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CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 86
PROCEEDINGE(Hearing convened at 9:30 a.m.)CHAIRMAN GARCIA: All right. Let's open
this hearing. Counsel, will you please read the
notice?
MR. KEATING: Yes. Pursuant to notice issued January 6th, 1999, this time and place have been set for a hearing in Docket No. 990001-EI, the fuel and purchased power cost recovery clause and generating performance incentive factor, transmission reconsideration.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Okay. First we'll ask Commissioner Johnson to turn off her mike. Turn off your mike over there.
We'll take appearances.
MR. STONE: I'm Jeffrey A. Stone of the law firm Beggs \& Lane in Pensacola, representing Gulf Power Company.
MR. MCGEE: Jim McGee on behalf of Florida Power Corporation.
MR. BEASLEY: Jim Beasley with the law firm of Ausley \& McMullen, representing Tampa Electric Company.
MR. CHILDS: Matthew Childs of Steel Hector \& Davis on behalf of Florida Power \& Light Company.

MR. BURGESS: Steve Burgess for the Public Council's Office, representing the citizens of the state of Florida.

MS. RAUFMAN: Vicki Gordon Kaufman of the McWhirter Reeves law firm representing the Industrial Power Users Group.

MR. KEATING: And Cochran Keating on behalf of Commission Staff.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Okay. Are there any preliminary matters?

MR. KEATING: Yes, I believe we have a few preliminary matters.

The first, I think, that we should bring up is Florida Power Corporation has filed a request for leave to substitute a witness and Staff's recommendation that the Commission grant that request.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: There being no objections -- I understand there is a personal tragedy in the witness's family. So who will be adopting the witness' testimony?

MR. McGEE: That will be Mr. Wieland.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Mr. Wieland will be adopting the testimony. Very good. Okay.

MR. KEATING: And, second, I'd like to see if we could get official notice of two things. One I
haven't asked the parties about, but I believe it might be appropriate to take official notice of the FERC Order 888, if there's no objection.

MR. sTONE: No objection.
MR. KEATING: And the second; I'm not sure
if it's necessary, but the Commission's original order regarding this matter, which is PSC-9800073-FOF-EI, which was issued January 13th, 1998.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Okay.
MR. CHILDS: Could I inquire, is there a FERC Order 888A that may also go with that?

MR. KEATING: Yes, that's correct.
MR. CHILDS: Would that be included?

MR. KEATING: Yes, that should be included.
Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Okay.
MR. KEATING: Next we have a -- I guess we should take this up as a preliminary matter, unless you feel otherwise. We have a few items that were stipulated that were addressed at the prehearing that Staff would like to go ahead and see if these can be moved into the record.

The first thing that was stipulated is that the prefiled direct testimony of FPL's Witness Dubin would be moved into the record.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: What was the witness'
name?
MR. REATING: The witness is Dubin.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Dubin?
MR. KEATING: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Okay. There being no objection, show Mr. Dubin's testimony moved into the record.

MR. KEATING: Second -- and Staff has handed out to all the commissioners, and I think the parties have them too, a set of exhibits. I think it should be the third exhibit in your stack. And the witness listed on the cover sheet is Witness Dubin for Florida Power \& Light. That exhibit consists of the transcript of Witness Dubin's deposition and Florida Power \& Light's responses to Staff's Third set of Interrogatories, No. 7 through 14.

It was also stipulated at the prehearing that this information could be --

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Mr. Keating, where exactly do I find that?

MR. KEATING: It should be in your package.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Here it is. I'm sorry.
Mr. Dubin's?
MR. KEATING: Ms. Dubin's, yes.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: And that's stipulated into the record also.

MR. KEATING: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: If there's no objection.
Very good. So show it --
MR. KEATING: If we could have that marked
for identification.
CHAIRKAN GARCIA: Give me a number.

MR. KEATING: As Exhibit No. 1.
CHAIRIAN GARCIA: All right. Show
Mr. Dubin's testimony and exhibits admitted into the record.

MR. KEATING: And that can have a short title, "Composite Exhibit, Deposition of Korel M. Dubin and Responses to Staff's Third Set of Interrogatories."

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Sounds like a good title, and so we'll adopt your title.
(Exhibit 1 marked for identification and received in evidence.)

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION FLORIDA POWER \& LIGHT COMPANY TESTIMONY OF KOREL M. DUBIN DOCKET NO. 980001-EI

October 14, 1998
Q. Please state your name and address.
A. My name is Korel M. Dubin and my business address is 9250 West Flagler Street, Miami, Florida 33174.
Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
A. I am employed by Florida Power \& Light Company (FPL) as Principal Rate Analyst in the Rates and Tariffs Department.
Q. Have you previously testified in this docket?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?
A. The purpose of my testimony is to address issues set forth in Attachment A of Commission Order No. PSC-98-1270-PCO-EI issued September 25, 1998 regarding transmission revenues associated with economy transactions.
Q. Does the FERC require that revenue from non-firm transmission services, subject to FERC jurisdiction be reflected as a revenue credit in the derivation of firm transmission service rates subject to FERC jurisdiction?
A. Yes. In Order No. 888, issued in Docket Nos. RM95-8-000 and RM94-7-001 the FERC stated "The Final Rule's general requirement for non-discriminatory transmission access and pricing by public utilities, and its specific requirement that public utilities unbundle their transmission rates and take transmission service under their own tariffs, apply to all public utilities' wholesale sales and purchases of electric energy, including coordination transactions (mimeo page 266)." Additionally, in 1993 for New England Power Co. (FERC 61,153), FERC accepted transmission rates that reflected a credit to the transmission cost of service for nonfirm transmission services provided to others. In that same case, FERC also required the company to credit the transmission cost of service to reflect the transmission component of off-system power sales revenues.
Q. How should the transmission revenues associated with economy transactions over the Energy Broker Network be separated between retail and wholesale jurisdictions?
A. For FPL, transmission revenue associated with economy transactions should continue to be separated based on energy. Although it may be appropriate to use a demand separator, FPL's current energy
separation factor and demand separation factor produce virtually the same results. Also, currently all fuel and fuel related costs and revenues that are included in the Fuel Cost Recovery factors are separated based on energy. Introducing another step in the calculation of our fuel factors that would not materially affect the results does not seem beneficial at this time.

FPL's separation factor for energy is calculated by taking actual annual Total Retail Energy at Generation and dividing it by. Total Company Energy at Generation. FPL's current separation factor for energy is $98.56 \%$.

FPL's current separation factor for demand is $98.05 \%$. FPL's separation factor for demand is calculated by taking actual annual Retail Average 12 CP at Generation and dividing it by Total Company Average 12 CP at Generation.

## Q. Does this conclude your testimony.

A. Yes, it does.

MR. REATING: Thank you. Another thing that was stipulated at the prehearing was to move the prefiled direct testimony of Gulf's Witness Howell into the record.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: There being no objection, show Mr. Howell's testimony admitted into the record. And.

I would assume that the fourth document down, now the third document down --

MR. REATING: That's correct. That is the deposition of Mr. Howell and Gulf's responses to Staff's Second Set of Interrogatories.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Okay. That would be also moved into the record, and I'm going to take a guess, but that would be Exhibit No. 2.

MR. REATING: Thank you.
CHAIRKAN GARCIA: And you will give it a short title for us.

MR. KEATING: Short title? Sure; I'll work on one. "Composite Exhibit, Deposition of M. W. Howell and Response to Staff's Second set of Interrogatories."

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Perfect. So that's the title.
(Exhibit 2 marked for identification and


FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

GULF POWER COMPANY
Before the Florida Public Service Commission Direct Testimony of
M. W. Howell Docket No. 980001-EI TRANSMISSION RECONSIDERATION Date of Filing: October 14, 1998
Q. Please state your name, business address and occupation. A. My name is M. W. Howell, and my business address is one Energy Place, Pensacola, Florida 32520. I am Transmission and System Control Manager for Gulf Power Company.
Q. Have you previously testified before this Commission?
A. Yes. I have testified in various rate case, cogeneration, territorial dispute, planning hearing, fuel clause adjustment, and purchased power capacity cost recovery dockets.
Q. Please summarize your educational and professional background.
A. I graduated from the University of Florida in 1966 with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering. I received my Masters Degree in Electrical Engineering from the University of Florida in 1967, and then joined Gulf Power Company as a Distribution Engineer. I have since served as Relay Engineer, Manager of Transmission,

Manager of System Planning, Manager of Fuel and System Planning, and Transmission and System Control Manager. My experience with the Company has included all areas of distribution operation, maintenance, and construction; transmission operation, maintenance, and construction; relaying and protection of the generation, transmission, and distribution systems; planning the generation, transmission, and distribution systems; bulk power interchange administration; overall management. of fuel planning and procurement; and operation of the system dispatch center.

I am a member of the Engineering Committees and the Operating Committees of the Southeastern Electric Reliability Council and the Florida Reliability Coordinating council, and have served as chairman of the Generation Subcommittee of the Edison Electric Institute System Planning Committee. I have served as chairman or member of many technical committees and task forces within the Southern electric system, the Florida Electric Power Coordinating Group, and the North American Electric Reliability Council. These have dealt with a variety of technical issues including bulk power security, system operations, bulk power contracts, generation expansion, transmission expansion, transmission interconnection requirements, central
dispatch, transmission system operation, transient stability, underfrequency operation, generator underfrequency protection, and system production costing.
Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?
A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide evidentiary support regarding the requirement of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) that revenues from non-firm transmission services shall be refiected as a revenue credit when calculating the firm transmission service rates of the Southern electric system (Southern) which are subject to the FERC's jurisdiction. Gulf Power is an operating company of Southern.
Q. Does the FERC require that revenue from non-firm transmission services subject to FERC jurisdiction be reflected as a revenue credit in the derivation of firm transmission service rates subject to FERC jurisdiction?
A. Yes. The FERC included this requirement in both Order No. 888 and Order No. $888-\mathrm{A}$ for transmission providers using annual system peak load pricing for their transmission services. On page 304 of the FERC's Order No. 888, issued April 24, 1996, the FERC clearly states
that as part of a mechanism to prevent over-recovery of costs ". . . revenue from non-firm services should continue to be reflected as a revenue credit in the derivation of firm transmission tariff rates."

This requirement was reaffirmed by the $F E R C$ in Order No. 888-A that was issued on March 4, 1997. Page 247 of Order No. 888-A states that ". . . The Commission [FERC] explained that revenue from non-firm transmission services should continue to be reflected as a revenue credit in the derivation of firm transmission service rates. The Commission [FERC] noted that the combination of allocating costs to firm point-to-point service and the use of a revenue credit for non-firm transmission service will satisfy the requirements of a conforming rate proposal enunciated in our Transmission Pricing Policy Statement."
Q. Has the Southern filed its Open Access Transmission Service Tariff to conform to the above mentioned requirements of $F E R C$ order No. 888 and FERC Order No. 888-A?
A. Yes. All of Southern's transmission service tariff filings, including the currently effective transmission service tariff, have complied with the FERC-ordered requirements to include non-firm revenue credits in the


#### Abstract

firm transmission service rate derivation. Southern's currently effective Open Access Transmission Tariff is a formulary rate tariff that provides for annual updates of the investment, expense, load, and cost of capital components of the firm transmission rate calculation. The scheduled updates provide the occasion for incorporating the most current non-firm transmission revenue credits in the determination of firm transmission rates. At the time of the annual updates to the input components of the formulary rate, the nonfirm transmission service revenue credits accumulated since the last update are reflected as a direct reduction to the transmission $O \& M$ expense component of the firm transmission service. This mechanism provides a safeguard against over-recovery of costs that could otherwise occur due to FERC's requirement in Order 888 that transmission charges be "unbundled" from economy energy sales. In fact, Southern's annual update filing on May 1, 1998 incorporated the required credit for nonfirm transmission revenues received during calendar year 1997 with the result being lower firm transmission rates for use of Southern's (and therefore Gulf's) transmission system from June 1, 1998 until the effective date of the next update.


Witness: M. W. Howell
Q. How would you compare this FERC process of including credit for non-firm transmission revenues in the annual updates to Southern's firm transmission rate with the requirement by the Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) that transmission revenues associated with economy energy sales be credited to retail customers through the fuel adjustment clause?
A. In principle, the two mechanisms are addressing the same concern. In both cases, the respective commissions are attempting to fashion a mechanism to protect against possible over-recovery of costs that might otherwise result in the short-term due to previously unanticipated revenues associated with the newly unbundled transmission charges. FERC's approach is to apply these revenues as a credit against transmission costs as part of the annual setting of transmission rates subject to its jurisdiction. The FPSC's approach is to take these same revenues and flow them directly to retail customers through the fuel clause in order to avoid ". . . a windfall for the seller." (Order No. PSC-98-0073-FOF-EI at page 7) To the extent that Gulf or any other utility is required to credit the same revenues in both jurisdictions, ". . . it will obviously be forced to credit more revenues than it receives." (Florida Power Corporation Motion for Reconsideration at page 5)
Q. Is the fact that both the FERC and the FPSC are each trying to address the potential of over-recovery by essentially capturing the same revenues twice of any concern?
A. In principle, yes. If both the FERC mechanism for addressing the concern about potential over-recovery by lowering transmission rates and the FPSC mechanism of flowing the same revenues back to customers through the fuel clause are in effect at the same time, the end result would be harm to the selling utility's shareholders due to under-recovery of costs. However, due to circumstances that have arisen recently in a docketed proceeding before the FERC involving Southern's Open Access Transmission Tariff, it appears that the potential that Gulf/Southern would prospectively be crediting the same revenues twice will be avoided for now.
Q. What has happened that has changed Gulf's concern on this issue?
A. The FERC's docketed proceeding in which Southern's Open Access Transmission Tariff is under review has several intervenors who are seeking changes to Southern's transmission rate tariff. Recently, the parties to that docketed proceeding (including the intervenors, the FERC
staff and Southern) have reached agreement in principle on a settlement that will, if approved, result in the termination of the contested proceeding. Although the settlement agreement has not yet been reduced to writing and is still subject to review and approval by the Administrative Law Judge assigned to hear the case and the FERC itself, we believe that the settlement will ultimately be approved. The net result of the settlement will be that Southern's firm "open access" transmission rates will be fixed for an undetermined amount of time, and will not be subject to annual updates for changes in investment, cost of capital, expense or load components. The settlement, if approved, also means that the non-firm revenue credits will not be updated annually so long as the fixed rate contemplated by the settlement agreement remains in effect.
Q. How should Gulf Power Company allocate transmission revenues associated with its sale of economy energy between the retail and wholesale jurisdiction?
A. The Company continues to believe that any transmission revenues received by the company due to economy energy transactions should be credited to operating revenues rather than through the fuel clause. In this fashion,
the FPSC's surveillance mechanism would be used to ensure that such revenues do not cause the Company to over-earn. By crediting the revenues to operating revenues, the Company avoids the prospect of having to, in effect, give away the same revenues twice. However, given the Commission's prior decision to credit such transmission revenues through the fuel clause, and given it is likely that for the foreseeable future the nonfirm transmission revenues received by Gulf will not be flowed back to the FERC jurisdiction through annual updates to Southern's firm transmission rates, Gulf's only remaining concern relative to this issue involves the use of a transmission-related jurisdictional separation factor to allocate revenues between the wholesale and retail jurisdictions. This concern is addressed in the testimony of Gulf's witness $S . D$. Cranmer.
Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
A. Yes.

MR. REATING: Okay. And I've got one other thing that was -- I believe I've talked to a few of the parties about stipulating this, and I don't believe there's an objection. It's the last exhibit in your packet.

It's Staff's composite exhibit consisting of Tampa Electric's Company's responses to Staff's Fifth Set of Interrogatories and responses to Staff's First Request for Production of Documents.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Is there an objection?
MR. 8TONE: No objection.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: There being no objection, we will give this Exhibit No. 3, and we will then rely on your title-making abilities to give this a title.

MR. KEATING: We'll title that "Composite Exhibit, Response to Staff's Fifth Set of Interrogatories and Staff's First Request for Production of Documents."

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Very good.
(Exhibit 3 marked for identification and received in evidence.)

MR. STONE: Commissioner, if I may. In regards to what has been identified as Exhibit 2, prior to the commencement of this hearing, I handed out a late-filed deposition exhibit to that
deposition. I have extra copies for the parties. I think it would be appropriate to either include it as part of Exhibit 2 or give it a separate exhibit number.

CHAIRKAN GARCIA: And these are addendums to
Exhibit 2?
MR. BTONE: I would be satisfied with that.
CHAIRKAN GARCIA: I know you gave me
something. What does it show on the cover?
MR. STONE: It shows --
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: This Gulf Power letter here?

MR. STONE: Well, no; it's the other one. In the upper right-hand corner it says "Docket No. --

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Have the parties seen this?

M8. KAUFMAN: No, Commissioner, I haven't seen it.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Before we do that, let's do that; let's give Ms. Kaufman a copy. And Staff has seen it. Is Staff all right with it?

MR. KEATING: Yes, we have a copy. This was a late-filed exhibit we had requested at Mr. Howell's deposition. And when we stipulated to have his deposition moved into the record, we had assumed that
this late-filed exhibit would be included in the deposition.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Ms. Kaufman, we'll let you think about it and read it, and then when you feel that you can let us put it in or you want to argue it, we'll do it then. Okay? Very good.

Mr. Keating, anything else?
MR. REATING: I don't believe there are any other preliminary matters, unless the parties have any to bring up.

MR. CHILDS: I have a preliminary matter. Commissioners, our witness has been excused. The material has been placed in evidence. I don't think there's anticipated any surprise evidence being offered. And I would respectfully ask to be permitted to be excused from the hearing.

CHAIRKAN GARCIA: Well, seeing that the intellectual level will be severely diminished by your departure, I'm sure we can get along. You are excused, I guess.

MR. CHILDS: Thank you.
MR. BEASLEY: Chairman, any objection?
(Laughter)
MR. REATING: Chairman Garcia, one other thing was brought to my attention --

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: If I get one, I'll grant it. I don't know. (Laughter)

MR. KEATING: -- that we may also take official notice of the amended order -- the amendatory order amending our original order in this matter that we've already taken official notice of.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: And what do you want to do with that?

MR. KEATING: Just to make sure that that's taken official notice of as well.

CHAIRHAN GARCIA: I think that's stated clearly into the record, but, nonetheless, we did it one more time and we still had no objection. So show that in the record.

MR. REATING: Very good.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: All right. Anything else?
MR. KEATING: That would be it.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Any other preliminary
matters from the companies or the parties? There being none, our first witness is -- Slusser, is it; the --

MR. MCGEE: And we will call Mr. Wieland in Mr. Slusser's place.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Okay. Why don't we do this. Mr. Wieland, if you'll just stand right there,
and we'll have Mr. Ritenour -- am I pronouncing it -Ms. Ritenour. I'm sorry. If you'll stand up and raise your right hand.
(Witnesses collectively sworn.)
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Mr. Wieland, what we're going to do is, one of our beloved attorneys -- and it's rare to say that about attorneys -- is leaving us, and so she is having a going away party at 10:00; and so what we will do is, we will allow you to begin -- what did the prehearing officer allow for? Just a brief summary?

We will take the brief summary of this party. We will allow you to move into the record, do the preliminaries, and then we will go to questioning after we take a short recess. All right.

MR. MCGEE: While Mr. Wieland is getting ready, I should mention to you that at the prehearing conference Mr . Burgess and I agreed to deleting a portion of Mr. Slusser's -- it will now be Mr. Wieland's testimony on Page 5, Lines 8 through 13, should be shown as stricken.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Line -- page what? I'm sorry, Mr. McGee.

MR. MCGEF: Page 5, lines -- the sentence that begins in Line 8 and goes through the end of that
paragraph on Line 13.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: All right. That will be deleted. Did everyone get that? Good.

KARL H. WIELAND
was called as a witness on behalf of Florida Power Corporation and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMIMATION

BY MR. MCGEE:

2 Would you give us your name and business address, please?

A Karl H. Wieland. My business address is Post Office Box 14042, St. Petersburg, Florida 33733.

Q What is your capacity with Florida Power Corporation?

A I'm the manager of financial analysis.

Q Mr. Wieland, do you have a document before you entitled "Direct Testimony of William C. Slusser, Jr." that consists of six pages and two attached exhibits?

A Yes.
0 Have you had a chance to read that testimony and become conversant in its contents?

A Yes, I have.

Q And will you adopt that testimony prefiled by Mr. Slusser as your direct testimony for this proceeding today?

A Yes.

Q Are you aware of any additions or corrections, other than the deletion that we just described, that need to be made to the testimony?

A No.

MR. McGEE: Mr. Chairman, we'd ask that Mr. Slusser's prepared testimony be inserted into the record as the direct testimony of Mr . Wieland.

CHAIRKAN GARCIA: Very well; it will be.
MR. MCGEE: And that his two exhibits be marked for identification. If you prefer to do that as a composite, or --

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: I think it would be easier to do as a composite. Mr. Keating shows me that that would be Exhibit 4.

MR. REATING: Yes.
CHAIRKAN GARCIA: And it's a composite
exhibit of -- I guess of exhibits of Mr. Slusser's testimony, attached to Mr. Slusser. Is that all right as a title for you Mr. Keating?

MR. KEATING: That will work, yes.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Okay. Good.
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## Transmission Reconsideration

## DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

 WILLIAM C. SLUSSER, JR.
## 1 Q. Would you please state your name and business address?

2 A. My name is William C. Slusser, Jr. My business address is 100 Central

5 Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
6 A. I am employed by Florida Power Corporation ("Florida Power" or "the
Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding? Avenue, CX1D, St. Petersburg, Florida 33701-3324. Company") in the capacity of the Director of the Pricing Department.
A. The purpose of my testimony is: (1) to describe the treatment that is afforded non-firm transmission service revenues in establishing the Company's firm transmission rates subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and (2) to present a methodology for establishing the portion of transmission revenues associated with economy transactions over the Energy Broker Network that the Florida Public Service Commission (FPSC) may treat as a revenue credit in establishing retail customers' fuel costs.

1 Q. Does the FERC require that revenue from non-firm transmission services subject to FERC jurisdiction be reflected as a revenue credit in the derivation of firm transmission service rates subject to FERC jurisdiction?

Yes. FERC's cost of service and rate-making practice has traditionally been to credit non-firm revenues on a functional basis to the fully allocated cost assigned to firm customers.

In past rate proceedings before FERC, Florida Power had always recognized revenues for non-firm transmission service as a credit in establishing its firm wholesale transmission rates. As a result of Order 888, the Company has further identified its off-system non-firm sales as having both generation and transmission components (whereas previously no separate transmission component had been identified) and has included the transmission component with all other non-firm transmission revenues as a credit in establishing firm transmission charges in its compliance Open Access Transmission Tariffs filed with FERC. The Company's current tariff, which is pending litigation at FERC as Docket No. ER97-4573, became effective November 9, 1997, subject to refund. The tariff includes a formula rate for establishing the Company's annual transmission revenue requirement as a basis for firm transmission rate development. The revenue requirement includes a credit for non-firm transmission use, which pursuant to Order 888, must include the Company's use. I have extracted from the tariff the formula rate and the application of
calendar year 1996 data in the formula as my Exhibit No. $\qquad$ (WCS-1) to demonstrate the revenue credit treatment being afforded in FERC rate-making for the Company's non-firm transmission use.
Q. What is the status of FERC Docket No. ER97-4573?
A. FERC encourages negotiated settlements of litigated dockets before them, and the parties in the proceeding, in fact, have reached a settlement which is before the FERC for their acceptance. Elements similar to those in the formula rate were used to develop stated settlement rates.
Q. Do all of your wholesale customers being provided transmission service take service under Florida Power's Open Access Transmission Tariff?
A. No, not as yet. Contracts with wholesale customers having bundled rate service or transmission service agreements in place prior to Order 888 were not abrogated by Order 888. The Company expects to amend those agreements in time and place the transmission service under the Open Access Transmission Tariff. When those prior agreements were established, traditional rate-making practices were employed such that all identified non-firm revenues were functionally credited to the firm customers' cost responsibility in establishing their firm rate charges.

Those customers currently served under the Open Access Transmission Tariff

> include customers served under the Company's previous Wholesale Transmission Tariff, T-1, and all new or amended wholesale agreements executed after Order 888 .
Q. How should Florida Power Corporation allocate transmission revenues associated with economy transactions over the Energy Broker Network between the retail and wholesale jurisdictions?
A. Florida Power has for years consistently utilized a 12 CP methodology before the FERC and the FPSC for establishing jurisdictional transmission cost responsibility. A jurisdictional factor derived using this methodology should be used to allocate transmission revenues associated with the economy transactions over the Energy Broker Network between the retail and wholesale jurisdictions.

The 12 CP methodology establishes the firm loadings of the respective jurisdictional customers at the time of each month's maximum loading on the Company's transmission system for a twelve months period of time. The respective twelve months' jurisdictional loadings form a basis for establishing a percentage jurisdictional responsibility. My Exhibit No. $\qquad$ (WCS-2) develops the jurisdictional responsibilities based on calendar year 1997 data as an example. As a matter of practice, the most recent calendar year of load data should be relied upon for developing the appropriate jurisdictional responsibility factors.
Q. How should the retail allocated revenues the Company realizes from economy transactions be treated in establishing rates for its retail customers?
A. For sales under existing economy sales agreements where the revenue has simply been unbundled into generation and transmission components, the appropriate jurisdictional portions of both the generation and transmission components of economy sales should be treated as a credit to the retail customer's fuel charge. Forany new economy agreement entered intonfer Order-888-where-a-separate-transmission charge is impesed in addition-to-a generation transaction price, the jurisdictional pertion of genceration-retated revenues should be treated as-eredit to the fuel charge and the jurisctictional portion-of transmission revenues should be treated as a revenue credit when base fates are established.

The above proposal results in similar ratemaking treatment as afforded retail customers before FERC's unbundling requirement. It varies only by the recognition that the transmission component of existing economy sales revenues are treated as a credit on a more proper jurisdictional basis of transmissionrelated responsibility.
Q. What would be the result on Florida Power if the FPSC rejected the use of a jurisdictional transmission cost factor as the basis for crediting
transmission revenues associated with economy transactions over the Energy Broker Network to retail customers?
A. If Florida Power must continue to credit the transmission revenues associated with these transactions on an energy basis as generation-related credits are treated, the retail customers would receive approximately $95 \%$ of these revenues as a credit in retail rate-making on the basis of their jurisdictional energy cost responsibility. As shown in my Exhibit No. $\qquad$ (WCS-2), wholesale transmission service customers are entitled to $25 \%$ of these revenues under FERC cost of service and rate-making practices where an appropriate jurisdictional transmission factor is employed. This obviously has a potential revenue loss to the Company by crediting $20 \%$ more revenue than the Company realizes from such transmission revenues.
Q. Does the Company's suggested treatment change the basis for the existing $\mathbf{8 0 \%} / \mathbf{2 0 \%}$ sharing of any gain realized by Florida Power in making an economy sale?
A. No, it doesn't. The $80 / 20$ split still applies to the jurisdictional portion of all revenues credited to the fuel clause from economy sales exceeding the jurisdictional fuel cost incurred in making the sale.
Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
A. Yes.

Q (By Mr. McGee) Mr. Wieland, would you give us a summary of your testimony, please?

A Certainly.
Commissioners, I might start by saying that this particular issue is probably one of the more confusing and misunderstood dockets I've been involved with for a while, and it's been dragging on forever. So if you'll indulge me, I'll just go over a little bit of the background and then try to just highlight what we're here for.

To start with, the Commission has had a long-standing policy of flowing back the so-called gains on broker sales, the difference between our costs and what we actually collect, back to the fuel clause. And they've also had a policy in the past of splitting those profits, at least the retail portion of it, on an $80 / 20$ basis with $80 \%$ going to the ratepayers.

Now, the way the retail portion of this gain has been determined in the past is to simply take the entire gain, and since it was thought to be production related, split it on an energy basis, which in Florida Power's case is about $95 \%$ going to the retail
jurisdiction and about 5\% to the wholesale jurisdiction. And at the time, it seemed to make a
lot of sense, because the retail customers pay $95 \%$ of the cost and the wholesale customers pay the other 5, so that was very fair and equitable.

Well, along comes Order 888, and it in essence says that you have to take this gain, that same amount of money, and split it into two pieces. You have to split it into a production piece and a transmission piece.

The issue arose as to -- there never was an issue about what to do with the production piece. We would handle that in exactly the same way as it was before. But the problem arose is, what do we do with the transmission piece; and that really was the subject of the initial docket.

The two things that were talked about is, you know, should those revenues be flowed back through the customer through a clause or should they be credited through operating revenues the way these types of transmission revenues have been treated in the past.

The Commission ruling on that ultimately was that they will be flowed back. And I would just like to say, because I'm not sure the record is totally clear on that, we have all the support of that; and from day one Florida Power's position was that those
revenues should be credited back to the fuel clause. The question is, why are we still here? What (sic) we're here is because we have an issue with how to determine the right jurisdictional amount to be flowed back. The order that the commission came out with originally required that the same 95 to 5 energy allocation be used to determine the jurisdictional amount for these transmission revenues.

The problem we have with that is that the FERC requires that transmission revenues be allocated on a demand basis and, in fact, so does this Commission. I mean, its just, you know, the way its allocations are done. And in Florida Power's case that makes a big difference, because Florida Power has some very large transmission business on the wholesale side, particularly because of companies like Seminole and FMPA that pay for not 5\%, but about $25 \%$ of the total transmission charge.

So the retail customers are really only paying for, through the cost allocation, about $25 \%$ of all the transmission expenses -- about $75 \%$ of the transmission expenses. The wholesale customers are paying for the other 25. And, furthermore, FERC requires that these transmission revenues, these gains, be flowed back on that same basis.

So we find ourselves in a peculiar position of having a requirement to flow 25\% of these revenues, these transmission revenues, through -- back to wholesale customers, and the Commission order says $95 \%$ has to go back to the retail customers.

Well, I don't -- you know, if you put those together, that's 120\%, meaning that for every $\$ 100$ we collect, we are required to pay out 120.

Now, we don't think that that was the intent of the Commission originally. We certainly don't think that's the fair way of doing it. And the testimony basically outlines what these issues are and suggests that the easy way to fix those is to simply adopt the right separation factors for those transmission revenues.

That concludes my summary.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Mr. Wieland, but then when you flow it back, do you flow -- I'm assuming you're saying that $25 \%$ then should go to the wholesale --

## WITNESS WIELAND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: -- and 75\% to the retail. But the flow-through should be through the energy --

WITNESS WIELAND: It's through the fuel
clause --
COMMISIONER CLARK: Fuel adjustment.
WITNESS WIELAND: Yes, absolutely. COMMISSIONER CLARE: Thank YOu.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Mr. McGee?
MR. MCGEE: Did you want to entertain --
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: I wanted to see how much
time of questions the parties had, because if we could finish now, we might want to take it up. Obviously you have none.

Do you, Public Counsel?
MR. BURGESS: I have a few questions.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Five minutes?
MR. BURGESS: Five minutes maybe.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Okay. Why don't we go
ahead and start, since we've got a few minutes.
CRO8S EXAMINATION
BY MR. BURGESS:
Q Mr. Wieland, do you have any opinion as to whether the treatment accorded this particular item should be consistent from across the four major IOUs that are regulated by the Public Service Commission?

A Yes, I think it should be consistent. Now, my understanding is that some of the other investor-owned utilities agree with us in principle,
but they said it's not a material issue.
I guess we're here on two fronts. I mean, I think we could say that, you know, in terms of the dollar volume, it's really not a material issue for Florida Power, but I think it just ought to be done right.

Q So you would agree that whatever the Commission does, it should do the same to all four utilities?

A Yes.
Q And can you tell me approximately the dollar effect of making the change that Florida Power Corp is seeking for, say, the most recent six-month fuel period?

A Well, I can tell you that for the April through September of '98 -- which I think is a number that I recall from the interrogatories -- the total difference between what Staff's order originally was and what Florida Power is proposing, in the neighborhood of $\$ 16,000$.

So, you know, if you assume that it's about the same the rest of the year, then on an annual basis we're talking about perhaps $\$ 30,000$ a year. So it's not a -- and, again, it's not a material issue.

I think it's just an issue that probably
ought to be done right simply because sometime down the road, you know, that same issue may come up in another area, and once things get mixed up they tend to take longer to untangle down the road than to do them right in the first place. But it's not a large monitary issue.

MR. BURGEss: Thank you, Mr. Wieland.
That's all I have.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Ms. Gordon-Kaufman?
MS. RAUFMAN: I have a couple questions. CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Okay. Let's give it a try.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MS. RAUPMAN:
Q Mr. Wieland, in this case your testimony only addresses existing agreements, right; existing economy sales agreements?

A Yes. We're talking about strictly agreements that were unbundled under the FERC order, not open access tariffs or anything like that; right.

0 Okay. So these existing agreements, they do not have what I will characterize as a separate transmission charge, correct?

A That's right.
Q And let's say you got one of these existing
agreements and you receive a pot of dollars. Essentially what you're saying is that you want to divide the dollars differently than you had previously done under these contracts, correct?

A That's right; and it's because previously, prior to FERC Order 888, there were no transmission charges.

Q Okay. But my question is, even under these existing agreements that we're talking about, there is not really a separate charge imposed for transmission, right?

A No. It is exactly the same amount of money. It's simply divided into two pieces.

M8. RAUFMAN: Thank you. That's all I have.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: This is going really well. Go ahead.

COMMISEIONER CLARR: I don't understand what you mean by existing agreements, because $I$ thought we were talking about economy broker sales; and I thought that was just something you did on an hour-by-hour basis.

WITMESS WIELAND: Yes, that's right. I think Ms. Kaufman is probably referring to the transmission agreements and the interexchange agreements that make those things possible.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I understand that. I didn't know you would have any contracts to make exist -- economy sales that were long-term contracts. I thought you just made them on an hour-by- hour basis.

WITNESS WIELAND: They are. But there are contracts in place that essentially say more than -no more than we agree to make sales if and when it makes sense. So there's actually contracts that, you know, don't require anyone to sell anything at any particular time. They just simply provide a framework for making those changes. But there's no -- you know, it is no more than a contract that basically allows you to make --

COMISSIONER CLARK: Broker sales.
WITMESS WIELAND: -- broker sales if and when it's appropriate for both parties. There's no requirement to make sales, no maximums, no -- you know, it's just something that --

COMMIBSIONER CLARK: Do you have to have those contracts to participate in the broker system?

WITNESS WIELAND: I believe so.
COMMISSIONER CLARK: Well, you learn
something new every day. Thanks.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: I always come to work
anxious. How many questions do you have?
MR. REATING: We probably have about 10 minutes of questions.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Okay. I think we can afford to be a little bit late, so go ahead and start.

COMMIESIONER CLARR: Well, while he's
looking, so when you then enter -- you have entered into new contracts, and those new contracts split out the transmission and the generation costs?

WITNESS WIRLAND: Yes. In fact, one of the reasons that the amount of money we're dealing with here is relatively small is because if you look at our history over the last, I'd say, two years, the majority of these, you know, so-called economy sales, nonfirm transactions, you know, whatever, day-by-day week-by-week type transactions are actually taking place outside the broker system; and all of those have transmission agreements under FERC Order 888. They're unbundled, and there's actually a production charge and a transmission charge for those.

It's only the broker which is becoming a smaller and smaller piece where this issue really applies and where we at this stage have not added a separate transmission charge. You know, we've simply unbundled the charge that's there.

COMMIESIONER CLARK: Okay.
MR. KEATING: Chairman Garcia, on second thought, this may take more than 10 minutes. We could be going --

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Very good.
MR. REATING: I think it's going to be maybe at least 20.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Very good. We'll take a break at this point, and we'll reconvene at 10:30, if that's all right with everyone.
(Brief recess.)

-     -         -             -                 - 

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: We'll reconvene this hearing, and Mr. Keating, you were going to continue your questioning.

MR. REATING: Yes. CROSS EXAMIMATION

```
BY MR. KEATING:
```

Q Good morning, Mr. Wieland.
A Good morning.
0 Staff has prepared an exhibit showing Florida Power Corporation's proposed separations method for a hypothetical broker sale. Do you have a copy of that exhibit in front of you?

A Yes, I do. Let me find it real quick.

MR. KEATING: And I believe this is in the Commissioners' packet. It has the witness listed as Karl Wieland and it's a one-page exhibit.
wITNESS WIELAND: Yes, I have it.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Do you want to give it an exhibit number?

MR. KEATING: Yes. If we could have that marked, I believe, as Exhibit No. 5.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Okay. Short title.
MR. KEATING: "A Summary of Florida Power Corporation's Proposed Regulatory Treatment of Broker Sales."

CHAIRIAN GARCIA: Okay.
(Exhibit 5 marked for identification.)
Q (By Mr. Keating) I'd just like to walk through that exhibit to verify Staff's understanding of the proposed methodology.

The exhibit is based on a $\$ 30$ buy quote, $a$ $\$ 20$ sale quote, and a $\$ 3$ transmission charge, with the transaction price at $\$ 25$.

Is it correct that the transaction price, assuming this is a sale by Florida Power Corporation, is $\$ 25$ both before and after the FERC requirement to unbundle transmission charges from economy sales?

A Yes, that's right.

Q Could you please briefly explain how the $\$ 5$ gain from the example sale was separated prior to the FERC order?

A Prior to the FERC order, $\$ 5$ was, first of all, separated on an $80 / 20$ basis; so essentially $\$ 4$ went to customers on a system basis and $\$ 1$ went to the shareholder. Those two amounts, though, were ultimately jurisdictionalized to where $95 \%$ of each one of those amounts would go to the jurisdiction, and I think the arithmetic on here basically shows that.

COMMISSIONER CLARE: Mr. Wieland, you sort of glossed over something. You need to go absolutely step by step on this for me.
wITNESS WIELAND: Okay. Starting with the $\$ 5$, the first step was to multiply that times . 8 ; take $80 \%$ of it, which is 4 .

Then the $\$ 4$ was still on a system basis;
wholesale and retail, in other words. And that then was separated into the two jurisdictions by this energy allocation factor, which in the past was approximately $95 \%$ retail and $5 \%$ wholesale.

So the $\$ 4$ would then get multiplied times .95, and that's the amount that went to the fuel clause, which is, I believe -- let me just verify that -- the $\$ 3.80$ that's shown at the very bottom of
the first column -- or the second column, I guess with the numbers on it. (Pause) Right.

So if you look at the very bottom where it says "After the 80/20 Split," prior to 888 , $\$ 3.80$ went to jurisdictional or retail ratepayers through the clause, and 95 cents went to Florida Power's shareholder as part of this $80 / 20$ sharing or incentive arrangement. The balance of the $\$ 5$ went to wholesale.

Q (By Mr. Keating) So if I understand it right, the bottom line, if you look at our exhibit, the column titled "Before Order 888," and down the last few rows on that exhibit where it's titled "After the $80 \% / 20 \%$ Split," the amounts that are listed there, are those the amounts -- under your calculation, are those the same amounts?

A Yes.
Q Now if you could look at the next column on that exhibit regarding Florida Power Corporation's treatment of these revenues after the FERC order.

Could you explain how the $\$ 5$ is separated in your proposal after the FERC unbundling requirement?

A Okay. I'll just try to walk down the schedule line by line. I think that may be the easiest way to get there.

We start off with taking the -- splitting
the $\$ 5$ into the two new pieces; $\$ 2$, which is production related, and $\$ 3$ which is transmission.

We start with the $\$ 3$ and jurisdictionalize that using the transmission separation, because it's a transmission revenue. So the retail portion of the $\$ 3$ is $75 \%$ of 3 , or $\$ 2.25$, which is on that first row underneath "Jurisdictional Treatment". The balance of it, the 75 cents, is the wholesale piece.

Furthermore, we take the production margin, which is the $\$ 2$, and multiply it times the production separation factor, which is 95\%. So $\$ 2$ times .95 is the $\$ 1.90$ that you see on the third row. And again, the 10 cents is the wholesale piece of that. So when you add all those numbers up, that should be five bucks.

Q And this is how you are --
A We don't stop here yet. I was just --
Q Okay.
A But to -- if you look at just the retail side of it then, focusing just on retail, you have $\$ 2.25$, which is the transmission piece, and \$1.90, which is the production piece, which gives you a total of $\$ 4.15$. That is then what is multiplied times this 80/20, which you actually see down at the very bottom again where it says "After 80/20 Split".

You take the $\$ 4.15 ; 80 \%$ of it is $\$ 3.32$, which flows to retail ratepayers, and $20 \%$ is the 83 cents, which goes to -- which becomes the stockholder incentive.

So when you contrast that before and after, before and after FERC Order 888, retail customers were getting $\$ 3.80$ that would now get $\$ 3.32$. The stockholder incentive was 95 cents. It is now

83 cents. So both the customer and the stockholder are getting a little bit less than that.

And if you wonder, well, who is getting the other piece, well, the wholesale jurisdiction is getting a little bit more, and simply because prior to that they were getting 95\% -- were getting $5 \%$ of the transmission, now they're getting 25\%.

So that the total dollars that are being split up, you're still dealing with the five bucks, but they're -- because of the FERC mandate, more of it is allocated to the wholesale jurisdiction simply because they are now transmission dollars; and the wholesale jurisdiction pays a lot higher proportion of transmission costs and, therefore, they're entitled to a higher proportion of the revenues.

Q So, Mr. Wieland, would you say that the exhibit that Staff has prepared accurately reflects
how Florida Power Corporation would treat these transactions before and after the FERC order?

A Yes.
COMMISSIONER CLARR: Mr. Wieland, I have a question. Do you know that the other companies do quote on the buyer the same way you do?

I seem to recall that $F P L$, when they quoted on the system their costs would be -- you know, they quote their costs to produce it and they add on to it the transmission cost. So it struck me that we were not comparing apples to apples in this situation.

WITNESS WIELAND: No, we're probably not, Commissioner; because I remember all of those discussions, and there was clearly -- and, in fact, one of the reasons this docket is so confusing is because we had four utilities, and we ultimately had four different positions.

