

Attached is the final audit report for the Utility stated above. I am sending the Utility a copy of the audit report. If the Utility desires to file a response to the audit report, it should send a response to the Office of Commission Clerk. There are confidential work papers associated with this audit.

LD/ld Attachment: Audit Report

cc: Office of Auditing and Performance Analysis File





# Hublic Serbice Commission

Office of Auditing and Performance Analysis Bureau of Auditing Miami District Office

# Auditor's Report

Florida Power & Light Company Nuclear Extended Power Uprate

# **Twelve Months Ended December 31, 2012**

Docket No. 130009-EI Audit Control No. 13-010-4-1 June 7, 2013

**Bety Maitre** Audit Manager

Gabriela M. Leon Andit Staff len l Audit Staff

Kathy Welch Reviewer

|--|

Purpos	ie	1
Object	ives and Procedures	2
Audit	Findings	
1:	Adjustment to Construction Carrying Cost	5
	Adjustment to Recoverable O&M	
Exhibi	ts	
1:	True-up	9

### Purpose

To: Florida Public Service Commission

We have performed the procedures described later in this report to meet the agreed-upon objectives set forth by the Office of Industry Development and Market Analysis in its audit service request dated January 10, 2013. We have applied these procedures to the attached schedules prepared by Florida Power & Light Company, and to several of its related schedules in support of its 2012 Nuclear Cost Recovery Clause for its construction cost expenditures for the Uprate activity in Docket No. 130009-EI.

This audit was performed following General Standards and Fieldwork Standards found in the AICPA Statements on Standards for Attestation Engagements. Our report is based on agreed-upon procedures. The report is intended only for internal Commission use.

# **Objectives and Procedures**

# General

### **Definitions**

Construction Costs are costs that are expended to construct the nuclear power plant, but not limited to, the costs of constructing power plant buildings and all associated permanent structures, equipment and systems.

Utility refers to Florida Power & Light Company. CCRC refers to Capacity Cost Recovery Clause. NCRC refers to Nuclear Cost Recovery Clause.

# Rate Base

**Objectives:** The objectives were to reconcile actual transfers of construction work in progress (CWIP) to plant, and to determine whether accumulated depreciation and depreciation expense on the plant transferred were based on the Commission base rate change Order No.'s, PSC-12-0647-PAA-EI, PSC-11-0575-PAA-EI, PSC-11-0078-PAA-EI, and PSC-10-0207-PAA-EI.

**Procedures:** We reconciled the amounts for Plant in Service from the orders to FPL's books and the Utility's filing, Appendix A and B. Depreciation is not recorded on the asset level and does not reconcile to the general ledger. Therefore, we recalculated accumulated depreciation and depreciation expense using Commission approved rates from Docket No. 080677-EI and actual Plant in Service. Plant in service, accumulated depreciation, and depreciation expense were compared to the Commission Base rate change Order No.'s PSC-12-0647-PAA-EI and PSC-11-0575-PAA-EI. Base rate change Orders PSC-11-0078-PAA-EI and PSC-10-0207-PAA-EI were not relevant to the 2012 test year.

# **Construction Work in Progress (CWIP)**

**Objectives:** The objectives were to verify that Construction Costs listed on the Utility's Schedule T-6 filing were supported by adequate documentation and that the capital additions were appropriately recoverable through the NCRC and in compliance with Section 366.93, F.S. and Rule 25-6.043, F.A.C.

**Procedures:** We traced CWIP additions in Schedule T-6 to the general ledger and judgmentally selected a sample for testing. We verified that additions had appropriate supporting documentation, were related to the Extended Power Uprate (EPU) project, and were charged to the correct accounts. Finding 1 discusses the adjustment to Construction Carrying cost revenue requirement.

## Recovery

**Objectives:** The objectives were to determine whether the Utility used the Commission approved CCRC factors to bill customers for the period January 1, 2012 through December 31,

2012, and whether Schedule T-3, T-3A, T-4, and Appendix C reflects the ordered amount in Commission Order No. PSC-11-0547-FOF-EI.

**Procedures:** We agreed the amount collected on Schedule T-3, T-3A, T-4, and Appendix C to the 2012 NCRC jurisdictional amount approved in Commission Order No. PSC-11-0547-FOF-EI and to the Capacity Cost Recovery Clause in Docket 130001-EI. In that audit, we reconciled revenues to the ledger and "Revenue and Rate" reports. We also selected a random sample of bills and recalculated each bill to verify use of the approved rate. No exceptions were noted.

