

Ruth Nettles

From: terry.scobie@verizon.com
Sent: Wednesday, August 08, 2007 4:25 PM
To: Filings@psc.state.fl.us
Cc: Lorena Holley; Colentha Wilson; Keino Young; de.oroark@verizon.com; david.christian@core.verizon.com; frank.app@verizon.com
Subject: Docket Nos. 070297-EI, 070298-EI, 070301-EI - Verizon Florida LLC's Issues ID Lists
Attachments: 070297-070298-070301 VZ Florida Issues ID.pdf

ORIGINAL

The attached filing is submitted in Docket Nos. 070297-EI, 070298-EI and 070301-EI on behalf of Verizon Florida LLC by

Dulaney L. O'Roark III
Six Concourse Parkway
Suite 800
Atlanta, Georgia 30328
(770) 284-5498
de.oroark@verizon.com

The attached .pdf document consists of 12 pages - transmittal letter (1 page), certificate of service (1 page), service list (1 page) and Issues ID Lists (9 pages).

(See attached file: 070297-070298-070301 VZ Florida Issues ID.pdf)

Terry Scobie
Executive Adm. Assistant
Verizon Legal Department
813-483-2610 (tel)
813-204-8870 (fax)
terry.scobie@verizon.com

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

06933 AUG-8 5

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

8/8/2007

Dulaney L. O'Roark III
Vice President & General Counsel, Southeast Region
Legal Department



Six Concourse Parkway
Suite 800
Atlanta, Georgia 30328

Phone 770-284-5498
Fax 770-284-5488
de.oroark@verizon.com

August 8, 2007 – VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Ann Cole, Commission Clerk
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 070297-EI
Review of 2007 Electric Infrastructure Storm Hardening Plan filed pursuant to
Rule 25-6.0342, F.A.C., submitted by Tampa Electric Company

Docket No. 070298-EI
Review of 2007 Electric Infrastructure Storm Hardening Plan filed pursuant to
Rule 25-6.0342, F.A.C., submitted by Progress Energy Florida, Inc.

Docket No. 070299-TP
Review of 2007 Electric Infrastructure Storm Hardening Plan filed pursuant to
Rule 25-6.0342, F.A.C., submitted by Gulf Power Company

Docket No. 070301-EI
Review of 2007 Electric Infrastructure Storm Hardening Plan filed pursuant to
Rule 25-6.0342, F.A.C., submitted by Florida Power & Light Company

Dear Ms. Cole:

Enclosed are Verizon Florida LLC's Issues ID lists for filing in Docket Nos. 070297-EI, 070298-EI and 070301-EI. Service has been made as indicated on the Certificate of Service. If there are any questions regarding this filing, please contact me at (770) 284-5498.

Sincerely,

s/ Dulaney L. O'Roark III

Dulaney L. O'Roark III

tas

Enclosures

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

06933 AUG-8 5

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that copies of the foregoing were sent via U.S. mail on August 8, 2007 to the parties on the attached list.

s/ Dulaney L. O'Roark III

Staff Counsel
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Bill Walker
Florida Power & Light Company
215 S. Monroe St., Suite 810
Tallahassee, FL 32301-1859

John T. Butler
Florida Power & Light Co.
700 Universe Boulevard
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

Paul Lewis, Jr.
Progress Energy Florida Inc.
106 E. College Avenue, Suite 800
Tallahassee, FL 32301-7740

John T. Burnett
Progress Energy Service Co. LLC
P. O. Box 14042
St. Petersburg, FL 33733-4042

Lee L. Willis
James D. Beasley
Ausley Law Firm
P. O. Box 391
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Paula K. Brown
Tampa Electric Company
P. O. Box 111
Tampa, FL 33601-0111

Beth Keating
Akerman Law Firm
106 E. College Avenue, Suite 1200
Tallahassee, FL 32301

J.Meza/E. Edenfield/
P. Carver/M. Gurdian
AT&T Florida
c/o Nancy H. Sims
150 S. Monroe St., Suite 400
Tallahassee, FL 32301-1556

