BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Fuel and purchased power	
cost recovery clause and generating	Docket No. 180001-EI
performance incentive factor.	Filed: October 2, 2018

THE FLORIDA INDUSTRIAL POWER USERS GROUP'S <u>PREHEARING STATEMENT</u>

The Florida Industrial Power Users Group (FIPUG), pursuant to Order No. PSC-2018-0079-PCO-EI, files its Prehearing Statement.

A. <u>APPEARANCES:</u>

Jon C. Moyle, Jr. Karen Putnal Moyle Law Firm, P.A. 118 North Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32312

Attorneys for the Florida Industrial Power Users Group

B. <u>WITNESSES AND EXHIBITS:</u>

FIPUG reserves the right to call witnesses listed by other parties in this docket.

C. <u>STATEMENT OF BASIC POSITION:</u>

Only reasonable and prudent costs legally authorized and reviewed for prudence should be recovered through the fuel clause. FIPUG maintains that the respective utilities must satisfy their burden of proof for any and all monies or other relief sought in this proceeding.

D. <u>STATEMENT OF ISSUES AND POSITIONS:</u>

I. <u>FUEL ISSUES</u>

COMPANY-SPECIFIC FUEL ADJUSTMENT ISSUES

Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

ISSUE 1A: Should the Commission approve as prudent DEF's actions to mitigate the volatility of natural gas, residual oil, and purchased power prices, as reported in

DEF's April 2018 and August 2018 hedging reports?

FIPUG: No.

ISSUE 1B: Has DEF made appropriate adjustments, if any are needed, to account for

replacement costs associated with the February 2017 forced outage at the Bartow plant? If appropriate adjustments are needed and have not been made, what

adjustments(s) should be made?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

Florida Power & Light Company

ISSUE 2A: Should the Commission approve as prudent FPL's actions to mitigate the

volatility of natural gas, residual oil, and purchased power prices, as reported in

FPL's April 2018 and August 2018 hedging reports?

FIPUG: No.

ISSUE 2B: What was the total gain under FPL's Incentive Mechanism approved by Order

No. PSC-2016-0560-AS-EI that FPL may recover for the period January 2017 through December 2017, and how should that gain to be shared between FPL and

customers?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 2C: What is the appropriate amount of Incremental Optimization Costs under FPL's

Incentive Mechanism approved by Order No. PSC-2016-0560-AS-EI that FPL should be allowed to recover through the fuel clause for Personnel, Software, and

Hardware costs for the period January 2017 through December 2017?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 2D: What is the appropriate amount of Variable Power Plant O&M Attributable to

Off-System Sales under FPL's Incentive Mechanism approved by Order No. PSC-2016-0560-AS-EI that FPL should be allowed to recover through the fuel

clause for the period January 2017 through December 2017?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 2E: What is the appropriate amount of Variable Power Plant O&M Avoided due to Economy Purchases under FPL's Incentive Mechanism approved by Order No. PSC-2016-0560-AS-EI that FPL should be allowed to recover through the fuel clause for the period January 2017 through December 2017?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

What is the appropriate amount of actual/estimated Incremental Optimization Costs under FPL's Incentive Mechanism approved by Order No. PSC-2016-0560-AS-EI that FPL should be allowed to recover through the fuel clause for Personnel, Software, and Hardware costs for the period January 2018 through December 2018?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 2G: What is the appropriate amount of actual/estimated Variable Power Plant O&M Attributable to Off-System Sales under FPL's Incentive Mechanism approved by Order No. PSC-2016-0560-AS-EI that FPL should be allowed to recover through the fuel clause for the period January 2018 through December 2018?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 2H: What is the appropriate amount of actual/estimated Variable Power Plant O&M Avoided due to Economy Purchases under FPL's Incentive Mechanism approved by Order No. PSC-2016-0560-AS-EI that FPL should be allowed to recover through the fuel clause for the period January 2018 through December 2018?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

What is the appropriate amount of projected Incremental Optimization Costs under FPL's Incentive Mechanism approved by Order No. PSC-2016-0560-AS-EI that FPL should be allowed to recover through the fuel clause for Personnel, Software, and Hardware costs for the period January 2019 through December 2019?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 2J: What is the appropriate amount of projected Variable Power Plant O&M Attributable to Off-System Sales under FPL's Incentive Mechanism approved by Order No. PSC-2016-0560-AS-EI that FPL should be allowed to recover through the fuel clause for the period January 2019 through December 2019?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 2K: What is the appropriate amount of projected Variable Power Plant O&M Avoided due to Economy Purchases under FPL's Incentive Mechanism approved by Order