And two of the positions were, you know, should you give it back to the fuel clause or credit it to operating revenues. I think that all got settled. The one $I$ found more confusing is, you know, can you actually charge more for these transactions than before.

And I think Florida Power's position and, I believe, TECO's was that, no, the FERC does not allow
that. And I do recall language that says, no, you can't really charge any more without having a formal transmission filing.

I think FPL and Gulf took the opposite role. And I'm not sure quite honestly whether -- in fact, I know for sure it hasn't been resolved, because all of those issues are still before FERC and none of them have been worked out.

But you're absolutely right. There are -FPL is -- and that's my recollection -- is actually charging a transmission charge, a separate charge that it didn't charge before. Now, whether that will -how that will actually work out in front of FERC, I certainly wouldn't know, but they are doing it differently.

COMMISBIONER CLARK: Well, if our objective in the broker was to have the least cost -- I don't know whether you would say it was the least cost to produce and deliver it or just the least cost to produce, it strikes me that everybody ought to be doing it the same way.
wITNEss WIELAND: Yes, I would agree with that. I think ultimately that's preferable, but I don't -- you know, I'm not sure that -- I certainly don't know how to resolve that, because that's -- you
know, that gets into FERC issues that, frankly, I'm not that familiar with.

And at this stage, you know, FERC not having made any rulings, we don't really know what they're going to say. We still think and we're still of the opinion that without going through a formal Section 205 rate case, that we are not allowed to charge more.

COMMISBIONER CLARK: Let me ask you this: If we had a single rate, if we -- if FERC -- let me just say, if we had a single rate for whatever reason for transmission in Florida, would that then solve this problem, because presumably everybody would have the same transmission component?

WITNESS WIELAND: Are you talking about if all of the retail rates were unbundled as well, or just --

COMMISBIONER CLARR: NO. If you had no pancaking of rates for transmission, if you had just one rate, would that solve this problem?

WITNESS WIELAND: I'm not really sure, Commissioner, because it's --

COMMIS8IONER CLARR: No, it wouldn't, because --

WITNESS WIELAND: -- the issue, the way I
understand it, is not so much whether the rates themselves are right; it's to whether you can actually charge more for this particular unbundling.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.
WITNESS WIELAND: But, you know, I presume one way to solve the confusion is for all of the utilities to file new transmission tariffs, but, you know, at this stage $I$ don't think we have any reason to do that.

COMMIB8IONER CLARK: Well, let me ask you another question. We're having workshops on transmission type issues, and is this something that should be addressed in that forum?

WITNESS WIELAND: I don't really know,
Commissioner. I know those are going on. I've not been that involved with those transitions -- so I'm not really sure it belongs there.

COMMISBIONER CLARR: Let me ask Staff; I
mean, are we looking at how the broker system functions and if there are changes that need to be made to it, or --

MR. KEATING: In this proceeding?
COMMISBIONER CLARK: NO.
MR. KEATING: I'm sorry.
COMMIssIONER CLARK: In general.

MR. BALLINGER: We're always looking at it. Personally, I think there are some changes that need to be done to it. We're not quite sure of the forum to bring that up.

COMMISBIONER CLARE: Okay.
MR. BALLINGER: I don't know that the
transmission workshop that you mentioned would be a place for this type of thing. This is more of an accounting issue, $I$ believe, that we're dealing with today of FERC requiring one thing and the PSC requiring maybe something else.

COMMIEBIONER CLARK: See, I don't see it as just an accounting issue. To me, is it appropriately priced on the broker system so you carry out the theory of having the least cost generation being the next generation that's on line.

MR. BALLINGER: That's the second issue, is should there be equality or consistency amongst the four to get that --

COMMISSIONER CLARR: Right.
MR. BALLINGER: -- premise of the broker.
COMMIBIONER CLARK: Right. Well -- okay.
We can't resolve it here.
And I'm somewhat comforted by the fact, Mr. Wieland, that you say we're not talking about a
whole lot of money here.
WITNESS WIELAND: No, we're not.
(BY Mr. Keating) on that note, TECO, Florida Power \& Light and Gulf have provided information in this proceeding that the dollar impact of separating the transmission revenues from broker sales are based on a transmission related separations factor is minimal, $I$ think less than $\$ 3,000$ for a six-month period, for each of these utilities.

You may have covered this in your summary. Could you tell why the dollar impact is larger for Florida Power Corporation?

A I'm sorry. Why the dollar impact is larger?
Q Yes.
A Well, there are two reasons, really. I think the single largest reason is because Florida Power has a substantial amount of wholesale transmission business, but creates the differences that we serve all of the transmission needs of Seminole Electric Cooperative and Florida Municipal Power Association, FMPA, both of which have sizable generation assets of their own.

So we provide their transmission, but we do not provide any production, or at least not all of their production.

And so if you look at the total production system that we have, that's why 95 or more percent of that is dedicated to the retail business. But on the transmission basis, since we serve all of these large transmission customers, it turns out to be that, you know, that they shoulder $25 \%$ of the cost and the retail business is only 75. That is the single largest reason.

The other reason is just the fact that in many cases demand allocators tend to be different from energy allocators. But it's the fact that we have a lot of wholesale transmission business, I would say, is the single largest factor.

Q In Mr. Slusser's prefiled testimony, he discusses $80 / 20$ sharing of gains on economy sales. You've adopted his testimony.

Does that testimony refer to all economy sales, or just those sales made on the Broker Network?

A The testimony and the phrasing "economy" strictly relates to EBN economy sales, those sales that actually flow through the so-called Florida broker sales; and in my understanding is that that is what this entire docket was restricted to.

Q Are there any other types of economy transactions that Florida Power Corporation makes
outside the Energy Broker Network?
A Yes, there are. And, in fact, I think I mentioned earlier that the volume of economy type sales are much larger off broker than they are on broker; and, you know, they're sales that -- we call them economy simply for lack of a better term, I guess, but they are not necessarily hourly sales.

They could be, you know, sales that are made anywhere from an hour to several hours to several days to perhaps a week. So they're of a different nature than the broker sales. But that's by far where the largest volume is. But they are not firm sales that are required to serve somebody else's load, for example. They're still sales that are done because they make sense for the buyer to buy for economic reasons.

Q Are there certain types of these sales that you could identify, or is it sort of a general --

A Well, if you look at the A schedules -- in fact, let me just pull one of those out for a moment. Maybe I can give you some names. (Pause) I'm not sure I have any with me.

But we have sales that are under a tariff called "OS," which is Opportunity Sales, and it's a general tariff that's filed with FERC that basically
says that we'll make sales under, you know, certain ceiling prices. And they're typically -- one of the major differences is that they are not cost based. In other words, the Florida broker is a split-the-savings arrangement between the seller's incremental cost and the buyer's decremental cost.

Most of these sales are just done on the market prices. Whatever a purchaser is willing to buy, that's the price that's agreed on. So the OS opportunity sales tariff is one.

I think there's another that -- whose name escapes me offhand, that falls in that category. But they are not -- whereas the EBN broker are all sold under so-called Schedule $C$, which is the original broker tariff.

Q Are the transmission revenues from these nonbroker economy transactions treated the same as the revenues from the broker transactions?

A No, they're not, because there are actually transmission revenues that are collected for those sales under -- and they are all made under FERC Order 888, the open access -- I mean, the open access tariff that was developed after FERC Order 888 and those revenues are treated like all nonfirm revenues have been treated forever -- for as long as I can
remember. They're all a credit to operating revenues and, you know, the commission has dealt with those revenue credits in the same way for all time, as far as I know.

Q Has FERC required that a transmission charge be unbundled from these types of economy sales?

A Yes.
Q According to FPL's Witness Dubin, and I'm just going to refer to -- I think we moved her deposition into the record -- according to her deposition, FPL credits all revenues in excess of fuel costs for nonbroker economy sales to the capacity clause and separates the revenues based on demand.

Does this differ from your treatment of revenues for nonbroker economy sales in any way?

A Yes, and no. In previous years, up until recently, we have treated those through the fuel clause much like the broker sales. But beginning this year, in basically just thinking about it more, we felt it was more appropriate to flow them through the capacity clause, because they are capacity and demand related sales. So we'll be -- we are planning on treating it the same way FP\&L is treating it beginning with January's filings.

Q Do you have an exact or an approximate
percentage of Florida Power Corporation's total economy sales revenues as compared to economy sales made over the Energy Broker Network? I know you've mentioned that the Broker Network is just a small part of that.

A I don't have an exact number and, of course, it's changed over time; but I would say that the broker sales constitute somewhere in the neighborhood of $10 \%$ or perhaps a little bit more of the total sales. You know, the vast majority of them have been non -- off broker.

Q What is the status of the open access transmission tariff that Power Corporation has filed with FERC?

A My understanding is that it's filed, it's in effect; but I don't know that we've received final approval from the FERC yet.

COMMISSIONER CLARR: I'm a little confused. Is this the one you filed and you settled with the parties and you're just waiting for them to confirm it?

WITNESS WIELAND: No. That, I believe, is -- well, I'm getting into an area that I'm not as familiar as I should be. But I understand that the settlement, I think that's been -- I think it's been
approved. Maybe I can get a -- I'm getting a nod from our transmission expert here. Yes.

The open access tariff is -- also approved.
So I stand corrected.
CONKISEIONER CLARR: OkAY.
2 (By Mr. Keating) Does that tariff include crediting nonfirm transmission revenues in the calculation of firm transmission rates?

A Well, I'm not sure that the tariff per se does that. The tariff, I think, just specifies what is to be charged.

But in going through the rate cases, FERC requires -- and it's part of the FERC language -- they require that nonfirm transmission sales be credited back to transmission revenues; or be credited back to those customers, I guess I should say; but that's a FERC Order 888 requirement rather than a tariff requirement.

COMMIBSIONER CLARR: Well, let me ask you this: When you develop the rates for the firm transmission, do you estimate how much revenue you would get from nonfirm so your rates are adjusted that way?

WITNESS WIELAND: Yes, we do; that's right. In fact, Commissioner, I know we haven't had a rate
case in a long time, but the retail commission does it exactly the same way. When you look our total cost of service, there is a revenue credit for wheeling, as we call it, or nonfirm transmission charges.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Yes.
Q (By Mr. Keating) I'm hoping you can
answer this question for me. At Mr. Slusser's deposition, at which I think you were present at --

A Yes.
Q -- he discussed the actions by Florida Power Corporation and other utilities to make economy sales outside the Energy Broker Network.

Could you briefly describe how these nonbroker sales are arranged between utilities?

A Well, we have a fairly active power marketing department that really is in charge of doing that, and essentially they work much like any other broker operation.

They have computers. They have -- you know, they're constantly in touch. They look at -- you know, they're both in verbal and by computer communication with other companies, not only here in Florida, but outside of Florida, and are constantly buying and selling energy that, you know, falls into that economy transaction.

So, you know, in some instances companies will just call and ask us if they have anything -- if we have anything to sell. In some cases they're -- I don't think I'd call them RFP's, but they're basically, you know, posting prices that people are willing to sell for.

So it's a -- you know, it's a fairly -- it's
a very open market where a lot of communication takes place between all the parties, and the arrangements are just made basically over the phone between brokers. And we do both our buying and selling that way.

Q Do you expect that these types of off-broker economy sales will start to edge out or reduce the sales that are made by Florida Power Corporation on the Broker Network?

A Well, I think they already have. I mean, if you compare -- and, in fact, I've done that out of curiosity -- if you go back a couple years and just look at our A schedules that we filed and, you know, look at broker versus nonbroker sales, it used to be -- even four years ago it used to be $90 \%$ broker and maybe a little piddling of other things; and now it's basically the other way around.

Q Do you expect that trend to continue?

A Yes, although it's -- I mean, I -- you can't really go much beyond 90\% without wiping out broker sales altogether; and I don't think they're going to go away. So we may already have reached a -- you know, sort of a level, a new level.

Q In Florida Power Corporation's response to Staff Interrogatory No. 13, you describe -- I believe it was you that responded to those interrogatories -you describe the necessary changes to the $A$ and $E$ schedules that would be necessary if the commission chose to require the separation of transmission revenues from economy sales based on demand.

A Right.
Q What would be involved in making the administrative changes on these schedules?

A Very little. I mean, it's basically just you're adding a line to a form and --

Q I guess I'll be a little more specific. In terms of time involved, and money involved.

A Time, I would say an hour or less. Money, nothing that $I$ could identify.
kR. REATING: Okay. Thank you. I don't have any more questions for Witness Slusser or --

MR. BURGESS: Commissioner, we just received this -- I mean, we've seen various versions of it, but
this schedule that was presented and discussed in cross-examination by Staff.

May I ask a couple of questions with regard to the schedule?

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Absolutely.
FURTHER EXAMINATION
BY MR. BURGESE:
Q Thank you. As I understand it, Mr. Wieland, from looking at this, that the transmission portion that would be carved out subsequent to 888 would also receive an $80 / 20$ split; is that correct?

A Yes.
0 What's the justification for that?
A Simply because the entire $\$ 5$ has gotten the 80/20 split before, and I don't know that the Commission ever intended to change that.

Q But there was never -- when the Commission decided $80 / 20$ split, they didn't envision that any of that differential was a cost coverage, did they?

A Was a cost coverage?
Q My understanding is that the reason that you need to use $75 \%$ now as opposed to the $95 \%$ is it covers a specific cost, and that is transmission cost.

So what I'm asking is, how then do you justify an 80/20 split on it if it's to cover a
specific cost?
A I'm not really sure I'd say "cover a specific cost". And FERC basically said that you take that same amount of money and you have it put it into two different buckets and give it back to the jurisdictions accordingly.

I mean, the company is not incurring any new costs because of that, and so I don't know that there was -- you know, that anyone has been suggesting that the $80 / 20$ doesn't still apply to the entire amount of money; although, you know, as this exhibit shows when you work through it all, that $20 \%$ that the company was going -- was getting before was more than it is getting now because of the -- just the changes in the arithmetic. But there's been no discussion in this docket that $I$ recall that, you know, said that the $80 / 20$ should only apply to the production piece.

Q I know, but I think it runs -- wouldn't you agree that it runs counter to the same logic that you use for the need to apply the $75 \%$ separation factor because it is now a transmission cost as opposed to a margin or a profit?

A No. I think those are two entirely separate issues. You know, the $80 / 20$ was from day one simply meant to be an incentive to companies to do more of
those kinds of sales. And that was -- I'm not sure how far it goes back, but it's been a long ways.

And, you know, I'm not sure that when that 80/20 was discussed there was any particular worry about, you know, how these things get jurisdictionalized. It was simply meant to be an incentive and something that the commission thought it was the right thing to do at the time. I don't know that this particular FERC order really changes any of that.

MR. BURGEsS: Thank you, Mr. Wieland. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRGAN GARCIA: Okay.
MR. McGEE: No redirect.
MR. REATING: Mr. Chairman, Staff requests that Exhibit No. 5 be moved into the record.

CHAIRKAN GARCIA: There being no objection, 5 is moved into the record.
(Exhibit 5 received in evidence.)
MR. MCGEE: And Florida Power would request that Exhibit 4 be moved in.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Very good. Exhibit 4 is moved in.
(Exhibit 4 received in evidence.)
MR. KBATING: And at this time Staff would
also like to see if we can have marked for identification the exhibit that's in your packet. It's a composite exhibit. It consists of the deposition of William Slusser and Florida Power Corporation's responses to Staff's Third Set of Interrogatories. It's my understanding that we may be able to stipulate this information into the record. UNIDENTIFIED 8PEARER: (Away from
microphone.) We have no --
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: There doesn't appear to be any, so it is stipulated into the record. And do we still give it an exhibit number? Let's go ahead.

KR. REATING: This was Exhibit 6.
CHAIRKAN GARCIA: Exhibit 6.
MR. KEATING: With the name "Composite Exhibit, Deposition of William Slusser and Responses to Staff's Third Set of Interrogatories."
(Exhibit 6 marked for identification and received in evidence.)

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Very good. Well,
Mr. Wieland, I believe you are excused.
(Witness Wieland excused.)
MR. 8TONE: Chairman Garcia, Commissioners,
Ms. Ritenour is taking the stand, and she has previously been sworn.

GUBAN D. RITENOUR
was called as a witness on behalf of Gulf Power Company and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. 8TONE:
Q Would you please state your name for the record?

A My name is Susan Ritenour.
Q And are you the same Susan Ritenour that prefiled direct testimony dated January 27, 1999, in this proceeding?

A Yes.
MR. STONE: For the record, Ms. Ritenour's testimony prefiled on January 27 was a revision to her testimony that had been filed earlier, in October.

Q (BY Mr. stone) If I were to ask you the questions contained in your prefiled direct testimony dated January 27, 1999, would your responses be the same?

A Yes.
MR. stons: We'd ask that her testimony be inserted into the record as though read.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Okay.

Before the Florida Public Service Commission Prepared Direct Testimony of Susan D. Ritenour Docket No. 990001-EI
Transmission Reconsideration Date of Filing: Revised January 27, 1999
Q. Please state your name, business address and occupation.
A. My name is Susan Ritenour. My business address is One Energy Place, Pensacola, Florida 32520-0780. I hold the position of Assistant Secretary and Assistant Treasurer for Gulf Power Company.
Q. Please briefly describe your educational background and business experience.
A. I graduated from wake Forest University in Winston-Salem, North Carolina in 1981 with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Business and from the University of West Florida in 1982 with a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Accounting. I am also a Certified Public Accountant licensed in the State of Florida. I joined Gulf Power Company in 1983 as a Financial Analyst. Prior to assuming my current position, I have held various positions with Gulf including Computer Modeling Analyst, Senior Financial Analyst, and Supervisor of Rate Services.

My responsibilities include supervision of: tariff administration, cost of service activities, calculation of cost recovery factors, the regulatory filing function of the Rates and Regulatory Matters Department, and various treasury activities.
Q. Have you previously filed testimony before this Commission in Docket No. 990001-EI?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?
A. The purpose of my testimony is to discuss the allocation of transmission revenues associated with economy sales transactions between the retail and wholesale jurisdictions.
Q. What is the proper jurisdictional separation factor for allocating transmission revenues between the retail and wholesale jurisdictions?
A. A transmission-related separation factor, based on coincident peak demand, properly allocates transmission revenues between the retail and wholesale jurisdictions. This is consistent with the way in which the transmission-related plant costs and operation and maintenance expenses were allocated in Gulf's last rate
case.
Q. Does Gulf propose to use a demand allocator to calculate the amount of transmission revenues to flow through the fuel clause?
A. No. For administrative simplicity, Gulf proposes to allocate the transmission revenues flowed through the fuel clause based on energy sales adjusted for line losses, as it has been doing for transmission revenues related to economy sales effective January 1997 pursuant to Commission Order No. PSC-98-0073-FOF-EI dated January 13, 1998. For Gulf Power, the energy allocator and the demand allocator are very similar. For 1997, the average energy allocator was 96.61503\%, and for 1998 through August, the average energy allocator was 96.63689\%. In Gulf's last rate case, the transmissionrelated investment and expenses were allocated based on coincident peak demand. For the period January 1997 through August 1998, the corresponding demand allocator was $96.31890 \%$ based on 1995 actual load data. This same allocator was used in the capacity and environmental cost recovery clause filings. For the period January 1997 through August 1998, $\$ 522,868$ of transmission revenues would have been allocated to the retail jurisdiction using the $96.31890 \%$ demand allocator. The
actual revenue flowed through the fuel clause during that 20 -month period based on energy allocators was $\$ 524,260$, or $\$ 1,392$ more than would have been returned to the customer using the demand allocator. Changing the allocation for these transmission revenues would require fairly substantial changes to Gulf's over/under recovery calculation each month, and to the actual "A" schedules filed each month and the final true-up and projection schedules, each filed annually. In summary, due to the immateriality of the difference in the energy and demand allocators for Gulf Power and the administrative costs involved with changing the allocator for the transmission revenues associated with economy sales, Gulf is proposing to continue using the energy allocator to flow these transmission revenues through the fuel clause to its customers.
Q. Ms. Ritenour, does this complete your testimony? A. Yes, it does.

Q (BY Mr. Stone) Ms. Ritenour, please
summarize your testimony.
A The purpose of my testimony in this proceeding is to discuss Gulf's position related to the allocation of transmission revenues related to economy sales between the retail and wholesale jurisdictions.

Based on Gulf's approved cost of service methodology, transmission related investment and expenses are allocated based on coincident peak demand. Similarly, any transmission revenues credited to customers are properly allocated based on demand.

However, in this proceeding for simplicity and administrative efficiency, Gulf is proposing that transmission revenues related to economy sales continue to be credited through the fuel clause based on an energy allocation.

For Gulf Power, the difference between the demand in energy allocators is negligible. Through December, 1998, Gulf has credited a 24-month total of $\$ 576,744$ of transmission revenues to its customers through the fuel clause based on an energy allocator.

If the demand allocator had been used for the same period, $\$ 575,231$ would have been credited to customers, for a difference of $\$ 1,513$, or only $.3 \%$.

Since Gulf's jurisdictional demand allocator is consistently slightly less than the jurisdictional energy allocator, the customers would have received a smaller credit.

Changing the allocation factor for
transmission revenues would require substantial revisions to the actual and projected fuel schedules and related spreadsheets that Gulf uses. Gulf has automated its fuel schedules using macro routines to import and export data between files and to calculate period-to-date amounts. These spreadsheets would have to be reprogrammed and tested if we were to make the changes to allocate transmission revenues based on demand.

It is our position that these
time-consuming, administrative efforts are not necessary for Gulf due to the immateriality of the difference in allocators.

That concludes my summary.
MR. STONE: We tender the witness. CROSS EXAMIMATION

BY MR. BURGESS:
0 So, Ms. Ritenour, the point is that the customers would actually lose by having to pay a higher fuel adjustment charge if this change were made
and it would cost the company a significant amount of money to implement the change?

A That's correct.
Q Do you have any reason -- do you think the companies should be treated consistently on this particular issue?

A In my opinion, not necessarily. I think what works for Gulf is not to make the change, because it's just not material. I don't think that necessarily has to apply to all the companies.

MR. BURGEss: Thank you, Ms. Ritenour.
MS. KAUFMAN: I have no questions.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Mr. Keating. CROS8 EXAMIRATION

BY MR. REATING:
Q Is it correct that Gulf Power does not make economy sales over the Energy Broker Network?

A That's correct.
Q What type of economy sales are your calculations based on?

A I can give you sort of a general answer to that. Mr. Howell is more of an expert in that field. But basically they're sales we make with other utilities based on economics and opportunity at a given point in time.

Q Since the Commission's original order on this matter was issued, how has Gulf been treating the revenues from its economy sales?

A The revenues, the energy related and the transmission revenues associated with economy sales, have been credited through the fuel clause.

We retain $80 \%$-- or we retain $20 \%$ of the profits, the $80 \%$ of the profits being credited through the fuel clause, and all the amounts related to economy, the production and transmission related amounts, have been credited based on the energy allocator.

0 Is this a change from how these revenues were treated prior to the Commission's order?

A No. Well, except for that in the past the transmission revenues were considered to be a base rate item that were reflected in the surveillance report. To that extent, there's a change; but in terms of the allocation of economy sales, no; no change.

0 And is this the same treatment that's used for all of Gulf's economy sales?

A Yes.
0 And Gulf is applying the $20 \%$ stockholder incentive to these same sales?

A Yes.
MR. KEATING: I have no more questions.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Okay. Very good. Do you
want to -- does the company have any --
MR. 8TONE: No redirect.
CHAIRKAN GARCIA: Is there anything that needs to be moved into the record of this witness? No?
(Witness Ritenour excused.)

MR. BTONE: Commissioner Garcia, earlier we had asked to have the late-filed exhibit as a supplement to Exhibit 2, and there was -- I wanted to give the parties an opportunity to review that.

CHAIRYAN GARCIA: Ms. Kaufman?
ms. RAUFMAN: We have no objection,
Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRKAN GARCIA: Very good. So we'll move this as an addendum to Exhibit 2.

MR. REATING: Correct. That would be fine. And there's one other thing, and I'm not sure on this one if we could stipulate this into the record. This is the last exhibit that's in your packet, which consists of the deposition of Ms. Ritenour taken earlier in this proceeding.

CHAIRKAN GARCIA: This is Ms. Ritenour's deposition.

MR. REATING: Correct.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: And is there an objection to moving it in?

MR. sTONE: Commissioner, we have no objection on Gulf Power's part, but we had provided a copy to all the parties, the errata sheets to both Ms. Ritenour's deposition -- which I assume they're going to ask for Exhibit No. 7 -- and also the errata sheets to Mr. Howell's deposition, which was Exhibit No. 2, and we would ask that that also be inserted into the record.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Is that all right with everyone?

MR. KEATING: So if we could have Ms. Ritenour's deposition marked as, I believe, Exhibit 7?

CHAIRGAN GARCIA: 7, yes.
MR. KEATING: Yes, Exhibit 7.
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Very good, and you'll give it a short title.

MR. KEATING: Deposition of
Susan D. Ritenour.
(Exhibit 7 marked for identification.)

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: And we will take this errata sheet, since it includes two persons, and we'll just give it another number. That would be Exhibit No. 8, and we will give it the short title "Errata Sheet, Ms. Ritenour and Mr. Howell," okay?
(Exhibit 8 marked for identification.)
MR. STONE: And I would move Exhibit 8 into the record.

CHAIRKAN GARCIA: Okay. And Exhibit 8 is moved into the record as well as Exhibit 7.
(Exhibits 7 and 8 received in evidence.)
CHAIRMAN GARCIA: Mr. Keating, maybe you might want to give the parties a date; dates.

MR. KEATING: Yes. I believe we currently have scheduled for briefs to be filed on March 4th.

CHAIRMAN GARCIA: All right. Well, then, there you have it. This hearing is adjourned.

Thank you very much.
(Thereupon, the hearing concluded at 11:25 a.m.)
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| 31/15, 31/17, 31/20, 73/3, 73/15 computer 67/21 | 14/20, 25/25, 2661, 26/24, 26/25, 27/2, 64/10, 6/411, 67/7, 73/4, 73/16, 83/24, 84/2, 84/9, 84/11, 84/17, 84/23 |  |
| computers 67/19 | Deputy $2 / 21$, |  |
| Concluded 1/17, 85/19 | describe 67/13, 69/7, 69/9 |  |


| F | 79/20, 80/8, 80/17, 81/8, 81/16, 82/2, 82/24, 84/7 Gulf's 14/3, 14/11, 79/4, 79/8, 80/1, $82 / 22$ | language 56/1, 66/13 large 41/15, 45/5, 61/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| fact $41 / 11,49 / 10,35 / 14,56 / 5,59 / 24,61 / 9,61 / 11$, 62/2, 62/20, 66/25, 68/18 <br> factor $1 / 8,6 / 10,51 / 20,53 / 11,60 / 8,61 / 13,71 / 20$, $\square$ |  | larger 60/11, 60/13, 62/4 <br> largent 60/16, 61/8, 61/13, 62/12 <br> late-filed 25/25, 26/23, 27/1, 83/12 |
| 80/5 <br> factors $42 / 14$ | hand 29/3 | Laughter 27/23, 28/2 |
|  | handed 9/9, $25 / 24$ | law $6 / 16,6 / 21,7 / 5$ |
| fails $63 / 12,67 / 24$ | handle 40/11 | learn $47 / 23$ |
|  | higher 54/21, 54/23, $80 / 25$ | leaving 29/7 |
| February 1/16, 86/11 | highlight 39/9 | Leval 3/3 |
|  | hintery 48/13 | LEON 86/2 |
| $50 / 23,51 / 3,51 / 4,52 / 19,52 / 21,54 / 5,54 / 18,55 / 2$, $55 / 25,56 / 7,56 / 13,57 / 1,57 / 3,57 / 10,59 / 10,62 / 25$, | hometily $56 / 5$ | level 27/18, $69 / 5$ |
|  | bour 47/4, 62/9, 69/20 | Light 2/20, 6/25, 9/14, $60 / 4$ |
| $63 / 21,63 / 23,64 / 5,65 / 14,65 / 17,66 / 12,66 / 13,66 / 17$, 71/3, 72/9 | hoar-by 47/4 | Light's 9/16 |
| field $81 / 22$ Fifth 25/7, 25/16 | hour-by-hour $46 / 20$ hourly $62 / 7$ | Lines 29/20, 29/24 ${ }^{\text {L }}$ |
| file $\mathbf{5 8 / 7}$ <br> filed $7 / 14,62 / 25,65 / 13,65 / 15,65 / 19,68 / 20,74 / 16$, 85/15 | hours 62/9 | listed 9/13, 50/2, 52/13 |
|  | HOWELL $4 / 6,5 / 5,5 / 16,14 / 3,14 / 21$ hypothetical 49/23 | little $39 / 8,48 / 5,54 / 10,54 / 13,65 / 9,65 / 18,68 / 23$, 69/16, 69/18 |
| files 80/10 |  | load 62/13 |
|  | 1 | long-standing 39/12 |
| filings 64/24 | ID 3/2 | long-term 47/3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { find } 9 / 21,42 / 1,49 / 25 \\ & \text { fine } 83 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | Identification 10/7, 10/19, 1/25, 25/20, 31/14, 32/1, |  |
| finishFIPUG23/92/16 | 50/14, 732, $73118,81 / 25,85 / 6$ ldentified $25 / 23$ | M |
|  | identify 6218, 69/21 | macro 809 |
| Five 43/13, 43/14, 53/14, $54 / 17$ | anteriaity | Madien 2/22 |
| fix $42 / 13$ | mplement $\mathbf{8 1 / 2}$ | major 43/21, 63/3 |
| F1 5/11 | mpert 80/10 | majority 4914, 65/10 |
| FLORIDA $1 / 1,1 / 20,2 / 3,2 / 4,2 / 7,2 / 10,2 / 14,2 / 15$, | imposed 46/10 | manager 3017 |
| 2/19, $2 / 23,2 / 24,3 / 2,3 / 4,6 / 19,6 / 25,7 / 3,7 / 14,9 / 13$, | mincentive $1 / 5,6 / 10,52 / 7,54 / 4,54 / 8,71 / 25,72 / 7$, | mandate $54 / 18$ |
| 4/4/5, 4/112, 4/19, 49/22, $50 / 10,50 / 22,52 / 6,52 / 18$, | 82/25 $63 / 5$ | margin 53/9, 71/22 |
| 55/1, 55/24, 57/12, $60 / 4,60 / 12,60 / 16,60 / 20,61 / 21$, | meurring 71/7 | marked 10/6, 10/19, 14/25, $25 / 20,31 / 14,32 / 1,50 / 8$, |
| 61/25, 63/4, 65/1, $67 / 10,67 / 23,68 / 15,63 / 6,72 / 20$, | mdulge 39/8 | 50/14, 73/1, 73/18, $94 / 17,84 / 25,85 / 6$ |
| 73/4, $86 / 1,86 / 3$ flow $42 / 2,42 / 18,61 / 21$, | Induatrial 2/15, 7/5 | market $638,68 / 8$ marketing $67 / 16$ |
| flow-through 42/23 |  | material 27/13, 44/1, 4/4, 44/24, 81/9 |
| flowed 40/16, 40/22, 41/5, 41/25 | inquire 810 | Matter 1/5, 877, 8/18, 27/11, 28/5, 82/2 |
| flowing 39/12 | Inserted 4/5, 4/7, 4/15, 31/10, 74/23, 84/13 | matters 7/10, 7/12, 279, $28 / 19$ |
| flows 54/2 | insertion 86/9 | MATTHEW 2/17, 6/24 |
| focusing 53/20 | intent $42 / 9$ | MeGEE 2/2, 6/19 |
| follows 30/8, $74 / 4$ | interexchange 46/24 | MeGlothlin $2 / 13$ |
| form 69/17 | Interregatories $3 / 4,5 / 6,5 / 8,5 / 14,9 / 17,10 / 16$, | McMullen 2/9, 6/22 |
| formal 56/2, 57/6 | 14/12, 14/22, 25/8, 25/17, 4/17, 69/8, 73/6, 73/17 | McWhirter $2 / 12,7 / 5$ |
| forum $58 / 2,59 / 3$ | Interrogatory $69 / 7$ | mention $29 / 17$ |
| four 43/21, 44/8, $55 / 16,55 / 17,59 / 19,68 / 22$fourth $14 / 8$ | fnvestor-owned 43/25 | mentioned 59/7, 62/3, 65/4 |
|  | IOUs $43 / 21$ | method 49/23 |
|  | lesue 39/5, 40/9, 40/10, 41/3, 441, 48/4, 4/24, | methodology 5017, 79/9 |
|  | 44/25, 45/2, 45/6, 48/22, 57/25, 59/9, 59/13, 59/17, 81/6 | microphone 7399 |
|  | lisued 6/7, 8/8, $82 / 2$ | mike 6/13, $6 / 14$ |
|  | lisues 42/12, 56/7, 571, 58/12, 71/24 | minmal $60 / 8$ minutes 43/13, 43/14, 43/16, 48/3, 49/3 |
| framework 47/11 | Item $43 / 20,82 / 17$ ftem $8 / 19$ | minutes 43/13, 43/14, 43/16, 48/3, 49/3 |
| front 49/24, 56/13 | IV 312 | mired 45/3 |
| fronts 4/2 |  | moment 62/20 |
| Fuel $1 / 6,6 / 9,39 / 14,41 / 1,42 / 25,43 / 2,44 / 13,51 / 23$, 55/19, 64/11, 64/17, 79/16, 79/22, 80/7, 80/9, 20/25, $82 / 6,82 / 9$ |  | $71 / 11,81 / 2$ |
| functions 58/20 | ```JAMES 2/2, 2/9 January 6/7, 8/8, 74/11, 74/15, 74/19 January's 64/24 JEFTRREY 2/5, 6/16 Jim 6/19, 6/21 JOE 1/13 JOHNSON 1/14, 6/13 JULIA 1/14 Juriadiction 39/24, 39/25, 51/9, 54/12, 54/19, 54/21 juriedictional \(41 / 4,41 / 7,32 / 5,53 / 7,80 / 1,80 / 2\) jurledictionalive 53/3 jurisdictionalived 51/8, 72/6 Jurledictions 51/19, 71/6, 79/7 fustification 70/13 Justify 70/25``` | Monroe 2/18 <br> merning 49/19, 49/20 |
| G |  | move 14/2, 29/13, $33 / 18,85 / 7$ moved $2 / 21,8825,97,1414,26 / 25,6419,72 / 16$, |
| gain 39/19, 39/21, 40/5, 51/2gains $39 / 13,41 / 25,61 / 15$ |  | 72/18, 72/21, 72/23, 83/7, 85/10 moving $84 / 3$ |
|  |  | MR. BALLINGER 59/1, 59/6, 59/17, 59/21 |
| $9 / 1,9 / 4,9 / 6,9 / 20,9 / 23,10 / 1,10 / 4,10 / 8,10 / 10$, 1017 , 14/5, $14113,1417,14123,25 / 10,2412,25 / 19$, |  | MR. BEASLEY 6/21, 27/22 |
|  |  | Mr. Burgews 4/11, 4/13, 4/16, 7/1, 29/18, 43/12, 43/14, 43/18, 45/7, 69/24, 70/7, 72/11, 80/22, 81/11 |
| $26 / 5,26 / 8,26 / 11,26 / 15,26 / 19,27 / 3,27 / 17,27 / 24$, |  | Mr. Chairman $31 / 9,72 / 12,72115,83 / 17$, 81/11 |
| 28/1, 28/7, 28/11, 28/16, 28/18, 28/24, 29/5, 29/22, |  | Mr. CHILDS $6 / 24,8110,8 / 13,27 / 11,27 / 21$ |
| 30/2, 31/12, 31/16, 31/20, 31/25, 43/5, 43/7, 43/13, |  | Mr. Dubin's $9 / 7,9 / 24,1011$ |
| $49 / 8,49 / 13,50 / 5,50 / 9,50 / 13,70 / 5,72 / 13,72 / 17 \text {, }$ |  | Mr. Howell 14/11, 81/22, 85/3 |
| 72/22, 73/10, 73/14, 73/20, 73/23, 74/24, 81/13, 83/3, |  | Mr. Howell's 14/6, 26/23, 84/11 |
| $83 / 6,83 / 11,83 / 15,83 / 18,84 / 1,84 / 4,84 / 14,84 / 19$, $84 / 21,85 / 1,85 / 9,85 / 12,85 / 16$ |  | $8 / 12,8 / 14,8 / 17,9 / 3,9 / 5,9 / 9,9 / 20,9 / 22,9 / 25,10 / 3$, $10 / 6,109,10 / 13,141,1410,1416,14 / 19,25 / 1$ |
| generating $1 / 7,6 / 10$ <br> generation 48/9, 59/15, 59/16, 60/22 | KARL 4/9, 30/5, 30/13, 50/3 KAUFMAN 2/12, 2/13, 7/4 KEATING 3/2, 7/7 KOREL 4/4, 10/14 | 25/15, 26/22, 27/7, 27/8, 27/24, 28/3, 28/9, 28/15, 29/17, 31/17, 31/19, 31/23, 31/24, 48/2, 49/2, 49/6, 49/14, 49/16, 49/18, $50 / 1,50 / 7,50 / 10,50 / 15,52 / 9$, 58/22, 58/24, $60 / 3,66 / 6,67 / 6,69 / 22,72 / 15,72 / 25$, 73/13, 73/15, 81/13, 81/15, 83/2, 83/20, 84/3, 84/16, |
| Group 2/16, 7/6 | $\underline{1}$ | 84/20, 84/23, 85/12, 85/14 <br> Mr. McGee 4/10, 6/19, 7/21, 28/22, 29/16, 29/23, |
| guess 8/17, 14/14, 27/20, 31/21, 4/2, 52/1, 62/7, <br> 66/16, 69/18 <br> Gulf $2 / 8,6 / 17,26 / 11,56 / 4,60 / 4,74 / 2,79 / 14,79 / 18$, | lack 62/6 <br> Lane 2/5,6/17 | 29/24, 30/10, 31/9, 31/13, 39/1, 43/5, 43/6, 72/14, 72/20 <br> Mr. Ritenour 29/1 <br> Mr. Slumer 31/2, 31/22 |
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IT IS STIPULATED that this deposition was taken pursuant to notice in accordance with the applicable Florida Rules of Civil Procedure; that objections, except as to the form of the question, are reserved until hearing in this cause; and that reading and signing was not waived.

IT IS ALSO STIPULATED that any
off-the-record conversations are with the consent of the deponent.

KOREL M. DUBIN
appeared as a witness and, after being duly sworn by the court reporter, testified as follows:

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. KEATING:
Q Good afternoon, Ms. Dubin. I'm Cochran Keating representing the Commission Staff. I just have a few questions for you.

First, looking at Page 2, Line 22 of your testimony, you used the term "economic tractions". I'm interested in finding out exactly how you define economy transactions as it's used in the testimony.

A Economy tractions for FPL are economy -they'd be broker transactions, and for FPL they're Schedule C.

Q So you're referring to only broker transactions?

A Yes.
0 Do you expect economy sales over the broker network in the future to remain the same, or possibly increase or decrease?

A We had a decrease in -- last year in economy sales, but we expect it to go up to about the same level it was in '97. Our fuel adjustment projections for '99 indicate that.

Q And that's for Florida Power \& Light?
A Yes.
$\mathbf{Q} \quad$ What was the 197 level?

A '97 level -- I'm just talking about the transmission service part of it -- was roughly a million dollars in '97 and the -- maybe like a million, two, a million, three; and in 1998 the transmission service was a little over $\$ 500,000$.

0 So you expected 199 to be --
A To be about a million --
Q - to be about the 197 level?

A Right.
2 Okay. Do you have any expectations about the level of economy sales over the broker network, for the entire broker network, whether those would remain about the same in the future, or decline or increase?

A Not -- only with what I mentioned about our projections for '99.

0 What types of economy sales, or what types of sales do you believe the Commission-approved $20 \%$ stockholder incentive applies to?

A Economy transactions Schedule $C$ and Schedule X, which is something that's done very infrequently, but it's also like a Schedule $C$; it's
just extended a little bit.
0 Do you have any Schedule C or X transactions that are not made over the broker network?

A No.
Q How does Florida Power \& Light treat revenues from nonbrokers' economy transactions currently?

A If you're referring to schedules like $O S$, opportunity sales, $A$, which would be emergency, or $B$, short-term, all of those are -- the energy portion is run through the fuel adjustment clause, and anything above that is run through the capacity clause.

Q On those types of sales are there any transmission charges, and if there are, how would those revenues be treated?

A Those revenues are treated as a credit to the capacity clause. They're reflected on the Schedule A6, and the fuel portion is credited back through fuel on the -- the transmission and capacity portion are credited to the capacity clause.

0 If the Commission ordered to separate transmission revenues from economy sales made over the broker network based on demand, what would be involved for Florida Power \& Light to implement that change?

A We would have to redo some of the computer
information for the A schedules, for Schedule A and Schedule A2.

Q Do you know about what sort of -- could you give an estimate --

A Yeah, the --
Q -- on the costs or time that would be involved?

A It would probably take somebody a good week to reprogram all the macros so that -- and test it out.

2 Would that be one person; say, you know, a full week for one person? I was just trying to get. a better idea.

A Yeah. Maybe two. Maybe one person doing it and one person checking it, but it would take probably a full 40 hours, say.

Q What is the status of the open access transmission tariff that Florida Power \& Light has filed with FERC?

A We have a settlement agreement. We filed a tariff on December 11th, and this month we got a -there's no opposition to the settlement agreement, and we got what's called Staff's initial comments supporting the settlement. So FERC Staff is supporting it.

Q Does the tariff include crediting of nonfirm transmission revenues in the calculation of firm transmission rates?

A (Pause) Yes. It's calculated in -- with the formula rates.

2 In response to Staff's Interrogatory No. 14 -- do you have that with you?

A Uh-huh.
Q The demand separation factor is greater than the energy separation factor in 1993, and for the next five years the demand factor is less than the energy factor.

