost recovery mechanism that was part of the settlement agreements approved in Order Nos. PSC-11-0089-S-EI and PSC-13-0023-S-EI?
- ISSUE 85:** What is the appropriate annual storm damage accrual and storm damage reserve
- A. For the 2017 projected test year?
 - B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?
- ISSUE 86:** What is the appropriate amount of Other Post Employment Benefits expense
- A. For the 2017 projected test year?
 - B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?
- ISSUE 87:** What is the appropriate amount of FPL's requested level of Salaries and Employee Benefits
- A. For the 2017 projected test year?
 - B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?
- ISSUE 88:** What is the appropriate amount of Pension Expense
- A. For the 2017 projected test year?
 - B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?
- ISSUE 89:** What is the appropriate amount and amortization period for Rate Case Expense
- A. For the 2017 projected test year?
 - B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?
- ISSUE 90:** What is the appropriate amount of uncollectible expense and bad debt rate
- A. For the 2017 projected test year?
 - B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 91: Has FPL included the appropriate amount of costs and savings associated with the AMI smart meters

- A. For the 2017 projected test year?
- B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 92: If the proposed change in accounting to defer and amortize the nuclear maintenance reserve is approved, is the company's proposed adjustment to nuclear maintenance expense appropriate?

ISSUE 93: What is the appropriate level of O&M Expense (Fallout Issue)

- A. For the 2017 projected test year?
- B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 94: What is the appropriate amount of depreciation, amortization, and fossil dismantlement expense (Fallout Issue)

- A. For the 2017 projected test year?
- B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 95: What is the appropriate level of Taxes Other Than Income (Fallout Issue)

- A. For the 2017 projected test year?
- B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 96: What is the appropriate level of Income Taxes

- A. For the 2017 projected test year?
- B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 97: What is the appropriate level of (Gain)/Loss on Disposal

- A. For the 2017 projected test year?
- B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 98: What is the appropriate level of Total Operating Expenses? (Fallout Issue)

- A. For the 2017 projected test year?

ISSUE 99: Is the company's proposed net operating income adjustment to remove Fukushima-related O&M expenses from base rates and recover all Fukushima-related expenses in the capacity cost recovery clause appropriate?

ISSUE 100: What is the appropriate level of Net Operating Income (Fallout Issue)

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

REVENUE REQUIREMENTS

ISSUE 101: What are the appropriate revenue expansion factor and the appropriate net operating income multiplier, including the appropriate elements and rates for FPL

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

ISSUE 102: What is the appropriate annual operating revenue increase (Fallout Issue)

A. For the 2017 projected test year?

B. If applicable, for the 2018 subsequent projected test year?

OKEECHOBEE LIMITED SCOPE ADJUSTMENT

ISSUE 103: Should the Commission approve a limited scope adjustment for the new Okeechobee Energy Center?

ISSUE 104: What is the appropriate treatment for deferred income taxes associated with the Okeechobee Energy Center?

ISSUE 105: Is FPL's requested rate base of \$1,063,315,000 for the new Okeechobee Energy Center appropriate?

ISSUE 106: What is the appropriate weighted average cost of capital, including the proper components, amounts and cost rates associated with the capital structure, to calculate the limited scope adjustment for the new Okeechobee Energy Center?

ISSUE 107: Is FPL's requested net operating loss of \$33.868 million for the new Okeechobee Energy Center appropriate?

ISSUE 108: What is the appropriate Net Operating Income Multiplier for the new Okeechobee Energy Center? (Fallout)

ISSUE 109: Is FPL's requested limited scope adjustment of \$209 million for the new Okeechobee Energy Center appropriate?

ISSUE 110: What is the appropriate effective date for implementing FPL's limited scope adjustment for the new Okeechobee Energy Center?

ASSET OPTIMIZATION INCENTIVE MECHANISM

ISSUE 111: Should the asset optimization incentive mechanism as proposed by FPL be approved?

COST OF SERVICE AND RATE DESIGN ISSUES

ISSUE 112: Is FPL's proposed separation of costs and revenues between the wholesale and retail jurisdictions appropriate?

ISSUE 113: What is the appropriate methodology to allocate production costs to the rate classes?

ISSUE 114: What is the appropriate methodology to allocate transmission costs to the rate classes?

ISSUE 115: What is the appropriate methodology to allocate distribution costs to the rate classes?

ISSUE 116: Is FPL's proposal to recover a portion of fixed distribution costs through the customer charge instead of energy charge appropriate for residential and general service non-demand rate classes?