No. PSC-2016-0560-AS-EI that FPL should be allowed to recover through the fuel clause for the period January 2019 through December 2019?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 2L: Has FPL properly reflected in the fuel and purchased power cost recovery clause the effects of the St. John's River Power Park transaction approved by Order No. PSC-2017-0415-AS-EI?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 2M: What is the appropriate revised SoBRA factor for the 2017 projects to reflect actual construction costs that are less than the projected costs used to develop the initial SoBRA factor?

FIPUG: As the SoBRA projects are neither cost effective nor needed, no new rates should be recovered.

ISSUE 2N: What is the appropriate revised SoBRA factor for the 2018 projects to reflect actual construction costs that are less than the projected costs used to develop the initial SoBRA factor?

FIPUG: As the SoBRA projects are neither cost effective nor needed, no new rates should be recovered.

ISSUE 20: Should the Commission approve revised tariffs for FPL reflecting the revised SoBRA factors for the 2017 and 2018 projects determined to be appropriate in this proceeding, effective January 1, 2019?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 2P: Are the 2019 SoBRA projects (Miami-Dade, Interstate, Pioneer Trail, Sunshine Gateway) proposed by FPL cost effective?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 2Q: What are the revenue requirements associated with the 2019 SoBRA projects?

FIPUG: As the SoBRA projects are neither cost effective nor needed, no new rates should be recovered.

ISSUE 2R: What is the appropriate base rate percentage increase for the 2019 SoBRA projects to be effective when all 2019 projects are in service, currently projected to be March 1, 2019?

FIPUG: As the SoBRA projects are neither cost effective nor needed, no new rates

should be recovered.

ISSUE 2S: Should the Commission approve revised tariffs for FPL reflecting the base rate

percentage increase for the 2019 SoBRA projects determined to be appropriate in

this proceeding?

FIPUG: No.

ISSUE 2T: Should the Commission approve FPL's proposed generation base rate adjustment

(GBRA) factor of 3.040 percent for the Okeechobee Clean Energy Center

expected to go in-service on June 1, 2019?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

Florida Public Utilities Company

ISSUE 3A: Has FPUC properly refunded \$221,415 to customers through the Fuel Clause in

accordance with Order No. PSC-2018-0028-FOF-EI?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

Gulf Power Company

ISSUE 4A: Should the Commission approve as prudent Gulf's actions to mitigate the

volatility of natural gas, residual oil, and purchased power prices, as reported in

Gulf's April 2018 and August 2018 hedging reports?

FIPUG: No.

Tampa Electric Company

ISSUE 5A: Should the Commission approve as prudent TECO's actions to mitigate the

volatility of natural gas, residual oil, and purchased power prices, as reported in

TECO's April 2018 and August 2018 hedging reports?

FIPUG: No.

GENERIC FUEL ADJUSTMENT ISSUES

ISSUE 6: What are the appropriate actual benchmark levels for calendar year 2018 for gains

on non-separated wholesale energy sales eligible for a shareholder incentive?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 7: What are the appropriate estimated benchmark levels for calendar year 2019 for

gains on non-separated wholesale energy sales eligible for a shareholder

incentive?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 8: What are the appropriate final fuel adjustment true-up amounts for the period

January 2017 through December 2017?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 9: What are the appropriate fuel adjustment actual/estimated true-up amounts for the

period January 2018 through December 2018?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 10: What are the appropriate total fuel adjustment true-up amounts to be

collected/refunded from January 2019 to December 2019?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 11: What are the appropriate projected total fuel and purchased power cost recovery

amounts for the period January 2019 through December 2019?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

COMPANY-SPECIFIC GENERATING PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE FACTOR (GPIF) ISSUES

Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

No company-specific GPIF issues for Duke Energy Florida, Inc. have been identified at this time. If such issues are identified, they shall be numbered 12A, 12B, 12C, and so forth, as appropriate.

Florida Power & Light Company

No company-specific GPIF issues for Florida Power and Light Company have been identified at this time. If such issues are identified, they shall be numbered 13A, 13B, 13C, and so forth, as appropriate.