Is there anything -- let's see how I can ask this. Was there anything different about 1993 than the next five years that would cause that?

A Yes. The energy separation factors and demand separation factors are based on the prior year's data, the prior year's sales, prior year's demand. So '93 is actually based on 1992. Hurricane Andrew was in 1992, which could definitely skew these figures.

Q How would that change the figures? How would the hurricane impact the figures?

A The demand is great and energy is a little bit lower than what it would have been. And basically
during the hurricane, what we ended up losing was a lot of our retail load; and that's why you see that.

Q Okay. I think that clears it up more for me.

Have you performed any calculations that would show the difference in the revenue credit to ratepayers if the transmission revenues from broker economy sales are separated based on demand rather than energy?

A Well, based on what we have for 1998, it was a little over $\$ 500,000$. And the difference -- and you can see that in the interrogatory. The difference between the demand and energy separation factors is half a percent. So it's not quite $\$ 3,000$ in that year.

8 I want to go back to one of my previous questions to follow up on one of the responses that you gave.

MR. KEATING: And, actually, do you all mind if we go off the record for a minute?

MR. CHILDS: Okay.
(Off-the-record discussion.)
Q (BY Mr. Keating) Okay. Back the record.
A few questions about the Schedule OS transactions. For those transactions, is a separate
transmission exponent identified?
A No.
2 And how are the revenues from those transactions treated?

A The total revenues for the transaction -for OS transactions are credited back through the fuel adjustment clause and the capacity cost-recovery clause.

The energy portion of it are credited back through the fuel adjustment clause, and the revenues -- the remainder of the -- balance of the transaction, those revenues are credited back to the capacity clause.

Q And Schedule oS transactions, are those hourly transactions?

A Yes.
Q And how are they priced?
A They're market based.
Q And were those transactions offered prior to FERC Order 888?

A Yes.
Q Have there been any significant changes in the settlement agreement that we referred to earlier at FERC?

A No.

Q And just to clarify my question, have there been any significant changes since the first hearing on this subject?

A Before the Commission?
$0 \quad$ Yes.
A No. Let me make sure $I$ understand the question. The Commission that you're talking about is the --

Q The Public Service Commission.
A The Public Service Commission. The answer is no.

9 All right. What is the difference between the amount of broker and OS transactions that Florida Power \& Light has?

A I can't tell you the exact difference here, but that we have more OS transactions than Schedule $C$.

MR. KEATING: I don't think I have any other questions for you.

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. BURGESS:
2 I'm Steve Burgess with the Public Counsel's Office. I know you just answered that you don't know exactly the difference, but I took it from an earlier answer that there was a fairly close proximity in the amount of broker sales that you have versus OS sales.

Did I understand that correctly?
In other words, is there an overwhelming majority of these economy sales that's one or the other category, or just OS?

A OS.
2 And it's a significantly greater --
A That I'd have to Check, but I believe so.
Q Now, I'm trying to understand this economy. And as you've been told off the record, there seems to be a little bit of a difference in understanding as to what that term means. It's not actually defined anywhere by order.

But you consider economy to be your broker sales, which is $C$ or $X$--

A Yes.
9 -- and OS sales. Or am I incorrect?
A Incorrect. Economy sales, broker economy sales, would be Schedule $C$ and Schedule $X$. $O$ is not on the broker.
$9 \quad$ No. You said broker economy sales. I'm saying your use of the term "economy sales". without any other qualification --

A That would be --
Q -- do you consider oS sales to be economy sales?

A I would call them interchange sales.
9 So you would equate economy sales with broker sales? You wouldn't use the two separately?

A Right. Correct.
Q And the treatment that you have for the os sales, you credit it through either the capacity or the fuel clause?

A Not either; both.
9 Both; yes. And that means that all of it has a true-up factor and immediate impact?

A Yes.
Q Does Florida Power \& Light apply an 80/20 split to the OS sales?

A No.
Q So it's your understanding that the $80 / 20$ factor was to be applied only to the broker sales?

A Yes. Well, only to Schedule $C$ and $X$.
Q Do you apply a jurisdictional separation factor to -- does Florida Power \& Light apply jurisdictional separation factor to oS sales?

A They get totaled into all of the fuel adjustment dollars and separated on energy, with the exclusion of the portion that would run through the capacity clause; and that portion of it would be separated on demand.

0 Has that always been the case? Has Florida Power \& Light always jurisdictionally separated both OS and its broker sales?

A As far as $I$ can remember, yes.
MR. BURGESS: Thank you. (Pause) Oh. I'm sorry. One other question.

Q (By Mr. Burgess) One of the things that you were answering is about the os sales with regard to FERC Order 888.

Will there be post-FERC Order 888 OS arrangements that you will have to consider whether a transmission factor needs to be segregated?

A I think there's a -- I think there's a tracking of the transmission, but I'm not exactly sure; but there is a way to identify that.

Q Well, my question is, what is going to be your treatment, what is going to be Florida Power \& Light's treatment, with regard to separating that? I mean, at this point what are you anticipating?

How do you anticipate effecting FERC Order 888 on OS sales with regard to the separate transmission charge?

A (Pause) There's a -- it's being credited back -- and I'm just trying to --

Q Well, may I hold that question, and just ask this question?

Do you consider FERC Order 888 to affect OS sales, to be placing this requirement that a transmission variable be singled out; do you consider that to affect your OS sales?

A Yes.
Q Well, then will you treat it in the same fashion that you would treat your broker sales?

A Treat it in the same fashion in that there's a separate component for transmission, yes. (Pause) And that transmission component would still be treated the same way it is now. It would be revenue credited and -- through the capacity clause and allocated on demand.

MR. BURGESS: Okay. Thank you very much.
(Deposition concluded at 1:40 p.m.)
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IN RE: Fuel and purchased power , cost recovery clause and generating performance incentive )

DOCKET NO. 990001-EI
DATE: JANUARY 12, 1999

FLORIDA POWER \& LIGHT COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO STAFF'S THIRD SET OF INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 7-14) TRANSMISSION RECONSIDERATION

Florida Power \& Light Company ("FPL") hereby provides this its Response to Staff's Second Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 7-14).
7. For the purpose of answering the following two interrogatories, assume that the Commission orders transmission revenues received in conjunction with economy EBN transactions to be allocated based upon the jurisdictional factor for transmission services:
a) indicate how the Commission should amend its Schedule A1 through Schedule A9 to show the impact of its order; and
b) indicate how the Comission should amend its Schedule E1 through Schedule E10 to show the impact of its order.
A. (a) On Schedule A1 and A2, the Transmission Revenues would first need to be subtracted from the "Total Fuel and Net Power Transactions," then the Transmission Revenues would need to be multiplied by the jurisdictional factor for transmission services and the result added back to the "Total Jurisdictional Fuel Cost."
(b) No change would be needed for the E Schedules since FPL does not forecast these revenues.
8. Could Florida Power \& Light Company's retail jurisdictional separation factor for transmission services be greater than its retail jurisdictional factor for generation service? If so, provide an example.
A. No. The retail jurisdictional separation factors for generation service and transmission service are both calculated based on demand (12 CP).
9. Please explain and show in detail how the energy separation factor discussed on page 3, lines 8 through 11 , of witness Dubin's testimony was calculated, including the source of the kWh used and the period covered.
A. Attachment 1, Interrogatory No. 9 is a page from FPL's Fuel Cost Recovery filing of October 5, 1998, Appendix II, page 9A to testimony of K. M. Dubin. The kWh used are 1997 actual. The energy separation factor is calculated as follows:

Total Retail Energy (Column 4, Line 81) $=\underline{85,257,282}$
Total Company Energy (Column 4, Line 85) $=86,503,205$

Therefore:
$85,257,282 \div 86,503,205=98.56 \%$ Energy Separation Factor
10. Please explain and show in detail how the demand separation factor discussed on page 3, lines 13 through 16 , of witness Dubin's testimony was calculated, including the source and derivation of the 12 CP demands used, and the period covered.
A. Attachment 1, Interrogatory No. 10 provides the information used to prepare FPL's Capacity Cost Recovery filing. The 12 CP demand used is actual 12 CP demand for 1997. The demand separation factor is calculated as follows:

Total Retail 12 CP Demand (Column 4, Line 79) $=14,461,314$
Total Company 12 CP Demand (Column 4, Line 83) $=14,748,556$

Therefore:
$14,461,314 \div 14,748,556=98.05 \%$ Demand Separation Factor
11. Please clarify the statement contained on page 2, lines 6 through 12, of witness Dubin's testimony which indicates that FERC will "require that revenue from non-firm transmission services, subject to FERC jurisdiction be reflected as a revenue credit in the derivation of firm transmission service rates."
A. FERC has required utilities to reflect revenue from nonfirm transmission services as a revenue credit in the derivation of firm transmission service rates. On pages 303 and 304 of Order No. 888, FERC states:
"In addition, revenue from non-firm services should continue to be reflected as a revenue credit in the derivation of firm transmission tariff rates. The combination of allocating costs to firm point-to-point service and the use of a revenue credit for non-firm service will satisfy the requirements of a conforming rate proposal enunciated in our Transmission Pricing Policy Statement."
12. Page 2, lines 12 through 17, of witness Dubin's testimony states that: "FERC accepted transmission rates that reflected a credit to the transmission cost of service for non-firm transmission services provided to others." Is it your opinion that the concept of FERC "accepting" a filing, is the same as FERC mandating a particular treatment?
A. No. The information was cited to show similar treatment by FERC under similar circumstances.
13. Does the FERC define "off-system" sales in the case cited in witness Dubin's testimony on page 2 , lines 15 through 17, as all off-system sales or only contract sales (as opposed to asavailable sales)? Please provide supporting documentation, if available.
A. Although we have found no specific definition in that case, FERC Order No. 888A (Order on Rehearing), issued on March 4, 1997, defines off-system sales transactions as sales other than those to serve the transmission provider's native load or a network customer's load.
14. Beginning on page 2, line 23, of witness Dubin's testimony, it is stated that: "Although it may be appropriate to use a demand separator, FPL's current energy separation factor and demand separation factor produce virtually the same results." Does this relationship hold historically? please provide documentation that supports the response to this interrogatory.
A. Yes. Attachment 1, Interrogatory No. 14 provides the documentation for the Energy and Demand Separation factor over the five-year period, from 1993 through 1997. The factors have been summarized in the table below and the table also includes separation factors for 1998.

| YEAR | ENERGY SEPARATION | DEMAND | DIFFERENCE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 1993 | FACTOR | SEPARATION FACTOR |  |
| 1994 | $97.90 \%$ | $98.60 \%$ | $-0.70 \%$ |
| 1995 | $98.70 \%$ | $97.88 \%$ | $0.82 \%$ |
| 1996 | $98.24 \%$ | $97.26 \%$ | $0.98 \%$ |
| 1997 | $98.22 \%$ | $97.33 \%$ | $0.89 \%$ |
| 1998 | $98.38 \%$ | $97.20 \%$ | $1.18 \%$ |
|  | $98.56 \%$ | $98.05 \%$ | $0.51 \%$ |

## AFFIDAVIT

## STATE OF FLORIDA ) <br> COUNTY OF DALE )

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, personally appeared Korel M. Dubin, who being first duly swot deposes and says:

That she occupies the position of Principal Rate Analyst, in the Rates and Tariff Department of Florida Power \& Light Company, 9250 W. Flagler Street, Miami, Florida and is the person who is sponsoring the answer to Staff's Third Set of Interrogatories No. 7 through 14, Docket No. 990001-El, and further says that said answers are true and correct to the best of her knowledge and belief.


I hereby certify that on this $\qquad$ day of JAnUARY . 1999, before me, an officer duly authorized in the State and County aforesaid to take acknowledgments, personally appeared Korel M . Dubin who is personally known to me, and she acknowledged before me that she executed this certification of signature as her free act and deed who did not take an oath.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and seal in the State and County aforesaid as of this $\qquad$ day of 1999.
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Florida Power \& Light Company Docket No. 990001-EI
Staffs Thind Set of Interrogatorie Attachment No. 1
Interrogatory No. 14
Page 1 of 11
Energy at Generation
Year used Total FPSC Total Company Energy Separation Factor

1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998

71,558,900
74,787,182
78,606,955
$82,160,147$
82,980,307
85,257,282

73,097,140
98.70\%

80,016,277 98.24\%
83,646,376 98.22\%
84,344,000 98.38\%
86,503,205 98.56\%


Fiorida Power \& Light Company
1993 Actual Energy Lomes by Rate Class

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Line } \\ & \text { No } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ryte } \\ & \text { Cless } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MWH } \\ & \text { Siler } \end{aligned}$ | Expension Futan | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Energy } \\ \text { nan } \\ \text { Genernion } \end{array}$ | Delivered Efficieny | Losses | Fwad <br> Cor <br> Recovery <br> Mniniplier |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | RS-1 Sex | 36,320850 | 1.072553616 | 32961.836 | 0.932257 | 2,688986 | 8.00210 |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | GS-1 Ser | 4.512.421 | 1.072553616 | 4.840.264 | 0.932257 | 327.84 | 1.00210 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Gsod-1 Pri | 4836 | 1.049677128 | 50,790 | 0.952674 | 2404 |  |
| 6 | GSbli Sex | 16.36185 | 1.072553616 | 17.443.333 | 0.532367 | 1.181.482 |  |
| 7 | Sabrex CSD-1 | 16319.237 | 1.07284848 | 17,494,123 | 0.932327 | L113886 | 1.00204 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | OS-2 Pri | 20.067 | 1.0496772* | 21.063 | 0.952674 | 997 | 0.54063 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Gstobl Pri | 366391 | 1.049677128 | 3 3-593 | 0.952674 | 18.301 |  |
| 12 | Gstold Sex | 6209.055 | 1.072653616 | 6.745.978 | 0.952267 | 456.923 |  |
| 13 | Subue CstD-1 | 4.85597 | 1.07131872 | 7,130,570 | 0.533368 | 475.124 | 1.00092 |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | CS-1 Pri | 24.78 | 1.04\%677tz | 20.95s | $0 \cdot 59074$ | 1,581 |  |
| 16 | CS-1 Ser | 250,75 | $1.07 \times 5516$ | 2012.s95 | 0.337287 | 1*,290 |  |
| 17 | Sateres-1 | 27439 | 1.07666390 | 23,550 | 0.534000 | 19401 | 1.00024 |
| 1s |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | Subre Csidi $/$ CSI | 69\%3\% | 1.071360016 | 7,204,51 | 0538393 | 4805 | 100059 |
| 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | GSED-2 Pri | 514993 | 1.049677128 | 540,576 | 0.952674 | 25.93 |  |
| 22 | CstD-2 Sec | 1.042 .016 | 1.072653616 | 1,117,72 | 0.932267 | 75,706 |  |
| 23 | SumembT-2 | 1.357.008 | 1.06505396 | 1,654731 | 0.9379720 | 10L,200 | 0.93500 |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | $\mathrm{CS}-2 \mathrm{Pri}$ | 52380 | 1.049677128 | 61.490 | 0.552674 | 2910 |  |
| 26 | $\mathrm{CS}-2 \mathrm{Sec}$ | 168483 | 1.073553616 | 180.724 | 0.932257 | 12211 |  |
| 27 | Salver CST-2 | 237063 | 1.06672593 | $2 \times 2214$ | 0.937468 | 15.151 | 0.99636 |
| 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | $\operatorname{sen}$ cosed $/ \operatorname{css}^{2}$ | 1.734.072 | 1.06536735 | 1.900,512 | 0.938732 | 116.441 | 0.97320 |
| 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 31 | Gsib-3 7m | 873,316 | 1.003561922 | 858.250 | 0.972031 | 24.94 | 0.96091 |
| 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33 | CS-3 Tm | $11^{\circ}$ | 1.028361927 | 11 | 0.97231 | 0 | 0.56091 |
| 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35 | Sabex GSLD3/CS3 | 873.327 | 1.028361972 | 898.271 | 0.97231 | 24,941 | 0.96091 |
| 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | ISST-1 Sec | 2000 | 1.072653616 | 2145 | 0.932867 | 145 | 1.00210 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39 | SST-3 Pri | 13.101 | 1.069677128 | 13.752 | 0.952674 | 651 |  |
| 40 | SST-1 Sec | 12912 | 1.072653616 | 13.850 | 0.932267 | 938 |  |
| 41 | SST-1 (D) | 28.013 | 1.061081741 | 27,602 | 0.942434 | 1.559 | 09912 |
| 42 |  |  |  |  |  |  | . |
| 43 | SST-1 Trn | 74.852 | 1.028561922 | 76.990 | 0.97201 | 2138 | 0.96091 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45 | CILCDPi | 302069 | 1.049677128 | 317,075 | 0.953674 | 15,006 | , |
| 46 | CHCD Ser | 1.130.657 | 1.072553616 | 1.212804 | 0.932267 | 82.146 |  |
| 47 | CICD | 1.432726 | 1.067509371 | 1,529.878 | 0.936497 | 97.152 | 0.97757 |
| 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 49 | CIICGSex | 53.459 | 1.072553616 | 57.343 | 0.932257 | 3.884 | 1.00210 |
| 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $5!$ | Subex CILCD /CTLC ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 1.486.185 | $1.067 \% 8620$ | 1.587 .281 | 0.936344 | 101.036 | 0.99774 |
| 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| . 33 | CLCTTm | 964.604 | 1.028361922 | 992.155 | 0.972731 | 27.551 | 0.96091 |
| 54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55 | ISST-D \& CLICD | 1.434,726 | 1.06716124 | 1,532,023 | 0.936491 | 97,288 | 0.99758 |
| 56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 57 | MET Pri | 78.724 | 1.049677128 | - 82.635 | $0.952 \times 74$ | 3.911 | 0.98063 |
| 58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 59 | OS-2 GSTD2 CSS \& MES | 1.882,863 | 1.051648791 | 2006,21! | 0.939453 | 121,348 | 0.99443 |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 61 | OLI Soc | 95.52 | 1.07353616 | 102.173 | 0.932267 | 6.980 | 1.00210 |
| 62 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63 | St-1 Sec | 200381 | 1.072653616 | 311.371 | 0.932067 | 21.000 | 1.00210 |
| 65 | Subter OLI / Sti | $383 \times 34$ | 1.073553616 | 413.54 | 0.932267 | 28,010 | 1.00210 |
| 66 |  | 3 | -1.035616 | 4, | 0.5060 | 2,010 | 1.00210 |
| 67 | St-2 5xa | 59985 | 1.072583616 | $6 \times 300$ | 0.933367 | 4.355 | 1.00210 |
| 68 |  |  |  |  | 0.8329 |  |  |
| 69 | Toel FPSC | 69.130.824 | 1.070576 | 24.77.182 | 0.933727 | 4936,338 | 1.00053 |
| 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 71 | Toel FERC Sales | 957,907 | 1.024759725 | 925.490 | 0.972010 | 27,544 |  |
| 72 | Compray Use | 186.973 | 1.072553616 | 200,557 | 0.932057 | 13.584 |  |
| 73 | Charge in Uateried Seive | (185,379) | 1.67853616 | (198847) | 0.532007 | $(13.468)$ |  |
| 74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75 | Toul FPL | 70.79035 | 1.070205907 | 75,744.382 | $0.53 \times 223$ | $4.980,057$ | 1.00000 |
| 76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 78 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 79 | CHC-1(T) CS-3. and SST-1/ | as heve the |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 | stme locs mintipier as the GSDD chers. | (axiacica) rux |  |  |  |  |  |

Florida Power \& Light Company Docket No. 990001-EI Staff's Third Set of Interrogatori Attachment No. 1
Interrogatory No. 14
Page 4 of 11
Flocida Power \& Light Cownpery 1994 Actal Eneryy Losser by Rate Class
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FLORIDA POWEF \& LIGHT projected capacity payments FOR OCTOBER 1993. MARCH 1994



## FLORIDA POWER \& LIGHT

 PROJEGTED CAPACITY PAYMENTS FOR OCTOBER 1995 - MARCH 1996|  | PROJECTED |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| OCTOBER | NOVEMBER | DEJEMBER | JANUARY | FEBRUARY | MARCH |  |

1. CAPACITY PAYMENTS TO NON-COGENERATORS
2. CAPACITY PAYMENTS TC COGENERATORS
3. REVENUES FROM CAPACITY SALES
4. SYSTEM TOTAL (Lines 1+2-3)
5. JURISDICTIONAL \% *
6. JURISDICTIONALIZED CAPACITY PAYMENTS
7. LESS: SJRPP CAPACITY PAYMENTS INCLUDED IN THE 1988 TAX SAVINGS REFUND DOCKET
8. FINAL. TRUE-UP -overrecovery/(underrecovery) OCTOBER 1994 - MARCH 1995 $\$ 4,856,873$

EST / ACT TRUE-UP -overrecovery/(underrecovery)
TOTAL

*CALCULATION OF JURISDICTIONAL \%

## FPSC

FERC

| AVG. 12 CP |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| AT GEN. $(M W)$ |  |
| 12.579 | $97.25530 \%$ |
| $12 \frac{355}{}$ | $2.74470 \%$ |
| 12.934 | $100.00000 \%$ |

NOTE: BA\$ED ON 1994 ACTUAL DATA



1. CAPACITY PAYMENTS TO NON-COGENERATORS
2. CAPACITY PAYMENTS TO COGENERATORS

2b. MOCOURSE CORRECTION
3. CAPACITY PAYMENTS FOR MISSION SETTLEMENT
4. REVENUES FROM CAPACITY SALES

4a. SJRPP SUSPENSION ACCRUAL
4b. RETURN REQUIREMENT ON SUSPENSION PAYMENT
5. SYSTEM TOTAL (Lines $1+2 \mathrm{a} \cdot 2 \mathrm{~b}+3 \cdot 4+4 \mathrm{a} \cdot 4 \mathrm{~b})$
B. JURISDICTIONAL \% *
7. JURISDICTIONALIZED CAPACITY PAYMENTS
a. LESS: SJRPP CAPACITY PAYMENTS INCLUDED IN THE 1988 TAX SAVINGS REFUND DOCKET
[APRIL
98. LESS:EST TACT TRUE.UP .. overrecovery/(underrecovery) OCTOBER 1996 - SEPTEMBER 1997 \$5,239,868

9b. MIDCOURSE CORRECTION - - overnecoveryifunderrecovery)
APRLL 1897 . MARCH 1998
ARCH
10. TOTAL (Linés $7+8.9$ )
\$175,707,643
11. REVENUE TAX MULTIPLIER
12. TOTAL RECOVERABLE CAPACITY PAYMENTS

- CPRC lectors are extended through December 1998 as a transilion to calendar year factors. "aCALCULATION OF JURISDICTIONAL \%

|  | AVG. 12 CP |  |
| :---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | AT GEN.(MW) | $\%$ |
| FPSC | 14.998 | $07.19921 \%$ |
| FERC | $\underline{432}$ | $2.80079 \%$ |
| TOTAL | 15.430 | $100.00000 \%$ |

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE <br> DOCKET NO. 990001-EI TRANSMISSION RECONSIDERATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of Florida Power \& Light Company's Response to Staff's Third Set of Interrogatories (7-14) has been furnished by Hand Delivery,** or U.S. Mail this 12th day of January, 1999, to the following:

Wm. Cochran Keating, Esq.**
Division of Legal Services FPSC
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Rm. 370
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
Joseph A. McGlothlin, Esq. Vicki Gordon Kaufman, Esq. McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin, Davidson, et al.
117 South Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
G. Edison Holland, Esq. Jeffrey A. Stone, Esq.
Beggs and Lane
P. O. Box 12950

Pensacola, FL 32576
Kenneth A. Hoffman, Esq.
William B. Willingham, Esq.
Rutledge, Ecenia, Underwood,
Purnell \& Hoffman, P.A.
P.O. Box 551

Tallahassee, FL 32302-0551
Suzanne Brownless, P.A.
1311-B Paul Russell Road
Suite 201
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
Ms. Angela Llewellyn
Regulatory Specialist
Regulatory.\& Business Specialist
Tampa Electric Co.
Post Office Box 111
Tampa, FL 33601

John Roger Howe, Esq. Office of Public Counsel
111 West Madison Street
Room 812
Tallahassee, FL 32399
Lee L. Willis, Esq.
James D. Beasley, Esq.
Ausley \& McMullen
227 S. Calhoun Street
P. O. Box 391

Tallahassee, FL 32302
James A. McGee, Esq.
Florida Power Corporation
P. O. Box 14042

St. Petersburg, FL 33733
John W. McWhirter, Jr., Esq. McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin, Davidson, Rief \& Bakas, P.A.
Post Office Box 3350
Tampa, Florida 33601-3350
Mr. John T. English
President \& CEO
Florida Public Utilities Co.
P.O. Box 3395

West Palm Beach, FL 33402


## EXHIBIT NO.

## DOCKET NO: 990001-EI

WITNESS:

PARTY:
GULF POWER COMPANY

DESCRIPTION: COMPOSITE EXHIBIT: DEPOSITION OF M.W. HOWELL TAKEN ON JANUARY 21, 1999, AND 2) RESPONSE TO STAFF'S SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 5-8)

PROFERRED BY: STAFF

EXHIBIT NO.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMHB81ON


BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Fuel and purchased power, DCCKET NO. 990001-EI cost recovery clause and , FILED: JAN.14, 1999

THE DEPOSITION OE:
TAKEN AT THE INSTANCE OF:

DATE:
TIME:

LOCATION:

REPORTED BY: generating performance incentive ; factor.

M. W. HOWELI

Florida Public Service Commission

January 21, 1999
Commenced: 10:30 a.m.
Concluded: 11:00 a.m.
Gerald L. Gunter Building 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Room 362
Tallahassee, Florida
Debra R. Krick
Court Reporter and Notary
Public in and for State of Elorida at Large

PREMIER REPORTING 6753 THOMASVILLE ROAD TALLAHASSEE, EL 32312 (850) 894-0828

BKEEAGF RECORTING
RECEVES 2.3-99


## APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

On behalf of Florida Public Service Commission:
WILLIAM COCHRAN KEATING, IV, ESQ. Florida Public Service Commission

2540 Shumard Oak Blvd
Tallahassee, FL 32399
On behalf of Gulf Power:
JEFFREY A. STONE, ESQ.
Beggs \& Lane
3 West Garden Street Pensacola, FL 32501

On behalf of Florida Power and Light:
RITA MCCLELLAN, ESQ.
CORBY DUBIN, ESQ.
9250 West Flagler Street Miami, FL
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## DEPOS ITION

Whereupon,

M.W. HOWELL

was called as a witness, having been first duly sworn to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION
BY MR. KEATING:
Q Good morning, Mr. Howell.
A Good morning.
Q. And $I$ just have a few questions for you this morning.

Let me find a good place to start.
In the original hearing in this docket that this reconsideration hearing stemmed out of, Gulf stated that it doesn't make sales in the energy broker network?

A That's right.
Q Does Southern Company make sales on the energy broker network?

A No. It's my understanding it's just a Peninsular Florida utility network. But Southern does not make sales on it.

Q Do you believe that the Commission-approved 20 percent stockholder incentive, applies to all economy sales, or only economy sales made over the broker
network?
A I am sorry, say that again.
Q Do you believe that the 20 percent stockholder incentive that was approved by the Commission applies to all economy sales, or to only economy sales made over the broker network?

A Well, I am only familiar with Gulf; and it applies to our economy transactions.

It is my understanding, but I don't know for a fact, that that also applies to the Peninsular Elorida companies. They are broker transactions, it does apply to that. They -- you know, if they make transactions outside the broker, economy transactions, it's my understanding it applies to that, too. But I do not know that for a fact. That's just my general understanding. It does apply to Gulf's economy transaction, none of which are on the broker -- energy broker network.

Q What do you base your understanding on in that area?

A Oh, I have read a few of the prior orders that they have issued, and --

Q Okay. Is there any particular order that you can point out?

A I didn't memorize it. I am sorry.
Q Okay.

MR. STONE: Is that a subject of this proceeding? I don't recall an issue being identified with regard to that, for this aspect of the case. In fact, I thought we went to great lengths not to have an issue identified to that case.

MR. KEATING: Can we go off the record for a second?
(Discussion off the record.)
MR. KEATING: We are back on the record. Staff would request that Gulf provide a late filed exhibit to the deposition.

MR. STONE: Oh, Cochran, let me try to define --

THE WITNESS: Specifying the orders that give us that authority?

MR. KEATING: Exactly.
MR. STONE: Like I said, I was going to try to do that.

THE WITNESS: I am sorry.
MR. STONE: I couldn't do it better than that.
We will endeavor to give you a late-filed exhibit that gives those orders.

MR. KEATING: Okay.
BY MR. KEATING:
Q In issue one, I am looking at -- well, I don't
have Gulf's prehearing statement in front of me, but -now I do.

In issue one, in your statement of issues and positions in the prehearing statement -- and that's page two of the prehearing statement -- Gulf states that FERC caused the revenue from non-firm transmission services subject to FERC jurisdiction, be reflected as a revenue credit in the -- be reflective of firm transmission service rates, for transmission providers using annual system peak load pricing for their transmission services.

Are all IOUs required by FERC to use annual system peak load pricing for the transmission services?

A I am not sure. I do know that all of the -- all the tariffs are very similar, but I am just not sure. FERC -- FERC is very specific in some areas about what they want included in that. And it may be that, you know, their tariffs are a little bit different.

But the tariffs coming out of 888 , the intent was that all non-firm transactions -- all non-firm transactions -- it's my understanding, those revenues must be credited regardless of what they use.

Q Are you aware of any instances where FERC has allowed an IOU to not use that sort of pricing?

A No, I am not. They -- you know, they have
stated in the orders themselves -- and in other documents that $I$ just can't recall exactly what they are -- that it is clear they don't want someone to, in effect, overearn. So you have to reflect those credits in there; otherwise, in their estimation, you're overcharging.

We have been doing that -- that's been a part of our filings with EERC in our tariffs long before the idea of 888 was born. This goes way back to putting those revenue credits into the calculation. It was not something that was initiated at the time that 888 changes were made. It long predates that.

Q Okay. Looking at page seven of your testimony, on roughly around line 19 -- I believe it's that portion of the testimony -- you discuss a settlement agreement involving Southern's open-access transmission tariff?

A Yes.
Q Which is then reviewed by FERC?
A Yes.
Q I was just curious about the status of that settlement agreement.

A Verbal agreement among all the intervenors, Southern and the FERC staff has been reached. We are going to file the end of this month, ballpark, a written document that basically puts in writing what we say we all agreed to, and that would be like an application to

FERC.
FERC, it's my understanding, would then have an Administrative Law Judge rule on that. And then it would later go to the full FERC Commission.

The timing of that -- the timing as to how long that could take is really uncertain. Some dockets before FERC just stay up there for years. Because this one, we don't expect anybody to contest it, we think it will go through, you know, a lot faster. Now, how fast fast is, I don't have a clue.

But in the settlement -- the settlement has been verbally agreed to at this point.

Q Since you filed your testimony, have there been any changes that you would consider significant to the -to that verbal agreement?

A No. They -- and I forget when this testimony was filed. They were still trying to iron out, you know, some minor wrinkles and everything. But nothing substantive has changed, other than they finally ironed out all the wrinkles, and we have finalized a verbal agreement.

Q So then you are still not crediting the non-firm transmission revenues; is that correct?

A Well, right now, we are operating under the tariff that we filed with FERC, which was a conforming
tariff, which does have those credits in there. And I don't know -- I personally don't know if we are going to go back, and what we had been collecting up to this point will be subject to any refunds. But the revenue credits are in, the conforming tariff that we filed.

The special tariff that was a result of the negotiated settlement will basically not have any revenue credits in there. It will just have a rate that will be fixed. It will not have annual updates. It will be fixed until some party comes in and says, we want to reopen this thing, or whatever.

And that could be -- you know, theoretically, somebody could come in the day after it's approved. It's not likely. But our expectation is that it will probably ride as a fixed amount for a few years. And however long that is, we can't predict, based on the rights that the parties have to petition before FERC.

Q Do you define economy sales, sort of split the savings manner, or is it all opportunity sales?

A Well, there are two types. With the latter, there are two types. There are split the savings, and then there are market-based economy transactions.

And I talked about that in my testimony at the hearing, where parties will agree on some level that they will make a transaction. It's not -- it does not have to
be tied to incremental, decremental cost, that type thing. They will just agree on a price.

And we saw this all over the U.S. in this last
summer in a lot of market transactions, and prices varied according to the market at each hour.

Q All right. I think we are about done here. But let me go off the record for a second.

A Sure.
(Discussion off the record.)
MR. KEATING: On the record.
BY MR. KEATING:
Q Do you apply the 20 percent stockholder incentive to all economy sales or only to split the savings economy sales?

A All.
Q Okay.
MR. KEATING: I think that's all that we -- all
that we have for you, Mr. Howell.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. BURGESS: Do you mind if I ask Mr. Howell
some questions?
MR. STONE: Assuming the question.
MR. BURGESS: I will ask them one by one, and you tell me.

THE WITNESS: One at a time.

BY MR. BURGESS:
Q I want to get some sense of your economy sales. Are you -- is Gulf -- or, I mean, is Southern Company effectively on a broker system that's similar to your understanding of Peninsular Florida broker system with other electricity producers?

A Steve, let me answer it this way, we are not on the broker. There was a Southern -- and I have probably got the acronym wrong -- called AIMS automated interchange matching system, or whatever that was predated the FERC 888 efforts.

And that was an attempt to set up a large southeast broker type system that would match buyers and sellers. And we were involved in that.

I haven't personally heard anything about that. I think it is still around, but I think there are very few, if any, transactions that actually take place. Most of our transactions are market transactions where we contact other utilities, and we either buy or sell, depending on our needs and their needs.

The great -- I am just not aware if we have any of that matching left. But if we do, it's a relatively small percentage over overall transactions. And there is no other automated southeast type matching system like
the Florida broker. It is strictly the companies, you know, buying and selling individually, that type.
$Q$ What I understood the main value of the broker system, was the real time match-up of need -- of one company to the availability of the other. I assume AIMS did the same, like an hour-to-hour basis of what the status of the companies were, with regard to the plants that they were about to bring on-line or take off-line?

A That's correct.
Q Well, how do you do that? I mean, I assume you still try to do that for efficiency's sake, even outside the AIMS process. How do you go about that, how do you communicate with the other systems to --

A They have a lot of little magic knowledge that they use. But, basically, they know -- the people that are in that marketing area know what the -- they just pick up the phone and call and ask what people need, do they have anything to sell, do they need anything. And they just keep up with the prices.

Q So it's just direct communication, rather than a broker doing it?

A It's not an automated system, that's correct. Yes.

Q Okay. If FERC -- under the EERC jurisdiction, it created this split the savings, as established in the
price mechanism. Can you tell me what process you go through to remove yourself from that, in order to come up with market base? And I guess this is what I am saying. Let me ask it this way. If there is a tariff that says, for these types of transactions FERC expects you to split the savings, how do you get around to a market base, something to where you might -- the seller might keep 80 percent or only 10 percent of the differential?

A Well, if you would .--
MR. STONE: Steve, I think your question --
MR. BURGESS: It's -- is it a legal question?
MR. STONE: I think your question, two concepts of it. At least it did in the way I heard it.

MR. BURGESS: Okay.
MR. STONE: The first part of your question, I thought you were getting into directly, was how do you transition from a FERC tariff that calls for a split the savings pricing mechanism, to a market-based pricing mechanism.

MR. BURGESS: Exactly. That was to be all of my question.

MR. STONE: Okay. You threw in the 10 percent --

MR. BURGESS: That was a number I made up. I was just saying, how do you move from it being 50
percent split to something else --
MR. STONE: Okay.
MR. BURGESS: -- that's other than 50 percent.
THE WITNESS: I will tell you all I know. How is that?

BY MR. BURGESS:
$Q$ That's good.
A At one time -- and this was the case maybe a year-and-a-half or so ago. The companies had tariffs with each other where they could make economy transactions. They actually had a FERC-filed tariff or schedule that allowed them to make transactions with each other.

You also can file a tariff petitioning FERC to get a market-based rate. And there -- there were certain conditions that you had to meet. And I don't remember if you had to file a system-wide tariff or what. But whatever you had to do, we have done that. And that's way back in my memory, now. And everybody's, you know, doing it on the market-based rate.

Q Some set of conditions that you don't recall all the specifics?

A That's correct.
Q That you just meet?
A That's right. We don't deal with that every
day. So it's long faded in my memory.
Q Well, how do you -- and I think you did provide this in your testimony at the original hearing on this. But how do you then define economy transactions, if they can be either market-based or meet this FERC tariff of split the savings, what -- how would you separate in your conceptual understanding, economy sales from non-economy off system sales?

A Well, an economy transaction is an opportunity. Does an opportunity exist this hour to make that transaction, or does an opportunity exist to make an eight-hour, you know, type transaction?

If you have got enough generation to meet your load, and you don't need -- you know, you don't have to buy anything, then an economy transaction would be where somebody else could maybe sell it to you cheaper than what you could generate.

Q Well, could I -- do I properly, then, understand the difference is that if you have a preexisting contract for an amount of sale, that would be non-economy; and if you have -- it is more ad hoc basis, you -- everything that falls into that category, you would call economy sales?

A Well, I wouldn't say everything. But certainly, if you have a contract like the UPS contracts that call
for like-base energy, supplemental, alternate and all of that, all of those are transactions that occur under the contract. An economy transaction is something that is not a -- there is no firm contract covering it. You either make it or not make it that hour, depending on whether the parties, you know, want to make it. But there is no obligation for anyone to make that transportation. The incentive is that hopefully both parties save money.

Q Do you remember at all why Gulf is not part of the Peninsular florida broker system? I mean, other than it not being in the Peninsular Florida, I mean, was there a reason that you recall, regulatory reason, something else that caused that?

A There was no regulatory reason. At the time, the Commission had just gone through a study with the Peninsular utilities on optimized generation expansion. The utilities were not -- they were separate utilities, no corporate ties. And they -- the Commission wanted to know what would an optimized generation expansion plan look like.

And so a study was done that said, if the individual utilities plan their systems this way, here is what the cost, the expansion will be. If they do optimized planning, as a Peninsular, here's what the cost
would be. And then compared those costs. And it was slightly lower, you know, if they planned as a single system.

So the Commission got interested then and, well, each utility basically -- and I am saying basically -- dispatches its generation to meet its load, and there are some economy transactions that are taking place among the Peninsular utilities at the time. But they are not centrally dispatched.

So they did a central dispatch study that said, if we could go into a central dispatch in the state, how much money would that save? And it saved X-dollars.

The only problem was, it was going to cost Y-dollars, which I think exceeded that savings to set up the central dispatch system. And the broker system was, in approximation to the central dispatch, cost very little to implement and was thereby implemented.

Gulf was already part of a true instantaneous economic central dispatch system in Southern. So it would be kind of difficult for us to include them or exclude us and all. So it was just almost a natural fit that we not be a part of that.

Q You were -- you had spoken about the revenue credits that is part of the FERC tariff, the revenue credits from transmission? I am switching to the
transmission revenue credits.
A Yes.
Q When you say that -- and as I understand it, FERC basically takes the previous year's transmission revenue and credits it in establishing the new transmission tariff.

A Correct. That's correct.
Q Okay. I assume they credit into the federal jurisdiction for off-system sales only the allocated portion, the portion that would be allocated to the federal, to the non-Public Service Commission?

A No. It's a single rate. They just take total system. We don't do any separation in coming up with those transmission rates.

Q Okay.
A You take your total system cost, you take your total system credits, you get a rate, here's the rate.

Q Okay. And then, so, obviously, then total system credits are added to it, once you have gotten total system cost?

A Yeah. You look at your total system cost, and then subtract out the total system credits that you get, and then the net is what you apply as a transmission rate.

Q Okay. And then you discussed the annual system
peak load pricing method as calculating the tariff that is used by FERC for calculating transmission tariff; is that right? Did I understand that correctly?

A I didn't get into peak load pricing. You use that calculation to come up with a tariff for a firm rate, for firm transmission.

Q Right. And, basically, is that the -- is that the annual kilowatt hour peak or kilowatt peak? I mean, is that what's used as a numerator, for calculating a price over the denominator, which is the cost?

A Well, the numerator is the cost. The denominator is the load. You get dollars per kilowatt.

Q Okay.
A And I am -- I don't get involved in the calculation. I am not sure if they take an average of the 12 monthly peaks, if they take the five-day average; but it is -- it is intended to be the peak load on the system. But it's -- it's applied consistently, though.

MR. BURGESS: Okay. Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

MR. STONE: I really object to all. I am just kidding.

Is that it?
MR. KEATING: Well, I believe that's it. That would conclude Mr. Howell's deposition.
a.m., and reading and signing by the witness was not waived.)
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Transmission Reconsideration GULF POWER COMPANY
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5. For the purpose of answering the following two interrogatories, assume that the Commission orders transmission revenues received in conjunction with economy EBN transactions to be allocated based upon the jurisdictional factor for transmission services:
(a) indicate how the Commission should amend its Schedule A1 through Schedule A9 to show the impact of its order, and
(b) indicate how the Commission should amend its Schedule E1 through Schedule E10 to show the impact of its order.