Maria T. Browne
Davis Law Firm
1919 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Suite 200
Washington, DC 20006

Susan S. Masterton
Embarq Florida Inc.
Mailstop: FLTLHO0102
1313 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Florida Cable Tele. Assn.
246 E. 6th Avenue, Suite 100
Tallahassee, FL 32303

H. M. Rollins Company, Inc.
P. O. Box 3471
Gulfport, MS 39505

Dennis Hayward
North American Wood Pole Council
7017 NE Highway 99, Suite 108
Vancouver, WA 98665

Howard Adams/Peter Dunbar
Time Warner Telecom
c/o Pennington Law Firm
P. O. Box 10095
Tallahassee, FL 32302-2095

Richard Jackson
City of Panama City Beach
110 South Arnold Road
Panama City Beach, FL 32413

Douglas J. Sale
Harrison Law Firm
P. O. Drawer 1579
Panama City, FL 32402-1579

R. Scheffel Wright/J. LaVia
Young Law Firm
225 S. Adams St., Suite 200
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Mayor Charles Falcone
Town of Jupiter Island
P. O. Box 7
Hobe Sound, FL 33475

Thomas G. Bradford
Deputy Town Manager
360 South County Road
Palm Beach, FL 33480

Preliminary Generic Draft Issues: Docket 070297-EI
Verizon Positions on TECO Plan

1. Does the Company's Plan meet the desired objectives of enhancing reliability and reducing restoration costs and outage times in a prudent, practical, and cost-effective manner to the affected parties? [Rule 25-6.0342(2)]

See Verizon's response to Issue No. 14.

2. Does the Company's Plan address the extent to which, at a minimum, the Plan complies with the National Electric Safety Code (ANSI C-2) [NESC] that is applicable pursuant to subsection 25-6.0345(2), F.A.C. [Rule 25-6.0342(3)(a)]

No. Although the Company's Plan addresses this subject, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided.

3. Does the Company's Plan address the extent to which the extreme wind loading standards specified by Figure 250-2(d) of the 2007 edition of the NESC are adopted for new distribution facility construction? [Rule 25-6.0342(3)(b)1]

No. Although the Company's Plan addresses this subject, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided. At a minimum, Verizon objects to the Plan to the extent it purports to impose rates, terms and conditions that are inconsistent with the parties' joint use agreement.

4. Does the Company's Plan address the extent to which the extreme wind loading standards specified by Figure 250-2(d) of the 2007 edition of the NESC are adopted for major planned work on the distribution system, including expansion, rebuild, or relocation of existing facilities, assigned on or after the effective date of this rule distribution facility construction? [Rule 25-6.0342(3)(b)2]

No. Although the Company's Plan addresses this subject, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided. At a minimum, Verizon objects to the Plan to the extent it purports to impose rates, terms and conditions that are inconsistent with the parties' joint use agreement.

5. Does the Company's Plan address the extent to which the extreme wind loading standards specified by Figure 250-2(d) of the 2007 edition of the NESC are adopted for distribution facilities serving critical infrastructure facilities and along major thoroughfares taking into account political and geographical boundaries and other applicable operational considerations? [Rule 25-6.0342(3)(b)3]

No. Although the Company's Plan addresses this subject, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided. At a minimum, Verizon objects to the Plan to the extent it purports to impose rates, terms and conditions that are inconsistent with the parties' joint use agreement.

**Preliminary Generic Draft Issues: Docket 070297-EI
Verizon Positions on TECO Plan**

6. **Does the Company's Plan address the extent to which its distribution facilities are designed to mitigate damage to underground and supporting overhead transmission and distribution facilities due to flooding and storm surges? [Rule 25-6.0342(3)(c)]**

No. Although the Company's Plan addresses this subject, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided.

7. **Does the Company's Plan address the extent to which the placement of new and replacement distribution facilities facilitate safe and efficient access for installation and maintenance pursuant to Rule 25-6.0341, F.A.C? [Rule 25-6.0342(3)(d)]**

No. Although the Company's Plan addresses this subject, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided.