Gulf Power Company

No company-specific GPIF issues for Gulf Power Company have been identified at this time. If such issues are identified, they shall be numbered 14A, 14B, 14C, and so forth, as appropriate.

Tampa Electric Company

ISSUE 15A: What adjustments, if any, should be made to correct Tampa Electric's calculations

of its GPIF rewards or penalties for the years 2014, 2015, and 2016?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 15B: Should the Commission approve Tampa Electric's proposed corrections to its

GPIF 2017 and 2018 targets?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

GENERIC GPIF ISSUES

ISSUE 16: What is the appropriate generation performance incentive factor (GPIF) reward or

penalty for performance achieved during the period January 2017 through December 2017 for each investor-owned electric utility subject to the GPIF?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 17: What should the GPIF targets/ranges be for the period January 2019 through

December 2019 for each investor-owned electric utility subject to the GPIF?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

FUEL FACTOR CALCULATION ISSUES

ISSUE 18: What are the appropriate projected net fuel and purchased power cost recovery

and Generating Performance Incentive amounts to be included in the recovery

factor for the period January 2019 through December 2019?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 19: What is the appropriate revenue tax factor to be applied in calculating each

investor-owned electric utility's levelized fuel factor for the projection period

January 2019 through December 2019?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 20: What are the appropriate levelized fuel cost recovery factors for the period

January 2019 through December 2019?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 21: What are the appropriate fuel recovery line loss multipliers to be used in

calculating the fuel cost recovery factors charged to each rate class/delivery

voltage level class?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 22: What are the appropriate fuel cost recovery factors for each rate class/delivery

voltage level class adjusted for line losses?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

II. CAPACITY ISSUES

COMPANY-SPECIFIC CAPACITY COST RECOVERY FACTOR ISSUES

Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

ISSUE 23A: What amount has DEF included in the capacity cost recovery clause for nuclear

cost recovery?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

Florida Power & Light Company

ISSUE 24A: What amount has FPL included in the capacity cost recovery clause for nuclear

cost recovery?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 24B: Has FPL properly reflected in the capacity cost recovery clause the effects of the

St. John's River Power Park transaction approved by Order No. PSC-2017-0415-

AS-EI?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 24C: What are the appropriate Indiantown non-fuel base revenue requirements to be

recovered through the Capacity Clause pursuant to the Commission's approval of

the Indiantown transaction in Docket No. 160154-EI for 2018 and 2019?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 24D: What is the appropriate true-up adjustment amount associated with the 2017

SOBRA projects approved by Order No. PSC-2018-0028-FOF-EI to be refunded

through the capacity clause in 2019?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 24E: What is the appropriate true-up amount associated with the 2018 SOBRA projects

approved by Order No. PSC-2018-0028-FOF-EI to be refunded through the

capacity clause in 2019?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

Gulf Power Company

No company-specific capacity cost recovery factor issues for Gulf Power Company have been identified at this time. If such issues are identified, they shall be numbered 25A, 25B, 25C, and so forth, as appropriate.

Tampa Electric Company

No company-specific capacity cost recovery factor issues for Tampa Electric Company have been identified at this time. If such issues are identified, they shall be numbered 26A, 26B, 26C, and so forth, as appropriate.

GENERIC CAPACITY COST RECOVERY FACTOR ISSUES

ISSUE 27: What are the appropriate final capacity cost recovery adjustment true-up amounts

for the period January 2017 through December 2017?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 28: What are the appropriate capacity cost recovery actual/estimated true-up amounts

for the period January 2018 through December 2018?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 29: What are the appropriate total capacity cost recovery true-up amounts to be

collected/refunded during the period January 2019 through December 2019?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 30: What are the appropriate projected total capacity cost recovery amounts for the

period January 2019 through December 2019?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 31: What are the appropriate projected net purchased power capacity cost recovery

amounts to be included in the recovery factor for the period January 2019 through

December 2019?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 32: What are the appropriate jurisdictional separation factors for capacity revenues

and costs to be included in the recovery factor for the period January 2019

through December 2019?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 33: What are the appropriate capacity cost recovery factors for the period January

2019 through December 2019?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

III. EFFECTIVE DATE

ISSUE 34: What should be the effective date of the fuel adjustment factors and capacity cost

recovery factors for billing purposes?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 35: Should the Commission approve revised tariffs reflecting the fuel adjustment

factors and capacity cost recovery factors determined to be appropriate in this

proceeding?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

ISSUE 36: Should this docket be closed?