## Answer:

At this time, it is anticipated that alterations would be necessary to schedules A-1, A-2, and A-6 and corresponding schedules E-1, (including E-1B, E-1B-1, and E-1D), E-2, and E-6. The identified $A$ and $E$ schedules would require substantial revisions to incorporate the use of a transmission-related jurisdictional separation factor based on coincident peak demand. The administrative costs associated with making such changes are unwarranted. For Gulf, there is no material difference in a jurisdictional separation factor based on coincident peak demand and a jurisdictional separation factor based on kwh sales; consequently the revenues that would flow to Gulf's customers through the fuel clause under a demand allocator would remain virtually unchanged from the present method.
(a) In order to accommodate the use of a demand allocator for transmission revenues received in conjuction with economy sales, the transmission revenues would be excluded from the "Estimated Economy Sales" and "Other Transactions" lines and the resulting total lines on Schedule A-6. As a result of this change, Schedule A-2 Section A must be altered by adding a new subtotal line for transactions subject to the energy allocator and a new line for the transmission revenues subject to the demand allocator. Some of the line descriptions for Section A would need to be edited. In Section B of Schedule A-2, several new lines would be needed to show the calculation of a demand allocator for transmission revenues. The true-up calculation included in Section $C$ of Schedule A-2 would also be changed by adding additional lines to separate the revenues subject to the demand allocator from the expenses subject to the energy allocator and to reflect appropriate subtotals. Various line descriptions and formulas in Section C would need to be edited to reflect the numeric changes. Changes to Schedule A-1 would begin with numeric changes to Line 14, "Fuel Cost of Economy Sales" and the subtotals on Line 18, "Total Fuel Costs \& Gains of Power Sales", and Line 20, "Total Fuel \& Net Power Transactions for Energy", as a result of the changes to Schedule A-6. A new line
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for "Transmission Revenue" could be labeled Line 20a, and a new total line entitled "Total ALL Fuel \& Net Power Transactions (Demand \& Energy)" could be labeled Line 20b. Another new line, 27a, would be added to the schedule for the "Jurisdictional Transmission Revenue" (this same information has been added to Schedule A-2, Section C). This amount would reduce the "TOTAL FUEL COST", Line 29, as would be reflected in a formula change.
(b) Changes to the estimated schedules would be similar to those needed for the actual schedules. Projected transmission revenue is currently included on the "Economy Sales" line for each month on Schedule E-6. The projected transmission revenue would be excluded from those lines, the subtotals, and totals. On Schedule E-2, the line description for Line 5 would need to be changed to reflect a subtotal of "Total Fuel \& Net Power Transaction for Energy". Additional lines would be necessary for "Transmission Revenue" and a new total line entitled "Total All Fuel \& Net Power Transactions (Energy and Demand)". The demand allocator should be included on a new line, 6b, "Jurisdictional Demand Allocator for Transmission Revenues". In the section where the calculation of the recovery factor is illustrated in cents/kwh, an additional line 7 c would be needed to include transmission revenues. There would also be formula changes to this section of the report that are not obvious from the face of the schedule. Other lines may require new line descriptions. The changes to Schedule E-1 would mimic the changes to Schedule A-1. The changes to Schedule E-1B would shadow the changes to Schedule A-2. Schedule E-1B-1 follows the layout of Schedule A-1; consequently the changes to this schedule would be the same as those already described for Schedule A-1. On Schedule E-1D, the line currently titled "Jurisdictional Fuel Factor" should be edited to "Jurisdictional Fuel Factor for Energy". New lines are needed for "Transmission Revenue" and "Jurisdictional Fuel Factor (Energy and Demand)". Some formula changes would also be necessary.
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6. Could Gulf Power Company's retail jurisdictional separation factor for transmission services be greater than its retail jurisdictional factor for generation service? If so, provide an example.

Answer:
For purposes of this discussion, it is assumed that the retail jurisdictional separation factor for transmission services would be the same as that used in the Capacity Cost Recovery Clause filings (a demand allocator which is updated every two years based on actual load data.) Also, "retail jurisdictional factor for generation service" is assumed to be the retail jurisdictional factor historically used in the fuel filings (which is based on kwh sales) adjusted for line losses. Based on these assumptions, over the past two years the retail jurisdictional separation factor for the Capacity Cost Recovery Clause filings has consistently been slightly less than the actual retail jurisdictional factor calculated in the monthly fuel filings after it is adjusted for line losses. This relationship is expected to continue. It is important to note that the largest difference between these two jurisdictional factors in any month during the last two years is $.55 \%$.
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7. Please provide a calculation of Gulf's 12 CP retail/wholesale separation factor based on the most recently available 12 -month period actual CP demands.

Answer:

## GULF POWER COMPANY CALCULATION OF 1997 12CPKW AT GENERATION BY RATE CLASS

| RATE CLASS | (1) <br> 1997 12CPKW <br> METER | (2) <br> DEMAND <br> LOSS <br> EXPANSION <br> FACTOR | $\begin{gathered} \text { (3) } \\ 1997 \\ \text { 12CPKW } \\ \text { @ GENER. } \end{gathered}$ | (4) <br> JURIS. ALLOCATOR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RS/RST | 818,073.00 | 1.1019333 | 901,461.88 |  |
| GS/GST | 45,752.25 | 1.1019255 | 50,415.57 |  |
| GSD/GSDT | 315,521.33 | 1.1016647 | 347,598.72 |  |
| LP/LPT | 184,352.75 | 1.0601470 | 195,441.01 |  |
| PX/PXT/RTP/CISR/SBS | 131,781.92 | 1.0313379 | 135,911.69 |  |
| OSI/OSII | 2,735.25 | 1.1020255 | 3,014.32 |  |
| OSIII | 2,333.25 | 1.1024447 | 2,572.28 |  |
| OSIV | 1,003.17 | 1.1024447 | 1,105.94 |  |
| JURISDICTIONAL | 1,501,552.92 |  | 1,637,521.41 | 96.48271\% |
| WHOLESALE | 57,882.25 | 1.0313354 | 59,696.01 | 3.51729\% |
| TERRITORIAL | 1,559,435.17 |  | 1,697,217.42 | 100.00000\% |
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8. Beginning on page 3 , line 21 , of witness M . W. Howell's testimony, it is stated that FERC requires that revenue from non-firm transmission services be reflected as a revenue credit in the derivation of firm transmission service rates. Was FERC addressing total non-firm transmission revenues, or only those non-firm transmission revenues which have been allocated to wholesale customers after separation? Provide citations to those portions of FERC Orders 888 and 888 -A which support your opinion.

## Answer:

The language on page 304 of FERC Order 888 and page 247 of FERC Order 888-A regarding the non-firm revenue credit requirement addressed in M. W. Howell's testimony does not specify whether total non-firm transmission revenues or those jurisdictionally separated, non-firm transmission revenues allocated to wholesale customers are to be used in the derivation of firm transmission service rates.

However, when there is only one firm transmission rate used for an entire transmission system, it is commonly assumed by all parties that all such non-firm transmission service revenues will be credited. Southern, in its most recent transmission service tariff filing with the FERC, has included total non-firm transmission service revenues in the derivation of its firm transmission service rate. This is a consistent approach, since Southern's total transmission system load and its total transmission system costs are also used in the calculation of the firm transmission service rate.

## EXHIBIT NO.

## DOCKET NO: <br> 990001-EI

## WITNESS:

PARTY:
TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY

## DESCRIPTION: <br> COMPOSITE EXHIBIT: 1) RESPONSES TO STAFF'S FIF T H S E T O F INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 23 28), AND 2) RESPONSES TO STAFF'S FIRST REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS (NO. 1)

PROFERRED BY: STAFF


## TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY <br> DOCKET NO. 990001-EI <br> FPSC STAFF'S 5th SET <br> INTERROGATORY NO. 23 <br> FILED: JANUARY 14, 1999 <br> PAGE 1 of 45 <br> TRANSMISSION RECONSIDERATION

23. For the purpose of answering the following two interrogatories, assume that the Commission orders transmission revenues received in conjunction with economy EBN transactions to be allocated based upon the jurisdictional factor for transmission services:
a) indicate how the Commission should amend its Schedule A1 through Schedule A9 to show the impact of its order; and
b) indicate how the Commission should amend its Schedule E1 through Schedule E10 to show the impact of its order.
A. a) Tampa Electric proposes to modify Schedules A1, A2 and A6 in order to show the amount and allocation of the economy sales transmission revenues. Schedule A6 is the schedule which identifies the fuel and total costs (including transmission costs) for economy sales. On page 1 of Schedule A6, a line will be added to the section on the estimated sales to include a line showing the estimated economy transmission revenues. Column 8 on Page 2 of the upper section of Schedule A6 includes transmission costs where Column 7 does not. TEC identifies the transmission revenues in a footnote at the bottom of page 2 and subtracts $80 \%$ of this amount from the total economy power sales. This amount is then credited to the retail jurisdiction as shown on Schedules A1 (Line 31a) and A2 (Lines 6a-c). To illustrate this, Tampa Electric is providing an example of what the A schedules for the months of April 1998 through September 1998 would be if these modifications were approved
b) Likewise, Tampa Electric proposes to modify Schedules E1, E-1B, E-1B-1, E-2 and E6 in the same manner as the corresponding A Schedules. Tampa Electric is providing an example of these schedules showing the proposed modifications.
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CALCULATION OF TRUE-UP AND INTEREST PROVISION TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY MONTH OF: APRIL, 1998 CURRENT MONTH

| ACTUAL | ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE AMOUNT | \% | ACTUAL | ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE AMOUNT | $\boldsymbol{*} 1$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27,437,874 | 29,909,035 | $(2,471,161)$ | (8.3) | 27,437,874 | 29,909,035 | (2,471,161) | (8.3) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 2,603,618 | 4,040,220 | $(1,436,602)$ | (35.6) | 2,603,618 | 4,040,220 | ( $1,436,602$ ) | (35.6) |
| 195,778 | 511,800 | (316,022) | (61.7) | 195,778 | 511,800 | $(316,022)$ | (61.7) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 638,325 | 899,600 | (261,275) | (29.0) | 638,325 | 899,600 | (261, 275) | (29.0) |
| 13,228 | 80,700 | (67,472) | (83.6) | 13,228 | 80,700 | (67,472) | (83.6) |
| 25,681,587 | 27,360,915 | $(1,679,328)$ | (6.1) | 25,681,587 | 27,360,915 | $(1,679,328)$ | (6.1) |
| (2,990) | $(3,500)$ | 510 | (14.6) | ( 2,990 ) | $(3,500)$ | 510 | (14:6) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |

B. MWH SALES

1. JURISDICTIONAL SALES
2. NONJURISDICTIONAL SALES
3. TOTAL SALES
4. JURISDIC. SALES-\% TOTAL MWH SALES

| $1,166,092$ | $1,156,538$ | 9,554 | 0.8 | $1,166,092$ | $1,156,538$ | 0,554 | 0.8 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 10,786 | 3,381 | 7,405 | 219.0 | 10,786 | 3,381 | 7,405 | 219.0 |
| $1,176,878$ | $1,159,919$ | 16,959 | 1.5 | $1,176,878$ | $1,159,919$ | 16,959 | 1.5 |
| 0.9908351 | 0.9970851 | $(0.0062500)$ | $(0.6)$ | 0.9908351 | 0.9970851 | $(0.0062500)$ | $(0.6)$ |




|  | calculation | OF TRUE-UP AND TAMPA ELECTRIC MONTH OF: CURRENT MONT | INTEREST PROVI COMPANY PRIL, 1998 |  |  |  | PERIOD TO D | ScIIEDULE <br> PAGE 3 OF |  | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ACTUAL | ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE AMOUNT | * |  | ACTUAL | ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE AMOUNT | * |  |
|  | 4,426,535 | 4,373,121 | 53,414 | 1.2 | NOT | APPLIC | ble |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { E YNT. } \\ & -10) \end{aligned}$ | 5,711,058 | 4,238,957 | 1,472,101 | 34.7 | NOT | APPLIC | ble |  | . |  |
| MOUNT | 10,137,593 | 8,612,078 | 1,525,515 | 17.7 | NOT | APPLIC | Le |  |  |  |
| INE D-3) | 5,068,797 | 4,306,039 | 762,758 | 17.7 | NOT | APPLIC | Le |  |  |  |
| . MONTH | 5.550 | 6.000 | (0.450) | (7,5) | NOT | APPLIC | Le |  |  |  |
| ENT MONTH | 5.530 | 6.000 | (0.470) | (7.8) | NOT | APPLIC | LE |  |  |  |
|  | 11.080 | 12.000 | (0.920) | (7.7) | NOT | APPLIC | Le |  |  |  |
| INE D-7) | 5.540 | 6.000 | (0.460) | $(7,7)$ | NOT | APPLIC | Le |  |  |  |
| D-8/12) | 0.462 | 0.500 | (0.038) | (7.6) | NOT | APPLIC | Le |  |  |  |
| LINE D-9) | 23,418 | 21,530 | 1,888 | 8.8 | NOT | APPLIC | BLE |  |  |  |


| (1) |  | POHER SOLD <br> TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY <br> FOR THE MONTH OF APRIL, 1998 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SCHEDULE A6 PAGE 1 OF 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |  | (7) | (8) | (9) |
|  |  |  | (3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SOLD T0 |  | TYPE | TOTAL MWH | MWH WHEELED | MWH <br> FROM OWN |  | $\operatorname{To}^{(B)}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FOR TOTAL } \\ & \text { FOST } \end{aligned}$ | ON ECONOMY |
|  |  | SCHEDULE | $\begin{gathered} \text { MWH } \\ \text { SOLD } \end{gathered}$ | OTHER SYSTEM | GENERATION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FUEG } \\ & \operatorname{cost} \end{aligned}$ | TOTAL COST | ADJUSTMENT | $(5) \times(6)(B)$ | ELERGY SALES |
| ESTIMATED: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ECON. | 103,172.0 | 0.0 | 103,172.0 | 1.669 | 2.193 | 1,721,800.00 | 2,262,700.00 |  |
| VARIOUS JURISDICTIONAL |  | $\mathrm{SCH}^{\text {che }}$ - ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 3,554.0 | 0.0 | 29,5540.0 |  | 1.688 | 424,100.00 | 497,000.00 |  |
| VARIOUS <br> SEPARATED |  | SCH: -D | 29,440.0 | 0.0 | 29,440.0 | 1.4400 | 1.688 0.000 | 424,100.00 | -07,000 |  |
| VARIOUS HARDEE POWER PARTNERS SEPARATED |  | CONTRACT | 22,231.0 | 0.0 | 22,231.0 | 2.286 | 3.094 | 508,100.00 | $\begin{aligned} & 687,800: 00 \\ & 956,600.00 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| HARDEE POWER PARTNERS SEPARATED VARIOUS |  | CONTRACT | 62,200.0 | 0.0 0.0 | $61,200.0$ | 1.467 2.402 | 1.563 2.402 | 897,600.00 | $\begin{aligned} & 956,600.00 \\ & 129,700.00 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | SCH. -J | 5,400.0 | 0.0 | 5,400.0 | 2.402 | 2.402 | --7-1900 |  | 432,720.00 |
| TOTAL INCLUDING VARIABLE O M COSTS <br>  <br> ESS UARIABLE 0 \& $M$ costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL EXCE. VARIABLE O \& M COSTS 80\% OF ECON. ENERGY SALES PROFITS |  | - | 224,997.0 | 0.0 | 224,997.0 | 1.796 | 2.040 | 4,040,220.00 | 4,591,000.00 | 432,720.00 |
| ACTUAL: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ECON.-C | 5,952.0 | 0.0 | 5,952.0 | 1.613 | 2.270 | 96,004.65 | 135,110.19 | 31,284,43 |
| FLA. PWR. CORP,FLA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CACKSONVILLE ELEC, AUTH. |  | ECON:-C. | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LAKE WORTH UTILITIES |  | ECON:-C | 221.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | - 0.00 | 118,416.00 | 46,559.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19,004.74 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CITY OF ST. CLOUD |  | ECON, - ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 971.20 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FLA. PWR. \& LIGHT | SEPAR. | SCH. - ${ }^{\text {S }}$ |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HARDEE POWER PARTNERS | SEPAR. | CONTRACT | 9,252.0 | 0.0 | 9,252.0 | 2.296 | 2.969 | 212,425.92 | 273,638.72 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



A. FUEL COST \& NET POWER TRANSACTION

1. FUEL COST OF SYSTEM NET GENERATION
a. FUEL REL. $R \& D$ AND DEMO. COST
2. FUEL COST OF POWER SOLD *
3. fuel cost of purchased power
a. DEMAND \& NONFUEL COST OF PUR. PWR.
b. PAYMENT TO QUALIFIED FACIlities
4. energy cost of economy purchases
5. total fuel \& net power transaction

Ga. ADJUSTMENTS TO FUEL COST
(FT. MEADE/WAUCHULA WHEELING LOSSES) bb. ADJUSTMENTS TO FUEL COST

Ec. ADJ. TO FUEL COST
7. adjusted total fuel a NET pWR.TRANS. 31,568,883

* INCLUDES ECONOMY SALES PROFITS (80\%)


## B. MEH SALES

1. JURISDICTIONAL SALES
2. NONJURISDICTIONAL SALES
3. total Sales
4. JURISDIC. SALES-X TOTAL MWH SALES
$28,253,753$
calculation of true -up and interest provision
TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY
MONTH OF: MAY, 1998 CURRENT MONTH

|  | CURRENT MONTH |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACTUAL | ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE |  | ACTUAL | ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE |


| $1,641,782$ | $3,202,420$ | $(1,560,638)$ | $(48.7)$ | $4,245,400$ | $7,242,640$ | $(2,997,240)$ | $(41,4)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $4,197,429$ | $1,949,700$ | $2,247,729$ | 115.3 | $4,393,207$ | $2,461,500$ | $1,931,707$ |  |


| 716,550 | 919,600 | $(203,050)$ | $(22.1)$ | $1,354,875$ | $1,819,200$ | $(464,325)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$46,751 \quad 206,300(159,549)(77.3)$
$31,572,701 \quad 33,175,638 \quad(1,602,937)$
(3,818)
PERIOD TO DATE
$28,253,753 \quad 33,302,458 \quad(5,048,705) \quad(15.2) \quad 55,691,627 \quad 63,211,493 \quad(7,519,866) \quad$ (11.9)
(5,048,70

0.0
0.0
$(22.1)$
(77.3)
(4.8) 57,254,288
$60,536,55$
$(3,282,265)$
2.7)
$(3,500)$
500)

| $1,209,189$ | $1,290,315$ | $(81,126)$ | $(6.3)$ | $2,375,281$ | $2,446,853$ | $(71,572)$ | $(2.9)$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 18,555 | 12,326 | 6,229 | 50.5 | 29,341 | 15,707 | 13,634 | 86.8 |
| $1,227,744$ | $1,302,641$ | $(74,897)$ | $(5.7)$ | $2,404,622$ | $2,462,560$ | $(57,938)$ | $(2.4)$ |
| 0.9848869 | 0.9905377 | $(0.0056508)$ | $(0.6)$ | 0.9877981 | 0.9936217 | $(0.0058236)$ | $(0.6)$ |


|  | CAI,CULATITON | OF True:Up AND MONTII OF: CURRENT MONTI | INTFREST PROV COMPANY 4AY, 1998 | ION |  | PERIOD TO DA'T | SCllintl <br> PAGE 2 | $:^{\wedge} 2$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ACTUAL | ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE AMOUNT | \% | ACTUAL | estrmated | DIFFERENCE AMOUNT | $\chi$ |
| C. TrUE-UP CALCULATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Jultisdictional fuel revenue | 27,856,841 | 30,139,984 | $(2,283,143)$ | (7.6) | 54,833,315 | 57,136,577 | $(2,303,262)$ | (4.0) |
| 2. FUEL AdJUSTMENT NOT APPlicamle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.01 |
| a. TRUE-UP PROVISION | 728,854 | 728,854 | 0 | 0.0 | 1,457,708 | 1,457,708 | 0 | 0.0 |
| b. Incentive provision | 60,591 | 60,591 | 0 | 0.0 | 121,182 | 121,182 | 0 | 0.0 |
| e. other adjustment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 3. JURIS. FUEL REVENUE APPL. TO PERIOD | 28,646,286 | 30,929,429 | $(2,283,143)$ | (7.4) | 56,412,205 | 58,715,467 | (2,303,262) | (3.9) |
| 4. ADJ. TOTAL FUEL \& NET ['WR. TILANS. (LINE A-7) | 31,568,883 | 33,172,138 | $(1,603,255)$ | (4.8) | 57,247,480 | 60,529,553 | $(3,282,073)$ | (5.4) |
| 5. Jurisdic. sales- x total mwh sales (LINE E-4) | 0.9848869 | 0.9905377 | (0.0056508) | (0.6) | NA | NA | - | - |
| 5a. JURISDIC. TOTAL FUEL \& NFTT PWR.TRANS. <br> (EXCLUDING ECONOMY TRANS. REV.) | . 31,091,779 | 32,858,253 | $(1,766,474)$ | (5.4) | 56,535,034 | 60,135,924 | $(3,600,890)$ | (6.0) |
| 5b. 80X ECONOMY TRANSMISSION REVENUES | - (38, ${ }^{0.8720)}$ | ) 0.0000000 | $(38,320)$ $0.8711756)$ | 0.0 0.0 | $(160,000)$ | $\text { NA } 0$ | $(160,000)$ | 0.0 |
|  | - (33,383) | ) 0 | (33, 383 ) | 0.0 | (136,422) | 0 | $(13 \overline{6}, 422)$ | 0.0 |
| 6. JURISDIC. TOTAL FUEL \& NET PWR.TRANS. <br> (INCLUDING ECONOMY TRANS. REV.) <br> 6A.JURISDIC. LOSS MULTIPLIER | - 31.05888396 | 32,858,253 | $(1,799.857)$ | (5:5) | 56,398, 612 | 60,135,924 | (3,737,312) | (6.2) |
| 6A.JURISDIC. LINS ${ }^{\text {6B }}$ (LINE MULTIPLIER | 31,062,434 | 32,862,525 | (1,800,091) | (5,5) | 56,405,944 | 60,143,742 | (3,737,798) | $(\overrightarrow{6} .2$ ) |
| GC. PEABODY COAL CONTRACT BUY-OUT AMORT. 6D. (LINE 6C x LINE 5) | 426,585 420,138 | 426,585 422,549 | ( $2,411^{0}$ ) | $\left(\begin{array}{c}0.0 \\ (0.6)\end{array}\right.$ | 852,701 842,349 | 855,701 850,414 | $(3,000)$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{l}0.4 \\ 0.9\end{array}\right\}$ |
| 6E. FUEL CREDIT DIFPERENTIAL FMPA/LKL SALE | 0 | (514,746) | 514,746 | 0.0 | (13,179) | $(1,032,480)$ | 1,019,301 | (98.7) |
| 6F. JURISDIC. TOTAL, FUEL \& NET PWR. trans. incl. Peabody and adjustment | $T^{31,482,572}$ | 32,770,328 | (1,287,756) | (3.9) | 57,235,114 | 59,961,676 | $(2,726,562)$ | (4.5) |
| 7. TRUE-UP PROV. FOR MO. +/- COLLECTED (LINE C-3-LINE C-6F) | $(2,836,286)$ | ) (1,840,899) | $(995,387)$ | 54.1 | (822,909) | $(1,246,209)$ | 423,300 | (34.0) |
| 8. IN'EERES'I PROVISION FOR THE MONTH | 18,179 | 14,878 | 3,301 | 22.2 | 41,597 | 36,408 | 5,189 | 14.3 |
| 9. true-up a int. prov, beg. of month | 11,776,883 | 10,302,894 | 1,473,989 | 14.3 | NOT APPLICAB |  |  |  |
| 9a. deferred true-up beginning of period | D (6,042, 407) | ) (6,042,407) | 0 | 0.0 | NOT APPLITCAB |  |  |  |
| 10. TRUE-UP COLLECTED (REIUNDED) | (728,854) | ) (728,854) | 0 | 0.0 | NOT APPLICAB |  |  |  |
| 11. END OF PERIOD TOTAL NET TRUE-UP (LINE C-7 through C-10) | 2,187,515 | 1,705,612 | 481,903 | 28.3 | NOT APPLICAB |  |  |  |

CALCULATION OF TRUE-UP AND INTEREST PROVISION


## D. INTEREST PROVISION

1. beginning true-up amount (LINE C-9 $+\mathrm{C}-9 \mathrm{a}$ )
2. ENDING TRUE-UP AMOUNT BEFORE INT. $($ LINES $\mathrm{C}-7+\mathrm{C}-9+\mathrm{C}-9 \mathrm{a}+\mathrm{C}-10)$
3. total beg. \& END. True-up amount
4. AVG. TRUE-UP AMT. (50x OF LINE D-3)
5. INT. RATE-FIRST DAY REP. BUS. MONTH
6. INT. RATE-FIRST DAY SUBSEQUENT MONTH
7. TOTAL (LINE D-5 + LINE D-6)
8. AVERAGE INT. RATE (50\% OF LINE D-7)
9. MONTHLY AVG. INT. RATE (LINE D-8/12)
10. INT. PROVISION (LINE D-4 $\times$ LINE D-9)

18,179

14,878 22.2 NOT APPLTCABLE

PONER SOLD

| (1) |  | POWER SOLD <br> tampa electric company FOR THE MON'H OF MAY, 1998 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SCHEDULLE A6 PAGE 1 OF 2 <br> (9) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |  | (7) | (8) |  |
|  |  | (2) | (3) | (4) |  |  |  |  | TOTAL | 80\% GAI |
| - SOLD T0 |  |  | TOTAL | MWH WHEELED | $\begin{gathered} \text { MWH } \\ \text { FROM } \\ \text { OWN } \end{gathered}$ | cents (A) | (B) | FOR FUEL | FOR TOTAL | ON ECONOMY ENERGY |
|  |  | SCHEDULE | SOLD | WHEELED | GENERATION | FUEL | TOTAL | ADJUSTMENT | cost | ENERGY SALES |
|  |  |  |  | SYSTEM |  | CosT | cost | (5) $\times(6)(\mathrm{A})$ |  |  |
| ESTIMATED: 327.520 .00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 70,187.0 | 1.700 | 2.283 | 1,193,200.00 | 1,602,600.00 | 327,520.00 |
| VARIOUS |  | SCON. -D | 70,187.0 | 0.0 | 3,883.0 | 1.666 | 1.666 | 1,64,700.00 | 64,700.00 |  |
| VARIOUS JURISDICTIONAL |  | SCH. - - | 30,800.0 | 0.0 | 30,800.0 | 1.458 | 1.710 | 449,200.00 | 526,800.00 |  |
| VARIOUS SEPARATED |  | CONTRACT | 30,800.0 | 0.0 | 0,0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 443, 000.00 |  |
| VARIOUS Honer partners separated |  | CONTRACT | 14,215.0 | 0.0 | 14,215.0 | 2.310 | 3.118 | 328,300.00 | 988,400.00 |  |
| HARDEE POWER PARTNERS SEPARATED LAKELAND/FMPA |  | SCH. - ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 63,240.0 | 0.0 | 63,240.0 | 1.468 | 1.563 0.000 | $928,600.00$ 0.00 | 988,400.00 |  |
| VARIOUS JURISDICTIONAL |  | SCH. -J | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 0.0 | 182,325.0 | 1.626 | 1.989 | 2,964,000.00 | 3,625,700.00 | 327,520.00 |
|  | STS |  | 182,325.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  | (89, 0.00 |  |  |
| LESS TRANSMISSION COSTS <br> LESS VARIABLE 0 \& $M$ COSTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & (89,100.00) \\ & 327,520.00 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| PLUS 80\% OF ECON. ENERGY SALE | ES PROFI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 182,325.0 | 1.756 | 1.989 | 3,202,420.00 | 3,625,700.00 | 327,520.00 |
| 80\% OF ECON. ENERGY SALES PROFIT | S | - | 182,325.0 | 0.0 | 182,325.0 | 1.756 | 1.98 | 3,202,420.00 |  |  |
| ACTUAL: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FLA. PWR. CORP. |  | ECON.-C | 9,858.0 | 0.0 | 9,858.0 | 1.552 | 1.759 | 152,993.58 | $173,394.10$ $4,455.05$ | $16,320.42$ 623.18 |
| FLA. PHR, \& LIGHT |  | ECON, -C | $\bigcirc 229.0$ | 0.0 | 229.0 | 1.605 | 1.945 | 3,676.07 | $4,455.05$ 0.00 | 623.18 0.00 |
| CITY OF LAKELAND |  | ECON:-C | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 83.00 | 115.05 | 25.08 |
| FT. PIERCE UTIL. AUTH. |  | ECON,-C | 5.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 1.674 | 2.301 | 83.70 0.00 | 110.00 | 0.00 |
| CITY OF GAINESVILLE CITY OF HOMESTEAD |  | ECON. - ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| CITY OFSSONVILLE ELEC. AUTH. |  | ECON. -C | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 0.000 | 0.000 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| KISSIMMEE ELEC. UTIL. |  | ECON, -C | 96.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 96.0 | 1.535 | 2.202 | 1,473.80 | 2,114.05 | 512.20 |
| LAKE WORTH UTILITIES |  | ECON, -C | 96.0 0.0 | 0.0 | 06.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 1.0 .00 | 2, 0.00 | 0.00 |
| CITY OF NEW SMYRNA BCH. |  | ECON.-C | 6,644.0 | 0.0 | 6,644.0 | 1.572 | 1.897 | 104,462.78 | 126,007.28 | 17,235.60 |
| ORLANDO UTIL. COMM. |  | ECON.-C | 6,644.0 | 0.0 | 1,079.0 | 1.568 | 2.253 | 16,919.53 | 24,312.42 | $5,914.31$ 0.00 |
| SEMINOLE ELECTRIC CO-OP |  | ECON:-C | 1,000 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 0.00 |
| CITY OF ST. CLOUD |  | ECON.-C | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 0.000 | 0.00 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| CITY OF STARKE |  | ECON,-C | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| CITY OF VERO BEACH |  | ECON,-C | 0.0 25.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 225.0 | 0.000 1.560 | 1.812 | 3,510.63 | 4,076.49 | 452.69 |
| EMPA |  | ECON.-C | 225.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 2250 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 3, 0.00 | . 0.00 | 0.00 |
| KEY WEST |  | ECON. - -C | 12.763.0 | 0.0 | 12,763.0 | 1.558 | 1.996 | 198,881.90 | 254,711.07 | 44,663.34 |
| REEDY CREEK |  | ECON, -C | $12,763.0$ 0.0 | 0.0 | 12,76.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 108,800 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| SONAT |  | SCH. - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| FLA. PWR. \& LIGHT | SEPAR. | SCH: - ${ }_{\text {S }}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| FMPA | SEPAR. |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 | - 0.00 |  |
| KISSIMMEE ELEC. UTIL. | SEPAR. | SCH. - -D | 8,502.0 | 0.0 | 8,502.0 | 1.699 | 1.843 | 144,444.66 | 156,666.51 |  |
| CITY OF NEW SMYRNA BCR. | SEPAR. | SCH. -D | 14,880.0 | 0.0 | 14,880.0 | 1.352 | 1.622 | $201,177.60$ $50,294.40$ | $241,353.60$ $60,338.40$ |  |
| WAUCHULA | SEPAR. | SCH. -D | 3.720 .0 | 0.0 | 3,720.0 | 1.352 1.352 | 1.622 | 49,429.12 | 59,300.32 |  |
| FT. MEADE | SEPAR. | SCH. -D | 3,656.0 | 0.0 | 3,656.0 | 1.350 | 0.000 | 49,40.00 | 0.00 |  |
| ST. CLOUD | SEPAR. | SCH. - ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 30,060.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 30,060.0 | 1.760 | 2.418 | 529,056.00 | 726,850.80 |  |
| HARDEE POWER PARTNERS | SEPAR. | CONTRACT | 30,060.0 | 834.1 | 3,765.9 | 1.347 | 1.347 | 50,723.56 | 50,723.56 |  |
| SEMINOLE ELECTRIC CO-OP PRECO-1 | JURISD. | SCH: -D | 4,600.0 | 80.0 | 3,776.0 | 1.863 | 1.863 | 14,456.12 | 14,456.12 |  |
| SEMINOLE ELECTRIC CO-OP HARDEE | JURISD. | SCH. -J | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| FLA. PWR. CORP. | JURISD. | SCH. -J | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| FLA ${ }^{\text {Cit }}$ OFR \% \% LIGESTEAD | JURISD. | SCH. -J | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| CITY OF HOMESTEAD KEY HEST | JURISD. | SCH. -J | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| KISSIMMEE ELEC. UTIL. | JURISD. | SCH. -J | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 0.000 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| CITY OF LAKELAND | JURISD. | SCH. -J | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| ORLANDO UTIL. COMM. | JURISD. | SCH: -J | 7.220 .0 | 0.0 | 7,220.0 | 2.309 | 2.309 | 166,743.22 | 166,743.22 |  |
| REEDY CREEK | JURISD. JURISD. | SCH. -J | 7,220.0 | 0.0 | . 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | - 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| SEMINOLE ELECTRIC CO-OP | JURISD. | SCH. -J | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| CITY OF NEH SMYRNA BCH. | JURISD. | SCH. -J | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 0.00 |  |
| WAUCHULA | JURISD. | SCH. -J | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| LAKE HORTH UTILITIES | JURISD. | SCH. -J | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| OGLETHORPE | JURISD. | SCH. -J | 0.0 | 0.0 | 00.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| FMPA |  | SCH. -D | 63,240.0 | 63,240.0 | 0.0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.0 |  |  |



```
TOTAL INCLUDING VARIABLE O & M COSTS 
```

80\% OF ECON. ENERGY SALES PROFITS
ACTUAL:



* THE PROFITS RELLECTED ARE ONLY ON TEC 40\% SEC


6．Fuel cost of Purchased Pouer－fira（A）
1．Energy Cost of Sch C，\＆Econonf Purchases（Broter）（AS） 8．Ebergy Cost of Other Econony Purchases Woa－
10．Capacity Cost of Sch．E Ecobony Purchases
12．707AL cost of purchaseo poice（LIAES 6 through 11）

4．Fuel Cost of Ecoooop Sales 186）

7．Fuel Cost of Sch．o Separ．Sales（A6）

20．Fuel cost of gipp Seh． 0 Separ．Sales lab
22．total puel cost and gains of porer sales
LKE $14+15+16+17+18+19+20+211$
23．Yet Iadvertant Interchange
24．Wheeliag Rec＇d．less Ybeeling Dely＇d．
25．Interchange and Wheeling losses
26．707AL fuEl AMD MET POMER TRASSACTIOMS
i．Yet dabillied $5+12-22+23+24-25\}$
28．Coapary Use

10．Systen IVH Sales
3la，Jurisdictional Transaission
32．Jurisdictiona！Thll Sales
3．Jurisdictional Loss kultiplier－1．00013
JI．Jurisdictional twa Sales Adjusted for line losses
5．Peabody Coal Contract buy－Out heort．Jurisdictionalized
36．Fuel Credit Differential－faph Sale

| 1 |  |  |  | NWH |  |  |  | cents／ixil |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACTVAL | ESTIMATED | Differexce |  | tCTEA | EStimated | disferexce |  | actuil | Esfixste |  |  |
| NTMAL |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AMOUN } \\ & (62,116 \end{aligned}$ | 1 |  |  | T1，50 | \％ |  |  |  |  |
| 35，825，625 | 35，887，741 |  | 10.21 | 1，265，327 | 1，893，820 |  | 1.2 | 209900 P．11875 |  | 10．08935］ | 14．2） |
| 3， 0250 | 3，1si， |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0 | 0.0 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.0 |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | － | － | 0.0 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.0 |
| （5，264） | （3，500） | （1，961） | 50.4 | 1， 265,372 （a） | 1，593，820（a） | 71，50i | 1.2 | 10．00030） | 10．00021） | （0．00009） | 12.9 |
|  |  | 1. | 0.0 | 1， $1,65,327$ a） | 1，593，820（a） | 11，507 | 1.2 | 0.00000 | 0.00900 | 0.00000 | 0.0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1，165，327（a） | 1，693，820（a） | 11，507 | 1.2 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.0 |
| 35，820，361 | 35，881，211 | 163，8801 | （0．2） | 1， 765 ， 327 | 1，693，820 | 11，501 | 4.2 | 2.02911 | 2.11854 | （0．08933） | （1．2） |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.05011 | 0.08051 | 2.6 |
| $3,411,322$ 8,826 | $2,099,300$ 203,400 | 1，192，022 | 193．7） | 110，882 | 68，827 | 12,050 $(1,500)$ | 194．6） | 3.13424 | 4.27580 | 10．84156） | ［19．71 |
| 8，826 | 203，400 | （19，${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.0 | － | 0 | 1, | 0.0 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 （a） | 0 （a） | 0 | 0.0 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.0 |
| 681，723 | 832，100 | （144，37） | （1i，4） | 38，012 | 36，523 | 1，489 | 1.1 | 1.80923 | 2.27829 | （0．46906） | （20．6） |
| 4，161，871 | 3，134，800 | 1，033，071 | $33.0$ | 149，151 | 110，107 | 39，041 | 35.5 | 2.79450 | 2.84105 | （0．05265） | （1．8） |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 1，314， 718 | 1，803，921 | 110，551 | 6.1 |  |  |  |  |
| 1，48，886 | 1，397，700 | 51.185 | 3.1 | 15， 313 | 30，584 | $(15,271)$ | ［16．9］ | 1.92382 | 1，51299 | 0.38083 | 24.1 |
| 3，105，335 | 1，188，000 | 2，617，335 | 536.3 | 15，313（a） | 90，581（a） | $(15,271)$ | （16．9） | 4.12324 | 0.53873 | 3.58451 | 669.4 |
| 518，802 | 500，300 | 17，902 | 3.5 | 31.510 | 34，091 | ＋119 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1.2 | 1.50334 | 1.66930 | 0.03404 | 2.3 |
| 10，922 | 103，300 | （32，318） | （131．3） | 4，345 | 5，920 | （1，575） | （26．6） | 1.63229 | 1.74493 | （0．11266） | （6．5） |
| ${ }^{1} 2271$ | $1{ }^{0}$ | （12i） | 0.0 |  | 50 | － $18{ }^{\circ}$ | 0.0 | ERR | 0.00000 | （0．81239 | 0.0 |
| ，302，942 | 135，500 | 167， 442 | 123.6 | 17，916 | 5,760 18,201 | 9，186 | 124.8 262.2 | 2.34004 | 2.35243 2.34548 | $\binom{0.01239}{0.22001}$ | $\left(\begin{array}{l}0.5 \\ 9.4\end{array}\right.$ |
| 1，401，001 | 126，900 | 974，101 | 228.2 | 65，915 | 18,201 61,200 | 17,14 （61，200） | ${ }^{262.2}$ | 2.12517 0.00000 | 2.34648 1.19101 | $\binom{0.22001}{1.49101}$ | $(1100.0$ |
|  |  | 2，883，061 | 12.1 |  |  |  |  | 3.54758 | 1.83763 | 1.70895 |  |
| 6，847，861 | 3，964，800 |  |  | 193，029 | 215，756 | $(22,127)$ | （10．5） |  |  |  | 93.1 |
|  |  |  |  | （1，299） | 0 | （1，249） | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 282 | 0 | ， 282 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 1，320 | 1，300 | 20 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |
| 33，140，3il | 35，051，241 | $(1,113,870)$ | （5．5） | 1，117，162 | 1，584，871 | 132，291 | 8.3 | 1.92395 | 2.21180 | （0．28185） | （12．1） |
|  | ： $2:$ ：$:$ ：$:$ ： | ：$:=:=:=$ ：$:$ ： | ： $2:$ ：$:=$ |  |  | ：：：：\％：$=:$ ： | ：：：：：＝－ | ：$:$ ：：$:=:$ ： | ：：：：：：\％ | ：：：：：：：： | ：：：： |
| 1，763，762｜a | 689，374（a） | 1，074，388 | 155.8 | 91，389 | 31，168 | 60，221 | 193.2 | 0.10271 | 0.01350 | 0.05921 | 136.1 |
| 1，87，697 a | 84,018 s | 12，649 | 1.3 | 1，541 | 3，800 | 144 | 19.6 | 0.00568 | 0.00571 | ［0．00003 | （0．5） |
| 1，172，011 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ） | 1，730，291（a） | $(258,280)$ | （14．9） | 16，272 | 18，230 | ［1，958） | 12.51 | 0.09528 | 0.11751 | （0．02229） | （19．0） |
| $\left.\begin{array}{r} 33 \\ 140,371 \\ 675,805 \\ 188,589 \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | $35\left(\begin{array}{c} 051,241 \\ (18,86 j) \\ 0 \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11913,870 \\ & (256,942 \\ & 118,689) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15.51 \\ 61.3 \\ 0.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,34,957 \\ {[31,505)} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,471,673 \\ & (17,585) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13,284 \\ (13,920) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.0 \\ 79.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.14507 \\ & 2.14507 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & ? .38193 \\ & 2.38193 \end{aligned}$ | $\left\{\left.\begin{array}{l} 0.23686 \\ 0.23686 \end{array} \right\rvert\,\right.$ | $\binom{9.9}{9.9}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32，385，817 | 34，635，378 | （2，249，501） | （16．5） | 1，513，152 | 1，451，088 | 59，364 | 4.1 | 2.19987 | 2.18193 | （0．29206） | ［10．2） |
| $\begin{gathered} ::=:::::::=:= \\ 12,390,087 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & =:=:=:=:= \\ & 31,639,881 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & :=:: 2:: z:= \\ & \{2,249,794\} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} =: 2::=:= \\ (6.5) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} :=::::=: 2::= \\ 1,513,150 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & :=:=: 2:=:=: \\ & 1,154,088 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} &:::=:=::=:= \\ & 2.11015 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} =:::=:=:=: \\ 2.38224 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { : : : : : : : : : : } \\ &(0.24209) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} &=:: z: z \\ &\|10.2\| \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 415，407 | 118，981 | 13，580） | 10.91 |  | 1，454，088 | 59，361 4.1 |  | 0.02345 | 0.02881 | （0．00136） | （4．7） |
|  |  |  |  |  | ：$:=:$ ：$:=:=$ | ：：：＝：：：：： | － |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | （410，500） | 170，500 | （100．0） | 1，513，452 | 1，454，088 | 59，364 | 1.1 | 0.00000 | （0．03236） | 0.03236 | 100．0） |
| （128，85t） | （128，854） | 0 | 0.0 |  | － $1,454,088$ | 59，364： | ：7：3： 4 | （0．04816） | （0．05012） | 0.00198 | （3．9） |
| 32，076，640 | 31，859，514 | $(1,782,874)$ | 15，3） | $\begin{gathered} 1,513,152 \\ ::=:=:=:= \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,154,088 \\ & :=:=:=:=: \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2.32857 \\ 1.00083 \\ 2.33050 \\ 10.004171 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.20913) \\ 0.00000 \\ 10.209301 \\ 0.00017 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (9.0) \\ & 0.0 \\ & {\left[\begin{array}{l} 9.0 \\ 4.1 \end{array}\right]} \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ：こ：ロ：ニ：こ：ニ | ：：： |  |  |  |  |
| （60，591） | （60，591） | 0 | 0.0 | 1，513，452 | 1，154，088 | 59，364 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} 12,016,019 \\ =:=1 \\ 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31,798,963 \\ & =:=:=:=:=: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (1,782,81) \\ & :=: 8: 8: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \{3,3\} \\ & =:=::=: ~ \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,513,152 \\ ::::=:=: \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,451088 \\ =:=::=:=2 \end{gathered}$ | ：\％：3： | ：：：：：： |  |  | \％sil？ | 19．8i |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 2.11109 \\ 2.117 \end{array}$ | $2.326$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10．209） |  | （9．0） |  |