### **Operation and Maintenance Expense**

**Objectives:** The objectives were to determine whether operation and maintenance (O&M) expenses on Schedule T-4 are supported by adequate source documentation and appropriately recoverable through the NCRC clause.

**Procedures:** We traced expenses in the filing to the general ledger. We judgmentally selected a sample of 2012 O&M expenses for testing. The source documentation for selected items was reviewed to ensure the expense was related to the EPU project and that the expense was charged to the correct accounts. Finding 2 discusses the adjustment to Recoverable O&M Revenue Requirement.

### **Carrying Cost on Deferred Tax Adjustment**

**Objectives:** The objectives were to determine whether Schedule T-3A - Carrying Cost on Deferred Tax Assets (DTA) included the correct balances from the supporting schedules and the deferred tax requirement amounts are accurately calculated.

**Procedures:** We traced the projected True-Up adjustments and the beginning balances included in the schedule to prior NCRC Commission Orders. We traced the estimated tax deduction for research and development to supporting schedules and the 2011 Federal Income Tax return. We traced the AFUDC rate applied by the Utility to the rate approved in Commission Order No. PSC-13-0163-PAA-EI. We recalculated Schedule T- 3A and verified the Construction Carrying Cost on DTA and the Under (Over) Recovery balance. No exceptions were noted.

### **Other Issues**

#### Separate and Apart Procedures

**Objectives:** The objectives were to review and document FPL's separate and apart process for identifying and applying the adjustments necessary to ensure costs recovered thru the NCRC are limited to the EPU.

**Procedures:** We reviewed FPL's testimony and procedures related to the separate and apart process. We reviewed the "Recoverable Cost Justification Forms" prepared by the Utility in 2012 and reconciled them to the sample items when applicable. We used the separate and apart procedures to determine whether CWIP and O&M sample items related to the EPU project. No exceptions were noted.

### True-up

**Objectives:** The objective was to determine if the True-Up and Interest Provision as filed on Schedule T-1 was properly calculated.

**Procedures:** We traced the revenue requirements for Carrying Costs on Construction and Deferred Tax Adjustment, O&M, and Base Rate to supporting calculation schedules. We recalculated the True-Up amounts as of December 31, 2012 using the Commission approved beginning balance as of December 31, 2011, Debt and Equity Components, the Financial Commercial Paper rates, and the 2012 EPU costs. We traced all adjustments to source documents. Finding 1 and 2 discuss the adjustments to Construction Carrying Cost and Recoverable O&M Revenue Requirements.

#### **Analytical Review**

**Objectives:** The objective was to perform an analytical review of the Utility's EPU Cost to determine if there were any material changes or inconsistencies from the prior year.

**Procedures:** We compared 2012 to 2011 costs and used the information to judgmentally select the sample. There was a large amount of CWIP placed in service with the completion of St. Lucie Units 1 and 2, and Turkey Point Unit 3 EPU projects in 2012. No exceptions were noted.

### Audit Findings

### Finding 1: Adjustment to Construction Carrying Cost

Audit Analysis: Total costs on Schedule T-6 and Appendix B included work order T00000002434 - GSU - St. Lucie Spare GSU Transformer Coolers & Pumps. The costs from this work order were calculated using an incorrect jurisdictional factor. The rate used was the Transmission - Other factor of 0.90431145. The correct rate for Transmission - GSU is 0.98051733. The first schedule on the following page computes the effect on carrying cost revenue requirement for Schedule T-3.

Work order T0000002434 - GSU - St. Lucie Spare GSU Transformer Coolers & Pumps was placed into service in November of 2012. Therefore, there is also an effect on Appendix B due to the costs being transferred to plant in service. The second schedule on the following page computes the effect on the base rate revenue requirement in Appendix C.

Effect on the General Ledger: There is no effect on the general ledger.

Effect on the Filing: Construction Carrying Cost and Base Rate Revenue Requirements should increase by \$3,740 and \$2,735, respectively.