8. **Does the Company's Plan provide a detailed description of its deployment strategy including a description of the facilities affected; including technical design specifications, construction standards, and construction methodologies employed? [Rule 25-6.0342(4)(a)]**

No. The Plan provides a general description of the facilities affected and identifies projects for 2007 through 2009, but the Plan lacks project level detail. Verizon notes that the Company has provided certain additional project information to Verizon that is not included in the Plan.

9. **Does the Company's Plan provide a detailed description of the communities and areas within the utility's service area where the electric infrastructure improvements, including facilities identified by the utility as critical infrastructure and along major thoroughfares pursuant to subparagraph (3)(b)3, are to be made? [Rule 25-6.0342(4)(b)]**

No. The Plan provides a general description of the facilities affected and identifies projects for 2007 through 2009, but the Plan lacks project level detail. Verizon notes that the Company has provided certain additional project information to Verizon that is not included in the Plan.

10. **Does the Company's Plan provide a detailed description of the extent to which the electric infrastructure improvements involve joint use facilities on which third-party attachments exist? [Rule 25-6.0342(4)(c)]**

No. The Plan does not provide a detailed description of the extent to which the electric infrastructure improvements involve joint use facilities with third-party attachments.

11. **Does the Company's Plan provide an estimate of the costs and benefits to the utility of making the electric infrastructure improvements, including the effect on reducing storm restoration costs and customer outages? [Rule 25-6.0342(4)(d)]**

Preliminary Generic Draft Issues: Docket 070297-EI
Verizon Positions on TECO Plan

No. Although the Plan includes high level cost estimates for 2007-09 of making infrastructure improvements, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided. Moreover, the Plan does not estimate or quantify the net benefits, if any, of implementing the Plan.

12. Does the Company's Plan provide an estimate of the costs and benefits, obtained pursuant to subsection (6) below, to third-party attachers affected by the electric infrastructure improvements, including the effect on reducing storm restoration costs and customer outages realized by the third-party attachers? (Rule 25-6.0342(4)(e))

No. The Plan does not provide such an estimate. Based on the information that has been provided thus far, Verizon is working to provide an initial estimate of its costs. Verizon will not be able to provide a complete assessment of the costs and benefits (if any) until sufficient project level detail has been provided.

13. Does the Company's Plan include written Attachment Standards and Procedures addressing safety, reliability, pole loading capacity, and engineering standards and procedures for attachments by others to the utility's electric transmission and distribution poles that meet or exceed the edition of the National Electrical Safety Code (ANSI C-2) that is applicable pursuant to Rule 25-6.034, FAC.? [Rule 25-6.0342(5)]

No. Although the Company's Plan includes attachment standards and procedures, Verizon objects to them to the extent they purport to impose rates, terms and conditions that are inconsistent with the parties' joint use agreement.

14. Base on the resolution of the preceding issues, should the Commission find that the Company's Plan meets the desired objectives of enhancing reliability and reducing restoration costs and outage times in a prudent, practical, and cost-effective manner to the affected parties. [Rule 25-6.0342(1) and (2)]

No. The Plan should be supplemented to provide sufficient project level detail. Moreover, based on Verizon's objections stated in response to the previous issues, the Plan fails to demonstrate that it achieves the objectives of enhancing reliability and reducing restoration costs and outage times in a prudent, practical, and cost-effective manner to the affected parties.

Preliminary Generic Draft Issues: Docket 070298-EI
Verizon Positions on PEF Plan

1. Does the Company's Plan meet the desired objectives of enhancing reliability and reducing restoration costs and outage times in a prudent, practical, and cost-effective manner to the affected parties? [Rule 25-6.0342(2)]

See Verizon's response to Issue No. 14.

2. Does the Company's Plan address the extent to which, at a minimum, the Plan complies with the National Electric Safety Code (ANSI C-2) [NESC] that is applicable pursuant to subsection 25-6.0345(2), F.A.C. [Rule 25-6.0342(3)(a)]

No. Although the Company's Plan addresses this subject, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided.