3，Fuel fiC Rounded to the Mearest ． 001 cents per IWI $\qquad$
（a）included for isforsational purposes only
CALCULATION OF TRUE-UP AND INTEREST PROVISION
schedule az
TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY
MONTH OF: JUNE, 1998
PAGE 1 OF 3 CURRENT MONTH
PERIOD to DATE
A. FUEL COST \& NET POWER TRANSACTION

1. FUEL COST OF SYSTEM NET GENERATION
a. FUEL REL. R \& d and demo. COSt
2. FUEL COST OF POWER SOLD *
3. FUEL COST OF PURCHASED POWER
a. DEMAND \& NONFUEL COST OF PUR. PWR.
b. Payment to qualified facilities
4. energy cost of economy purchases
5. total fuel \& Net power transaction
6a. ADJUSTMENTS TO FUEL COST
6. AdJUSTMENTS TO FUEL COST
6c. ADJ.TO FUEL COST
7. ADJUSTED TOTAL FUEL \& NET PWR.TRANS. 33,140,37

* INCLUDES ECONOMY SALES PROFITS (80\%)
B. MWH SALES

1. JURISDICTIONAL SALES
2. NONJURISDICTIONAL SALES
3. total sales
4. JURISDIC. SALES-X TOTAL MWH SALES

| $1,513,452$ | $1,454,088$ | 59,364 | 4.1 | $3,888,733$ | $3,900,941$ | $(12,208)$ | $(0.3)$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 31,505 | 17,585 | 13,920 | 79.2 | 60,846 | 33,292 | 27,554 | $82.8 ;$ |
| $1,544,957$ | $1,471,673$ | 73,284 | 5.0 | $3,949,579$ | $3,934,233$ | 15,346 | 0.4 |
| 0.9796078 | 0.9880510 | $(0.0084432)$ | $(0.9)$ | 0.9845943 | 0.9915379 | $(0.0069436)$ | $(0.7)$ |

TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY


| c. true-up calculation | CAlCulation of true-up and interest provision TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY CURRENT MONTH |  |  |  | PERIOD TO date PAGE 2 OF |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ACTUAL | estimated | DIFFERENC AMOUNT | E | ACTUAL | EStimated | DIFFERENCE AMOUNT | x |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Jurisdictional fuel revenue | 35,075,112 | 33,986,791 | 1,088,321 | 3.2 | 89,908,427 | 91,123,368 | (1,214,941) | (1,3) |
| 2. FUEL Adjustment not applicablea. True-up provision | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 728,854 | 728,854 | 0 | 0.0 | 2,186,562 | 2,186,562 | 0 | 0.0 |
| a. TRUE-UP PROVISION b. INCENTIVE PROVISION | 60,591 | 60,591 | 0 | 0.0 | 181,773 | 181,773 | 0 | 0.0 |
| c. 'transition adjustment <br> d. OTHER | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 3. JURIS. FUEL REVENUE APPL. TO PERIOD <br> 4. ADJ. TOTAL FUEL \& NET PWR. TRANS. <br> (Line A-7) | 35,864,557 | 34,776,236 | 1,088,321 | 3.1 | 92,276,762 | 93,491,703 | (1,214,941) | (1.3) |
|  | 33,140,371 | 35,054,241 | $(1,913,870)$ | (5.5) | 90,387,851 | 95,583,794 | $(5,195,943)$ | (5.4) |
| 5. Jurisdic. sales- x total kwh sales <br> (LINE B-4) | 0.9796078 | 0.9880510 | (0.0084432) | (0.9) | NA | NA | - | - |
| 5a, JURISDIC. TOTAL FUEL NET PWR.TRANS. <br> 5b. $80 \times$ ECONOMY TRANSMANS. REV.) <br> 5b. 80X ECONOMY TRANSMISSION REVENUES <br> 5c. TRANSMISSION SEPARATYON FACTOR <br> 5d. JURIS. ECONOMY TRANSMISSION REV. <br> 6A (INCLUDING ECONOMY TRANS REV.) <br> GA.JURISDIC. LOSS MULTIPLIER <br> 6B. (LINE $6 \times$ LINE 6A) | . $32,464,566$ | 34,635,378 | $(2,170,812)$ | (6.3) | 88,999,600 | 94,771,302 | (5,771,702) | (6.1) |
|  | 0.8724698) | 0.0000000 | $0.87{ }^{907698}{ }^{16}$ | 0.0 | (250, 160 ) | na 0 | $(250,160)$ | 0.0 |
|  | 0.878,689) |  | (78,689) | 0.0 | (215,111) | NA 0 | $(215,111)$ | 0.0 |
|  | - 32,385,877 | 34,635,378 | ( $2,249,501$ ) | (6.5) | 88,784,489 | 94,771,302 | $(5,986,813)$ | (6.3) |
|  | 32, ${ }^{1} 90000808$ | 34,639,881 | (2,249,794) | (6.0) | 88,796,031 | 94,783, 623 | $(5,98 \overline{7}, 592)$ | ( $\overline{6} .3$ ) |
| GC. PEABODY COAL CONTRACT BUY-OUT AMORT. 6D. (LINE 6C x LINE 5) | $\begin{aligned} & 424,054 \\ & 415 ; 407 \end{aligned}$ | 424,054 | $(3,580)$ | $\binom{0.0}{(0.9)}$ | $1,276,755$ $1,257,756$ | $1,279,755$ $1,269,401$ | $(13,000)$ | $\binom{0.2}{0.9}$ |
| 6E. YNTEREST ON SEPT. 97 ADJ. ON FUEL <br> 6F. FUEDIT CREDFFERENTIAL-FMPA/LKL DIFFERENTIAL-FMPA SALE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 0 | $(470,500)$ | 470,500 | 0.0 | $(13,179)$ | $(1,502,980)$ | 1,502,980 | 0.0 |
| 6G. Revenue refund true-up adjustment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 6h. OIL below the discharge valve <br> 6I. TRANSMISSION ADJ. (JAN.-NOV. 97) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 6J. JURISDIC. TOTAL FUEL \& NET PWR. INCL. ALL ADJUSTMENTS | 32,805,494 | 34,588,368 | $(1,782,874)$ | (5.2) | 90,040,608 | 94,550,044 | (4,509,436) | (4.8) |
|  | 3,059,063 | 187,888 | 2,871,195 | 1,528.3 | 2,236,154 | (1,058,341) | 3,294,495 | (311.3) |
| 8. INTEREST PROVISION FOR THE MONTH <br> 9. TRUE-UP \& INT. PROV. BEG. OF MONTH <br> 9a. Deferred true-up beginning of period <br> 10. TRUB-UP COLLECTED (REFUNDED) | 15,523 | 7,176 | 8,347 | 116.3 | 57,120 | 43,584 | 13,536 | 31.1 ; |
|  | 8,229,922 | 7,748,019 | 481,903 | 6.2 | NOT APPLICABL |  |  |  |
|  | D $(6,042,407)$ | (6,042,407) | 0 | 0.0 | NOT APPLICAB |  |  |  |
|  | (728,854) | $(728,854)$ | 0 | 0.0 | NOT APPLICABL |  |  |  |
| 11. end of period total net true-up (LINE C-7 through C-10) | 4,533,247 | 1,171,802 | 3,361,445 | 286.9 | NOT APPLICAB |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. jurtsdictional fuel revenue
2. FUEL ADJUSTMENT NOT APPLICAble
a. TRUE-UP PROVISION
35,075,112

| c. true-up calculation | CAlCulation of true-up and interest provision TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY CURRENT MONTH |  |  |  | PERIOD TO date PAGE 2 OF |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ACTUAL | estimated | DIFFERENC AMOUNT | E | ACTUAL | EStimated | DIFFERENCE AMOUNT | x |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Jurisdictional fuel revenue | 35,075,112 | 33,986,791 | 1,088,321 | 3.2 | 89,908,427 | 91,123,368 | (1,214,941) | (1,3) |
| 2. FUEL Adjustment not applicablea. True-up provision | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 728,854 | 728,854 | 0 | 0.0 | 2,186,562 | 2,186,562 | 0 | 0.0 |
| a. TRUE-UP PROVISION b. INCENTIVE PROVISION | 60,591 | 60,591 | 0 | 0.0 | 181,773 | 181,773 | 0 | 0.0 |
| c. 'transition adjustment <br> d. OTHER | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 3. JURIS. FUEL REVENUE APPL. TO PERIOD <br> 4. ADJ. TOTAL FUEL \& NET PWR. TRANS. <br> (Line A-7) | 35,864,557 | 34,776,236 | 1,088,321 | 3.1 | 92,276,762 | 93,491,703 | (1,214,941) | (1.3) |
|  | 33,140,371 | 35,054,241 | $(1,913,870)$ | (5.5) | 90,387,851 | 95,583,794 | $(5,195,943)$ | (5.4) |
| 5. Jurisdic. sales- x total kwh sales <br> (LINE B-4) | 0.9796078 | 0.9880510 | (0.0084432) | (0.9) | NA | NA | - | - |
| 5a, JURISDIC. TOTAL FUEL NET PWR.TRANS. <br> 5b. $80 \times$ ECONOMY TRANSMANS. REV.) <br> 5b. 80X ECONOMY TRANSMISSION REVENUES <br> 5c. TRANSMISSION SEPARATYON FACTOR <br> 5d. JURIS. ECONOMY TRANSMISSION REV. <br> 6A (INCLUDING ECONOMY TRANS REV.) <br> GA.JURISDIC. LOSS MULTIPLIER <br> 6B. (LINE $6 \times$ LINE 6A) | . $32,464,566$ | 34,635,378 | $(2,170,812)$ | (6.3) | 88,999,600 | 94,771,302 | (5,771,702) | (6.1) |
|  | 0.8724698) | 0.0000000 | $0.87{ }^{907698}{ }^{16}$ | 0.0 | (250, 160 ) | na 0 | $(250,160)$ | 0.0 |
|  | 0.878,689) |  | (78,689) | 0.0 | (215,111) | NA 0 | $(215,111)$ | 0.0 |
|  | - 32,385,877 | 34,635,378 | ( $2,249,501$ ) | (6.5) | 88,784,489 | 94,771,302 | $(5,986,813)$ | (6.3) |
|  | 32, ${ }^{1} 90000808$ | 34,639,881 | (2,249,794) | (6.0) | 88,796,031 | 94,783, 623 | $(5,98 \overline{7}, 592)$ | ( $\overline{6} .3$ ) |
| GC. PEABODY COAL CONTRACT BUY-OUT AMORT. 6D. (LINE 6C x LINE 5) | $\begin{aligned} & 424,054 \\ & 415 ; 407 \end{aligned}$ | 424,054 | $(3,580)$ | $\binom{0.0}{(0.9)}$ | $1,276,755$ $1,257,756$ | $1,279,755$ $1,269,401$ | $(13,000)$ | $\binom{0.2}{0.9}$ |
| 6E. YNTEREST ON SEPT. 97 ADJ. ON FUEL <br> 6F. FUEDIT CREDFFERENTIAL-FMPA/LKL DIFFERENTIAL-FMPA SALE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 0 | $(470,500)$ | 470,500 | 0.0 | $(13,179)$ | $(1,502,980)$ | 1,502,980 | 0.0 |
| 6G. Revenue refund true-up adjustment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 6h. OIL below the discharge valve <br> 6I. TRANSMISSION ADJ. (JAN.-NOV. 97) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 6J. JURISDIC. TOTAL FUEL \& NET PWR. INCL. ALL ADJUSTMENTS | 32,805,494 | 34,588,368 | $(1,782,874)$ | (5.2) | 90,040,608 | 94,550,044 | (4,509,436) | (4.8) |
|  | 3,059,063 | 187,888 | 2,871,195 | 1,528.3 | 2,236,154 | (1,058,341) | 3,294,495 | (311.3) |
| 8. INTEREST PROVISION FOR THE MONTH <br> 9. TRUE-UP \& INT. PROV. BEG. OF MONTH <br> 9a. Deferred true-up beginning of period <br> 10. TRUB-UP COLLECTED (REFUNDED) | 15,523 | 7,176 | 8,347 | 116.3 | 57,120 | 43,584 | 13,536 | 31.1 ; |
|  | 8,229,922 | 7,748,019 | 481,903 | 6.2 | NOT APPLICABL |  |  |  |
|  | D $(6,042,407)$ | (6,042,407) | 0 | 0.0 | NOT APPLICAB |  |  |  |
|  | (728,854) | $(728,854)$ | 0 | 0.0 | NOT APPLICABL |  |  |  |
| 11. end of period total net true-up (LINE C-7 through C-10) | 4,533,247 | 1,171,802 | 3,361,445 | 286.9 | NOT APPLICAB |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

- INCENTIVE PROVISION
60,591
c. transition adjustment
d. OTHER

3. Juris. fuel revenue appl. to period
4. ADJ. TOTAL FUEL \& NET PWR. TRANS.
5. JURISDIC (LINE B-i) SAles- $x$ total kwi sales
$35,864,557$
33,140,371
0.9796078
0.9880510

6A. JUARSDIC.
6B. LINE
$\mathbf{6}$
LINE MALTIPLIER
GC. PEABODY COAL CONTRACT BUY-OUT AMORT.
GLINE 6 C (LINE 5 )
$32,464,566$
$(90,160)$
0.8727698
$(78,689)$
$32,385,877$
32,1908013
390,087
34,635,378

$$
0.0000000_{0}^{0}
$$



| $199$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |



A. FUEL COST \& NET POWER TRANSACTION

1. FUEL COST OF SYSTEM NET GENERATION
a. FUEL REL. $R \& D$ AND DEMO. COST
2. FUEL COST OF POWER SOLD *
3. FUEL COST OF PURCHASED POWER
a. DEMAṄD \& NONFUEL COST OF PUR. PWR.
b. PAYMENT TO QUALIFIED FACILITIES
4. ENERGY COST OF ECONOMY PURCHASES
5. TOTAL FUEL \& NET POWER TRANSACTION

Ga. ADJUSTMENTS TO PUEL COST
(FT. MEADE/WAUCHULA WHEELING LOSSES)
6b. ADJUSTMENTS TO FUEL COST
Cc. ADJ. TO FUEL COST
7. ADJUSTED TOTAL PUEL \& NET PWR.TRANS. * INCLUDES ECONOMY SALES PROFITS (80\%)

CALCULATION OF TRUE-UP AND INTEREST PROVISION
SCHEDULE AZ TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY

PAGE 1 OF 3
MONTH OF: JULY, 1998

$35,135,362$

| $4,163,921$ | $3,679,780$ | 484,141 | 13.2 | $15,257,182$ | $14,887,220$ | 369,962 | 2.5 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $4,385,100$ | $2,229,300$ | $2,155,800$ | 96.7 | $12,249,629$ | $6,790,100$ | $5,459,529$ | 80.4 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |

701,719
45,128

36,103,388
(931,788)
(2.5) $126,503,311132,629,470$
$(6,126,159$
(86.6)
(3,500)
(770)
$22.0 \quad(16,342)$
$\begin{array}{ll}0.0 & 0 \\ 0.0 & 0\end{array}$
0
(2.5) $126,486,969132,615,47$
$(932,558)$
37,031,676
-

## B. MWH SALES

1. JURISDICTIONAL SALES
2. NONJURISDICTIONAL SALES
3. TOTAL SALES
4. JURISDIC. SALES-X TOTAL MWH SALES

| $1,600,177$ | $1,515,374$ | 84,803 | 5.6 | $5,488,910$ | $5,416,315$ | 72,595 | 1.3 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 29,317 | 23,564 | 5,753 | 24.4 | 90,163 | 56,856 | 33,307 | 58.6 |
| $1,629,494$ | $1,538,938$ | 90,556 | 5.9 | $5,579,073$ | $5,473,171$ | 105,902 | 1.9 |
| 0.9820085 | 0.9846881 | $(0.0026796)$ | $(0.3)$ | 0.9838391 | 0.9896119 | $(0.0057728)$ | $(0.6)$ |

c. TRUE-UP CAICULATION

1. JURISDICTIONAL FUEL REVENUE:
2. FUEL ADJUSTMENT NOT APPLICABLE
a. True-up provision
b. INCENTIVE PROVISION
c. IRANSITION ADJUSTMENT
d. OTHER
3. JURIS. FUEL REVENUE APPL. TO pERIOD
4. ADJ. TOTAL FUEL \& NET PWR. TRANS.
5. JURISDIC, SALES- * TOTAL KWH SALES

Sa. JURISDIC, TOTAL FUEL ${ }^{2}$ NET PWR.TRANS.
(EXCLUDING ECONOMY TRANS. REV.)
Sb. BOX FCONOMY TRANSMISSION REVENUES
Sc. TRANSMISSION SEPARATION FACTOR
Sd. JURIS. ECONOMY TRANSMISSION REV.
B. JURISDIC. TOTAL FUEL \& NET PWR.TRANS.
(INCLUDING ECONOMY TRANS. REV.)
6A.JURISDIC. LOSS MULTIPLIER
CC. PEABODY COAL CONTRACT BUY-OUT ABORT.
GD. (LINE EC $\times$ LINK 5 )

CF. FUEL CREDIT DIFFERENTIAL-FMPA SALE
6G. REVENUE REFUND TRUE-UP ADJUSTMENT
6H. OIL below the discharge valve
61. TRANSMISSION ADJ. (JAN .-NOV. 97)
6.J. JURIDIC. TOTAL FUEL \& NET PHR.

8. INTEREST PLOVISION FOR THE MONTII

9, TRUE-UP \& INT. PROV. BEG. OF MONTH 9a. DEFERIED TRUE-UP BEGINNING OF PERIOD
10. 'THUL-UP COLDFCTED (RETUNDED)
11. END OF PERIOD TOTAL NET TRUE-UP





## A. FUEL COST \& NET POWER TRANSACTION

1. FUEL COST OF SYSTEM NET GENERATYON
a. FUEL REL. R \& D AND DEMO. COST
2. FUEL COST OF POWER SOLD *
3. FUEL COST OF PURCHASED POWER
a. DEMAND \& NONFUEL COST OF PUR. PWR.
b. PAYMENT TO QUALIFIED FACILITIES
4. ENERGY COST OF ECONOMY PURCHASES
5. TOTAL FUEL \& NET POWER TRANSACTION

6a. ADJUSTMENTS TO FUEL COST
(FT. MEADE/WAUCHULA WHEELING LOSSES)
6b. ADJUSTMENTS TO FUEL COST
CALCULATION OF TRUE-UP AND INTEREST PROVISION
SCHEDULE A2 TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY

PAGE 1 OF 3
AMPA ELECTRYC COMPANY
CURRENT MONTH $\quad$ PERIOD TO DATE

| ACTUAL | ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE |  | ACTUAL | ESTIMATED |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AMOUNT | $\%$ | DIFFERENCE |  |  |

6c. ADJ.TO FUEL COST
$35,524,071$
3,064,333 3,671,180

| $3,929,738$ | $2,197,000$ | $1,732,738$ | 78.9 | $16,179,367$ | $8,987,100$ | $7,192,267$ | 0 | 0 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| 799,978 | 980,200 | $(180,222)$ | $(18.4)$ | $3,544,295$ | $4,608,600$ | $(1,064,305)$ | $(23,1)$ |  |
| 48,680 | 279,200 | $(230,520)$ | $(82.6)$ | $\ldots$ | 162,613 | $1,129,100$ | $(966,487)$ | $(85,6)$ |
| $37,238,134$ | $37,672,116$ | $(433,982)$ | $(1.2)$ | $163,741,445$ | $170,301,586$ | $(6,560,141)$ | $(3.9)$ |  |
| $(4,497)$ | $(3,500)$ | $(997)$ | 28.5 | $(20,839)$ | $(17,500)$ | $(3,339)$ | 19.1 |  |

. ADJUSTED TOTAL FUEL \& NET PWR.TRANS.

* INCLUDES ECONOMY SALES PROFITS (80\%)


## B. MWH SALES

1. JURISDICTIONAL SALES
2. NONJURISDICTIONAL SALES
3. TOTAL SALES
4. JURISDIC. SALES-X TOTAL KWH SALES

| $1,517,887$ | $1,495,046$ | 22,841 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 26,230 | 22,019 | 4,211 |
| $1,544,117$ | $1,517,065$ | 27,052 |
| 0.9830129 | 0.9854858 | $(0.0024729)$ |


| 1.5 | $7,006,797$ | $6,911,361$ | 95,436 | 1.4 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 19.1 | 116,393 | 78,875 | 37,518 | $47.6{ }^{\text {i }}$ |
| 1.8 | $7,123,190$ | $6,990,236$ | 132,954 | 1.9 |
| $(0.3)$ | 0.9836600 | 0.9887164 | $(0.0050564)$ | $(0.5)$ |

(
2. FUEL ADJUSTMENT NOT APPLICABLE
a. TRUEMUP PROVISION
b. INCENTIVE PROVISION
c. TRANSITION ADJUGTMENT
d. OTHER
3. JURIS. FUEL REVENUE APPL. TO PERTOD

$$
35,885,991
$$

1. ADJ (LNE TOTAL FUEL \& NET PWR. TRANS.

$$
37,233,637
$$

5. JURISDIC, SALES- \% TOTAI KWH SALES
0.9830129 (LINE B-4)

6C. PEABODY COAL CONTRACT BUY-OUT AMORT.
6D. (LINE 6C $\times$ LINE 5 )
6E. YNTEREST ON SEPT G7 ADJ, ON FUEL
6F. FUEL CREDIT DIFFERENTIAL,-FMPA SASE


36,55
36,5

6G. Revenue refund true-up adjustment
6H. OIt, BELOW TIIE DISCHARGE VALVE
61. TRANSMISSION ADJ. (JAN.-NOV. 97)

6J. JURISDIC. TOTAL FUEL \& \& NET PWR.

(LINE C-3 - LINE C-6J)
8. INTEREST PROVISION FOR THE MONTH
9. TRUE-UP \& INT. PROV. BEG. OF MONTH

9a. DEFERRED TRUE-UP BEGINNING OF PERIOD
10. TRUE-UP COLLECTED (REFUNDED)
11. END OF PERIOD TOTAL NET TRUE-UP

36,970,768
$(1,084,777)$

| 22,897 | $(3,447)$ | 26,344 | $(764.3)$ | 104,132 | 43,829 | 60,303 | 137.6 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $11,905,246$ | $6,351,262$ | $5,553,984$ | 87.4 | NOT APPLICABLE: |  |  |  |
| $(6,042,407)$ | $(6,042,407)$ | 0 | 0.0 | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  |  |
| $(728,854)$ | $(728,854)$ | 0 | 0.0 | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  |  |
| $4,072,105$ | $(1,691,088)$ | $5,763,193$ | $(340.8)$ | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | CALCULATION OF TRUE-UP AND INTERES'T PROVISION TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY MONTH OF: AUGUST, 1998 CURRENT MONTH |  |  |  | Period to date $\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { SCHEDULE } \\ & \text { PAGE } 30 \% \\ & \text { Of }\end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ACTUAL | EStimated | DIFFERENC AMOUNT | F * |  | ACTUAL | EStimated | DIfFERENCE AMOUNT | * |
| D. INTEREST PROVISION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 1. BEGINNING TRUE-UP AMOUNT (LINE C-9 + C-9a) | 5,862,839 | 308,855 | 5,553,984 | 1,798.2 | NO'T | APPLIC |  |  |  |
| 2. ENDING TRUE-UP AMOUNT DEFORE INT. <br> (LINES $\mathrm{C}-7+\mathrm{C}-9+\mathrm{C}-9 \mathrm{a}+\mathrm{C}-10$ ) | 4,049,208 | (1,687,641) | 5,736,849 | (339.9) | NOT | APPLIC |  |  |  |
| 3. total beg. \& end. true-up amount | 9,912,047 | $(1,378,786)$ | 11,290,833 | (818.9) | NOT | APPLIC | LE |  |  |
| 4. AVG. TRUE-UP AMT. (50x OF LINE D-3) | 4,956,024 | (689,393) | 5,645,417 | (818.9) | NOT | APPLIC | LE |  |  |
| 5. INT. RATE-FIRST DAY REP. BUS. MONTIt | 5.560 | 6.000 | (0.440) | (7.3) | NOT | APPLIC | LE |  |  |
| 6. INT. RATE-FIRST dAY SUBSEQUENT MONTH | 5.520 | 6.000 | (0.480) | (8.0) | NOT | APPLIC | LF |  |  |
| 7. TOTAL (LINE D-5 + LINE D-6) | 11.080 | 12.000 | (0.920) | (7.7) | NOT | APPL, C |  |  |  |
| 8. AVERAGE INT. RATE (50\% OF LINE D-7) | 5.540 | 6.000 | (0.460) | (7.7) | NOT | APPLIC | LE |  |  |
| 9. MONTHLY AVG. INT. RATE (LINE D-8/12) | 0.462 | 0.500 | (0.038) | (7.6) | NOT | APPLIC |  |  |  |
| 10. INT. PROVISION (LINE D-4 $\times$ LINE D-9) | 22,897 | (3,447) | 26,344 | (764.3) | NOT | APPLIC |  |  |  |

POWER SOLD




1. Fuel cost of Syster fet Generation $\langle\mathrm{A}\rangle$
2. Speot Ruclear suel
3. Coal Car Inrestaent
ta. Adj. To Fivel Cost |Feade/liauch. Yheeling losses)
tb. djustnents to Fuel Cost
ic. Adjustaents to fuel cost
j. fotal cost of generated poner \{lives 1 throech 4 c )
4. Fuel cost of Purchased Pouer - firn (AI)
5. Eaergy Cost of Sca C, X Econony Purthases (Broker) (Ag) 8. Eaergy Coss of Ocher Econony Purchases (1)
6. Capacity Cost of Sch, E Econory Purchases
7. Pafreats to pualiffiog facilities (A8)
8. TOTAL COST Of Purchased poner (lises 6 fliouce 11)

9. Fuel Cost of Econosy Sales [A6]
10. Gain on Ecobony Sales - 80\% (a6) EXCL. TRaHS
11. Fuel cost of Sch. D Separ, Soles (A6)
12. Fuel Cost of Sch. 0 Jurisd. Sales
13. Fuel Cost of Sch. $G$ Jurisd. Ssles
14. Fuel Cost of Sch. J Jurisd. Sales tab
15. Suel Cost of BPP Sch. O Separ. Ssles
16. Fuel cost of other Pouer Sales (ab)
17. TOTAL FUEL COST AED GABSS OF pOLIER SLLES
(LXE 11 $+15+16+17+18+15+20+21$
18. Yet Inadrertant lnterchange

19. TOTAL GUEL AXD NET POUER TRAKSACTLOMS
20. Wet ULHE $5+12-22+23+24-251$
21. Yet vabilled
22. 1\&0 losses
23. Systea TVI Sales
jla. Jurisdictional transsission
24. Jurisdictional 5 IV Sales
25. Jurisdictional boss Multiplier - 1.00013

3f, Jurisdictional sut Sales Adjusted for Line losses
35. Peabody Coal Coatract Buy-Out Amort, Jurisdictionalized
36. Fuel Credit Differedial - EyPd Sale
17. True-up :
38. Total Jerisdictional fuel Cost (Excl. GPIf)
39. Revenue fas facto
10. Fuel Cost Adjusted for Taxes (Excl. GPIF)
12. Fuel Cost Adjusted for Taxes (Iacl, GPIF)
13. Fuel FAC Rounded to the Yearest . 001 cents per ING


[^1]
A. FUEL COST \& NET POWER TRANSACTION

1. FUEL COST OF SyStem net generation
a. FUEL REL. $R$ \& $D$ and demo. Cost
2. FUEL COST OF POWER SOLD *
3. FUEL COST OF PURCHASED POWER
a. DEMAND \& NONFUEL COST OF PUR. PWR.
b. PAYMENT TO QUALIFIED FACILITTES
4. ENERGY COST OF ECONOMY purchases
5. TOTAL FUEL \& NET PONER TRANSACTION

6a. ADJUSTMENTS TO FUEL COST
(FT. MEADE/WAUCHULA WHEELING LOSSES)
6b. ADJUSTMENTS TO FUEL COST
6c. ADJ.TO FUEL COST
7. ADJUSTED TOTAL FUEL \& NET PWR.TRANS. * INCLUDES ECONOMY SALES PROFITS (80\%)
B. MWH SALES

## 1. JURISDICTIONAL SALES

2. NONJURISDICTIONAL SALES
3. Total Sales
4. Jurisdic. Sales-x total kwh sales

SCHEDULE A2
PAGE 1 OF 3
AMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY
MONTH OF: SEPTEMBER, 1998 CURRENT MONTH


| ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE AMOUNT | * | ACTUAL. | ESTIMATED | DIFFERENCE AMOUNT | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34,679,220 | $(4,456,394)$ | (12.9) | 192,399,511 | 208,814,406 | $(16,414,895)$ | (7.9) |


| $30,222,826$ | $34,679,220$ | $(4,456,394)$ | $(12.9)$ | $192,399,511$ | $208,814,406$ | $(16,414,895)$ | $(7.9)$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |  |


| $2,128,387$ | $3,211,940$ | $(1,083,553)$ | $(33.7)$ | $20,449,902$ | $21,770,340$ | $(1,320,438)$ | $(6,1)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3,912,702$ | $1,435,400$ | $2,477,302$ | 172.6 | $20,092,069$ | $10,422,500$ | $9,669,569$ | 92,8 |

$651,899 \quad 848,600(196,701) \quad(23.2) \quad 4,196,194 \quad 5,457,200 \quad(1,261,006) \quad(23.1)$
$21,707 \quad 312,400(290,693)(93.1) \quad 184,320 \quad 1,441,500 \quad(1,257,180) \quad(87,2)$
$32,680,747(34,063,680(1,382,933)(4.1) 196,422,192204,365,266$ (7,943,074) (3.9)

| $(3,775)$ | $(3,500)$ | $(275)$ | $(24,614)$ | $(21,000)$ | $(3,614)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 0 |


| 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0.0 | 0 | 0 |

0.0
$32,676,972$
$34,060,180 \quad(1,383,208)$
(4.1) $196,397,578204,344,266 \quad(7,946,688)$

| $1,543,055$ | $1,521,153$ | 21,902 | 1.4 | $8,549,852$ | $8,432,514$ | 117,338 | 1.4 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 12,087 | 15,674 | $(3,587)$ | $(22.9)$ | 128,480 | 94,549 | 33,931 | 35.9 |
| $1,555,142$ | $1,536,827$ | 18,315 | 1.2 | $8,678,332$ | $8,527,063$ | 151,269 | 1.8 |
| 0.9922277 | 0.9898011 | 0.0024266 | 0.2 | 0.9851953 | 0.9889119 | $(0.0037166)$ | $(0.4)$ |

c. true-up calculation

1. jurisdictional fuel revenue
2. FUEL ADJUSTMENT NOT APPLICABLE
a. TRUE-UP PROVISION
b. INCENTIVE PROVISION
c. transition adjustment
d. other
3. juris. fuel revenue appl. to period
4. ADJ. TOTAL FUEL \& NET PWR. trans.

 5b. BOX ECONOMY TRANSMISSION REVENUES 5c: TRANSMISSION SEPARATION FACTOR


6C. PeABODY COAL CONTRACT BUY-OUT AMORT.
6E. INTEREST ON SEPT ${ }_{\text {CREDIT }}^{\text {97 }}$ ADJ. ON FUEL 6F. FREDIT DIFFERENTIAL-FMPA/LKL SALE
6G. revenue refund true-up adjustment 6h. oil below the discharge valve
6I. TRANSMISSION ADJ. (JAN.-NOV. 97)
6J. JURISDIC. TOTAL FUEL \& NET PWR.

5. interest provision for the month
6. TRUE-UP \& INT. PROV. BEG. OF MONTH

9a. deferred true-up beginning of period
10. TRUE-UP COLLECTED (REPUNDED)
11. END OF PERIOD TOTAL NET TRUE-UP
calculation of
TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY PROVISION HONTH OF: SEPTEMBER, 1998 CURRENT MONTH
ACTUAL
$35,770,993$

$$
35,770,993
$$

ES
0
$\mathbf{7 2 8}, 851$
60,591

36,560,43
32,676,972
0.9922277
$32,422,997$

$32,378,936$
$32,383,145$
2,796,369

33,755,409
3,764,066
2,594,519
1,169,547
25,042
$10,114,512$
$(3,791)$
4,351,31
$(6,042,407)$
$(728,851)$
7,132,362
$(6,042,407)$
28,833

130,751

| $\begin{aligned} & 33,712,804 \\ & 33,7 \mathrm{i} 9,187 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (1,333,868) \\ & (1,334,0000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (4.0) \\ & (4.00 \\ & (4.0) \end{aligned}$ | $193,115,987$ $193,141,092$ | $202,070,643$ $202,096,913$ | $(8,954,656)$ $(8,955,821)$ | (4.4) $(4.4)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 416,461 \\ & 412,214 \end{aligned}$ | $1,010^{0}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 0.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,533,731 \\ & 2 ; 496,794 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,536,731 \\ & 2 ; 509,595 \end{aligned}$ | $(13,000)$ | $\{0.15\}$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| $(373,992)$ | 373,992 | 0.0 | (13, 179) | $(2,938,153)$ | 2,924,974 | (99.6) |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 33,755,409 | (959,040) | (2.8) | 195,624,707 | 201,868,355 | $(6,043,648)$ | (3.0) |
| 2,594,519 | 1,169,547 | 45.1 | 6,949,774 | 130,751 | 6,819,023 | 5.215 .3 |
| (3,791) | 28,833 | (760.6) | 129,174 | 40,038 | 89,136 | 222.6 |

(728,851) $0 \quad 0.0$ NOT APPLICABLE
$170,7896,961,573$ 4,076.1 NOT APPLICABLE

6,819,023
$5,215.3$
(4.3)
$(8,597,260)$
0.0
0.0

| SC |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PAGE | SHF | OF |

## E

AMFFERENCE $x$
775.376
0
0
$(1)$
0
0

| 775,375 | 0.4 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $(7.946,688)$ | $(3.9)$ |

89,136
D. INTEREST PROVISION

1. beginning true-up amount (bINE C-9 + C-9a)
2. ENDING TRUE-UP AMOUNT BEFORE INT. (LINES C-7 + C-9 + C-9a + C-10)
3. total beg. \& end. true-up amount
4. AVG. TRUE-UP AMT. (50x OF LINE D-3)
5. Int. RATE-FIRST DAY REP. BUS. MONTH
6. INT. RATE-FIRST DAY SUBSEQUENT MONTY
7. TOTAL (LINE D-5 + LINF D-6)
8. AVERAGE int. rate (50x OF LINE D-7)
9. Monthly avg. int. Rate (line D-8/12)
10. INT. PROVISION (LINE D-4 $x$ LINE D-9)

CALCULATION OF TRUE-UP AND INTEREST PROVISION
SChedUle A2 TAMPA FLECTRIC COMPANY
MONTH OF: SEPTEMBER, 1998 CURRENT MONTH

$4,072,105(1,691,088) 5,763,193(340.8)$ NOT APPLICABLE

| $7,107,320$ | 174,580 | $6,932,740$ | $3,971.1$ | NOT APPLICABLE |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $11,179,425$ | $(1,516,508)$ | $12,695,933$ | $(837.2)$ | NOT APPLICABLE |
| $5,589,712$ | $(758,254)$ | $6,347,966$ | $(837.2)$ | NOT APPLICABLE |
| 5.520 | 6.000 | $(0.480)$ | $(8.0)$ | NOT APPLICABLE |
| 5.220 | 6.000 | $(0.780)$ | $(13.0)$ | NOT APPLICABLE |
| 10.740 | 12.000 | $(1.260)$ | $(10.5)$ | NOT APPLICABLE |
| 5.370 | 6.000 | $(0.630)$ | $(10.5)$ | NOT APPLICABLE |
| 0.448 | 0.500 | $(0.052)$ | $(10.4)$ | NOT APPLICABLE |



| (7) | (8) | SCHEDULE A. PAGE 2 OF 2 <br> (9) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \$ \\ & \text { FOR FUEL } \\ & \text { ADJUSTMENT } \\ & (5) \times(6)(A) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \$ \\ & \text { FOR TOTAL } \\ & \text { (5) } \operatorname{COST}(6)(B) \end{aligned}$ | 80\% GAIN ON ECONOMY ENERGY SALES |
| 0.00 $20,240.39$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.00 \\ 23.478 .32 \end{array}$ | 2,590.34 |
| 11,601.34 | 13,162.80 | 1,249.17 |
| 5,925.99 | 6,582.88 | 525.51 |
| 5,018.20 | 6,021.94 | 802.99 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 3,173.34 | 3,493.96 | 256.50 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 269.66 | 317.36 | 38.16 |
| 8,789.75 | 10,200.72 | 1,128.78 |
| - 0.00 | 0.00 | 10.00 |
| 323.95 | 409.23 | 68.22 |
| 0.00 $1,141.81$ | 1,587.72 | 0.00 356.73 |
| 1,14.00 | 1.0000 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |


|  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $(55,054.0)$ | 2.003 | 2.639 |
| 55.054 .0 | 2.118 | 2.758 |
| $(80.0)$ | 5.395 | 5.395 |
| 80.0 | 4.878 | 4.878 |



| (2) | (3) | (4) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TYPE | TOTAL | MWH |
| 4 | MHF | WHEELED |
| SCHEDULE | SOLD | OTHER |
|  |  | SYSTEM |
| SCH. -D | 61,200.0 | 61,200.0 |
| ECON.-C | 879.0 | 0.0 |
| ECON, -C | 470.0 | 0.0 |
| ECON,-C | 286.0 | 0.0 |
| ECON.-C | 217.0 | 0.0 |
| ECON.-C | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ECON.-C | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ECON.-C | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ECON.-C | 165.0 | 0.0 |
| ECON.-C | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ECON, -C | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ECON, -C | 14.0 | 0.0 |
| ECON, -C | 432.0 | 0.0 |
| ECON, -C | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ECON.-C | 19.0 | 0.0 |
| ECON. - - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ECON, - ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 56.0 | 0.0 |
| ECON, - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ECON.-C | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ECON, -C | 0.0 | 0.0 | FOR THE MONTH OF SEPTEM

KHH--
TOTAL
COST
TOTAL $\$$
FOR FUEL
ADJUSTMENT
$(5) \times(6)(A)$
TOTAL $\$$
FOR TOTAL
(5) $\operatorname{COST}(6)(B)$
FMPA
HARDEE PWR. PARTNERS TO FPC
HARDEE PWR. PARTNERS TO FPRLL
HARDEE PWR. PARTNERS TO REEDY CREEK
HARDEE PWR. PARTNERS TO GAINESVILLE
HARDEE PWR. PARTNERS TO JACKSONYILLE
HARDEE PWR. PARTNERS TO KISSIMMEE
HARDEE PWR. PARTNERS TO NEN SMYRNA BCH
HARDEE PWR. PARTNERS TO ORLANDO
HARDEE PWR. PARTNERS TO STARKE
HARDEE PWR. PARTNERS TO FMPA
HARDEE PWR. PARTNERS TO HOMESTEAD
HARDEE PWR. PARTNERS TO SEMINOLE
HARDEE PWR. PARTNERS TO FT. PIERCE
HARDEE PWR. PARTNERS TO TALLAHASSEE
HARDEE PWR. PARTNERS TO LAKELAND
HARDEE PWR. PARTNERS TO LAKE HORTH
HARDEE PWR. PARTNERS TO KEY WEST
HARDEE PWR. PARTNERS TO VERO BEACH
HARDEE PWR. PARTNERS TO ENERGY AUTH.
(1)

SOLD TO

## ADJUSTMENTS TO AUGUST 1998

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (2) | (3) |
| TYPE | TOTAL |
| SCHEDULE | MWH |
| SOLD |  |


| $(8)$ | $(9)$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL $\$$ | 80X GAIN |
| FOR TOTAL | ON ECNNOMY |
| COST | ENERGY |
| (5) $X(6)(B)$ | SALES |


| ESTIMATED: |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| VARIOUS |  |
| VARIOUS |  |
| VARIOUS |  |
| VARIOUS |  |
| HARDEE POKER PARTNERS SEPICTIONAL |  |
| LARELAND/FMPA SEPARATED |  |
| VARIOUS |  |

ECON.
SCH. -D
SCH. -D
CONTRACT
CONTRACT
SCH. -D
SCH. -J

| $479,664.0$ |
| ---: |
| $30,734.0$ |
| $198,878.0$ |
| 0.0 |
| $109,746.0$ |
| $373,320.0$ |
| $28,824.0$ |
| $1,221,166.0$ |


| 4.0 | 0.0 | $479,664.0$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 4.0 | 0.0 | $30,734.0$ |
| 8.0 | 0.0 | $198,878.0$ |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 6.0 | 0.0 | $109,746.0$ |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | $373,320.0$ |
| 4.0 | 0.0 | $28,824.0$ |
| .0 | 0.0 | $1,221,166.0$ |


| 1.648 |
| ---: |
| 1.740 |
| 1.466 |
| 0.000 |
| 2.348 |
| 1.487 |
| 2.362 |
| 1.651 |


| 2.225 |
| ---: |
| 1.740 |
| 1.710 |
| 0.000 |
| 3.156 |
| 1.563 |
| 2.362 |
| -2.014 |


| $7,904,600.00$ | $10,672,900.00$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $534,700.00$ | $534,700.00$ |
| $2,915,800.00$ | $3,401,600.00$ |
| $0,576,300.00$ | $3,463,400.00$ |
| $5,552,500.00$ | $5,835,000.00$ |
| $-680,900.00$ | $680,900.00$ |
| $20,164,800.00$ | $24,588,500.00$ |

PLUS 80\% OF ECON. ENERGY SALES PROFITS
TOTAL EXCL. VARIABLE O ECON. ENERGY SALES PROFITS
ACTUAL:
FLA. PHR. CORP.
FLA. PWR, \& LIGHT
CITY OF LAKELAND
FT. PIERCE UTIL. AUTH.
FT. PIERCE UTIL, AUTH
CITY OF GAINESVILLE
JACKSONVILLE ELEC, AUTH
KISSIMMEE ELEC, UTIL.
LAKE WORTH UTILITIES
CITY OF NEH SMYRNA BC
ORLANDO UTYL. COMM.
ORLANDO UTIL. COMM.
SEMINOLE ELECTRIC CO-OP
CITY OF ST. CLOUD
TALLAHASSEE
CITY OF VERO BEACH
FMPA
KEY WEST
TONAT ENERGY AUTHORITY
THE ENERGY AUT
NP ENERGY INC.
KOCH
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY
FLA. PWR. \& LIGHT FMPA
KISSIMMEE ELEC, UTIL.
CITY OF NEM SMYRNA BCH.
REEDY CREE
FORT MEADE
CITY OF ST. CLOUD
HARDEE PONER PARTNERS SEMINOLE ELECTRIC CO-OP PRECO-1
SEMINOLE ELECTRIC CO-OP HARDEE
FLA. PWR, CORP.
FLA. PHR \& LIGHT
CITY OF HOMESTEAD
KEY WEST
CITY OF LAKELAND
ORLANDO UTIL
REEDY CREEK
SEMINOLE ELECTRIC CO-OP
FLA. PWR. CORP.