#### Carrying Charge Adjustment on Work Order T0000002434

Description	Rates	Be	g. Bal.	Τ.	Jan-12		Feb-12	Γ	Sar-12	Г	Apr-12		May-12	J	un-12	_	Jul-12		log-12	<u> </u>	Sep-12	1	Oct-12		Nov-12	D	ec-12	12-	Mo Total	Г	End Bal.
Work Order T0000002434		\$ 2	214,337	15	100	5	21,449	\$	65,100	\$	4,839	5	2,111	\$	241	\$	614,073	\$	6,338	\$	1,682,088	\$	24,847	\$	(295,762)	\$	•	\$	2,125,424	S	2,339,761
Adjustments		5	(1,11	)	SO	Γ	92		\$28,890		(\$28,912)		\$0		(\$8)		\$558,829	(	\$558,857)		\$1,444,748		(\$444)		(\$289,160)		8	S	1,155,086	\$	1,153,975
T9000002434 Net of Adj.		\$ 2	215,44	5	100	5	21,449	\$	36,210	S	33,751	5	2,111	\$	249	\$	55,244	\$	565,195	\$	237,340	\$	25,291	\$	(6,602)	s	•	\$	970,338	5	1,185,786
Trans. GSU Jursidicitional Amt.	0.98051733	5	211,250	) \$	98	\$	21,031	\$	35,504	\$	33,094	S	2,070	ŝ	244	S	54,168	\$	554,183	\$	232,716	\$	24,798	S	(6,473)	\$	•	S	951,433	\$	1,162,683
Trans. Other Jursidicitional Ant.	0.90431145	S	194,832	2 5	90	5	19,397	5	32,745	S	30,521	S	1,909	\$	225	S	49,958	\$	511,112	S	214,629	\$	22,871	S	(5,970)	\$	•	\$	\$77,488	S	1,072,319
Difference		\$	16,411	S	:	5	1,635	\$	2,759	5	2,572	\$	_161	\$	19	\$	4,210	\$	43,071	5	18,087	\$	1,927	S	(503)	\$	•	5	73,945	\$	90,364
Trans. GSU Jursidicitional Ann. Diff.		5	16,418	5	8	S	1,635	5	2,759	\$	2,572	S	161	\$	19	\$	4,210	\$	43,071	\$	18,087	\$	1,927	\$	(503)	ŝ	•	s	73,945	S	90,364
Transfer to Plant in Service						Ι.																		5	90,364			\$	90,364	\$	90,364
CWIP Base Eligible for Return		\$	16,411	: 5	16,426	5	18,204	\$	21 <u>,1</u> 16	5	23,860	5	24,218	\$	24,448	\$	28,871	\$	72,176	5	90,705	\$	93,346	S	3,286	s	3,709	S	3,740	5	3,740
Average CWIP				S	16,422	5	17,315	S	19,660	5	22,488	5	24,039	\$	24,333	\$	26,659	\$	50,523	ų	\$1,440	\$	92,026	S	48,316	S	3,498				
Equity Comp. grossed up for taxes	0.007439034			S	122	5	129	\$	146	S	167	\$	179	\$	181	\$	198	S	376	s	606	\$	685	S	359	S	26	\$	•	\$	3,174
Debt Component (Average CWIP	0.001325847			5	22	\$	23	S	26	S	30	S	32	\$	32	S	35	\$	67	\$	108	\$	122	S	64	S	5	\$	•	\$	566
Total Return Requirements				5	144	5	152	S	172	5	197	S	211	S	213	\$	234	5	443	5	714	S	\$07	S	423	\$	31	5	•	Ŝ	3,740

# Adjustment to Base Revenue Requirement

Description	Rates		Nov-12	Dec-12		Total
Work Order T0000002434		\$	2,339,761	\$ 2,339,761		
Trans. GSU Jursidicitional Amt.	0.98051733	\$	2,294,176	\$ 2,294,176		
Trans. Other Jursidicitional Amt.	0.90431145	\$	2,115,873	\$ 2,115,873		
Difference		\$	178,304	\$ 178,304	\$	178,304
Depreciation	2.90%	\$	215	\$ 431	\$	646
Accumulated Depreciation		\$	215	\$ 646	\$	646
Net Plant In Service		\$	178,088	\$ 177,657	\$	177,657
Average Plant		\$	89,044	\$ 177,873	\$	177,873
Return	9.30%	\$	690	\$ 1,379	\$	2,069
Total Depreciation and Return		\$	906	\$ 1,809	\$	2,715
Base Eligible for Return		S	906	\$ 2,719		
Average CWIP		\$	453	\$ 1,812	-	
Equity Comp. grossed up for taxes	0.007439034	\$	3	\$ 13	\$	17
Debt Component (Average CWIP	0.001325847	\$	1	\$ 2	\$	3
		\$	4	\$ 16	\$	20
Total Return Requirements		\$	910	\$ 1,825	\$	2,735

### Finding 2: Adjustment to Recoverable O&M

Audit Analysis: The Utility paid \$15,609.16 for one-year extended warranties on 521 hand held radios during the test year which were included in the costs on T-4. Each radio comes with a 3-year warranty. The extended warranty claim period is outside the remaining duration of the project, which is scheduled to be completed in 2013. On May 29, 2013, the Utility reclassified the one-year warranty purchases from recoverable O&M to non-recoverable O&M. On the next page, we calculate the effect on Recoverable O&M Revenue Requirements.

