

Scott A. Goorland Principal Attorney Florida Power & Light Company 700 Universe Boulevard Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420 (561) 304-5633 (561) 691-7135 (Facsimile) scott.goorland@fpl.com

June 25, 2014

Ms. Carlotta S. Stauffer, Commission Clerk Office of Commission Clerk Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 140082-EI - Petition for Change to Pole Inspection & Load

Assessment Requirements

FPL's Response to Staff's Second Data Request

Dear Ms. Stauffer:

Enclosed for filing on behalf of Florida Power & Light Company ("FPL") are the original and five copies of FPL's responses to Staff's Second Data Request dated June 11, 2014, relating to FPL's Petition for Change to Pole Inspection & Land Assessment Requirements.

If you have any questions regarding this filing, please do not hesitate to contact me at (561) 304-5633 or scott.goorland@fpl.com. Thank you for your assistance.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott A. Goorland Principal Attorney

AFD Attachment
APA —
ECO —
ENG 3
GCL 1
IDM —
TEL —

Florida Power & Light Company Docket No. 140082-EI Staff's Second Data Request Data Request No. 1

Q.

Paragraph 15 on Page 6 of the Petition indicates that FPL projects an incremental savings of approximately \$1.0 million annually, or \$8.1 million over the eight-year cycle, as a result of this deviation from its pole inspection excavation requirements. Please state what FPL's savings would be annually and over the eight-year cycle, if FPL would not be required to excavate for inspections of CCA poles that are less than 26, 27, 29, and 30 years of age?

<u>A.</u>

	Annual Incremental	8-Year Cycle	1st Cycle
<u>Years</u>	Savings (Millions)	Savings (Millions)	Failure Rate
<26	\$0.8	\$6.5	0.07%
<27	\$0.9	\$7.2	0.07%
≤ 28 (FPL's request)	\$1.0	\$8.1	0.08%*
<29	\$1.1	\$9.0	0.09%
<30	\$1.2	\$9.9	0.10%

^{*}FPL notes that the failure rate for CCA poles < 16 years old was 0.08%, when the FPSC approved FPL's initial excavation exemption request in 2008.

Florida Power & Light Company Docket No. 140082-EI Staff's Second Data Request Data Request No. 2

Q.

Paragraph 19 on Page 7 of the Petition indicates that FPL projects an incremental savings of approximately \$528,000 annually or approximately \$4.2 million over the full second eight-year pole inspection cycle for this load assessment test exemption. Please state what FPL's savings would be annually and over the full second eight-year cycle, if FPL would not be required to inspect poles with a load assessment result from the first eight-year cycle of less than 65, 70, 75, 85, 90 and 95 percent of full loading?

<u>A.</u>

% Full <u>Load</u>	Annual Incremental Savings (Millions)	8-Year Cycle Savings (Millions)	# Failures FPL Sample*	2 nd Cycle Failure Probability**
<65	\$0.4	\$3.2	0	0.00%
<70	\$0.5	\$3.6	0	0.00%
<75	\$0.5	\$3.9	0	0.00%
≤ 80 (FPL's request)	<u>\$0.5</u>	<u>\$4.2</u>	<u>o</u>	0.07%
<85	\$0.6	\$4.5	1	0.22%
<90	\$0.6	\$4.6	3	0.69%
<95	\$0.6	\$4.8	3	1.52%

^{*} Per Exhibit B of FPL's April 18, 2014 petition

^{**} Per Monte Carlo simulations

Florida Power & Light Company Docket No. 140082-EI Staff's Second Data Request Data Request No. 3

<u>Q.</u>

FPL's response to Question 5c of staff's first data request indicates that FPL utilized a Monte Carlo simulation and determined the probability of a pole that tested below 80 percent of full load during the first eight-year cycle failing a load assessment test in the second eight-year cycle is 0.07 percent. Using the Monte Carlo simulation, what is the probability of a pole that tested below 65, 70, 85, 90, and 95 percent of full load during the first eight-cycle failing a load assessment test in the second eight-year cycle?

<u>A.</u>

See FPL's response to Staff 2nd Data Request, Question 2.