1,221,166.0
$0.01,221,166.0$
1.783
2.014 $2,214,640.00$
$\qquad$

| 47 |
| :---: |
| 61 |
| 6 |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |


1.991
1.650
1.656
0.000
1.684
1.730
0.000
0.000
1.821
2.171
1.604
1.701
0.000
0.000
1.993
0.000
1.626
0.000
1.626
1.872
3.343
1.528
2.780
3.129
0.000
0.000
0.000
1.677
1.459
1.459
1.461
0.000
2.037
1.946
1.695
0.000
4.443
0.000
0.000
0.000
0.000
0.000
2.263
0.000
2.297
4.878
2.901
1.965
2.246
0.000
2.552
2.169
0.000
0.000
3.108
4.640
1.884
2.176
0.000
0.000
4.457
0.000
1.945
0.000
2.012
7.701
6.675
2.121
29.035
24.719
0.000
0.000
0.000
1.824
1.751
1.751
1.754
0.000
2.673
1.946
1.695
0.000
4.443
0.000
0.000
0.000
0.000
0.000
2.263
0.000
2.297
4.878

| 943,241.74 | 1,374,740.31 | 345,198.85 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1,022,424.21 | 1,217,829.01 | 156,323.86 |
| 109,761.98 | 148,855.05 | 31,274.45 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 38,920.27 | 58,983.93 | 16,050.92 |
| 19,095.62 | 23,942.07 | 3,877.15 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 |
| 32,284.56 | 55,107.78 | 18,258.58 |
| 5,166.93 | 11,042.90 | 4,700.77 |
| 701,977.51 | 824,366.75 | 97,911.39 |
| 303,897.79 | 388,701.09 | 67,842.65 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 2,910.46 | 6,507.38 | 2,877.54 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 14,290.52 | 17,099.31 | 2,247.03 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 1,369,488.74 | 1,694,598.96 | 260,088.18 |
| 9,189.19 | 37,813.50 | 22,899.45 |
| 64,957.79 | 129,689.25 | 51,785.16 |
| 34,388.00 | 47,725.00 | 10,669.60 |
| 229,479.62 | 2,396,843.36 | 1,733,890.99 |
| 287,786.96 | 2,273,167.24 | 1,588,304.22 |
| 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| 1,131,059.25 | 1,230,541.85 |  |
| 1,280,913.20 | 1,537,302.40 |  |
| 320,364.00 | 384,488,40 |  |
| 313,038.12 | 375,699.12 |  |
| 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| 5,133,985.24 | 6,737,955.48 |  |
| 475,809.11 | 475,809.11 |  |
| 75,461.40 | 75,461.40 |  |
| (2,081.26) | $(2,081.26)$ |  |
| 72,153.36 | 72,153.36 |  |
| 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| (39.53) | (39.53) |  |
| 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| $\binom{895.85}{163.20}$ | $\binom{895.85}{163.20}$ |  |
| 1,038,548.50 | 1,038,548.50 |  |
| , 0.00 | - 0.00 |  |
| 405,954.68 | 405,954.68 |  |
| 3,902.05 | 3,902.05 |  |



36. Fuel Factor Rounded to Nearest . 001 cents per KWH

| ACTUAL |  | ESTIMATED |  |  |  | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Oct-97 | Nov-97 | Dec-97 | Jan-98 | Feb-98 | Mar-98 | PERIOD |

A 1. FUEL COST OF SYSTEM NET GENERATION
2. FUEL. COST OF POWER SOLD *
3. FUEL COST OF PURCHASED POWER
3a. DEMAND \& NON.FUEL COST OF PUR. PWR.
3b. ENERGY FAYMENTS TO QUALIFIED FACILITIES
4. ENERGY COST OF ECONOMY PURCHASES
5. ADJUSTMENTS TO FUEL COST
(FT. MEADE IWAUCHULA WHELING)
5a. ADJUSTMENTS TO FUEL COST
6. TOTAL FUEL \& NET POWER TRANSACTION
(SUm Of LIRES AI ThrOUgh A5a)
-jNCLUDES ECONOMY SALES PROFITS (80\%)
$30.720,965 \quad 29,985.481 \quad 28,227,389$
$30.720 .96 \overline{3}$
4.559 .181
1.597 .832
0
$29,985.481$
6.107 .143
409.518

| 627.610 | 532.270 | 628.100 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 98.690 | 32.265 | 26.900 |
| $(3.521)$ | $(2.573)$ | $(3,500)$ |

28.482 .355

| $33,421.028$ | 27 |
| ---: | ---: |
| $6,340,900$ | 4 |
| $1,256.700$ | 1 |
| 0 |  |

27.347.757
29.210.128
4.091 .300

| 310,000 | 70 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 16,800 |  |


| 708,300 | 690.500 | 3.496 .780 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 32.000 | 62.700 | 269.355 |
| $(3,500)$ | $(3.500)$ | $(20.094)$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 25.054 .057 | $26.819,188$ | 159.927 .555 |


| B 1. JURISDICTIONAL MWH SALES |
| :---: |
| 2. NONJURISDICTIONAL MWH SALES |
| 3. TOTAL SALES (Lines B1 + 82) |
| 4. JURISOIC. \% OF TOTAL SALES (Line B1/B3) |
| C 1. JURISDICTIONAL FUEL RECOVERY REVENUE (Net of Revenue Taxes) <br> 1a. ADJUSTMENTS TO FUEL REVENUE |
| 2. TRUE-UP PROVISION |
| 2a. INCENTIVE PROVISION |
| 2b. OTHER |
| 3. FUEL REVENUE APPLICARLE TO PERIOD (Sum of Lines C1 Through C2b) <br> 4. TOTAL FUEI \& NET PWR. TRANS. (Line A6) |
| 4a. JURISDIC, TOTAL FUEL \& NET PWR.TRANS. <br> (Line A6 $\times$ Line B4) <br> 4b. $80 \%$ ECONOMY TRANSMISSION REVENUES 4c. TRANSMISSION SEPARATION FACTOR 4d. JURIS. ECONOMY TRANSMISSION REV. <br> 5. JURISDIC. TOTAL FUEL \& NET PWR.TRANS. (INCL. ECON. TRANSMISSION REV.) <br> 5a. JURISDIC. LOSS MULTIPLIER |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| 5e. FUEL CREDIT DIFFERENTIAL. <br> 5f. REVENUE REFUND TRUE-UP ADJUSTMENT <br> 5g. TRANSMISSION ADJ. (JAN.-NOV. 1997) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |
|  |
| 6. JURISDIC. TOTAL FUEL \& NET PWR.TRANS. INCL. PEABODY, FUEL CREDIT, ADJ. |
| 7. OVER(UNDER) RECOVERY |
| 8. INTEREST PROVISION |


| 1,323,633 | 1,107,991 | 1,144,352 | 1.232,094 | 1,145,793 | 1,104.945 | 7.058.809 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12.130 | 9.024 | 1.994 | 3.070 | 2.276 | 1.973 | 30.492 |
| 1.335.763 | 1.117.035 | 1.146.346 | 1.235.164 | 1,148,069 | 1.106.923 | 7.089.301 |
| 0.9909150 | 0.9919036 | 0.9982606 | 0.9975145 | 0.9980175 | 0.9982131 | - |
| 30.482,950 | 25.453.995 | 26,327,148 | 28,367,455 | 26,374,109 | 25,421,900 | 162.427.557 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1.122,779 | 1,122.779 | 1,122,779 | 1,122.779 | 1.122.779 | 1.122,779 | 6,736,674 |
| (16.097) | (16.097) | $(16,097)$ | $(16.097)$ | $(16.097)$ | (16.094) | (96,579) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 31.539,632 | 26,560,677 | 27.433.830 | 29,474,137 | 27.480 .791 | 26.528,585 | 169.067.652 |
| 28,482,395 | 24,849,818 | 26,061,969 | 28.660,128 | 25.054.057 | 26,819,188 | 159,927,555 |
| 28,223.747 | 24,648.623 | 26.016.637 | 28,588.893 | 25.004,387 | 26,771.265 | 159,253.552 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.889 | 0.889 | 0.889 | 0.889 | 0.889 | 0.889 | 0.889 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 28,223,747 | 24,848,623 | 26,016,637 | 28,588,893 | 25,004,387 | 26,771,265 | 159,253,552 |
| 1.00013 | 1.00013 | 1.00013 | 1.00013 | 1.00013 | 1.00013 | $\bullet$ |
| 28.227.416 | 24.651 .827 | 26,020.019 | 28,592.610 | 25,007.638 | 26.774.745 | 159.274.255 |
| 444,301 | 441,770 | 439,240 | 436.709 | 434.178 | 431,647 | 2.627 .845 |
| 440,266 | 438,193 | 438,476 | 435.624 | 433.317 | 430,876 | 2.616.752 |
| $(64,574)$ | (272.593) | 251,220 | (19.701) | $(374,957)$ | (191,130) | (671.735) |
| (329.229) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (329.229) |
| 0 | 0 | $(2,011,564)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | (2.011.564) |
| 0 | 0 | (41.159) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (41.159) |
| 0 | 0 | (59.110) | 0 | 0 | 0 | (59.110) |
| 28,273,879 | 24,817,427 | 24,597.882 | 29,008,533 | 25,065,998 | 27,014,491 | 158.778,210 |
| 3,315,753 | 1,743,250 | 765,274 | 465.604 | 2.414,793 | $(485,906)$ | 10.289.442 |
| 8.255 | 14.810 | 26,137 | 24,707 | 26.418 | 25.759 | 126.086 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 40,415,528 |

TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY
FOR THE PERIOD OF: OCT., 1997 THRU MAR.,
FOR PEROD OF.OCT., 8107 THRU MAR.,199B

|  | DOLLARS |  |  |  | MWH |  |  |  | conisikwH |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ESTIMATED | estimateo | DIFFERENCE |  | ESTIMATED ACTUAL | $\begin{gathered} \text { ESTMMATED } \\ \text { ORIGINAL } \end{gathered}$ | Difference |  | ESTIMATEO ESTIMATED |  | OIFFERENCE |  |
|  | actual | ORIGINAL | AMOUNT | $\%$ |  |  | AMOUNT | $\%$ |  |  | AMOUNT | \% |
| 1. Fuat Cost of System Net Ganeration (EJ) | 178,912.748 | 183.4.4.29: | [9,934,481) | (5.3) | 8.361 .058 | Heseritis | (474,021) | (5.4) | 2.13068 | 213733 000000 | 0.00235 00000 | 0.1 |
| 2. Spent Nuctarer Fuel Disposal Cost | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 000000 | -0.00000 | 0.0 |
| 3. Coall Car Investment | 0 | \% | 0 | 0.0 | ${ }^{0}$ | 0, | - ${ }^{0}$ | 0.0 | (0.000024) | $\left.{ }^{0} 0000000\right)$ | (000004) |  |
| 4. Adjustments to Fuel Cosi (Fl. Meade/Wauct. Wheeling) | (20.004) | (1) \%is | (2,094) | 14.6 | 8,341, [558 | 8,835,679 | (474.021) | (5.4) | (0.00024) 0.00000 | ${ }^{(00000000}$ | (0.00000 | 0.0 |
| 4a. Adjustments to Fuel Cost | 0 | । | 0 | 0.0 | 8.361,658 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. TOTAL COST OF GENERATED POWER | 178,892,654 | 188.829.229 | (9,936,575) | (5.3) | 8,361,658 | 8,835,679 | (474,021) | (5.4) | 2.13944 | 213712 | 0.00232 | 0.1 |
| 6. Fual Cost of Purchased Power - (Exciusive of Econ) (E7) | 5,812,150 | $3,60 \cdot 40$ | 2,202,950 | 61.0 | 132,798 | 111.017 | 20.887 | 18.7 | 4.37670 | 3.22506 | 1.15164 | 35.7 |
| 7. Enargy Cost of Sch C, X Etonomy Purchases (Broker) (E9 | 269,355 | 24. ${ }^{\text {ate }}$ | 26,655 | 11.0 | 7.146 | 5.654 | 1.488 | 26.3 | 3.76931 | 428950 | (0.62019) | (12.1) |
| 8. Energy Cost of Other Econ Purch (Non-Broker) (E9) | 0 | ${ }^{\circ}$ | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | ${ }^{\prime}$ | 0 | 0.0 | 0.00000 0.0000 | 0.00000 000000 | 0.00000 0.00000 | 0.0 |
| 9. Energy Cost of Sch. E Econ Purchases (E9) | 0 | ${ }_{6}$ | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | \% | 0 | 0.0 | 0,00000 | 0000000 | 0000000 | 00 |
| 10. Capactiy Cost of Sch. E Economy Purchases | 3,496,780 |  | (335,520) | (8.8) | 213,690 | 235,63: | (21.349) | (0.1) | 1.63638 | 1.63050 | 000588 | 0.4 |
| 11. Enargy Payments to Qualliying Facilitios (EB) | 3,406,780 | 3 By 306 | (335,520) | (8.6) | 213,600 | ssous | (21.34) | (0.) |  |  |  |  |
| 12. TOTAL COST OF PURCHASEO POWER | 9,578,265 | 7.684.200 | 1,894,095 | 24.8 | 353,634 | 352,608 | 1,026 | 03 | 270853 | 2.17025 | 0.52928 | 24.3 |
| 13. rotal avallable mwh (line $5+$ line 12) |  |  |  |  | 8.715,292 | 9,188,287 | (472,096) | (5) 1 ) |  |  |  |  |
| 14. Fue! Cost of Economy Sates (E6) | 15,529.464 | 18,56t:300 | (3.430,536) | (18.1) | 1.073,728 | 1,443,020 | (160,292) | ${ }^{(13.6)}$ | 1.44631 | 1.52532 | (0.07901) | (5.2) |
| 15. Gain on Economy Sates - $80 \%$ (E8) EXCL. TRANS. | 4,070.505 | 2.474 4830 | 1,595,625 | 64.5 | 1,073,728 | 1,243,020 | $(169,292)$ | (13.6) | 0.37910 | 019910 | 0.8000 |  |
| 16. Fuel Cost of Schedule D Salos - Jurisd. (E6) | 456,486 | 511 (x) | (55,014) | (10.8) | 31,353 | 33.73 | (2.440) | (72) | 1.45597 | 15.1363 | (0.05766) | (3.8) |
| 16a. Fuel Cost of Schedule D Sales - Separaled (E5) | 2.848,206 | 2 Hz 000 | 25,606 | 0.9 | 190, 198 |  | 8,565 | 4.5 156.9 | 1.42984 | 1.48065 | (0.05081) | (3.4) |
| 16b. Fual Cost of Schedule D HPP Sales - Coniract (E8) | 1,254,714 | 514.470 | 739,914 | 143.7 | 60,244 | 23,462 | 36,792 30292 | 156.9 415.6 | 2.08272 1.92682 | 2.10512 | (0.71240) 0.23759 | 15.1 14.1 |
| 16c. Fuel Cost of Schedule J Sales - Jurisd. (E6) | 939.249 4.146 .138 | 159.706 ,+ 054.600 | 779.549 $(808,462)$ | 488.1 $(16.3)$ | 48,746 241,121 | 203,950 | (12,838) | (4.4) | 1.47488 | 1.68547 | (021061) | (12.5) |
| 17. Fuel Cost of Other D Power Salas (E6) | 4,146,138 | +1,954.600 | (8008,462) | (168.5) | 281.121 60 | 203,549 | (12,838) | (90.2) | 2.00833 | 0.12346 | 1.88487 |  |
| 172. Fuol Cost of Other Contract Sales (E6) <br> 17b. Transmission Cost for Various Sales (E6) | $\begin{gathered} 1,205 \\ (702,583) \end{gathered}$ |  | (7.695) | (86.5) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18, total fuel cost and gains on power sales (LINES 14 thru 17b) | 28,543,384 | 27.880.780 | 662,604 | 2.4 | 1.694,450 | 1,801,520 | $(107.070)$ | (5.9) | 1.68452 | 1.54763 | 0.13689 | 8.8 |
| 19. Net Inadvertant Interchange |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19a. Wheeilng Rec'd. Lest Wheeling Delv'd. 19b. Interchange and Wheelling Losses |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} (10,538) \\ 25,477 \end{gathered}$ | 20.800 | $\begin{gathered} (10,538) \\ (1,323) \end{gathered}$ | (4.9) |  |  |  |  |
| 20. TOTAL FUEL AND NET POWER TRANSACTIONS | 159,027.555 | 188,632,649 | $(0,705,094)$ | $\text { ( } 6.2 \text { ) }$ | $6.984,234$ | $\begin{gathered} 7,359,967 \\ ==ธ===== \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (375.733) \\ E=== \pm=5=5 \end{array}$ | $(5.1)$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2.28984 \\ =======\pi \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.29121 \\ ==\pi= \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ${ }_{== \pm= \pm 200137}^{(0.00}$ | $=======:$ |
| 21. Net Unbilled | (4,780,820) - | (4,1t0,683) ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | (870.137) | 18.3 | $(208,784)$ | (178,411) | $(29.373)$ | 16.4 | (0.06845) | (0.05585) | (0.01260) | 22.6 |
| 22. Company Use | 459,708 - | 434.413 | 25,295 | 5.8 | 20,076 | 18.960 | 1.116 | 5.9 | 0.00648 | 0.00608 | 0.00040 | 6.6 |
| 23. TR D Losses | 1,815,237 * | 8,471.612 | $(6,556,375)$ | (77.4) | 83,641 | 365,744 | $(288,103)$ | (77.4) | 0.02702 | 0.11847 | (0.09145) | (77.2) |
| 24. Sysiom KWH Sales | 159.927.555 | 168,632,649 | (0,705,084) | (5.2) | 7,089,301 | 7.150,674 | (61,373) | (0.9) | 2.25590 | 2.35828 | (0.10238) | (4.3) |
| 25. Wholesaie KWH Sales | $(674,003)$ | (377.781) | $(206,222)$ | 78.4 | (30,492) | (16.064) | (14.428) | 89.8 | 2.21043 | 2.35172 | (0.14129) | (6.0) |
| 25a. Jurisdletional Transmisslon | 0 | , | - | 0.0 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |
| 26. Jurisdlctional KWH Sates | 159,253,552 | 168,254,868 | (0,001,316) | (5.3) | 7.058,809 | 7.134,610 | (75,601) | (1.1) | 2.25610 | 235829 | (0. 10219 ) | (4.3) |
| 262. Jurisolictional Loss Mutilipller |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.00013 225639 |  | 0.00000 $(0.10221)$ | 0.0 (4.3) |
| 27. Jurisdlctlonal KWH Sales Adjusted for Line Losses | 159,274,255 | 168,276,741 | (9,002,486) | (5.3) |  | 7,134,610 |  | $\underset{z x=\pi}{(1.1)}$ | 2.25639 |  | (0.10221) |  |
| 28. True-up* | $(694,267)$ | (6.736.674) | 6,042,407 | (89.7) | 7,058,809 | 7,134,610 | $\stackrel{(75,801)}{ }= \pm= \pm=$ | $(1.1)$ | (0.00984) | (0.09442) | 0.08458 | (89.6) |
| 29a. Peabody Coal Contract Buy-out Amor. (Jurisd.) | 2,616,752 | 2,021.092 | $(5,240)$ | (0.2) | 7.058,800 | 7,134,610 | (75,801) | (1.1) | 0.03707 | 0.03675 | 0.00032 | 09 |
| 20b. Fuel Credit Differenilat | (671,735) |  | (671,735) | 0.0 | 7.058,809 | 7.134,610 | (75.801) | (1.1) | (0.00952) | 0.00000 | (0.00952) | 0.0 |
| 20C. Revenue Refund True-Up Adjustment | $(329,229)$ | 9 | $(329.229)$ | 0.0 | 7,058,809 | 7.134,610 | (75,801) | (1.1) | (0.00466) | 0.00000 | (0.00466) | 00 |
| 29d. Transmlsslon Adj. (Jan.-Nov. 1997) | (2.011.564) | 0 | (2,011.564) | 0.0 | 7,058.809 | 7,134,610 | (75,801) | (1.1) | (0.02850) | 0.00000 | (00.02850) | 0.0 |
| 290. Oill Below the Discharge Valve | (41.159) | 0 | (41, 159) | 0.0 | 7,058,809 | 7.134,640 | (75.801) | (1.1) | (0.00058) | 0.00000 | (0.00058) | 0.0 |
| 29t. Adj. to include interest on Fuel Credit Diff. | ( 58,110 ) | 0 | (59,110) | 0.0 | 7,058,809 | 7,134,610 | $(75,801)$ | (1.1) | (0.00084) | 0.00000 | (0.00084) | 0.0 |
| 30. Total Jurisdietional Fuel Cost (Excl. GPIF) | 158,083,043 | 164,162,059 | $(6,078,116)$ | (3.7) | 7,058,009 | 7.134,610 | (75,001) | (1.1) | 2.23053 | 2.30093 | (0.06140) | (2.7) |
| 31. Revenue rax Factor |  |  |  |  | - = = | - |  | = $=$ | 1.00083 | 1 noites | 0.00000 | 0.0 |
| 32. Fuel Factor (Excl. GPIF) Aduusted for Taxes | 158.215,153 | 164,298,314 | $(6,083,161)$ | (3.7) | $\begin{gathered} 7,058,809 \\ =\div==\pi=\pi 下 \end{gathered}$ | $=x====== \pm \times x=$ | $\begin{array}{r} (75,801) \\ =x=\pi=== \pm \end{array}$ | (1.1) | 2.24139 | 2.30284 | (0.06145) | (2.7) |
| 33. GPIF ** ( $\$ 363,547$ )-Not Adjusted for Taxes) | (363,850) | 06.060 | (460.510) | (476.4) | 7.058,009 | 7.134,610 | $(75,801)$ | (1.1) | (0.00515) | 0.00135 | (0.00650) | (481.5) |
| 34, Fuel Factor Adjusted for Yaxes Including GPIF | 157,851,303 | 164,394,974 | (6,543,671) | (4.0) |  |  | $\begin{gathered} (75,801) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | (1.1) | 2.23624 | 2.30419 | (0.06795) | (2.9) |
| 35. Fuel Factor Rounded to Nearest . 001 cents per KWH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.236 | 2.304 | (006800) | (3.0) |
| - Included For Informational Purposes Only <br> *- Calculation Based on Jurisdictional KWH Sales |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) - | 10 |  | LINE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | STIMATED |  |  |  |  |
| Apr 98 | May-98 | Jun-98 | Juil98 | Aug-98 | Sap.98 | TOTAL PERIOD |  |
| 29,909,035 | 33,302,458 | 35,887,741 | 37,149,056 | 37,886,896 | 34.679,220 | 208,814,406 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1a |
| 4,040,220 | 3,202,420 | 3,964,800 | 3,679,780 | 3,671,180 | 3,211,940 | 21,770,340 | 2 |
| 511.800 | 1,949,700 | 2,099,300 | 2,229,300 | 2,197,000 | 1.435,400 | 10,422,500 | 3 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 a |
| 899.600 | 919,600 | 832,100 | 977,100 | 980,200 | 848,600 | 5,457,200 | 3b |
| 80,700 | 206,300 | 203,400 | 359,500 | 279,200 | 312,400 | 1,411,500 | 4 |
| (3,500) | (3.500) | (3,500) | (3.500) | (3,500) | (3,500) | (21,000) | 4a |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 0 | 0 | 46 |
| 27.367.415 | 33,172,138 | 35,054,241 | 37.031,676 | 37,668,616 | 34,060,180 | 204,341. 266 | 5 |
| 1,156,538 | 1,290,315 | 1,454,088 | 1,515,374 | 1,495,048 | 1,521,153 | 8,432,514 | 6 |
| 0.9970851 | 0.9905377 | 0.9880510 | 0.9846881 | 0.9854858 | 0.9898011 | - | 6a |
| 27.277.671 | 32,858,253 | 34,635,378 | 36.464,651 | 37,121,886 | 33,712,804 | 202,070,643 | 6b |
| xxxx | xxxx | xxxx | x $x$ x $x$ | xxxx | xxxx | 0 | 6 c |
| 0.889 | 0.889 | 0.889 | 0.889 | 0.889 | 0.889 | 0.889 | 6d |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 |
| 27,277,671 | 32,858,253 | 34,635,378 | 36.464,651 | 37,121,886 | 33,712,804 | 202,070,643 | 66 |
| 1.00013 | 1.00013 | 1.00013 | 1.00013 | 1.00013 | 1.00013 | - | 7 |
| 27.281.217 | 32,862,525 | 34,639,809 | 36,469,391 | 37,126.712 | 33,717,187 | 202,096,913 | 7a |
| 429,116 | 426,585 | 424,054 | 421,523 | 418,992 | 416,461 | 2,536,731 | 7b |
| 427.865 | 422,549 | 418,987 | 415,069 | 412,911 | 412.214 | 2,509,595 | 76 |
| $(517,734)$ | (514.746) | $(470,500)$ | $(527,637)$ | $(533,544)$ | $(373,992)$ | (2,938,153) | 7d |
| 27.191,348 | 32,770,328 | 34,588,368 | 36,356,823 | 37,006,079 | 33,755,409 | 201,668,355 | 8 |
| 2.3511 | 2.5397 | 2.3787 | 2.3992 | 2.4752 | 2.2191 | 23916 | 9 |
| (0.0519) | (0.0519) | (0.0519) | (0.0519) | (0.0519) | (0.0519) | (0.0519) | 10 |
| 2.2992 | 2.4878 | 2.3268 | 2.3473 | 2.4233 | 2.1672 | 2.3397 | 11 |
| 1.00083 | 1.00083 | 1.00083 . | 1.00083 | 1.00083 | 1.00083 | 1.00083 | 12 |
| 2.3011 | 2.4899 | 2.3287 | 2.3492 | 2.4253 | 2.1690 | 23416 | 13 |
| (0.0043) | (0.0043) | (0.0043) | (0.0043) | (0.0043) | (0.0043) | (0.0043) | 14 |
| 2.2968 | 2.4856 | 2.3244 | 2.3449 | 2.4210 | 2.1647 | 2.3373 | 15 |
| 2.297 | 2.486 | 2.324 | 2.345 | 2.421 | 2.165 | 2.337 | 16 |



# TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY <br> DOCKET NO. 990001-EI <br> FPSC STAFF'S 5th SET INTERROGATORY NO. 24 <br> FILED: JANUARY 14, 1999 <br> PAGE 1 of 1 <br> TRANSMISSION RECONSIDERATION 

24. Could Tampa Electric Company's retail jurisdictional separation factor for transmission services be greater than its retail jurisdictional factor for generation service? If so, provide an example.
A. Tampa Electric Company's basic position is that transmission revenues should be allocated according to transmission usage and generation revenues allocated through the current energy allocation. Therefore, a comparison between the two factors under the predicate question is an apples vs. oranges problem. However, if one were comparing demand factors only; the following answer is appropriate.

Generally, the Company's retail jurisdiction separation factor for transmission service would be less than its retail jurisdictional factor for generation service. The Company's transmission loadings for other than native load result primarily from two types of transmission reservations:
(1) Parties reserving transmission service only from the Company (without contracting with the Company for a power sale), and
(2) Parties contracting with the Company for bulk power sales that are also reserving transmission service for delivery of the energy to a Company interface with another utility or to a load within the Company's control area.

In both of the above circumstances, transmission loadings would be greater than generation loadings resulting in a retail jurisdictional separation factor for transmission services that would be less than its retail jurisdictional factor for generation service.

An example could be derived where the Company's retail jurisdictional separation factor for transmission services would be greater than its retail jurisdictional factor for generation service only. The example would include a specific circumstance where parties take delivery of contracted bulk power sales at the Company's generating plant bus and over their own transmission line(s) without necessitating a Company transmission reservation or use of the Company's transmission assets.

TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY DOCKET NO. 990001-EI FPSC STAFF'S 5th SET
INTERROGATORY NO. 25
FILED: JANUARY 14, 1999
PAGE 1 of 1
TRANSMISSION RECONSIDERATION
25. Refer to pages 4 through 5 of Mr. Kordecki's direct testimony, filed October 14, 1998. Please describe the rationale for allocating revenues derived from Reactive Supply and Voltage Support based upon generation.
A. Mr. Kordecki's testimony has been withdrawn.

# TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY DOCKET NO. 990001-EI <br> FPSC STAFF'S 5th SET <br> INTERROGATORY NO. 26 <br> FILED: JANUARY 14, 1999 <br> PAGE 1 of 1 TRANSMISSION RECONSIDERATION 

26. Refer to page 4 of Mr. Kordecki's direct testimony, filed October 14, 1998. Clarify the following statement: "These factors could be updated each year in the same manner as the Capacity Cost Recovery Clause."
A. Mr. Kordecki's testimony has been withdrawn.

TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY DOCKET NO. 980001-EI FPSC STAFF'S 5th SET INTERROGATORY NO. 27
FILED: JANUARY 14, 1999
PAGE 1 of 1
TRANSMISSION RECONSIDERATION
27. Please provide the calculation of TECO's most recent transmission rates as described on page 4, lines 13 through 19 of Mr. Kordecki's prefiled direct testimony.
A. Mr. Kordecki's testimony has been withdrawn.

# TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY DOCKET NO. 980001-EI <br> FPSC STAFF'S 5th SET INTERROGATORY NO. 28 <br> FILED: JANUARY 14, 1999 <br> PAGE 1 of 1 <br> TRANSMISSION RECONSIDERATION 

28. For the fuel cost projection period April through September, 1998, and using the method described on page 4 , lines 1 through 19, of Mr. Kordecki's prefiled direct testimony, please show the calculation and application of transmission and energy separation factors for revenues from economy broker transactions.
A. Tampa Electric has provided the modified A Schedules for April 1998 through September 1998 which are affected by the proposed change in transmission separation calculations in response to Interrogatory No. 23.
```
TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY DOCKET NO. 980001-EI FPSC STAFF'S 1st REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS DOCUMENT NO. 1
FILED: JANUARY 14, 1999
PAGE 1 of 1
TRANSMISSION RECONSIDERATION
```

1. Please provide the portion of TECO's FERC wholesale transmission tariff which includes the rate design methodology described on page 4, lines 1 through 11, of Mr. Kordecki's prefiled direct testimony.
A. Mr. Kordecki's testimony has been withdrawn.
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## EXTRACTIONS FROM FLORIDA PUWER CORPDRATION＇S OPEN ACCESS TRANSMISSION TARHFF EFFICTIVE NOVEMBER 9，1997，SUBJRCT TO REFUND
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$\qquad$ (WCS.
Florida Powar Corperation FERC Transmission Tariff

## ATTACHMENTH

## Ravenue Requirement

1. Annual Transmission Revenue Requirement
2. The Annual Transmission Revenue Requirament shall be determined by apolication of the formula set out below to the Transmission Provider's costs and loads.
3. The amount in (1) shall be effective until amenced by the Transmisaion Previder or modified by the Commission.

Annual Transmission Revanue Requiramant Equala:
'Oparation 8 Maintenance Expanses
Flus Depreciation \& Amortization Expenses
Plus Taxas Other Than incorne Taxes
Plus Rotum
Plus . . Income Taxes
Plus Cost of Customar Facilitios
Less Rovenus from Diruct Cost Assessments
Less Other Tranamission Revenues
Equala Annual Transmission Revenue Requirement

First Revised Volume No. 6
A. Oparation \& Malntonance Expenzes Equal:

Administrative and General Expenses - Accounts 920-923, 925, 926, 929-931 and 935, exeluding amounts paid to EEI and EPRI

Multiplied by Wages and Salaries Transmission Alloeator

| Equals | Subtolal 1 <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Administrative and General Expenses - Account 924.30, Property <br> Insurance other than nuclear |
| :--- | :--- |
| Multipliad by Gross Electric Transmisision Plent in Serviea Allocator |  |
| Equals | Subtotal 2 |
|  | Subtotal 1 |
| Plus | Subtotal 2 |

Plus . Aceount 924.20, storm Demage insurance, allocated based on the ratio of Gross Transmiasion Plant to the Sum of Gross Tranemistion Plant and Gross Distribuston Plant

Plus $\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { Redispatch costs incurried by the Transmasion Frovider or a } \\ & \text { Customer where such redispatch costs are not paid by the } \\ & \text { Transmigtien Provider or a Cuatomer on an inoremental basis }\end{aligned}$
Plus Transmission Expensas (Acsounts 500, 502-564 and Accounts 566573)

Equals Total Operation a Maintonance Expenses

1. Operating and Maintenance expense items which are oxtraordinary or non-recurring and have a significant effect on charges under this Tariff are separately identhed. The expense forithese items reflects amorization over three to five years, as appropriate under the circumstancas. The unamortized balanees of such identified llems are recognized as an adeition to rate base in this formula. The Transmisgion Provider may propese to change extraordinory property losses or OPEB expenae (eurrantly $\$ 22,191,000$ ) purbuant to a unilateral fling under Section 205 of the Foderal Power Act and any Customer may seak to change such eharges under Section 200 of the Act.

Flonda Power Corporatien FERC Transmissian Tariff First Revised Volume No. 6

Opan As FERC Transmission Tarif Page 4 of 19

> B. Dapreciation Amortization Expenses Equal:
General Plant Depreciation Expense
Plus Intangible Plant Deprociation Expense
Equals Subtotal 1
Multiplied by Wages and Salaries Transmission Allocator
Equals Subtotal 2
Subtotal 2
Plus Transmission Flant Depreciation Expense
Equals Total Deprectation \& Amortization Expensey
C. Taxes Other Than Income Taxes Iqual:
FICA
Plus Faderal \& State Unemployment Compensation
Equala Subtotal 1
Multiplied by Wages and Salaries Tranamiasion Allocator
Equat Subtotal 2
County and Leed Proparty Taxes
Plus Liemees \& Other Miscellaneous Taxas Exeluding Fuels, RevenueRolated Taxes, Regulatory Assussment Foes and Franchisa Faes
Equats Subtotal 3
Subtotal 3
Multiplied by Groas Electric Transmiasion Plant In-Service Allecator
Equals Subtotal 4
y The dapreciation and amortization expense is derived from depreciation ratien establishedif Docket No. ERes-457-000. The Tranemlasion Provider may propose to change depreciation rates pursuant to a unilateral filing under Sections 205 of the Fodaral Power Act and any Custornar mivy meak to change tuch rates purauant to Saction 208 of tha Aet.

Subtotal 2
Plus Subtatal 4

Equals Total Tayes Othep Than Income Taxes
D. Roturn

The Retum is the product of the Electric Transmissian Rata Base (avarage of beginning and end of yoan balances) and the Rate of Retum.

Elcetric Transmission Rate Base - the total of the following items:
a. Transmission Plant-In-Service (Accounts 350-359)

Less b. Accumulated depraciation resarve for the plant iteme listed in (a) above.

Plus $\quad$. Balance of ganeral plant (Accounts 389-388) and intangrato plant (Accounts 301-303), excluding expenses that are rolated solely to ratall service (Incuding ratail rolated load management and cumtomer information systems) nit of aceumulated depreciation resorve and allocatyd to tranemission on the basis of the Wages and Salaries Transimission Alloeater.

Flus d. Sum of transmiaskon plant matariales and supplies and ateceation to transmisaton of general and common matrials and supplies (excluding Aceount 185 ampunts) on the basis of the Wages and Salartes Transmission Alocator.

Flus e. Prepayments allecated to tranemiseion on the basie of the Grose Electrie Trensmiasion Pient-In-Service Allocator.

Plus $\quad$. An allowance for cash working capital equal to $1 / 8$ of the transmission operation and maintonance exponses.

Flus a. Land hald for future transmission use.
Plus h. The unamertized portien of extraordinary or non-recurring Oparating and Maintenance expense items.

Less
i. Accumulated deferred ineome taxes (Accounts 182, 190, 254, 281. 282, 283), detormined on a functionalized basis.

Rate of Return - the figure determined based an the following formula:
Rate of Retum $=(D R \times D C)+(P R \times F C)+(C R \times C C)$
$\qquad$ (WCS

## Whare:

ORa Debt ratio is the patio of the Transmission Frovider's long term dabt to its total utility capisalization. Cebt includes bencs (Account 221) plus other long-term debl (Aceount 224) plus unamertized premium on leng-term debt (Account 225) less unamortized disceunt on long-term debt (Account 226) less unamortized debt expenses (Account 181) less unamorized loss on reacquired debt (Account 189).
$D C=$ Debk eest rate is the ratio of the following expense amounts for the year to the avarage debt balance included in the formula for OR above: interest on long-ramn debt (Account 427) plus amortzation of cebt discount and expense (Account 428) plus' amortization of loss on raacquired debt (Aceeunt 428.1) less amorization of premium on debt (Account 429).

PR = Preferted tock ratio is the ratie of the Tranemission Provider's proferred stock (Acpeunt 204), based on the average of the beginning and end of year balances, to the Transmission Frovider's total utility capitalization.

PC $=$ Preferred trock cost rata it the ratio of the preforred stock dividends expense to the average preferred stock balanea in the formula for PR above.
$C R$ : Commen equity ratio is the ratio of the Trunemiesion Previder's common aquity to Tranamission Provider's total utility eapitalization. Common equlty is equal to total propriotary capital (Accounts 201 through 217) minus preferred stock issued (Account 204) minus investment in subsidiary companies (Account 123.1).

CC = Commen equity cost rate of 10.8 pereant ${ }^{7}$
Total utility eapitalization ahall be equal to the wial of the Transmisaion Provider's longrterm debt, praforred stack and utllity eommon equity balances (average of baginning and end of year). As such, $O R+M R+C R$ shall equal ona hundred percent ( 100 percent).

## E. Ineome Taxes

Income Taxes equal the total Federal and State income Taxes ealeulatad by the following formula:
income Taxis $=\{\{($ RE $\times$ CEOC $)+$ PMTD $] \times\{$ FIT Factor $\}\}+$ PMTD
Where: RB $=$ Transmission Rate Baso

CEOC = Weighted Cost of Equity Capital

[^2]PMTD = Allocation of Permanent Tax Diffareneas, ineluding Investment
$\quad$ Tax Credits, determined on a functionalized basis.

Composite Tax Rate $=$ State Tax Rate $+(100.000 \%$ - State Tax Rate $)$ (Faderal Tax Rate)

FIT Factor $\quad=\quad$ (Composite Tax Rate) $/(100.000 \%$ - Composite Tax Rata)

## F. Cost of Customar Facllities

Crndits for Customer Transmisston Facifties pursuant to Section 30.9 of this Tarif

## G. Rovenues from Direct Cost Assamaments

Rovanues from Direct Assignment Facilties
Flus Farfoitad resenvation fees and pernalies callected from Transmission Customert.
Flus The costs of Systom Impact Studlos or Facilities Studies that are collectod from a Cusiomer under this Tarifif

The Transmission Provider will apply Commission policies in determining whather transmiasiom facilities constructed in connection with sorviea purauant to tarifts, rate schedules or contracts other than this Tarint, Including transmiation in connection with rotal servica, should be directly astignned or eharged to customars on an incremental basin, If the Comminsion makes a datomination of the revenue requirementa with reapact to facilities that should be diraety asaigned or charged on an incrernental basis, thoce revenues will be credted in this formula rata. If such facilies would be airsetly assigned or charged on an incrumental basis if thoy wers relatad to Iranametions subject to the Commiasion's jurisdiction, the credit shall be equal to the product of (i) the Annual Tranamiation Rovenue Requirument calculated without regard to this Section G; and (i) the rallo of the gross investment in elrectly asslored or ineremmentilly chargad facilities to the Groes Electrie Transmission Flenth-Gorvice.