3. Does the Company's Plan address the extent to which the extreme wind loading standards specified by Figure 250-2(d) of the 2007 edition of the NESC are adopted for new distribution facility construction? [Rule 25-6.0342(3)(b)1]

No. Although the Company's Plan addresses this subject, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided.

4. Does the Company's Plan address the extent to which the extreme wind loading standards specified by Figure 250-2(d) of the 2007 edition of the NESC are adopted for major planned work on the distribution system, including expansion, rebuild, or relocation of existing facilities, assigned on or after the effective date of this rule distribution facility construction? [Rule 25-6.0342(3)(b)2]

No. Although the Company's Plan addresses this subject, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided.

5. Does the Company's Plan address the extent to which the extreme wind loading standards specified by Figure 250-2(d) of the 2007 edition of the NESC are adopted for distribution facilities serving critical infrastructure facilities and along major thoroughfares taking into account political and geographical boundaries and other applicable operational considerations? [Rule 25-6.0342(3)(b)3]

No. Although the Company's Plan addresses this subject, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided.

6. Does the Company's Plan address the extent to which its distribution facilities are designed to mitigate damage to underground and supporting overhead transmission and distribution facilities due to flooding and storm surges? [Rule 25-6.0342(3)(c)]

No. Although the Company's Plan addresses this subject, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided.

Preliminary Generic Draft Issues: Docket 070298-EI
Verizon Positions on PEF Plan

7. Does the Company's Plan address the extent to which the placement of new and replacement distribution facilities facilitate safe and efficient access for installation and maintenance pursuant to Rule 25-6.0341, F.A.C? [Rule 25-6.0342(3)(d)]

No. Although the Company's Plan addresses this subject, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided.

8. Does the Company's Plan provide a detailed description of its deployment strategy including a description of the facilities affected; including technical design specifications, construction standards, and construction methodologies employed? [Rule 25-6.0342(4)(a)]

No. The Plan provides a general description of the facilities affected for 2007, including a list of possible projects identified by the AIS model, but the Plan lacks such a general description for 2008-09 projects and lacks project level detail for 2007-09. Verizon notes that the Company has provided certain additional project information to Verizon that is not included in the Plan.

9. Does the Company's Plan provide a detailed description of the communities and areas within the utility's service area where the electric infrastructure improvements, including facilities identified by the utility as critical infrastructure and along major thoroughfares pursuant to subparagraph (3)(b)3, are to be made? [Rule 25-6.0342(4)(b)]

No. The Plan provides a general description of the facilities affected for 2007, including a list of possible projects identified by the AIS model, but the Plan lacks such a general description for 2008-09 projects and lacks project level detail for 2007-09. Verizon notes that the Company has provided certain additional project information to Verizon that is not included in the Plan.

10. Does the Company's Plan provide a detailed description of the extent to which the electric infrastructure improvements involve joint use facilities on which third-party attachments exist? [Rule 25-6.0342(4)(c)]

No. The Plan does not provide a detailed description of the extent to which the electric infrastructure improvements involve joint use facilities with third-party attachments.

11. Does the Company's Plan provide an estimate of the costs and benefits to the utility of making the electric infrastructure improvements, including the effect on reducing storm restoration costs and customer outages? [Rule 25-6.0342(4)(d)]

No. Although the Plan includes high level cost estimates for 2007-09 of making infrastructure improvements, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided. Moreover, the Plan does not estimate or quantify the net benefits, if any, of implementing the Plan.

Preliminary Generic Draft Issues: Docket 070298-EI
Verizon Positions on PEF Plan

12. Does the Company's Plan provide an estimate of the costs and benefits, obtained pursuant to subsection (6) below, to third-party attachers affected by the electric infrastructure improvements, including the effect on reducing storm restoration costs and customer outages realized by the third-party attachers? (Rule 25-6.0342(4)(e))

No. The Plan does not provide such an estimate. Based on the information that has been provided thus far, Verizon is working to provide an initial estimate of its costs. Verizon will not be able to provide a complete assessment of the costs and benefits (if any) until sufficient project level detail has been provided.