ISSUE 117: How should the change in revenue requirement be allocated to the customer classes?

ISSUE 118: What are the appropriate service charges (initial connection, reconnect for nonpayment, connection of existing account, field collection)

A. Effective January 1, 2017?

B. Effective January 1, 2018?

ISSUE 119: Is FPL's proposed new meter tampering penalty charge, effective on January 1, 2017, appropriate?

ISSUE 120: What are the appropriate temporary construction service charges

A. Effective January 1, 2017?

B. Effective January 1, 2018?

ISSUE 121: What is the appropriate monthly kilowatt credit for customers who own their own transformers pursuant to the Transformation Rider

- A. Effective January 1, 2017?
- B. Effective January 1, 2018?

ISSUE 122: What is the appropriate monthly credit for Commercial/Industrial Demand Reduction (CDR) Rider customers effective January 1, 2017?

ISSUE 123: What are the appropriate customer charges

- A. Effective January 1, 2017?
- B. Effective January 1, 2018?

ISSUE 124: What are the appropriate demand charges

- A. Effective January 1, 2017?
- B. Effective January 1, 2018?

ISSUE 125: What are the appropriate energy charges

- A. Effective January 1, 2017?
- B. Effective January 1, 2018?

ISSUE 126: What are the appropriate charges for the Standby and Supplemental Services (SST-1, ISST-1) rate schedules

- A. Effective January 1, 2017?
- B. Effective January 1, 2018?

ISSUE 127: Should the Commercial Industrial Load Control (CILC) rate schedule be reopened to new customers?

ISSUE 128: What are the appropriate charges for the Commercial Industrial Load Control (CILC) rate schedule

- A. Effective January 1, 2017?
- B. Effective January 1, 2018?

ISSUE 129: What are the appropriate lighting rate charges

- A. Effective January 1, 2017?
- B. Effective January 1, 2018?

ISSUE 130: Is FPL's proposal to close the customer-owned street lighting service option of the Street Lighting (SL-1) rate schedule to new customers appropriate?

ISSUE 131: Is FPL's proposal to close the current Traffic Signal (SL-2) rate schedule to new customers appropriate?

ISSUE 132: Is FPL's proposed new metered Street Lighting (SL-1M) rate schedule appropriate and what are the appropriate charges

- A. Effective January 1, 2017?
- B. Effective January 1, 2018?

ISSUE 133: Is FPL's proposed new metered Traffic Signal (SL-2M) rate schedule appropriate and what are the appropriate charges

- A. Effective January 1, 2017?
- B. Effective January 1, 2018?

ISSUE 134: Is FPL's proposed allocation of the new Okeechobee Energy Center limited scope adjustment, currently scheduled for June 1, 2019, reasonable?

ISSUE 135: Should FPL's proposal to file updated base rates in the 2018 Capacity Clause proceeding to recover the Okeechobee Energy Center limited scope adjustment be approved?

ISSUE 136: Should the Commission approve the following modifications to tariff terms and conditions that have been proposed by FPL:

- a. Close relamping option for customer-owned lights for Street Lighting (SL-1) and Outdoor Lighting (OL-1) customers;
- b. Add a willful damage clause, require an active house account and clarify where outdoor lights can be installed for the Outdoor Lighting (OL-1) tariff;
- c. Clarify the tariff application to pre-1992 parking lot customers and eliminate the word "patrol" from the services provided on the Street Lighting (SL-1) tariff;

- d. Remove the minimum 2,000 kW demand from transmission-level tariffs;
- e. Standardize the language in the Service section of the distribution level tariffs to include three phase service and clarify that standard service is distribution level; and
- f. Add language to provide that surety bonds must remain in effect to ensure payments for electric service in the event of bankruptcy or other insolvency.

ISSUE 137: Should the Commission give staff administrative authority to approve tariffs reflecting Commission approved rates and charges effective January 1, 2017, January 1, 2018, and tariffs reflecting the commercial operation of the new Okeechobee Energy Center (June 1, 2019)?

ISSUE 138: What are the effective dates of FPL's proposed rates and charges?

OTHER ISSUES

ISSUE 139: Should the Commission approve FPL's proposal to transfer the Martin-Riviera pipeline lateral to Florida Southeast Connection?

ISSUE 140: 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 which will be required as a result of the Commission's findings in this rate case?

ISSUE 141: Should this docket be closed?