## H. Other Tranamiasion Rovanues

Revenus from Firm Point-To-Point Transmission Service and Network Contract Demand Transmission Serviee provided at other than a fullyallocated embadded cont basis

Plus

Plus

Revanus from Firm Point-To-Point Transmission Sarvice and Network Contract Demand Pransmission Sarvica provided on a fully-allocated, embecced cost pasis, for whieh the term of service is less than one calendaf month.

Revenue from Nen-Firm Transmissian Serviee

1. Allocators
2. Wages and Salaries Transmiasion Allocater

The ratic of (i) transmission wages and salaries to (ii) total electric wages and salaries less administrative and general wages and salaries included in betal electric wages and salarias.

## 2. Gross Electric Tranamission Piant-In-Servicu Allocator

The ratio of average of 13 monthly balaneas of Gross Electric Transmission Plant-In-Service to the sum of (1) electric production, transmission, and distribution plant-in-sarvies; and (ii) general plant allocated based on the wages and salares allocetor.

## II. Annual Distribution Substation Reqenue Requirament

The Annual Distribution Substation Revenua Requirement shall be detarmined by applying the following formula to the Transmiasion Providar's costs and loads. This formula shall be offoctive untik amunded by the Transmission Provider or modified by the Commiasion.

Operation \& Maintenenca Expunses
Plus Depreciation a Amorization Expenses
Plual Tixes Other Than Ineome Taxen
Plus
Rotum
Plus: Incorne Taxes
Less Rovenuas related to Dirmet Cost Assignment
Equals Annual Distribution Substation Revanue Requirament
A. Operation \& Maintenanee Exponsest' Equal:

|  | Administrative and Ceneral Expenses - Accounts 920-923, 925, 928, 925-931 and 935, exeluding amounts pand to EEI and EPRI |
| :---: | :---: |
| Multiplied by | Substation Proportion of Oistribution Plant Allocator |
| Multipliad by Equals | Wages and Salaries Distribution Allocator Subtotal 1 |
|  | Administrative and Genaral Expenses - Account 924,30, Property Insurance other than nuclear |
| Multiplied by | Substation Propertion of Distribution Plant Allocator |
| Multiplied by Equals | Gross Electric Distrioution Plant in Servics Allocator Subtotal 2 |
|  | Account 924.20, Storm Damage Insurance. allocatod based on the ratio of Gross Distribution Plant to the Sum of Grose Tranemisselon. Plant and Grose Diatribution Plant |
| Multiplied by Equals | Substation Proportion of Distribution Plant Allocator Subrotal 3 |
|  | Sublotal 1 |
| Prus | Subtotal 2 |
| Plus | Subtotal 3 |
| Plut Equals | Distribution Expenses (Aceounts 582, 581, 592 plus allocation of Accounts 580, 588, 589, 500, 598 an the basis of Substation Proportion of Distribution Plant Alocator). <br> Total Operation \& Maintenance Expenses |

[^3]
## B. Depraclation A Amertization Expenses Equal:

|  | Distribution Depreciatien Expense |
| :--- | :--- |
| Multiplied by <br> Equala | Substation Proportion of Distribution Fl <br>  <br>  <br> Subtotal 1 |
|  | Guneral Plant Depreciation Expense |
| Plus | Intangible Plant Depreclation Expense |
| Equals | Subtotal 2 |

## Subtotal 2

Multipliad by Subatation Proportion of Diatribution Plant Allocator
Multiplied by Wages and Salarims Distritution Allecator
Equals Subtotal 3

Subtotal 1
Plus Subtotal 3
Equala T Total Daprociation a Amorization Expensay

## C. Taxes Other Than Income Taxas Equal:

FICA

| Plut Equals | Federel \& State Unemployment Compensation Subtotal 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Subtotal 1 |
| Multipliad by | Subatation Proportion of Distribution Plant Allocator |
| Muiliplied by Equals | Wages and Salarice Distribution Allecator Subtotal 2 |

[^4]| Florida Power Corporation FERC Transmission Tariff First Ravised Volume No. 6 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | County and Local Property Taxes |
| Plus Equais | Lleenses \& Other Miscallaneous Taxes Excluding Fuel Taxes and Revenue Related Taxes and Regulatory Assessment Fees and Franchise Fees <br> Subtotal 3 |
|  | Subtotal 3 |
| Multiplind by | Substation Proportion of Distribution Plant Allocalor |
| Multiplised by Equals | Gross Eiectric Distribution Plant-In-Servica Allocator Subtotal 4 |
| Pluㅕㅜㄹ Equals | Subtatal 2 <br> Subtotal 4 <br> Total Taxes Other Than income Taxes |

D. Retum

The Raturn is the product of the Flectric Distribution Substation Rate Ease (average of beginning and end of yoar balances) and the Riate of Return.

Electrle Distribution Substation Rato Base - the total of the following items:
a. Distribution Substation Piant-In-Sanvice (Accounts 360-362)

Lass b. Accurrulated depraciation pesorve for the plant itama listed in (a) above.

Plus c. Balance of genaral plant (Aceounts 389-389) and intangible plant (Aecounts 301-303) net of accumulatad dapreciation reserve and ailocatidy to distriburtion substation on the basis of the Substation Proportion of Distribution Plant Alocator times the Wagee and Salaries Distribution Allocater.

Flus d. Sum of (i) allocation of distribution plant matarials and supplies on the basis of Subatation Proportion of Distribution Plant Allocator and (i) allocation of general and common materials and supplies (excluding Account 155 amounts) on the basis of Substation Proportion of Distribution Plant Allocator times the Wages and Salaries Dlatribution Allocator.

Fius e. Prepaymments allocated to Distribution Substation on the basis of the Substation Prepertion of Distribution Prant Allectitor timas the Gross Electre Distribution Plantin-Servica Allocater.

| Plus | f. | An allowance for cash working eapital equal to $1 / 8$ of the distribution substation operation and maintenance expenses. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Plus | g. | Land held for future distribution substation use. |
| Plus | $n$. | The unamertized portion ef oxtraordinary or nor-recurring Operating and Maintanance expense items. |
| Lass | i. | Accumulated deforted Inceme taxes (Accounts 182, 190, 254, 281, 282, 283) detomined on a functlonalized basis. |

Rate of Retum - the figure determined based an the following formula:
Ratu of Retum $=(D R \times D C)+(P R \times P C)+(C R \times C C)$
Whare:
DR = Debt ratio is the ratio of the Company's long tom dabt to its total utility capitalization, based on the avarage of beginning and and of yaar balances. Debt includes bofida (Account 221) plus other long-tarm dabt (Aceount 224) plus unamortized promiuni on ${ }^{\circ}$ longetarm debt (Account 225) less unamonizad discount on long-term debt (Account 228) leas unamorized debt expenses (Account 181) lets unamortized loss on raecquirad debt (Account 189).

DC = Debt coet rate is the ratio of tha following expence ternourts for the year to the avorige debt balance includad in the formula for DR above, bused on the averege of beginning and end of year bulanceas: intereat on long-tarm debt (Account 427) plus amortization of debt dincount and expanse (Account 428) plus amorization of loss on reacaulrit dobt (Account 429.11 leas amorization of promium on deat (Account 429).

PR $=$ Proforted stock ratio is the ratio of the Tranemkasion Providar's prafarrad slock (Account 204) to the Tranamlasion Providar's tatan willity capitalization, based on the average of beginning and and of yoar belancea.
$P C=$ Profored stock coot rate is the ritio of ine preforred stock dividends expense to the avernge preforred stock balance in the formula for PR above, based on the average of beginning and and of yoar balancas.
$C R=$ Commen equity ratio is the ratie of the Company's cemmen equity to Company's tetal utility capitalization, based on the average of the beginning and end of yoar balances. Commen eqully is equal to total proprietary capital (Aceounts 201 through 217) minus praferred stock issued (Account 204) minus invaitment in subsidiary companies (Account 123.1).

Total utility eapitalization shall be equal to the total of the Company's long-term debt, proferred stock and utillty common equity balances (average of beginning and end of year). As such, DR 4 PR + en shall equal one hunared percent ( 100 parcent).
E. Income Taxes

Income Taxes equal the total Federal and State Income Taxus calculatod by the following formula:

Income Taxas $=\{[(R B \times C E C C)+P M T D] \times[F T T$ Factor $]+$ PMTD.
Whars: RB $=$ Distribution Substation Rate Base
CEQC : Waightad Cost of Equily Capital
PMTD = Allocation of Permanent Tax Differoncas, including Investront Tax Cradis, detamined on a functionalized basis.

Comporite Tax Rate $=$ State Tax Rate $+(100.000 \%$ - State Tax Rato $)$ (Federal Tax Ratu)

FIT Factor $\quad$ (Composila Tax Rata) $/(100.000 \%$. Composite Tax Rate)

## Allocitars

## A. Subatation Proportion of Diatribution Plant Allocator

The ravio of whe avarage of thirteen monthly belances of diatribution substation plant to total distribution plembin-tervice.

## B. Wages and Belarles Dlatribution Allocator

The rate of (i) diswibution wages and salaries to (ii) total electric wages and salaries less administrative and goneral wages and salaries incuded in totai elactric wages and salaries.
C. Cross Electile Distibution Plantin-Sorvice Alloester

7 The Transmission Frovider may propose to change the common equity cost rate pursuank to a unidateral filing under Soction 206 of the Foderal Power Act and any Customar may seak to change the rate pursuent to Section 206 of the Act.

The ratio af the Gross Electric Distritution Plant-In-Senviea to the sum of (i) eiectrie production; transmission, and distnbution plant-in-servics; and (ii) general plant, allocaiad basec on the wages and salaries allocator.

## III. Methodology for Applying Formula Rate

1. Etilmatesund truezuns; Rates for Network Integration Service, Long-Term Firm Point-To-Point Transmission Sevice, Network Contract Demand Transmission Sunvico for terms of one yoar or more and Distribution Substation Service shall initlally bo established on an estimated basis and shall be trued up based en actual costs and loads for the year in whieh transmiesien sarvice is provided. Pealiminary estimatos of charges, accompanied by supperting cost and load data, shail be provided to Custemars by May 1 , and Customers may provide comments to the Tranamission Provider on the proliminary estimatus by May 15. Estimated charges shail be revised to become effective each June 1 and shall be based on actual costs and loads for the provious calandar year. Estrmated chargos for a ealondar yoar shail be trued up not later than the following June 1. Rates for Short-Term Firm Point-To-Point Transmistion Serviea, Notwork Contract Demand Tranamission. Servies for laes than one your and Non-Firm Point-To-Poink Tranambsion Servica will be adjuated each June 1 based on actual costs and loads for the previous calerpar year.
2. Fatmetad domands and radispatch engta: Bals may incorporate estimatad billing determinants and/or rediapateh costs. When the Tranemission Provider uses estimated billing demands and/op rodispatch costs in abiling statoment, it shall adjust such bills in the secord billing staternent after that billing statoment to refect aedual billing demands andor rediepatch costs for instance, eatimates of January billing demands are adjuated in the March biling statement).
3. Irumura: if estimated billings exceedad actual costs, the Transmission Provider shall return the difference, plus intorest calculated at the rate set for refunde under the Feceral Power Act pursuant to 18 C.F.R. © 35.19, together with the adjusted bill. If eatimated billinge under-recovarud actual costs, the Customer shall pay the differtence, plus interust calculated at the rate sep for refunds under the Federal Power Act pursuant to 18 C.F.R. $\$ 35.19 \mathrm{n}$, to the Transmissien Provider within 20 days after the date of the adjustad bill. In the event a payment is not made by the applicatle due data, a late payment charge shall acerva at the rate set for rafunds under the Federal Pewer Act pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 3 E.10a for the period beginning on the date on which the adjuatad bill is rendered and ending on the date that payment is received.
4. Audite: The Transmissien Provider and the Customer eaen have the night, within :wenty-four months following the receipt of a bill or an adjusted bill, to aucit each other's accounts and records for the period covered by the bill ar acjusted bill. During normal businass hours and subject to conditions consiatent with the eonduct by the Transmission Provider and the Customer of their regular bueinese affairs and responsibillties, the Tranemisation Provider and the Cuatomer esch will provice the other or any muditor retained by the other access to, and upon requast copies of, its
books, pacords. and other decuments that are related to the pariormance of the Parties' obligations under this Tarif. Such bocks. records and other documents shall include all doebments (including electronic records, computer programs, inpuls to eemputer programs and the likg) that would be avallable (under a protective order or otherwise) in a proceeding before the FERC under Section 205 of the Federal Power Act, including out nct limited to dociumants which set farth (a) eosts applicable to the plarning. design, construction, opspation, maintenance and ratiroment of facilitios to the extent necassary to anable the verification of the costs billed and crectits provided pursuant to this Tariff; ard (b) motering information related to the provision of servica or the calculation of chargas pursuant to this Tanff. The auditing Farty shall bear the cost of any copying, review or audit of such boeks and recerds. Notwithstanding the foregeing, neither Farty shall be required to make availabla to the other any reperts or inionmation relating to personnal practices, staffing or labor ralations or minutes of the Beard of Directors and eommittees thereef. The audited Party shall be provided a copy of all final audit reports. The Transmission Provider and the Customer each agree to faeilitate the negotiation of non-discicsure agreaments of protective ordens as necussary to make avalladie for audit documents that are subject to nonoiscresure agreemants or lieansing agreements with third parties. The audited party may seek issuance of raasenabie orotactive orders, If appropriate, and the audising party may seek crdars requiring production. In the ovant of a dispute regarding disciosure of production of decuments, the lime limits for cendueting an audit and for challenging bille of adjuated billa shall tee tolled from the date of the request for production to the earitar of (1) the date of production of the requested documonts or (ii) the date of issuance of a final non-riviewable order denying diselosure of the requasted documiants.
5. Einality of Alling.Adnatmentr: Each bill or adjuated bill thall become final for all purpeses, other than chailenges to (i) the prudence of the Tranamisation Provider's actiens or (ii) the reseorablenuss of the Transmission Providur's decisicns with respect to whather costs and/or facilives should be difecty assigned, enarged ineremantally to insef or others of included in ambedded costs, 30 manths atter the date appearing therecn uniess the Customer has proviously raised an obiection thereto. Thereatter, the Customer shall not challenge the bill for any peason (other than the reasons sot out above) ineluding the aceuracy or reaconablenese of the till or the rasesmabieness of accounting treatment of any costs or revanuat speciffed in or underiying the bin. The Compeny shall not revise a Customers original or adjuated bill for a given perloc more than 30 months atter the date of the original bill; proviged that the Company shail rovise the bills of all similarly situated Customers if any Customer makes a timely and suceessful challenge to a bill or adjusted bill.

FLORIDA POWER CORPORATIO FERC Dacket No. ER97. Exmbit No. (FPC - 104) FanA. Too sarvices Section 1
Revenua Cradis
Page 2 of 3

## PLORIDA POWER CORPORATION PRICING DEPARTMENT

## REVENUE FROM NON-FIRM TRANSMISSION BERVI CE CALENDAR YEAR 1086

1. Hourty Non-Firm Savies: Total MWh at doint of repapk $172,54 \mathrm{~d}$
II. FPC Hourty NanFirm Use: Total MWH deslivarad

618,845 (Far FERC Form T, Page 310) for Non-Requiraments Sales
618,885 MWH $\times$ 3.32 S/NWh $\times 10267=\$ 3,109,887$

Total $1+11=32,682.740$

FLORIOA POWER CORPDRATION
Dovalopment of Annual Pranamiasion Ravanua Requiramont Based On Culandar Year 1008 Onta
 Emibit No. $\qquad$ (FWe 101)

| Annual Tranamuation $n$ | vanue Requirumant Eruals: | 310001 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 25.048 |
| Plus: |  | 22,094 |
| Puas: | Tuma OMmi Thes ineome Tavee | 10.205 |
| Plus: | atiurn | 11,940 |
| Mus: | nearme Teme | 17.256 |
| Whas: | Sued fer Evemener Pautilias | 0 |
| Lem: | Aownua fros Blime Com davenrmanis | 0 |
| Equida: Lam: |  Ouner Thnamizcion Romention | T1, wid |
| Equpus: |  | 11, 1.40 |




1,77


 238

— 78 mm .


|  | 5.38\% | 1 | 29.41/ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1.23\% | 1 | 10.102 | 768 |
|  | 14.2\% | 8 | 51.418 | 9,403 |
| Mas: Pren Amita of Mes. Teas | 14.20\% | y | 43 | \% |

UOKKEI NO. 980001-EI W. C. Slusser Evhibit No. rWCs FERC Transmission Tarif Page 18 of 19

FLORIDA POWER CORPOKAFION
Devalogmant of Avnual Transmisalon Rovanue Raquirement Gased on Calendar Yiar 1gos Dals
$\qquad$
Exhitor Ma. $\qquad$ (FAC. 191)

## ghtum Equals:



FLORIDA POWIR CORPORATION
Devilapment of annual frmandation Rovenua Regulrement
Gated On Calenday Ygar ient Data
 Fine Eethel Ma. In ${ }^{7}$


Cotk for Cratamer Fantivit:
Greaver lor Elusamer Pruntmionion Paellites

## Almentant

1. Wages and salmins Trantimission Alocriter (Wigge Ruto)







 basd en lio Wapm and sminien aromer.

Powetran Tinvinulan flativaien cicumber curn and cult sery. tater


FLDRADAFONFECORPORATIOM



DOtber mo．200001 at
w．c．amand enomin
 Ther： 10 O 1

|  | maf | fixal | mater | c－atr | max | nent | 易县 | Anet | 3 | CTET | move | Pectir |  | 12 crompas | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rivesmit } \\ & \text { peximzol } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \％minum | rages | 40.410 | 4ays | 20．80p | anter | 0，403 | Suns | 44000 | 48.38 | 40.77 | 4901． | 40，00 | 901409 | c0，124 |  |
| 3 mavineom | smix | 3019 | 240939 | 23047 | 31，04 |  |  | 159tid | 4 men | 4800 | 31203 | 38945 | 4a39 | 2xis |  |
| －amecr | name |  | tacoe | 0，45 | 87， | 15．741 | 8．377 | youp | 29，0\％ | 21， | 12， | 11，946 | vencom | 20．613 |  |
| －mantm |  |  | 127 | 110 |  |  | vom | 14 | \％ | 1 | m\％ | 17 | 4 | 10.61 |  |
| －cant． | epay | 0.30 |  | are |  | 5 mon | neet | Tre | 380 | 0.370 | E．707 | 4.70 | － | 5.040 |  |
| 3 mind | 4，336 |  | $4{ }^{48}$ | 38003 |  | 4.701 | 5 | 403 |  | 5 \％ever | 4 | 4.10 | copen | －200 |  |
| －mencion | mat |  | 3 | 23 |  |  |  |  | 2380 |  | 23 |  | 50 | 25 |  |
| to |  | zenara | 20，ast | numb | 3818 | suan | 080 | gen | mutis | Sopens | 34，ux | simb |  | 1 |  |
| 18 wimungor |  | 20983 | 2ata |  |  |  |  |  | mene | 3nye | 515 | ziten | moe．je4 | 25xay |  |
| 19 Arizpr crime |  | 7009 | 4173＊ | 4ax |  |  | \％ |  | 5eroz | mexam | 19am | rease | senfer | ${ }^{2589}$ |  |
| $1{ }^{1}$ ESCL | 1den 10\％ | 103\％，94e | Napla | de | and | 18 | 13tane | 9 |  | 10048919 | 8．150／80 | 1200，${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 4，74］me | 2，140，as： |  |
|  | 10.88 | 2，4n3 | 9，046 | 4514 | 0.80 |  |  |  | 䢕 | 1.10 | c， 19 | 415 | －18000 | 1，1m |  |
| 10 encruman | $8.508$ | $3$ | S．208 | gas | 14．20 |  |  |  | 12．1110 | 4 |  | 4 | 1 mem | 18.315 |  |
| 17 cral | 12803 | vima | vames | wisme |  | － | $1{ }^{\text {andax }}$ |  | 4 mma | 4 |  |  | 47，000 | 3.071 |  |
| 16 crapar | a7eot | 4750 | them | 4 mma | 4／80\％ | csam | 417，${ }^{\text {a }}$ | cxas | 47 mm | 0000 | 47 cis | 47008 | mayme | 13，062 |  |
| 10.1 Exirwatl | 142013 | 19，20？ | 11.85 | 19，207 | MEay | 11，207 | njew | 12909 | 11，94） | 1290 | 17， 4 p | 14.2 | 1840em | 47.8184 |  |
| 10 Ecc mbaly | 11293 | （1）Ny | yent | 93，207 | 30.308 | 12881 | 12880 | 1429 | 12850 | 4200 | $18 \times 10$ | 20\％ | 4a1， 23 | 11,04 |  |
| 110 mecosisco | 2981 | 23817 | 20，${ }^{4}$ | 23，987 | 23017 | tentis | 2987 | 29817 | 38817 | 2907\％ | atery | 2ax | 2aty | 3a88 |  |
| An mafllion | － |  |  |  |  | 20117 | 19.118 | salin | Mext | － | － | － | cency | clas |  |
| （ armanate | 2easani | 1manto | 1，40830 | 3003） | Lemben | Emamate | 2saxam | 3，481000 | 2，408，200 | 103041 | 4.20 .8142 | －mamem | zacesion | 1．manti | 40es |
| ETime | －143\％ | S思䞨 | crese： | staxaly | C4．00 | Emate | M1940 | 1 | Qvant | 1 | 1ary | ckenat | cterspry |  | ［14988 |
| Foren 1 ＋mit | arenpen | 0，04800 | a1memomber | croente | sprense | assseme | －anam | aman | ematems | yamer | Astmor | 7．71828 | H3094，009 | 7．medel | 400004 |
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## EXHIBIT NO.

## DOCKET NO: 990001-EI

## WITNESS:

KARL H. WIELAND

## PARTY:

DESCRIPTION:

FLORIDA POWER CORPORATION

SUMMARY OF FPC'S PROPOSED REGULATORY TREATMENT OF BROKER SALES

PROFERRED BY: STAFF

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COWMISSION DOCKET 990001 EEI EXHIBIT NO 5 COBPANY/ WITNESS

Existing
Agreements
Modified by
Order 888
BeforeOrder 888
FPC'S Incremental Cost ..... $\$ 20.00$ ..... $\$ 20.00$
Buyer's Incremental Cost 30.00 ..... 30.00
Transaction Price 25.00 ..... 25.00
FPC's Transmission Rate ..... 3.00
Margin ..... 5.00 ..... 2.00
Purchaser's Cost ..... 25.00 ..... 25.00
Jurisdictional Treatment of Transmission and Gain
Retail Portion of Transmission (75\%) ..... 2.25
Wholesale Portion of Transmission (25\%) ..... 0.75
Retail Portion of Margin (95\%) ..... 4.75 ..... 1.90Wholesale Portion of Margin (5\%)0.250.10
Retail Credit (before 80\%/20\% Split)Fuel Clause4.75$4.15(2.25+1.90)$
Wholesale Credit
Fuel Clause ..... 0.25 ..... 0.10
Base Rates ..... 0.75
Total Wholesale Credit ..... 0.25 ..... 0.85
After 80\%/20\% Split:
Retail Credit to Fuel Clause ..... $3.80(.8 \times 4.75)$
$3.32(.8 \times 4.15)$
Stockholder Incentive ..... $0.95(.2 \times 4.75)$ ..... $0.83(.2 \times 4.15)$
*Source: Pre-filed testimony of K.H. Weiland, Part G, Page 21, Docket No. 970001-EI See also: Hearing Transcript, Vol. 1, pages 82-83, Docket No. 970001-El

EXHIBIT NO. $\qquad$ 6

## DOCKET NO: <br> 990001-EI

WITNESS:

PARTY:

DESCRIPTION:

WILLIAM C. SLUSSER, JR.

FLORIDA POWER CORPORATION

COMPOSITE EXHIBIT:

1) DEPOSITION OF WILLIAM C. SLUSSER, JR. TAKEN ON JANUARY 21, 1999, AND 2) RESPONSES TO STAFF'S THIRD SET OF INTERROGATORIES (NOS. 13-15)

PROFERRED BY: STAFF


BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

THE DEFOSITION OE:
TAKEN AT THE INSTANCE OF:

DATE:
TIME:

LOCATION:

REPORTED BY:

WIIIIAM C. SLUSSER, JUNIOR
Florida Public Service Commission

January 21, 1999
Commenced: 2:05 p.m.
Concluded: 3:25 p.m.
Gerald L. Gunter Building 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Room 362
Tallahassee, Florida
Debra R. Krick
Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for State of fiorida at Large

PREMIER REPORTING 6753 THOMASVILIE ROAD TALLAHASSEE, FL 32312 (850) 894-0828

## BUREAU OF REPORTING

RECEMED 2. 3.99


## APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

On behalf of Florida Public Service Commission:

WILLIAM COCHRAN KEATING, IV, ESQ. Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd<br>Tallahassee, FL 32399<br>On behalf of Florida Power Corporation:<br>JAMES A. MCGEE, ESQ.<br>Florida Power Corporation<br>Post Office Box 14042<br>St. Petersburg, FL 33733<br>On behalf of Florida Power and Light:<br>CORBY DUBIN, ESQ.<br>9250 West Flagler Street Miami, FL<br>On behalf of the Citizens of Elorida:<br>STEVE BURGESS, ESQ.<br>Office of Public Counsel<br>111 West Madison Street Room 812<br>Tallahassee, FL 32399<br>Also appearing:<br>Todd Bohrmann, FPSC<br>David Wheeler, FPSC Judy Harlow, FPSC<br>Tom Billinger, EPSC<br>Karl Wieland, Florida Power Corp.
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Examination by Mr. Keating4

## D E P O S I T O N

Whereupon,

WILLIAM C. SLUSSER, JUNIOR

was called as a witness, having been first duly sworn to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION
BY MR. KEATING:
Q Good morning.
A Good afternoon.
Q I hope you're Mr. Slusser. We haven't met before. I am Cochran Keating with the Commission staff.

A Okay.
Q I just have a few questions for you this afternoon.

First, in your testimony, you advocate crediting the transmission-related revenues from the economy transactions to retail customers, based on the transmission allocator. Do you advocate the use of this method for all economy transactions or only those transactions which occur over the energy broker network?

A Mr. Keating, I am not sure I got all the pieces of that question. But what $I$ am advocating is the theory that the transmission component of the revenue that's realized from a non-firm sale, in particular economy
sales, economy sales through the broker, that that transmission revenue piece be jurisdictionalized on a basis that represents the transmission cost for jurisdictional cost responsibilities.

And I would say that any type of revenue of a non-firm nature transmission non-firm nature should be jurisdictionalized on a transmission basis, cost basis as opposed to a generation basis.

Q Okay.
A So that does go beyond just broker transactions. Any kind of a non-firm sale by the company, the transmission revenue component -- when it's treated in ratemaking -- that the part that's treated in ratemaking for retail jurisdiction should be attributed to the retail business on the basis of a transmission responsibility.

Q Okay. I have got a table I would like you to take a look at, and I have got a few extra copies.

This table displays the historic sales from 1978 to 1998 over the energy broker network.

Would you agree that on a megawatt hour basis the statewide broker network sales have been declining over the last few years?

A Well, this table indicates that -- I am not that familiar with this table. If I am understanding that,
this is all energy broker transactions. It's not just -it's not related to Florida Power in particular.

Q Correct. This is statewide.
A Yeah. This indicates there was a peak of sales transactions in 1988, 4.4. million megawatt hours. And it's declined in 1998 to 1.1 million megawatt hours.

Q Do you expect economy sales over the broker network to continue declining or to perhaps remain the same or increase in the future?

A I really don't have the knowledge of how the projections of the broker system might result. There -I am familiar with a lot of efforts to realize economy savings by all the utilities in Florida, prior to the transactions actually being able to be consummated by the energy broker system. And I am sure that's what's cut into the transactions that we see here. But I don't have any forecasts of what the future is on it.

Q What about any expectations about economy sales in general, not just broker sales?

A Well, I think economy sales, in general, are strongly being pursued by utilities as ways of helping to reduce their customers' rates.

I know our company is aggressively attempting to pursue all avenues of economy sales and purchases that will help reduce our rate payers' fuel billings.

Q Have Florida Power Corporation sales over the broker network increased or decreased or remained about the same for -- say for the past three years?

A It's my understanding, similar to the state picture here, that Florida Power's result in transactions on the broker have been lessened, as a result of transactions prior to them being able to occur on the broker system.

Q Okay. What about Florida Power Corporation's economy sales in general?

A Economy sales in general. I think the information on Florida Power Corp. should show that we probably are a greater purchaser of economy energy than we are a seller. We are as aggressive at trying to find the best purchases, as we are when we do have capacity of selling it. It's a matter of probably timing, whether we are a greater buyer or seller. And I think right now we are a greater purchaser.

Q Okay. And I may not have been clear in my question. Do you expect, then, that your economy sales in general would increase or decrease or remain about the same as the current level?

A I really don't know.
Q Would the decline in sales over the broker network reduce your concern or reduce the dollar impact?

A As I was --
Q Let me restate that.
Would it reduce your concern about the appropriate separation factor used in separating the transmission revenues by reducing the dollar impact?

A Well, my issue -- and that our company continues to raise is, one of the theories of what happens to any transmission revenue that the company realizes, and so whether it's revenue from economy -from the Florida broker transactions or revenues from other schedules that we may sell under, like an opportunity schedule or a power sales tariff, the issue that I keep wanting to ensure is that we have appropriate jurisdictional crediting of the -- of that as a transmission revenue, and that it just not be treated as generation.

So I tend to disagree that the lessening sales under the broker is really what's at issue. The -- that could change, I really don't know, the future of the broker system; or the theory if one argued, well, it's done this way for the broker, it ought to be done this way for other economy transactions. That's my concern, that we have consistent cost treatment with respect to transmission revenues.

Q Okay. Looking at page three of your testimony,

I believe you discuss a settlement proposal regarding Power Corp.'s open-access transmission tariffs, which are currently under review by PERC; is that correct?

A Actually, we have got acceptance of that settlement from PERC. The acceptance was issued in late November, as I recall.

Q Okay. And this one -- hopefully, this question might take us a little time to get through, since I am -since the transmission language is fairly new to me.

But turning to page six of your testimony, in your discussion in lines 3 through 12 -- well, actually based on the discussion in lines 3 through 12, could you run through maybe a simple numerical example showing the mechanics of how the PERC ratemaking requirement causes the 20 percent revenue shortfall?

A Yes, certainly. The -- and I would like to stay with numbers that will add up to 100 here, I guess.

Q Okay.
A That would be the easiest --
Q That sounds good to me, too.
A -- to work with.
We are required to recognize revenues that we receive for sales of non-firm transactions, economy, opportunity, any of that. PERC Order 888 requires us to recognize that revenue and book it as transmission
revenue on our books; that it is in a category of revenue that can be classified as revenue, non-firm revenue coming from making a non-firm transmission sale, if you wish.

If Florida Power was to realize $\$ 100$ of transmission sales during a period of time, that hundred dollars is -- in ratemaking is to be credited to customers who support the facilities that allowed you to engage in that transaction. Those customers are what we call our firm long-term customers. It's customers that you have built the facilities for, you have planned the facilities for them, it meets their capacity needs. You have engaged in a responsibility of building facilities to serve what we call firm customers. And I am talking about transmission here, transmission system.

Whenever we make a sale, the sale can only be accomplished if we have some generation facilities and transmission facilities to deliver that power to an entity.

The hundred dollars that we receive is actually almost incremental revenue, because there is no cost that the company's incurred when it makes a non-firm sale. It makes a sale out of already existing capability, capability that the firm customers weren't using.

If the firm customers were using the capability,
we could not have made the sale. So whenever we make a sale, it's on a non-firm basis, it's using our customers' capability that otherwise they weren't using. And the ratemaking theory that has been endorsed by the PERC and by this Commission and probably most all commissions throughout the country, is one that the rate payers that are supporting the investment -- that any revenues -additional revenues you realize from them ought to go toward reducing their cost of service.

So this hundred dollars that we would have realized needs to go back in ratemaking to the customer supporting the transmission system:

The firm customers of Florida Power Corp. and firm transmission customers of Florida Power Corporation are responsible for about 25 percent of Florida Power's cost responsibility. They make up 25 percent of the load on our transmission system at the time of our monthly peaks.

Our retail customers' load makes up 75 percent of the load responsibility at the time of our peaks. And that's how they normally assign cost responsibility for the transmission system. So this hundred dollars should also go back to the two jurisdictional groups in proportion to the way they had been assigned the cost.

So an example that I gave, the hundred dollars
in wholesale ratemaking, $\$ 25$ should go to wholesale customers and $\$ 75$ to retail customers.

An order out of the Florida Public Service Commission in January of '98, instructed utilities to do something different with the transmission revenue from -that's associated with economy sales. They said to put that revenue -- treat it as if it was in a pot of dollars that gets jurisdictionalized on a generation basis. On a generation basis, the retail customers get 95 percent of the revenue.

So we are in a situation where the Commission has ordered that of this hundred dollars, $\$ 95$ should go toward recognizing either base rates or lower fuel cost of your retail customers. And the PERC ratemaking, we have $\$ 25$ that is credited in rates of our wholesale customers.

So the sum of $\$ 95$ and $\$ 25$ is $\$ 120$. That's more than, obviously, the hundred dollars that we realized in the sale of the transmission, non-firm transaction. So it's as simple as that. It is as simple as the numbers I demonstrate here.

Q Well, that was a good explanation, that at least I could understand. Thank you.

A Sure.
Q Still, on page six of your testimony, on lines

17 through 19, you discuss the $80-20$ sharing of gains on economy sales?

A Yes.
Q How are you defining economy sales?
A These are the energy broker network sales, the Florida broker sales.

Q Okay. So it's just those sales on the broker?
A Yes.
Q And not all economy sales in general?
A That's correct.
Q. Okay. How are the revenues from non-broker economy transactions currently being treated?

A The generation of revenues from such sales are fully -- by fully, I mean 100 percent of the margin on generation revenues from other than broker transaction sales -- are being treated as a credit in calculating the retail customer's fuel adjustment cost.

So 100 percent of the generation revenues are being put in as a credit in the retail customer's -their jurisdictional portion of that is 95 percent. So they are getting 95 percent of the generation revenues. The transmission revenues are recorded as transmission revenues.

Most -- most, if not all of other transactions, have been under agreements established since Order 888,
which requires the transaction have its transmission service component taken under the company's open access tariff. So there is a separate determination of the transmission charges for other types of non-firm sales that the company may engage in.

And that revenue is recorded as revenue related to transmission, and is taken up in an analysis of the company's jurisdictional revenues through jurisdictional separation studies; or would be taken up in a rate proceeding where it gets credited appropriately as a transmission jurisdictional item in establishing of base rates.

MR. KEATING: Do you mind if we go off the record for a minute?

MR. MCGEE: No.
THE WITNESS: NO.
(Discussion off the record.)
BY MR. KEATING:
Q What types of economy sales does Florida Power Corporation currently have?

A Yes, Mr. Keating. I think you can categorize the economy sales that Florida Power engages in in three groups.

The first group is that that transpires under the Florida broker system. They are a match of
someone's -- of one utility's incremental cost versus another utility's decremental cost, and the charge is actually the average of the two prices.

That is typically under what we call interchange schedules with other utilities, as a Schedule C interchange schedule. That particular schedule is one that Order 888 required utilities to unbundle the revenues that it was realizing from the -- from the split the savings charge that it was realizing out of the transaction for the purpose of recognizing that a transmission use was being made by the utility to be comparable with any other entity that uses the transmission system, that there ought to be identified a transmission cost and revenue responsibility.

So Florida Power Corp., in compliance with PERC's Order 888, filed on January 1st, 1997, to unbundle its Schedule $C$ so that the charge that it was realizing could be booked as having a generation charge and a transmission charge.

PERC did not require other non-firm coordination sales that were in existence by the utility at the time of Order 888 to be unbundled. It was only the Schedule $C$ that they had required to be unbundled. But the company may engage in other non-firm transactions, such as an emergency sale, which is a schedule $A$, or other various
schedules of interchange sales that might be called -also a non-firm or economy -- a lingo of whether it's economy or non-firm -- the idea, in my opinion, is it is still capacity that the utility has that isn't committed to, that it has an opportunity to make a sale with. And, therefore, there can be some non-firm revenue coming in on that. However, the -- no other schedules were required to be unbundled.

PERC did require any new agreements, or new transactions, new -- call them economy or non-firm sales transactions to be unbundled when they were entered into. And what I mean by unbundled, that they have a generation charge and a transmission charge, and that the transmission be provided under the utilities open-access transmission tariff.

I somewhat deviated -- I started off with some categories. Let me not leave that. The first category being the Florida broker transaction sales that we have unbundled our Schedule $C$ before PERC to comply with Order 888. We have possibly other non-Florida broker sales that may be under various interchange schedules, maybe even using Schedule $C$. Sometimes Schedule $C$ may not have been exclusively for Florida broker purposes. But by and large, that was the schedule being used for florida broker transactions. But any other use of Schedule $C$ and
other interchange schedules, that -- those revenues were not unbundled, and they are still being recorded as generation-related revenues, and credited through the fuel clause as wholly generation-related revenues.

The third category that $I$ was leading to is, any agreements entered into after Order 888 , where the company has established -- which the company has established several rate tools for our power marketing group to enter into, they can take -- the power sales tool can be of the form of a power sales tariff that the company has approved from the PERC of -- actually, we have two types of power sales tariffs. One is at market rates, and one is at cost based rates.

We also have added to many of our interchange schedules a schedule called $O S$, which is -- OS stands for opportunity sale; opportunity sale schedule. And that OS schedule, as well as our power sales tariffs, require that the entity wanting the power to be delivered, or the seller of the power can arrange for the transmission to be provided. But it has to be provided under Florida Power's open access transmission tariff under the same rates, terms and conditions as anybody else that's using Florida Power's transmission system.

So we have separate billing and revenues recorded for this last category of new transactions, and
we can label that new non-broker economy or non-firm transactions -- whichever you want to call it -- as that category.

Those -- that last category, the generation component of the sale under the power sales tariff or under the OS tariff, the generation revenue is fully flowed and credited through the fuel clause.

The transmission revenue is recorded on the company's books and is recognized in jurisdictional separation cost analysis, or earnings, jurisdictional surveillance earnings, or is recognized in establishing base rates when there is a rate proceeding.

The company just completed a rate proceeding for its wholesale customers in its transmission rates, and recognized all of that additional transmission revenue, or that -- what we record as transmission revenue under those type of sales, as a credit in establishing the stated rates for our wholesale firm transmission customers. And for our retail customers, those revenues are going to show up as a credit and show up as, you might call it, a mathematically additional earnings by the retail business in the company's surveillance reports.

Does that help you?
Q I think it does, yes. Thank you.

A Okay.
MR. KEATING: Would you like to take a quick
break?
THE WITNESS: I am fine.
BY MR. KEATING:
Q Are you all right?
A Yes.
Q I didn't know if you wanted to get a glass of water or something --

A I am fine.
Q -- being asked to go through that a couple times.

Mr. Slusser, under the operation of Florida Power Corporation's transmission tariff discussed on page two and three of your testimony, is the actual amount of the non-firm transmission revenues received ultimately reflected in the rate charge to customers, or is the projected amount reflected?

A The docket ER 97-4573, that was the most recent docket establishing the wholesale transmission rates for Florida Power Corporation, are -- the final result of them are a settlement based on a fixed actual cost of service point in time; that the company had proposed that the rate be established as a formula rate and be calculated as a projected charge and then trued up
subsequently, based on actual cost and actual loads.
We still have an interest in having a formula rate for this kind of service to our wholesale customers. However, in negotiations with our wholesale customers, we conceded at this point in time continuing our pursuance of a formula rate and agreed on a fixed stated rate. And in the settlement establishing the stated rates, we employed calendar year actual '96 cost and data, including credits for non-firm transmission use from all three types of transactions that I had described before as a credit to the transmission cost of service in establishing the wholesale transmission rates.

Q In response to interrogatory number 15, Florida Power Corporation indicated that the difference between the projected revenue credit based on the energy allocation and the transmission allocation is $\$ 180,000$.

Does this calculation reflect only the broker transaction, or does it include all economy transactions?

A That particular part of the response refers to all economy transactions.

Q Okay.
MR. KEATING: Do you mind if we go off the
record again for a second?
MR. McGEE: No.
MR. KEATING: Okay. Thank you.
(Discussion off the record.)
MR. KEATING: Back on the record again. BY MR. KEATING:

Q Also in your response to interrogatory number 15, or Florida Power Corporation's response, you indicate that the difference in the methods based on the actual period April through September 1998 is $\$ 16,215$.

Does this difference reflect only broker transactions or all economy transactions?

A Yes. Mr. Keating, the interrogatory responses -- actually 13A demonstrate the actual -- the actual amounts under the Florida broker that the company realized from April through September of '98. And that particular response shows a calculation of the difference in, if all of the transmission revenue component was flowed through the fuel clause as the Commission had ordered this past year, versus the way that the company is seeking the transmission revenue be treated as a separate jurisdictional separation; that the impact for the total of these six months, as it relates to just Florida broker transactions, is only $\$ 16,215$.

Q I think I have just got a couple more questions.

What type of administrative cost would be involved in making the changes to the $A$ and $E$ schedules
to reflect using the demand allocator?
A We believe it would be very minimal administrative costs. We aren't going to be adding any personnel to do it. We just see this as just another small calculation to be made in conjunction with the preparation of the $A$ schedules or the $E$ schedules.

The fuel accounting group at Florida Power that prepares the A schedules have a preference of establishing the jurisdictional amount that the -- that the transmission -- the transmission revenue credit that should go to the retail jurisdiction, their desire is to calculate that off-line very much like interrogatory 13-A on column $E$ does it, and insert that in a line item as a system credit to the fuel cost. And by doing it this way, mathematically, you're -- one is getting the right result and answer.

In other words, if you studied exhibit -interrogatory 13-A, you will find that the company took the transmission component of revenue and jurisdictionalized it first by multiplying it by the retail transmission responsibility, which right now is 75 percent. And it's been 75 percent for a number of years, very close to that.

