ORIGINAL

STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners: Lisa Polak Edgar, Chairman J. Terry Deason Isilio Arriaga Matthew M. Carter II Katrina J. Tew



GENERAL COENTS TELL TO THE SE MICHAEL G. COOKE (850) 413-6248 06 JUL 26 PM 1: 30

COMMISSION CLERK

Hublic Service Commission

July 26, 2006

SECOND STAFF DATA REQUEST Submitted by E-Mail

Patrick M. Bryan, Esquire Law Department Florida Power & Light Company 700 Universe Boulevard Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

Mr. William G. Walker, III Vice President, Regulatory Affairs Florida Power & Light Company 215 South Monroe Street, Suite 810 Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1859

RE: Docket No. 060150-EI - Petition for approval of revisions to contribution-in-aid-of-construction definition in Section 12.1 of First Revised Tariff Sheet No. 6.300, by Florida Power & Light Company (FPL).

Dear Messrs. Bryan and Walker:

To assist us in ana	lyzing the above-refe	renced Petition file	d in this docket,	the Commission
staff requests that you prove	ide responses to the fo	ollowing Staff Data 1	Requests:	

CMP 1. Please provide in electronic format the analysis discussed in FPL's response to staff's June 9, 2006, data request No. 3. 2. In its response to staff's data request No. 3, FPL states that a restoration benefit would only **ECR** be produced by undergrounding generally contiguous facilities. Has FPL determined a minimum size GCL: area that would be necessary for undergrounding to provide benefits to the general body of ratepayers? If no objective size criterion has been set, please describe the methodology FPL will use to determine OPC if a specific requested project would be eligible for the discount. RCA 3. Please explain why FPL's proposed tariff is only available to local governments, as SCR opposed to, for example, homeowners associations. Please explain how limiting the proposed tariff to SGA tocal governments is not unduly discriminatory to other entities that may wish to avail themselves of such a program under the proposed tariff. OTH

06581 JUL 268

FPSC-COMMISSION CL.ERM

SECOND STAFF DATA REQUEST Docket No. 060150-EI

Submitted by E-Mail July 26, 2006

Page 2

- 4. Please clarify whether FPL proposes to set the government adjustment factor (GAF) at 25% in every instance, or whether the GAF will vary among local governments requesting conversion, up to 25% as a maximum GAF. If FPL proposes to vary the GAF, please explain how FPL will determine the appropriate GAF for each local government.
- 5. The following questions refer to Attachment A included with FPL's responses to staff's June 9, 2006 data request.
- a. Please explain how FPL developed the ball park cost estimates for all the local governments listed in the attachment.
- b. The attachment shows that certain local governments received a binding cost estimate (Deerfield Beach, Flagler Beach, Daytona Beach, Martin County, St. Johns County). Please explain why in every instance the binding cost estimate is lower than the ballpark cost estimate.
- c. Assume all local governments listed pursue the conversion and the ballpark cost estimates shown equal the actual conversion costs. Please state the total conversion costs for all local governments listed and the impact on the 1,000 kWh residential bill if FPL were to put 25% of the conversion costs in rate base at the end of 2006 (assuming no base rate stipulation is in effect).

If at all possible, please submit your responses to this Second Staff Data Request by e-mail to me and to Elizabeth Draper by close of business on Wednesday, August 16, 2006. Ms. Draper's e-mail address is edraper@psc.state.fl.us. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

s/Rosanne Gervasi, Senior Attorney rgervasi@psc.state.fl.us

cc: Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services R. Scheffel Wright, Esq.
John LaVia, Esq.