Effect on the General Ledger: There is no effect on the General Ledger

Effect on the Filing: Recoverable O&M Revenue Requirements should be reduced by \$15,329.

#### Effect on Schedule T-4

		Jan-12	F	reb-12	L	Mar-12		Apr-12		May-12		Jun-12		Jul-12		Aug-12		Sep-12		Oct-12		Nov-12		Dec-12	17	Mo Total
Juripdictional Generation O&M Cost																										
Nuclear Generation O&M Cost	5	(2,9%)	s	(150)	)		S	(6,292)			\$	(3,176)									\$	(2,996)			\$	(15,609)
Jurisdiction Factors	0.	98202247	0.9	6202247		0.98202247	0	98202247	~	0.98202247	Ö	.98202247	0	98202247	9	0.98202247	0	98202247	0.	98202247	<b>_</b>	0.98202247	0	98202247		.98202247
Jurisdictional Recoverable Gen. O&M Cost	\$	(2,942)	\$	(147)	3 2		\$	(6,178)	5		\$	(3,119)	5		\$		\$		\$	•	5	(2,942)	s		5	(15,329)
Interest Provision					$\mathbf{t}$		_								-						-				E	
Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Cost	S	(2,942)	5	(147)			s	(6,178)	\$	•	\$	(3,119)	S		S	-	\$	•	\$	-	S	(2,942)	\$	•	5	(15,329)
Prior Month (over)/under Recovery	15	•	s	(2,942)	) \$	5 (147)	\$	(0)	\$	(6,179)	\$	O	\$	(3,120)	S	(1)	5	0	\$	(I)		(1)	\$	(2,944)		
Balance Eligible for Interest	5	•	\$	(2,942)	) \$	(3,089)	\$	(3,090)	S	(9,268)	5	(9,269)	S	(12,389)	S	(12,390)	\$	(12,391)	\$	(12,392)	5	(12,393)	\$	(15,337)		
Average Unemortized Balance	5	•	\$	(1,471)	) S	(3,016)	\$	(3,090)	S	(6,179)	\$	(9,269)	\$	(10,829)	\$	(12,389)	5	(12,390)	\$	(12,392)	\$	(12,393)	\$	(13,865)		
Interest Rate		0.00625%	-	0.00958%	4	0.00833%		0.00875%		0.01042%		0.00958%		0.01042%		0.01208%		0.00875%		0.00875%		0.01250%		0.00875%		
Interest Provision	5		5	(9	2 5	(0)	5	(0)	5	(1)	\$	(1)	5	(i)	5	(1)	\$	0	5	0	S	(2)	5	(1)	S	(10)
Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Cost	5	(2,942)	\$	(147)	<u> </u>		\$	(6,178)	5		\$	(3,119)	5	_ •	\$	•	\$	•	\$	-	S	(2,942)	\$		5	(15,329)
Total Interest Provision	5	•	S	(0)	) \$	(0)	\$	(0)	S	(I)	\$	())	5	())	S	(1)	\$	(1)	S	(1)	5	(2)	5	(1)	S	(10)
Total Jurisdictional Cast W/ Interest	5	(2,942)	5	(147	) \$	; (O)	\$	(6,179)	\$		\$	(3,120)	\$	(1)	S	(1)	\$	(I)	\$	_(1)	5	(2,944)	5	(1)	5	(15,338)