13. Does the Company's Plan include written Attachment Standards and Procedures addressing safety, reliability, pole loading capacity, and engineering standards and procedures for attachments by others to the utility's electric transmission and distribution poles that meet or exceed the edition of the National Electrical Safety Code (ANSI C-2) that is applicable pursuant to Rule 25-6.034, FAC.? [Rule 25-6.0342(5)]

No. Although the Company's Plan includes attachment standards and procedures, Verizon objects to them to the extent they purport to impose rates, terms and conditions that are inconsistent with the parties' joint use agreement.

14. Base on the resolution of the preceding issues, should the Commission find that the Company's Plan meets the desired objectives of enhancing reliability and reducing restoration costs and outage times in a prudent, practical, and cost-effective manner to the affected parties. [Rule 25-6.0342(1) and (2)]

No. The Plan should be supplemented to provide sufficient project level detail. Moreover, based on Verizon's objections stated in response to the previous issues, the Plan fails to demonstrate that it achieves the objectives of enhancing reliability and reducing restoration costs and outage times in a prudent, practical, and cost-effective manner to the affected parties.

Preliminary Generic Draft Issues: Docket 070301-EI
Verizon Positions on FPL Plan

1. **Does the Company's Plan meet the desired objectives of enhancing reliability and reducing restoration costs and outage times in a prudent, practical, and cost-effective manner to the affected parties? [Rule 25-6.0342(2)]**

See Verizon's response to Issue No. 14.

2. **Does the Company's Plan address the extent to which, at a minimum, the Plan complies with the National Electric Safety Code (ANSI C-2) [NESC] that is applicable pursuant to subsection 25-6.0345(2), F.A.C. [Rule 25-6.0342(3)(a)]**

No. Although the Company's Plan addresses this subject, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided.

3. **Does the Company's Plan address the extent to which the extreme wind loading standards specified by Figure 250-2(d) of the 2007 edition of the NESC are adopted for new distribution facility construction? [Rule 25-6.0342(3)(b)1]**

No. Although the Company's Plan addresses this subject, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided. At a minimum, Verizon objects to the Plan to the extent it (i) purports to impose rates, terms and conditions that are inconsistent with the parties' joint use agreement; and (ii) adopts the extensive use of extreme wind loading standards.

4. **Does the Company's Plan address the extent to which the extreme wind loading standards specified by Figure 250-2(d) of the 2007 edition of the NESC are adopted for major planned work on the distribution system, including expansion, rebuild, or relocation of existing facilities, assigned on or after the effective date of this rule distribution facility construction? [Rule 25-6.0342(3)(b)2]**

No. Although the Company's Plan addresses this subject, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided. At a minimum, Verizon objects to the Plan to the extent it (i) purports to impose rates, terms and conditions that are inconsistent with the parties' joint use agreement and (ii) adopts the extensive use of extreme wind loading standards.

5. **Does the Company's Plan address the extent to which the extreme wind loading standards specified by Figure 250-2(d) of the 2007 edition of the NESC are adopted for distribution facilities serving critical infrastructure facilities and along major thoroughfares taking into account political and geographical boundaries and other applicable operational considerations? [Rule 25-6.0342(3)(b)3]**

No. Although the Company's Plan addresses this subject, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided. At a minimum, Verizon objects to the Plan to the extent it (i) purports to impose rates, terms and

Preliminary Generic Draft Issues: Docket 070301-EI
Verizon Positions on FPL Plan

conditions that are inconsistent with the parties' joint use agreement and (ii) adopts the extensive use of extreme wind loading standards.

6. Does the Company's Plan address the extent to which its distribution facilities are designed to mitigate damage to underground and supporting overhead transmission and distribution facilities due to flooding and storm surges? [Rule 25-6.0342(3)(c)]

No. Although the Company's Plan addresses this subject, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided.