And then it grosses it up -- I call it grossing it up, by the jurisdictional factor that's inherent in
the fuel clause, which is a separation based on energy or -- yes, based on energy. So the amount that was to get to the retail business is calculated off-line and then grossed up by the way the fuel clause would separate it. And you have a -- an amount that is proper mathematically, to put as a system line item, as a credit; so that when it flows through and then that amount ends up being jurisdictionalized, you are getting the exact credit that the retail is responsible for or should get.

That's the preference that our fuel accounting people would like. If that's not clear, I would like to try that again, because it is important for them to do that. And maybe I need to get out an A schedule to help explain that.

Q I think --
MR. MCGEE: We could do this off the record.
BY MR. KEATING:
Q Yeah. I think what I was, really just wanted to get at was what sort of costs would be involved in doing it.

A We feel very minimal costs, very minimal.
Q Okay. So it wouldn't involve hiring additional personnel. So it would just be the cost of time, I guess, for the personnel you have to --

A That's correct. It is one of many line items that he would need in on those schedules, that it's not a difficult exercise to include in the A schedules.

Q About how much time do you think -- could you estimate that would take?

A Once this is set up, you know, on an Excel spreadsheet, that spreadsheet -- the format can be reused each month. And I see it hardly as any time at all.

MR. KEATING: Well, I think that's all the questions that we have.

MR. McGEE: Steve.
MR. BURGESS: I have some questions.
MR. MCGEE: Okay.
CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. BURGESS:
Q Mr. Slusser, with regard to the transmission revenues, treatment of transmission revenues for new non-broker economy sales following PERC Order 888 -those that you intend or are crediting into the base rates, is that already taking place, or this is something that's planned? I mean, has it -- have any of these actually happened up to this point?

A The company is engaging in those type of transactions, so we are realizing revenues and recording them on our books. We -- we will recognize those
revenues in the jurisdictional reports made to the Commission. We haven't had a -- we settled our wholesale transmission tariff with the level of transactions that were occurring in 1996.

To the extent that we have -- have more transactions than we had of that type in 1996, then you might argue that in wholesale rates they haven't been totally reflected. But they were reflected for the level of non-firm -- all non-firm transactions the company was engaged in in 1996.

MR. BURGESS: Jim, this is -- I am going to recognize that this is a little bit of a legal. question, and that $I$ am going to ask Mr. Slusser. But I want to know under what authority you crediting fuel, crediting base rates for this instead of fuel, what authority exists. In other words, what made you decide to run this as a revenue credit in base rates for the jurisdictional portion, as opposed to the way that you intend to continue to credit the broker sales transmission rate?

MR. MCGEE: Steve, can he answer that in terms of why he thinks it's proper for him to do that?

MR. BURGESS: Absolutely.
THE WITNESS: Well, thank you, Jim.
I not only think it's proper, but we have had,
over the years, other non-firm transmission transactions that we have recorded revenues for, that have always been treated in base ratemaking; either before PERC or before the Florida Public Service Commission. That is the traditional approach that, when a -- whenever you have identified functional revenues that you realize, that they are taken into account in establishing the base rates when base rates are established. I am not aware of any situation that we had had recorded transmission revenues where those recorded transmission revenues would have been treated any other way. That has always been the practice before PERC. That is traditional ratemaking by a regulatory body.

And I can state that we have had other -- it's no different than other charges for transmission use that we make by others on our system. We have, what I call, wheeling through our system. If there is a transaction between Tampa Electric and Tallahassee, they use our system. That is recorded transmission revenue that is treated in base ratemaking before both PERC and Florida Public Service Commission. BY MR. BURGESS:

Q Now --
A That is the practice.

Q And from what you are saying, it sounds like that the broker sales will be a departure from that, because you will be charging a separate transmission factor associated with broker sales. And yet, those will continue to go through credit, revenue credit in the fuel adjustment clause.

A Okay. I indicated that where we in the future are moving toward having a totally separate additional transmission charge, I don't believe that that should go through the fuel clause. I think that should be treated as a credit in base ratemaking.

I did say, for the purposes of the intent of the Florida broker revenues, that to get -- I think the Commission's desire was, to the extent practicable, treat those revenues -- to the extent practicable the way they were benefiting customers before, that that is a position the company is taking on those transmission revenues. And we are willing -- because it was credited before as a generation credit through the fuel clause, even though it's transmission, we are willing, to the extent practicable -- keep those revenues going through the fuel clause, but first jurisdictionalize them properly.

Q Let me use a numerical example and see if $I$ understand whether a particular transaction would take place with these new post-Order 888 non-broker economy
sales?
A Okay.
Q So let's say we enter into some of those; if your fuel cost is 100, and you have a willing buyer at 105, and your transmission cost is 10 , would you make that sale?

A Well, first the -- most often the buyer must -I shouldn't say must. But we prefer that the buyer arrange the transmission. That's a preference.

Q But arrange what transmission?
A If Tampa Electric was wanting to buy from Florida Power Corp., Tampa Electric would need to make transmission arrangements to buy that power. And so it knows it's going to be charged -- in your example, was it 10 for transmission?

Q Yes.
A And it is going to get a generation bid from Florida Power of 105. So if Tampa Electric wants to make that purchase, it is going to get two billings. It is going to get a bill for 105, and it is going to get a bill for 10 .

Q Okay. I have not communicated well. Your next -- your incremental fuel cost as a seller is 100. TECO's decremental fuel cost is a 105. Based strictly on fuel, the transaction would take place.

A I am with you.
Q Now, suppose transmission is 10. Does that undermine the sale, does that mean now this sale will not take place, even though 10 is a phantom cost? It doesn't -- it's not an incremental cost to the total system cost at all?

A Well, to the extent that Tampa Electric would be subject to more charges than its own incremental cost, the deal wouldn't occur, that's correct.

Q In other words, you would not be free to say, well, our total cost is only 100 , so we will just arrange it this way; we will separate out 10 as the transmission cost, and we will just charge you 90 for the fuel?

A You see, that's countering what Order 888 is trying to accomplish. It's unbundling the company.

Transmission is a separate service from generation. And the transmission is to charge its 10, because it has that responsibility to collect that and benefit its other transmission customers.

The generation entity has got to -- it's not prudent for them to sell below their incremental costs. In fact, I don't think they -- they are allowed to sell.

Q That's my question. That is exactly my question.

A They would not sell below their incremental
costs.
Q Below the incremental energy cost, it will not happen?

A The generation component will not.
Q So an economic transaction will not take place under certain circumstances?

A Well, I see the economics there a little different maybe than you do, because you have ignored there is a transmission cost there. You are saying the only cost is an incremental generation cost. I am saying there is both a generation cost and a transmission cost.

Q I understand. I understand.
The transmission has already been fully covered, though, this other way, is my only point of that.

I am just trying to find out what the -- what Power Corp.'s policy is on that. I am really not taking issue as to that propriety of whether that sale should take place or not. I just wanted to find out whether it does.

And you are saying, no, it cannot happen?
A That's correct. When we unbundle our economy schedule, we said that we would not engage in a transaction where the transmission charge, itself, exceeded -- or the margin was less than our transmission charge. The company definitely has that practice that
it's not going to have a negative margin.
Q I want to also ask about -- you are familiar with an issue that -- perhaps you are not -- that has been raised as a concern of Public Counsel, that this position may exceed the bounds of the reconsideration, itself. Are you familiar with that?

A (Witness shakes head in the negative.)
Q Okay. Well, then, let me just put it this way, is -- was it your understanding that the initial order from which this reconsideration was taken authorized the treatment of allowing transmission revenue, separated transmission revenue to go through as a base rate credit as opposed to a fuel adjustment credit?

A Well, my understanding, that's not an issue. The issue is the treatment of the transmission component of broker transactions. That's my understanding of this proceeding.

Q The entire proceeding, including the original proceeding?

A Well, the original proceeding has evolved to just this proceeding. That's all that remains. And the issues in this proceeding are the treatment of the transmission revenue associated with broker transactions.

Q But didn't Power Corp.'s reconsideration acknowledge that transmission revenues that are broken
out are properly credited in the fuel cost recovery docket?

A I am not aware of that.
Q Okay.
A I do not recall that.
Q Don't worry. It would be a legal argument if it comes down to it. I just wanted to know if you are aware of that.

MR. BURGESS: Those are all the questions I have. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Sure, Mr. Burgess. Okay.
MR. KEATING: I don't have anything else.
MR. MCGEE: None for me.
(Whereupon, the deposition was concluded at 3:25 p.m., and reading and signing by the witness was not waived.)
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BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Fuel and Purchased Power Cost Recovery Clause and Generating Performance Incentive Factor.

Docket No. 990001-EI
Submitted for filing:
January 07, 1999

## FLORIDA POWER CORPORATION'S RESPONSE TO STAFF'S THIRD SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO FLORIDA. POWER CORPORATION (NOS. 13-15)

Florida Power Corporation ("FPC") hereby responds to Staff's Third Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 13-15), propounded December 10, 1998.

## INTERROGATORIES

13. For the purpose of answering the following two interrogatories, assume that the Commission orders transmission revenues received in conjunction with economy EBN transactions to be allocated based upon the jurisdictional factor for transmission services:
a) indicate how the Commission should amend its Schedule A1 through

Schedule A9 to show the impact of its order; and

b) indicate how the Commission should amend its Schedule E1 through Schedule E9 to show the impact of its order.

Response:
a) Florida Power Corporation would propose not to amend any parts of Schedules A1 through A9. Rather, the broker savings on Schedule A6 (Short-term energy sales) will already be adjusted for the transmission component of EBN broker savings. The calculation would be performed off-line as shown on the attached schedule. The adjusted credit would then be flowed back in the same manner that occurs currently.
b) Florida Power Corporation would propose amending Schedule E6 to break out the refundable EBN Transmission revenues (see E6 schedule attached). The EBN transmission revenues would also be reflected on a separate line (after the retail/wholesale allocation) on Schedule E1 (see line 27a of the El schedule attached).

Staff's Third Set of Interrogatories To Florida Power Corporation.
Docket No. 980001-El (Transmission Reconsideration)

## Interrogatory \# 13a

|  | Current <br> Method <br> (a) <br> 100\% Broker Savings | (b) Transmission Service | (c) <br> Broker <br> Savings Excl Xmission | energy <br> (d) <br> Juridictional Separation | (e) <br> Transmission at $75 \%$ grossed up $\left.\left\{\left(\mathrm{b}^{*} .75\right) / \mathrm{d}\right)\right\}$ | Proposed Method (f) <br> Flow through Credits \{c+e\} | (g) <br> Variance between both methods $\qquad$ (a-f) | (h) 80\% Ratepayer Credit $\qquad$ ( $\mathrm{g}^{*} .8$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Apr | 63,284 | 25,481 | 37,803 | 97.32\% | 19,637 | 57,440 | 5,844 | 4,675 |
| May | 39,683 | 18,311 | 21,371 | 97.01\% | 14,157 | 35,528 | 4,154 | 3,324 |
| Jun | 16,999 | 7,386 | 9,613 | 97.22\% | 5,698 | 15,311 | 1,688 | 1,351 |
| Jul | 40,145 | 12,750 | 27,395 | 96.34\% | 9,926 | 37,321 | 2,824 | 2,259 |
| Aug | 43,491 | 11.403 | 32,088 | 96.02\% | 8,907 | 40,995 | 2,496 | 1.997 |
| Sep | 50,463 | 14,775 | 35,688 | 96.25\% | 11,513 | 47,200 | 3,262 | 2,610 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ 16,215 |

Staff's Third Set of interrogatories To Florida Power Corporation. . Docket No. 980001-E1 (Transmission Reconsideration) interrogatory \# 13b

## FLORIDA POWER CORPORATION

FUEL AND PURCHASED POWER COST RECOVERY CLAUSE ESTIMATED FOR THE PERIOD OF: APRIL 1998 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 1998

|  |  | DOLLARS | MWH | CENTS/KWH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fuei Cost of Systern Net Generation | 246,483,156 | 14,463,054 | 1.70423 |
| 2. | Spent Nuclear Fuel Disposal Cost | 2,870,107 | 3,069,633 | 0.09350 |
| 3. | Nuclear Fuel Replacement Cost | 0 | 0 | 0.00000 |
| 4. | Adjustment to Fuel Cost | 1,891,000 | 0 | 0.00000 |
| 5. | TOTAL COST OF GENERATED POWER | 251,244,263 | 14,463,054 | 1.73715 |
| 6. | Energy Cost of Purchased Power (Exct. Econ \& Cogens) (ET) | 21,484,690 | 1,197,350 | 1.79435 |
| 7. | Energy Cost of Sch. C, X Economy Purchases (Broker) (E9) | 16,709,910 | 640,000 | 2.73933 |
| 8. | Energy Cost of Economy Purchases (Non-Broker) (E9) | 1.485,854 | 43,800 | 3.39236 |
| 9. | Energy Cost of Schedule E Economy Purchases (E9) | 0 | 0 | 0.00000 |
| 10. | Capacity Cost of Economy Purchases (E9) | 0 | 0 | 0.00000 |
| 11. | Payments to Qualifying Facilities (E8) | 83,252,679 | 4,021,143 | 2.07037 |
| 12. | TOTAL COST OF PURCHASED POWER | 122,933,133 | 5.872,293 | 2.09344 |
| 13. | TOTAL AVAILABLE KWH |  | 20,335,347 |  |
| 14. | Fuel Cost of Economy Sales (E6) | $(5,027,600)$ | $(300,000)$ | 1.67587 |
| 149. | Gain on Economy Sales - 80\% (E6) | $(643,200)$ | $(300,000)$ * | 0.21440 |
| 15. | Fuel Cost of Other Power Saies (E6) | 0 | 0 | 0.00000 |
| :a. | Gain on Other Power Sales (E6) | 0 | 0 | 0.00000 |
| . 0. | Fuel Cost of Unit Power Sales (E6) | 0 | 0 | 0.00000 |
| 16a. | Gain on Unit Power Sales (E6) | 0 | 0 | 0.00000 |
| 17. | Fuel Cost of Stratified Sates (E6) | $(9,883,064)$ | $(491,211)$ | 2.01198 |
| 18. | TOTAL FUEL COST AND GAINS ON POWER SALES | $(15,553,864)$ | (791,211) | 1.96583 |
| 19. | Net inadvertent interchange |  | 0 |  |
| 20. | TOTAL FUEL AND NET POWER TRANSACTIONS | 358,623,532 | 19,544,136 | 1.83494 |
| 21. | Net Unbilled | 10,797,257 | $(588,425)$ | 0.06080 |
| 22. | Company Use | 1,667,962 | $(90,900)$ | 0.00940 |
| 23. | T\& D Losses | 20,179,149 | $(1,099,716)$ | 0.11360 |
| 24. | Adjusted System KWH Sales | 358,623,532 | 17,765,095 | 2.01874 |
| 25. | Wholesale KWH Sales (Excluding Supplemental Sales) | (12,178,897) | $(603,602)$ | 2.01770 |
| 26. | Jurisdictional KWH Sales | 346,444,635 | 17,161,493 | 2.01873 |
| 27. | Jurisdictional KWH Sales Adjusted for Line Losses X 1.0016 | 346,998,946 | 17,161,493 | 2.02196 |
| 27a. | EBN Transmission Revenues | $(540,000)$ | 17,161,493 | (0.00315) |
| 28. | Prior Period True-Up (E1-B, Sheet 1)** | (2,007,311) | 17,161,493 | (0.01170) |
| 28 a . | Market Price True-Up ** | 0 | 17,161,493 | 0.00000 |
| 28b. | Nuclear Replacement Cost (E1-C) | 18,371,207 | 17,164,493 | 0.10705 |
| 29. | Total Jurisdictional Fuel Cost | 362,822,842 | 17,161,493 | 2.11416 |
| 30. | Revenue Tax Factor |  |  | 1.00083 |
| 31. | Fuel Cost Adjusted for Taxes | 363,123,985 | 17,161,493 | 2.11591 |
| 32. | GPIF ** | 1,172,147 | 17,161,493 | 0.00683 |
| - | Fuel Factor Adjusted for taxes including GPIF | 364,296,132 | 17,161,493 | 2.12274 |
| 34. | Total Fuel Cost Factor (rounded to the nearest . 001 cents/ KWH) |  |  | 2.123 |

[^5]Staff's Third of Interrogatories To Florida Power Corporation.
Docket No. 98uv01-EI (Transmission Reconsideration)
Interrogatory \# 13b
SCHEDULE E6

## FLORIDA POWER CORPORATION - FUEL COST OF POWER SOLD

## ESTIMATED FOR THE PERIOD OF: APR-98 THROUGH SEP-98


14. Could Florida Power Corporation's retail jurisdiction separation factor for transmission services be greater than its retail jurisdiction factor for generation service? If so, provide an example.

Response:
It is unlikely that the retail jurisdictional factor for transmission services would be greater than for generation services. However, it is conceivable that this situation could occur if wholesale generation customers could by-pass the Company's transmission system. For example, a wholesale entity could construct its own transmission line to directly connect and receive power from a FPC generating resource. If this were the only wholesale transaction and represented 5\% of FPC's generation sales, the retail jurisdictional factor for transmission service would be $100 \%$ and the retail jurisdictional factor for generation service would be 95\%.
15. Using the projected fuel and purchased power cost recovery period April through September, 1998, show the calculation of the revenue credit to the fuel clause for transmission and energy related revenues from broker economy transactions based on the method proposed in the prefiled testimony of William C. Slusser. (i.e. separated on both a $12 \mathbf{C P}$ transmission basis and on an energy basis). Please show the same calculation assuming that all the revenues are credited on an energy basis.

Response:
The calculations are shown on the attached sheets.
The results are as follows:
Credit based on 12 CP allocation for transmission: $\quad \$ 1,183,200$
Credit based on energy allocation (as filed): $\quad \$ 1,363,200$
Difference before retail/wholesale allocation: (\$ 180,000)
Difference after retail/wholesale allocation:
(\$ 155,920)

Please note that the April - September 1998 projection of economy sales (ECONSALE on schedule E-6) includes EBN broker sales as well as non-broker sales. EBN broker sales typically are only $10 \%$ of total economy sales on an actual basis. For reporting of actual sales, non-broker sales are reported on Schedule A1, lines 15 and 15 a.

The difference in gains for the two allocation methods on an actual basis for the April-September 1998 period is $\$ 16,215$ (see attachment to interrogatory 13a).

Staff's Third of Interrogatories To Florida Power Corporation.
Docket No. 98uv01-El (Transmission Reconsideration)
Interrogatory \# 13b
(12 CP Transmission Basis)
FLORIDA POWER CORPORATION - FUEL COST OF POWER SOLD ESTIMATED FOR THE PERIOD OF: APR-9B THROUGH SEP-98

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |  | (7) |  | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MONTH | - SOLD To | TYPE <br> \& SCHEDULE | total KWH SOLD | KWH <br> WHEELED <br> FROM <br> OTHER <br> SYSTEMS | KWH <br> FROM <br> OWN GENERATION | (A) FUEL cost | C/KWH (B) TRANS REVENUE | (C) total cost | $\begin{gathered} \text { FUEL } \\ \text { COST } \\ \$ \\ (6) \times(7 A) \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL <br> cost <br> $\$$ <br> (Excl Trans Rev) <br> (6) $\mathbf{x}(7 \mathrm{C}-7 \mathrm{~B}$ ) | $\qquad$ <br> GAIN ON POWER SALES s (9)-(8) $\times(80 \%)$ | REFUNDABLE <br> TRANSMISSION <br> REVENUES <br> $\$$ <br> $(6) \times(7 B) \times(80 \%) \times(76 \%)$ |
| Apr-98 | ECONSALE | C | 20,000,000 |  | 20,000,000 | 1.568 | 0.300 | 2.136 | 313,600 | 367,200 | 42,880 | 36,000 |
|  | SALE OTHER | - | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | STRATIFIED | -- | 48,764,000 |  | 48,764,000 | 1.786 | 0.000 | 1.786 | 871,000 | 871,000 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL |  | 68,764,000 |  | 68,764,000 | 1.723 | $\cdots$ | 1.888 | 1,184,600 | 1,238,200 | 42,880 | 36,000 |
| May-98 | ECONSALE | C | 40,000,000 |  | 40,000,000 | 1.515 | 0.300 | 2.083 | 606,000 | 713,200 | 85,760 | 72,000 |
|  | SALE OTHER | -- | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | STRATIFIED | -- | 25,011,000 |  | 25,011,000 | 1.767 | 0.000 | 1.767 | 442,063 | 442,063 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL |  | 65,011,000 |  | 65,011,000 | 1.612 | ... | 1.962 | 1,048,063 | 1,155,263 | 85.760 | 72,000 |
| Jun-98 | ECONSALE | c | 40,000,000 |  | 40,000,000 | 1.528 | 0.300 | 2.096 | 611.200 | 718,400 | 85,760 | 72,000 |
|  | SALE OTHER | -- | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | STRATIFIED | -- | 20,852,000 |  | 20,852,000 | 2.141 | 0.000 | 2.141 | 446,394 | 446,394 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL |  | 60,852,000 |  | 60,852,000 | 1.738 | --- | 2.111 | 1,057,594 | 1,164,794 | 85,760 | 72,000 |
| Jul-98 | ECONSALE | C | 80,000,000 |  | 80,000,000 | 1.758 | 0.300 | 2.326 | 1,406,400 | 1,620,800 | 171,520 | 144,000 |
|  | SALE OTHER | -- | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | STRATIFIEO | -- | ${ }^{1} 87,869,000$ |  | 87,869,000 | 2.047 | 0.000 | 2.047 | 1,798,578 | 1,798,578 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL |  | 167,869,000 |  | 167,869,000 | 1.909 | --- | 2.180 | 3,204,978 | 3,419,378 | 171,520 | 144,000 |
| Aug-98 | ECONSALE | C | 60,000,000 |  | 60,000,000 | 1.814 | 0.300 | 2.382 | 1,088,400 | 1,249,200 | 128,640 | 108,000 |
|  | SALE OTHER | - | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | STRATIFIED | -- | 136,981,000 |  | 136,981,000 | 1.987 | 0.000 | 1.987 | 2,721,827 | 2,721,827 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL |  | 196,981,000 |  | 196,981,000 | 1.934 | $\ldots$ | 2.107 | 3,810,227 | 3,971,027 | 128,640 | 108.000 |
| Sep-98 | ECONSALE | C | 60,000,000 |  | 60,000,000 | 1.670 | 0.300 | 2.238 | 1,002,000 | 1,162,800 | 128,640 | 108,000 |
|  | SALE OTHER | .- | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | STRATIFIED | -- | 171,734,000 |  | 171,734,000 | 2.098 | 0.000 | 2.098 | 3,603,202 | 3,603,202 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL |  | 231,734,000 |  | 231,734,000 | 1.987 | --- | 2.134 | 4,605,202 | 4,766,002 | 128,640 | 108,000 |
| Apr-98 | ECONSALE | C | 300,000,000 |  | 300,000,000 | 1.676 | 0.300 | 2.244 | 5,027,600 | 5,831,600 | 643,200 | 540,000 |
| thru | SALE OTHER | -- | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sep-98 | STRATIFIED | - | 491,211,000 |  | 491,211,000 | 2.012 | 0.000 | 2.012 | 9,883,064 | 9.883,064 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL |  | 791,211,000 |  | 791,211,000 | 1.885 | $\cdots$ | 2.100 | 14,910,664 | 15,714,664 | 643,200 | 540,000 |

Staff's Third Set of Interrogatories To Florida Power Corporation.

- Docket No. 980001-El (Transmission Reconsideration)

Interrogatory \# 15
(Energy Basis)

## FLORIDA POWER CORPORATION FUEL COST OF POWER SOLD

 ESTIMATED FOR THE PERIOD OF: APR-98 THROUGH SEP 98| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |  | (8) | (9) | (10) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MONTH | SOLD TO | TYPE <br> a SCMEDULE | TOTAL KWH SOLD | KWH <br> WHEELED <br> FROM <br> OTHER <br> SYSTEMS | KWH <br> FROM <br> OWN generation | C/KW <br> (A) <br> FUEL <br> COST | (B) TOTAL cost | TOTAL $\$$ FOR FUEL ADJ (6) $\times(7 \times(A)$ | total cost 5 (6) $\times(7)$ (B) | REFUNDABLE GAIN ON POWER SALES $\mathbf{\$}$ |
| Apr-98 | ECONSALE | C 20,000,000 |  |  | 20,000,000 |   <br> 1.568 2.136 |  | 313,600 | 427,200 | 90,880 |
|  | SALE D | D | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | SALE OTHER | - | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | STRATIFIED | - | 48,764,000 | $\cdots$ | 48,764,000 | 1.786 | 1.786 | 871.000 | 871,000 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL |  | 68,764,000 |  | 68,764,000 | 1.723 | 1.888 | 1,184,600 | 1,298,200 | 90,880 |
| May-98 | ECONSALE | c | 40,000,000 |  | 40,000,000 | 1.515 | 2.083 | 606,000 | 833,200 | 181,760 |
|  | SALE D | D | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | SALE OTHER | - | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | STRATIFED | - | 25,011,000 |  | 25,014,000 | 1.767 | 1.767 | 442,063 | 442,063 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL |  | 65,011,000 |  | 65,011,000 | 1.612 | 1.962 | 1,048,063 | 1,275,263 | 181,760 |
| Jun-98 | ECONSALE | c | 40,000,000 |  | 40,000,000 | 1.528 | 2.096 | 611,200 | 838,400 | 181,760 |
|  | SALED | D | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | SALE OTHER | - | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0. |
|  | STRATIFIED | - | 20,852,000 |  | 20,852,000 | 2.141 | 2.141 | 446,394 | 446,394 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL |  | 60,852,000 |  | 60,852,000 | 1.738 | 2.111 | 1,057,594 | 1,284,794 | 181,760 |
| Jul-98 | ECONSALE | c | 80,000,000 |  | 80,000,000 | 1.758 | 2.326 | 1,406,400 | 1,860,800 | 363,520 |
|  | SALED | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | SALE OTHER | - | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | STRATIFIED | - | 87,869,000 |  | 87,869,000 | 2.047 | 2.047 | 1,798,578 | 1,798,578 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL |  | 167,869,000 |  | 167,869,000 | 1.909 | 2.180 | 3,204,978 | 3,659,378 | 363,520 |
| Aug-98 | ECONSALE | c | 60,000,000 |  | 60,000,000 | 1.814 | 2.382 | 1,088,400 | 1,429,200 | 272,640 |
|  | SALED | D | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | SALE OTHER | - | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | STRATIFIED | - | 136,981,000 |  | 136,981,000 | 1.987 | 1.987 | 2,721,827 | 2,721,827 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL |  | 196,981,000 |  | 196,981,000 | 1.934 | 2.107 | 3,810,227 | 4,151,027 | 272,640 |
| Sep-98 | ECONSALE | $c$ | 60,000,000 |  | 60,000,000 | 1.670 | 2.238 | 1,002,000 | 1,342,800 | 272,640 |
|  | SALED | D | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | SALE OTHER | - | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | STRATIFIED | - | 171,734,000 |  | 171,734,000 | 2.098 | 2.098 | 3,603,202 | 3,603,202 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL |  | 231,734,000 |  | 231,734,000 | 1.987 | 2.134 | 4,605,202 | 4,946,002 | 272,640 |
| Apr-98 | ECONSALE | C | 300,000,000 |  | 300,000,000 | 1.676 | 2.244 | 5,027,600 | 6,731,600 | 1,363,200 |
| THRU | SALE D | D | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sep-98 | SALE OTHER | - | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | STRATIFIED | - | 491,211,000 |  | 491,211,000 | 2.012 | 2.012 | 9,883,064 | 9,883,064 | 0 |
|  | TOTAL |  | 791,211,000 |  | 791,211,000 | 1.885 | 2.100 | 14,910,664 | 16,614,664 | 1,363,200 |

## AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF FLORIDA ) Docket No. 980001-EI

COUNTY OF PINELLAS )
Docket No. 980001-EI

I, Karl H. Wieland, having been first duly sworn, hereby depose and affirm that I am employed by Florida Power Corporation in the capacity of Director, Business Planning; that I am the person who provided answers for the Response of Florida Power Corporation to Staff's Third Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 13-15) to Florida Power Corporation and that said answers are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Dated this 7th day of January, 1999.

## FLORIDA POWER CORPORATION



Director, Business Planning

The foregoing was acknowledged before me this 7th day of January, 1999, by Karl H. Wieland who is personally known to me and who took an oath.
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## DEPOSITION

Whereupon,
SUSAN D. RITENOUR
was called as a witness, having been first duly sworn to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. KEATING:
Q Good morning, Ms. Ritenour.
A Good morning.
Q I just have a few questions. This really shouldn't take too long at all, and you can get back in the fog and head for Pensacola.

First note, on page three, line 10 of your testimony, pre-filed in this case, you use the term economy sales.

How do you define economy sales as you use it in your testimony?

A Mr. Howell could probably give you a better description of what economy sales are than I could. But I think they are basically the sales that we make,
opportunity sales, if you will --
THE WITNESS: Is that --
MR. HOWELL: Correct.
THE WITNESS: -- that we make to other
utilities.
BY MR. KEATING:
Q Did the calculations that you have on page three of your testimony there apply to economy sales in general, or are those only economy sales that are made on the energy broker network?

A Gulf doesn't make any sales on the energy broker network. So they would apply to -- they apply to our economy sales, but those are not on the broker network.

Q Beginning on line. 19 -- I am sorry.
So the economy sales that you are referring to in your testimony, are those sales made by Gulf or sales made by Southern?

A I think Mr. Howell -- it would be better to ask him that question. He really has a deeper understanding of how that works than I do.

Q Going down to page -- to line 19 on page three of your testimony.

A Uh-huh.
Q You indicated, for January 1997 through August 1998, the difference between the energy calculation and demand allocation is $\$ 885$ ?

A Uh-huh.
Q Have you prepared any -- performed any calculations for the figures that you used to reach that
number? I understand that it's the difference between -I believe -- is it $\$ 525,145$ on line 20 , and the $\$ 524,260$ on line 24?

A Yes. I have that. And, basically, it's just simply the transmission revenues to the period of January ' 97 through August of 1998 that we ran through the clause. Of course, we ran through the clause from the period of January ' 98 through August of '98. But they were effective back to January of '97 once the decision was made. So it's 20 months worth of revenues, which is 542,851.14, which isn't in my testimony. That's the total number of the transmission revenues.

And then multiplied by the demand factor.
While we are talking about those numbers, one thing I wanted to point out today that sort of came to my attention when we were bringing the interrogatories together, the fact that $I$ have in my testimony for the demand allocator is the demand allocator that was in our last pre-cost service study. Because as I was preparing this testimony, I was thinking in terms of the proper allocation, and going back to how we allocated in our last case. And I went and used that factor.

What I probably should have done in my
testimony -- and it didn't -- just one of those things that I didn't focus on at the time is, we have an updated
amount for that demand allocator that we used in the capacity in the environmental filings every -- which is what we showed you in the -- one of the interrogatory responses.

And I should have used that there, the one that would have been in effect for that period. And if you do that, the actual difference would have been that the customers would have received $\$ 1,392$ less, rather than $\$ 885$ more, using the demand allocator.

So -- which is more consistent with reality, that the demand allocator is a little lower than the energy allocator on a consistent basis. And, therefore, they would get a little bit less money.

Q Did you say that those -- that that calculation was in response to staff interrogatories?

A The calculation of the demand allocator, I think -- wasn't that one of the interrogatories? Let me look.

Yeah. Interrogatory seven. And actually, in interrogatory seven, the question asked for the most recent available split; which is based on our 1997 load data that we filed, I think, around May or June, mid-year of ' 98.

The actual factor that would have been used during the period up through September of '98, which is
what these revenues -- up to the point that I wrote my testimony -- include, would have been the factor that was based on the '95 load data immediately prior to that. But this is the latest demand split, which is what the interrogatory asked for.

Q If you could give me just a minute.
A Sure.
(Discussion off the record.)
MR. KEATING: I guess we could go off the
. record for just a minute.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Sure.
(Discussion off the record.)
MR. KEATING: Back on the record.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
BY MR. KEATING:
Q The allocated that you calculated in your response to interrogatory number seven, that is based -am I correct in believing that that's based on the latest load research data?

A Right, that's right. The load research data is prepared every two years. So, basically, what we have done in capacity is to give you a little background; and then in environmental, and that came along, was the demand allocator would stay the same for basically two years until we got new load data, and then we would
update it based on that latest load data.
So this is the latest and greatest that we started using, effective -- effective the October '98 period, since that's the first time it was available consistently to be used. We used it in the projection beginning of June. We filed in June.

Q You stated in your testimony that -- and your testimony refers to the $\$ 885$ difference.

A Right.
Q But you stated that that difference in the separation factors is not material for Gulf. Is there a point at which the difference between the two factors would result in a dollar difference that would become material to Gulf?

A I am sure there is a threshold. That's hard to say. Whether -- at some point -- let me put it this way. At some point, I guess the dollars would become material. But I don't have a particular threshold in mind at which point they would. They would have to increase substantially over what they -- the difference is now, in my mind.

And I just don't see the difference between our demand and energy allocators changing to the point that it would become that material, especially given the fact that over the last two years worth of data now for two
years the amount comes to close to $\$ 600,000$ for the transmission revenue. And that amount in itself is fairly immaterial to Gulf.

So I just think for an allocation -- the difference in an allocation factor applied to $\$ 600,000$, in theory, it could get to the point where it's material. But as a practical matter, I just don't see how it could. I just think that relationship couldn't deviate that much between the demand and energy allocators.

I don't know if that answered your question right now. But in terms of defined threshold, I don't have one. Could it become material? You know, I suppose so.

Q If there was a threshold level, would you prefer to see it based on the amount of the transmission revenues or based on the allocation factors?

A I think it --
MR. STONE: May I ask for a clarification of the question? Are you asking if there is a threshold level for when we would suggest making a change in which allocator is used? Is that the question that you are asking?

MR. KEATING: I believe so, yes.
MR. STONE: With that clarification, I think that makes it easier to answer the question.

MR. KEATING: Okay.
THE WITNESS: Yes. And to further clarify for how I am taking the question and answering it, I mean, I think what you are saying is there is a threshold at which the amount -- the impact on the customers would become material.

If there was such a threshold, I think it would be more appropriate to base it on the allocators -the difference in the allocators instead of the gross dollar amount of the transmission revenues, because they could go up substantially. I don't think that they will, based on my understanding, you know. But they could go up substantially. And the difference could still stay pretty small, because the allocators are so close together.

So if there was a threshold that determined -- I think it would be more appropriate to base it on a spread that might develop between the retail-wholesale relationship based on energy, and the retail-wholesale relationship based on demands. BY MR. KEATING:

Q So when you said they could go up significantly, you are referring to the transmission --

A Yes. I am saying, even if they were to go up significantly, based on our allocators -- the demand
allocator and the energy allocator -- the difference would probably still not go up significantly, because they are just so close together.

Q All right. In your response to staff interrogatory number five -- have you got that with you?

A Yes.
Q If you want to pull that out.
You describe the necessary changes to the $A$ and E schedules of transmission revenues, are separated based on demand?

A Right.
Q We had -- Florida Power Corporation responded to an identical inteṛrogatory; it was number 13B of staff's interrogatories to Florida Power Corporation.

Have you seen that response?
A Yeah. We got those responses. Okay. I have got it.

Q Okay. Florida Power Corporation prepared a table, I guess it's a couple of pages in here, in their response. Let's see, there is schedule E-1 and E-6.

Have you prepared any similar, I guess, graphic reproduction of what's in your testimony?

A No. To be honest, that's how we started to answer the question, which is to visually demonstrate it. And we realized that there would just be so much to
change to really fully answer the question visually, showing the actual changes to the documents, that which sort of -- which supports the position that we take, that it's really not worth the administrative burden, if you will, to make those changes based on the immateriality of the difference.

We didn't go through and revise all of our schedules. We felt that would be premature, not knowing if we needed to do all of that. And it would require a good bit of work. And in Power Corp., I guess they showed these two here. But I think they would be more involved -- at least for Gulf, they would have been more involved than that.

Q What would be involved in the administrative changes in the schedules?

A Okay. Basically, a couple of things. First of all, initially -- initially just reprogramming all of the schedules. We have -- ours currently is in a Lotus file; we are transferring it to Excel.

It's just in a spreadsheet format. And it's time-consuming just to change the face of the schedules to insert the rows and columns to break out certain amounts; certain dollars to use one allocator and certain dollars to use another allocator. That's time-consuming, if you take one page at a time.

And that's a one-time shot, and making sure that you get it all right, and it flows through and all of that. But one thing that compounds that is that the way we have our spreadsheets set up -- and without getting too technical, we have got a lot of macros that we have set up in there in order to help us calculate year-to-date amounts, in order to help us -- when we do the monthly actual filings, we have macros that will bring in the data from our projection filing each month, rather than having to put it in again -- rekey it, basically, again, when we are doing the actual, versus budget comparison.

So we would have -- our -- I guess what I am saying is, over time, we have kind of made some pretty fancy spreadsheets to automate some things and to get all of those macros and stuff to work. It is more complex than just inserting a row or two on the face of the spreadsheet.

And that's the one time shot that would be time-consuming.

The other part of it is just each month, the way the schedule would have to be laid out to do the allocation, is just more confusing. I think it would be -- I -- when we were looking at it, trying to lay it out as cleanly as we could, I even thought in terms of
people trying to use it, use the data -- it would just be a little hard. It's going to be a little more confusing to follow. Instead of having total fuel cost, total fuel and net power transactions, you would have two subtotals for that. And it would just be -- on any given -- on an ongoing basis, we thought it would be more confusing than it's worth, to be honest. But that's the type of administrative cost I am talking about.

Q Could you put a, I guess, a guess on about how much time something like that would involve?

A Probably. She said several days worth of work, based on the amount of time we put in. Just initially looking at the interrogatories, we -- it was a couple of days already. We really didn't get into any of the programming.

So I think several days is probably a conservative estimate of work -- you know, probably a few weeks worth of work. And then ongoing, you know, probably a few hours every month of making sure that the dollars -- it's just more complex to make sure the dollars flow where they need to flow every month, because you aren't having clean totals to tie into, basically.

And in the projection -- for one thing, the projection wasn't done that way. So that would just add one more administrative -- like I said, we have our files
set up so it brings in the projected data and compares it to the actual. That would just be one more thing we would have to fix.

And that -- in the grand scheme of things, it's not, you know, millions of dollars or anything like that. But I think it would more than offset -- way more than offset $\$ 1,000$ of -- in terms of the opportunity cost and administrative cost of what the retail rate -- number one, the retail rate payers would get a thousand, 1500 -whatever I said earlier -- less money.

And we would -- I think I can safely say the administrative cost would be more than $\$ 1,000$ to get it all done. It's just so immaterial to go to the trouble, basically.

MR. KEATING: Okay. Well, I don't have any other questions for you.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. BURGESS: May I ask a couple of questions?
CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. BURGESS:
Q I am Steve Burgess with the Public Counsel's office.

As far as you know, has the energy allocator been used -- always been used to allocate the revenue credit associated with sales of economy energy, or
economy energy sales?
A Associated with economy energy sales?
2 Yes.
A As far as $I$ know, yes. I know in the fuel clause it has -- and I believe back when it was in base rates, that would be the allocator that would have been used then, too.

Q Okay.
A I think the profit, I guess the profit economy.
Q So your recollection is going all the way back to when it was even a base rate issue. And what you are saying is, to your knowledge, there has always been the energy allocator used or applied to it?

A Right.
MR. BURGESS: Thank you.
MR. STONE: I have no questions.
MR. KEATING: Okay. I guess that concludes Ms.
Ritenour's deposition.
(Whereupon, the deposition was concluded at 10:30 a.m., and reading and signing by the witness was not waived.)
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## Page Line
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9
10
11

22 Add a comma after "capacity". Delete the word "is". Change the semicolon to a comma. The line should read "done in capacity, to give you a little background, and".

23 Delete the comma and the word "and" and add "when".
5 Add the words "at the" at the end of the line.
3 Delete the word "Gulf" and add "Gulf's fuel factors".
4 Add the words "assume that". The line should read "mean, I think what you are saying is assume that there is a".

5 Delete the words "the amount -".
13 Change the period to a comma and continue the sentence, uncapitalize "and".

20 Change "demands" to "demand".
9 Change "of" to "if" and delete the comma.
16 Change "Yeah" to "Yes".
11 Change "they" to "there".
12 Change "they" to "there".
1411 Delete the comma after the word "actual".

7 Add the word "difference" after the phrase "offset $\$ 1,000$ of".
8 The line should read "administrative cost." Delete the rest of the line.

## ERRATA SHEET

## Page Line

9 Delete the word "one" and start the sentence. Change " 1500 " to " $\$ 1,500$ ". The line should read "The retail rate payers would get a thousand, \$1,500 -".

179 Add the word "on". The line should read "I think the profit, I guess the profit on economy."
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## ERRATA SHEET

Page Line
105 Delete the comma after "in"
12
10 Insert comma after "AIMS" and capitalize "Automated"
1211 Capitalize "Interchange Matching System"
Add ", which" at the end of the line
178 Change "transportation" to "transaction"
17 25 Change "Peninsular" to "Peninsula"
18 1 The line should read "would be. And then they compared those costs.
And it was"
1815 Delete the comma at the end of the line
1816 Change "in" to "an"
1817 Add a comma after "implement"

CORRECTIONS
Corrections to the deposition of M. W. HOWELL, taken In Re: Fuel and purchased power cost recovery clause and generating performance incentive factor, Docket No. 990001-EI, taken on January 21, 1999.

Page-Line Correction

-
-


[^0]:[^1]:    Based on Jurisdictiopal Sales
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[^2]:    y The Transmission Provider may propose to change the common equity cost rate pursuant to a unilateral filing under Seetion 205 of the Fadaral Power Aet and any Custemar may seek to change the rate pursuant to seetion 206 of the Act.
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