# <u>Exhibits</u>

# Exhibit 1: True-up

Schedule T-	1 (True-up) Construction	on Costs a	ie and Turkey Pela nd Carrying Costs : Retell Revenue R	on Construction	Cost Balance				[Section (S(c)1.b.)
	FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY	LANATION:	Provide the calculat requirements based previously filed expr	I on actual expend					For the Year Ended 12/31/20 Witness: Winnie Powers
Line No.			(A) Actual January	(8) Actual February	(C) Actual Merch	(D) Actual April	(E) Actual May	(F) Actual June	(C) 6 Month Total
1.	Pro-Construction Revenue Resultements		\$0	J S0	uristictional Dollar \$0	s . 50	30	50	50
	Conduction Carrying Cost Revenue Requirements (Schedule T-3, line 9)		<b>\$9,444,265</b>	\$10,623,846	\$11,924,575	\$11,739,684	\$10,068,362	\$10,943,399	\$64,544,251
	Recovenable O&M Revenue Requirements (Schedule T-4, line 38)		\$655,547	\$347,355	\$258,852	\$777,111	\$627,147	\$598,753	\$3,282,585
	DTA(DTL) Cerving Cost (Schedule T-3A, line 8)		(\$211,250)	(\$201,990)	(\$190,060)	(\$154,823)	(\$121,075)	(\$111,409)	(\$990,606)
•	Other Adjustments (a) (Assends: C , Line 8)		\$47	\$77	\$10,410	\$1,587,244	\$4,718,766	\$4,745,452	\$11,061,998
	Total Period Revenue Requirements (Lines 1 Strough 5)		\$9,888,510	\$10,769,289	\$12,001,577	\$13,949,215	\$15,233,220	\$16,076,195	\$77,976,207
•	Projected Revenue Requirements for the period (Order No. PSC 11-0547-FOF-EI)		\$8,628,039	\$9,217,049	\$10,221,314	\$11,033,343	\$11,520,667	\$17,017,054	\$57,837,467
	Difference (Line 6 - Line 7)		\$1,260,571	\$1,552,240	\$1,780,353	\$2,915,873	\$3,772,553	(\$940,850)	\$10,340,740
L	Adual / Estimated Revenue Requirements for the period (Order No. PSC 12-0850-FO	F-EN	\$9,489,324	\$10,723,121	\$11,880,002	\$13,439,890	\$15,427,515	\$19,009,623	\$79,989,475
10.	Final Taus-up of Uprate Construction Carrying Costs (Line 6 - Line 9)		\$399,286	\$46,168	\$121,675	\$509,326	(\$134,295)	(\$2,933,428)	(\$1,991,268)

\* Totals may not add due to rounding

11. (a) Other Adjustments Line 5 represents Base Rale Revenue Requirements for 2012 and carrying costs on overlunder recoveries. Refer to Appendix C Line 8.

Schedule	T-1 (True-up) Construe	ction Costs ar	ie and Turkey Poin ni Carrying Costs : Retail Revenue Ri	on Construction	n Cost Balance				(Section (\$)(c)1.b.)
COMPANY	UBUC SERVICE COMMISSION E: FLOREDA POWER & UGHT COMPANY IO : 130009-EI	iplanation:	Provide the calculat requirements based previously field expr		For the Year Ended 12/01/20 Wilness: Winnie Powers				
Line No.			(H) Actual July	(1) Actual August	(J) Actual September	(X) Actual October	(L.) Actual November	(M) Actual December	(N) 12 Morth Total
				•	Inisdictional Dollars	. —			
	Pre-Condituction Revenue Requirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2.	Construction Carrying Cost Revenue Requirements (Schedule T-3, time 9)		\$11,510,980	\$12,353,415	\$7,079,278	\$6,047,571	\$5,861,708	\$4,503,305	\$112,000,508
L.	Recoverable O&M Revenue Requirements (Schedule T-4, line 38)		\$455,322	\$831,020	\$81,023	\$15,873	\$316,430	\$2,251,320	\$7,214,153
).	DTA(DTL) Carrying Cost (Schedule T-3A, inc (s)		(\$100,339)	(\$86,723)	(\$74,052)	(\$65,964)	(\$45,921)	(\$25,304)	(\$1,388,939)
5.	Other Adjustments (a) (Appendix C, Line 8)		\$4,989,900	\$5,306,931	\$13,011,647	\$15,379,798	\$16,314,089	\$18,525,903	\$84,590,266
i.	Total Period Revenue Requirements (Lines 1 through 5)		\$18,855,464	\$18,404,543	\$20,037,867	\$21,377,257	\$22,446,305	\$25,255,224	\$202,415,988
'.	Projected Revenue Requirements for the period (Order No. PSC 11-0547-FOF-8)		\$12,972,687	\$13,371,098	\$13,999,601	\$14,583,896	\$14,936,543	\$15,415,131	\$152,916,422
<b>}.</b>	Difference (Line 6 - Line 7)		\$3,883,777	\$5,033,545	\$6,099,286	\$6,793,381	\$7,509,763	\$9,940,093	¥19.494.565
).	Achuel / Estimated Revenue Requirements for the pariod (Order No. PSC 12-0650-F	OF-ED	\$19,293,241	\$17,167,070	\$17,939,335	\$20,334,659	\$22,284,958	\$21,542,955	\$198,531,694
10.	Final True-up of Uprate Construction Carrying Costs (Line 6 - Line 9)		(\$2,436,778)	\$1,237,573	\$2,158,552	\$1,042,597	\$161.348	\$3,712,269	\$3,884,294

\* Totals may not add due to rounding

.

11. (a) Other Adjustments Line 5 represents Base Rele Revenue Requirements for 2012 and carrying costs on overAnder recoveries. Refer to Appendix C Line 8.

10