7. Does the Company's Plan address the extent to which the placement of new and replacement distribution facilities facilitate safe and efficient access for installation and maintenance pursuant to Rule 25-6.0341, F.A.C? [Rule 25-6.0342(3)(d)]

No. Although the Company's Plan addresses this subject, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided.

8. Does the Company's Plan provide a detailed description of its deployment strategy including a description of the facilities affected; including technical design specifications, construction standards, and construction methodologies employed? [Rule 25-6.0342(4)(a)]

No. The Plan provides a general description of facilities affected for 2007, including a list of CIF customer names and a list of community project feeder route numbers, but the Plan lacks project level detail for 2007 and does not identify facilities affected in 2008 and 2009. Verizon notes that the Company has provided certain additional project information to Verizon that is not included in the Plan.

9. Does the Company's Plan provide a detailed description of the communities and areas within the utility's service area where the electric infrastructure improvements, including facilities identified by the utility as critical infrastructure and along major thoroughfares pursuant to subparagraph (3)(b)3, are to be made? [Rule 25-6.0342(4)(b)]

No. The Plan provides a general description of facilities affected for 2007, including a list of CIF customer names and a list of community project feeder route numbers, but the Plan lacks project level detail for 2007 and does not identify facilities affected in 2008 and 2009. Verizon notes that the Company has provided certain additional project information to Verizon that is not included in the Plan.

10. Does the Company's Plan provide a detailed description of the extent to which the electric infrastructure improvements involve joint use facilities on which third-party attachments exist? [Rule 25-6.0342(4)(c)]

No. The Plan does not provide a detailed description of the extent to which the electric infrastructure improvements involve joint use facilities with third-party attachments.

Preliminary Generic Draft Issues: Docket 070301-EI
Verizon Positions on FPL Plan

11. Does the Company's Plan provide an estimate of the costs and benefits to the utility of making the electric infrastructure improvements, including the effect on reducing storm restoration costs and customer outages? [Rule 25-6.0342(4)(d)]

No. Although the Plan includes high level cost estimates for 2007-09 of making infrastructure improvements, Verizon cannot complete its assessment of this aspect of the Plan until sufficient project level detail has been provided. Moreover, the Plan does not estimate or quantify the net benefits, if any, of implementing the Plan.

12. Does the Company's Plan provide an estimate of the costs and benefits, obtained pursuant to subsection (6) below, to third-party attachers affected by the electric infrastructure improvements, including the effect on reducing storm restoration costs and customer outages realized by the third-party attachers? (Rule 25-6.0342(4)(e))

No. The Plan does not provide such an estimate. Based on the information that has been provided thus far, Verizon is working to provide an initial estimate of its costs. Verizon will not be able to provide a complete assessment of the costs and benefits (if any) until sufficient project level detail has been provided.

13. Does the Company's Plan include written Attachment Standards and Procedures addressing safety, reliability, pole loading capacity, and engineering standards and procedures for attachments by others to the utility's electric transmission and distribution poles that meet or exceed the edition of the National Electrical Safety Code (ANSI C-2) that is applicable pursuant to Rule 25-6.034, FAC.? [Rule 25-6.0342(5)]

No. Although the Company's Plan includes attachment standards and procedures, Verizon objects to them to the extent they purport to impose rates, terms and conditions that are inconsistent with the parties' joint use agreement.

14. Based on the resolution of the preceding issues, should the Commission find that the Company's Plan meets the desired objectives of enhancing reliability and reducing restoration costs and outage times in a prudent, practical, and cost-effective manner to the affected parties? [Rule 25-6.0342(1) and (2)]

No. The Plan should be supplemented to provide sufficient project level detail. Moreover, based on Verizon's objections stated in response to the previous issues, the Plan fails to demonstrate that it achieves the objectives of enhancing reliability and reducing restoration costs and outage times in a prudent, practical, and cost-effective manner to the affected parties.