FIPUG: No position at this time.

CONTESTED ISSUES

FIPUG

ISSUE A: Are FPL's proposed solar projects prudent?

FIPUG: No.

ISSUE B: Are FPL's proposed solar projects needed?

No. FIPUG:

Ε. **STIPULATED ISSUES:**

None at this time.

F. **PENDING MOTIONS:**

None at this time.

G. STATEMENT OF PARTY'S PENDING REQUESTS OR CLAIMS FOR **CONFIDENTIALITY:**

None.

H. **OBJECTIONS TO QUALIFICATION OF WITNESSES AS AN EXPERT:**

FIPUG objects to a witness being considered an expert witness unless the witness affirmatively states the subject matter area(s) in which he or she claims expertise, and voir dire, if requested, is permitted.

I. STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH ORDER ESTABLISHING **PROCEDURE:**

There are no requirements of the Order Establishing Procedure with which the Florida Industrial Power Users Group cannot comply at this time.

> /s/ Jon. C. Moyle Jon C. Moyle, Jr. Moyle Law Firm, P.A. 118 North Gadsden Street

Tallahassee, FL 32301 (850) 681-3828 (Voice)

(850) 681-8788 (Facsimile)

jmoyle@moylelaw.com

Attorneys for Florida Industrial Power Users Group

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing response was furnished to the following by Electronic Mail, on this 2nd day of October, 2018:

Suzanne Brownless
Johana Nieves
Florida Public Service Commission
Gerald L. Gunter Building
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850
sbrownle@psc.state.fl.us
jnieves@psc.state.fl.us

Ken Hoffman Florida Power & Light Company 215 S. Monroe Street, Suite 810 Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1858 Ken.Hoffman@fpl.com

James Beasley./J. Jeffry Wahlen/ Ashley M. Daniels Ausley & McMullen Post Office Box 391 Tallahassee, Florida 32302 jbeasley@ausley.com jwahlen@ausley.com adaniels@ausley.com Ms. Paula K. Brown Tampa Electric Company Post Office Box 111 Tampa, Florida 33601 regdept@tecoenergy.com

Matthew Bernier 106 East College Avenue, Suite 800 Tallahassee, Florida 32301 Matthew.bernier@duke-energy.com Dianne M. Triplett
299 First Avenue North
St. Petersburg, Florida 33701
Diane.triplett@duke-energy.com

John Butler/Maria Jose Moncada Florida Power & Light Company 700 Universe Blvd. (LAW/JB) Juno Beach, FL 33408 John.Butler@fpl.com Maria.Moncada@fpl.com Russell A. Badders/Steven R. Griffin Beggs & Lane Post Office Box 12950 Pensacola, Florida 32591-2950 rab@beggslane.com srg@beggslane.com Jeffrey A. Stone/Rhonda J. Alexander Gulf Power Company One Energy Place Pensacola, Florida 32520-0780 jastone@southernco.com rjalexad@southernco.com

Beth Keating Gunster, Yoakley & Stewart, P.A. 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 601 Tallahassee, Florida 32301 bkeating@gunster.com

James W. Brew/Laura A. Wynn Stone Mattheis Xenopoulos & Brew, P.C. 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW Eighth Floor, West Tower Washington, DC 20007-5201 jbrew@smxblaw.com law@smxblaw.com J.R. Kelly/Patricia A. Christensen/Charles J. Rehwinkel/Erik L. Sayler
Office of Public Counsel
111 W. Madison Street, Room 812
Tallahassee, Florida 32399
Kelly.jr@leg.state.fl.us
Christensen.patty@leg.state.fl.us
Rehwinkel.charles@leg.state.fl.us
Sayler.erik@leg.state.fl.us

Mike Cassel Florida Public Utilities Company 1750 S. 14th Street, Suite 200 Fernandina Beach, Florida 32034 mcassel@fpuc.com

Robert Scheffel Wright/John T. LaVia, III Gardner Bist Wiener Wadsworth Bowden Bush Dee LaVia & Wright, P.A. 1300 Thomaswood Drive Tallahassee, Florida 32308 schef@gbwlegal.com jlavia@gbwlegal.com

/s/ Jon C. Moyle
Jon C. Moyle
Florida Bar No. 727016