

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Investigation into the)	DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
adequacy of the electrical)	ORDER NO. 23909
transmission grid in North)	ISSUED: 12-20-90
Florida.)	
)	

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

MICHAEL McK. WILSON, Chairman
 THOMAS M. BEARD
 BETTY EASLEY
 GERALD L. GUNTER
 FRANK S. MESSERSMITH

ORDER ON TRANSMISSION GRID IN NORTH FLORIDA

BY THE COMMISSION:

This docket was initiated to investigate whether the existing and currently planned transmission grid in Florida is sufficient to transfer existing and planned generation and purchased power from north Florida to load centers in central and south Florida.

On August 27, 1990 a Prehearing Conference was held before Commissioner Gunter, Prehearing Officer. At the prehearing conference the parties identified three issues: 1. Is the current transmission grid sufficient to transfer existing and planned purchased power from north Florida to load centers in central and south Florida?, 2. Are transmission facility improvements needed?, and 3. What additional transmission facilities should be further evaluated?

During the prehearing conference Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc. (SEC), Florida Municipal Power Agency (FMPA), and Alabama Electric Cooperative, Inc. (AEC) sought to raise certain additional issues pertaining to the joint planning, access, and allocation of transmission facilities in Florida. The basic position of SEC, FMPA, and AEC was that all electric utilities in the state should be, or have the opportunity to be, involved in statewide transmission system planning and operation. They also contended that access to a jointly planned, owned, and operated transmission grid should be made available to all electric utilities without discrimination. In order to implement this position, SEC, FMPA, and AEC advocated Commission adoption of

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

11249 DEC 20 1990

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 2

certain general principals governing the planning, development, and operation of the statewide transmission grid. At the August 27 prehearing conference, it was determined that these issues were not germane to the proceedings at hand. Rather, the limited scope and purpose of this docket was to evaluate the adequacy of Florida's existing and planned transmission system and to identify those additional transmission facilities, if any, which should be evaluated further to increase the import capability and transmission capacity from north Florida to central and south Florida.

ISSUE 1: Is the existing and currently planned transmission grid sufficient to transfer existing and planned purchased power from north Florida to load centers in central and south Florida?

Florida's transmission grid has the capability of reliably transferring 3200 MW of generation and purchased power from north Florida to load centers in central and south Florida. This transfer limit was established through technical studies performed by the Florida Electric Power Coordinating Group (FCG) and is primarily a function of the physical characteristics of the transmission facilities interconnecting peninsular Florida with the Southern Company and the generation and transmission facilities throughout Florida. The transfer limits established by the FCG represent the maximum amount of power which can be prudently transferred without subjecting customers to major blackouts in the event of an unplanned outage of a major generating unit or transmission line in Florida.

Under certain operating conditions, as much as 3400 MW of power can reliably be transmitted without violating the single contingency reliability criteria. In addition, recent FCG studies for the winter of 1991 indicate that the import limit may be increased to 3600 MW during a capacity emergency. While the actual import capability may, under certain ideal operating conditions, exceed the base capability of 3200 MW and has been used to purchase additional short term non-firm capacity and energy, this extra capacity is not consistently available to support the purchase of additional firm capacity. Hence, for the purpose of analyzing the adequacy of the Florida transmission grid, we have primarily relied on the base transfer capability of 3200 MW.

The owners of the transmission facilities which interconnect Florida's electrical system with the Southern Company system have allocated and assigned the current state base import capability

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 3

pursuant to a negotiated agreement entitled, the " Florida-Southern Transmission Interface Allocation Agreement" dated May 14, 1990. This agreement was approved by the FERC by an order issued July 30, 1990, in Docket No. ER90-399-000. According to the agreement, of the 3200 MW Total Base Import Capability, a total of 2784 MW is jointly allocated to FPL and JEA and the remaining 416 MW is allocated to FPC. Apart from the 3200 MW base capability, the City of Tallahassee has been assigned 175 MW, to be increased to 200 MW upon the installation of certain capacitor banks on the City's system. Tallahassee was treated separately in the agreement because its system is relatively isolated in north Florida and the purchase of power by Tallahassee from Southern apparently does not materially effect other transmission flows in Florida. Although Tallahassee's Assigned Import Capability is not included in the Total Base Import Capability, the City may continue to participate in the Florida Broker System and sell wholesale power to utilities in central and south Florida subject to the operating conditions and constraints of the transmission network. See Tables 1 through 5(b), (Attachment 1) for an indication of how Florida's utilities plan to utilize the state import capability.

The tables in Attachment 1 support the following conclusions:

1. From a statewide perspective, the transmission grid appears sufficient to transfer current and anticipated firm committed purchases of power to load centers in central and south Florida.

As is illustrated in Table 1, from 1991 through 1992, it appears that approximately 400 MW of uncommitted transmission capacity is available statewide. From 1993 through May, 2010, over 800 MW of uncommitted transmission capacity is available statewide. (For the brief period of June through December, 1994, approximately 1060 MW of capacity is available) With the expiration of UPS contracts with the Southern Company in June, 2010, the statewide uncommitted transmission capacity increases to 2338 MW.

2. From a statewide perspective, the transmission grid does not appear to have sufficient capacity to transfer all available but, as yet, uncommitted firm power purchases from the Southern Company and from Qualifying Facilities planning to locate in north Florida.

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 4

FPC, FPL and JEA have committed to purchase significant amounts of Unit Power Sales (UPS) from the Southern Company pursuant to contracts entered into in 1982 and 1988. Also, FPL and JEA have recently signed a letter of intent to purchase Scherer Unit 4 from Georgia Power Company. These represent the bulk of the committed power purchases which are to be transmitted into Florida. In addition to these committed resources, however, FPC, FPL, and JEA also have the opportunity to accelerate their UPS purchases under their 1988 contracts with the Southern Company. The net amount of these Early Purchase Options, after backing out FPL and JEA's planned Scherer purchases pursuant to the terms of the letter of intent with Southern, is shown in Table 5(a). For the period of January through May, 1993, a total of 1200 MW is available pursuant to Early Purchase Options. During this period, the net available transmission import capability of the state is only 826 MW. Therefore, there is insufficient transmission capability to import 374 MW of available Early Purchase Options during this six month period. Also, numerous Qualifying Facilities have expressed interest in locating in north Florida. They are listed in Table 5(b). If constructed, their aggregate effect would be to reduce the Florida/Southern import capability by approximately 1030 MW.

3. Florida Power Corporation has fully subscribed its allocation of the state's transmission import capability. (See Table 2) Starting in 1995, and as early as 1993 if they fully exercise their Early Purchase Options with Southern, FPC will have no transmission capability to move any additional power from north to south. At present, Qualifying Facilities with an aggregate capacity of 666 MW are planning projects in FPC's northern service area. (See Table 5(b)) Unless FPC participates in the construction of additional transmission capacity or wheeling arrangements can be made with other utilities, these projects can not be developed.

4. Florida Power & Light has fully subscribed its allocation of the state's transmission import capability. (See Table 3) In fact, FPL must purchase additional transmission capacity from JEA in order to fully utilize its committed Southern Company UPS and Scherer purchases. Without further enhancement to their transmission capability, FPL can not exercise its Early Purchase Options with the Southern Company. Further, Qualifying Facilities with an aggregate capacity of 600 MW (excluding Panda Energy who appears to be pursuing an interconnection with FPC) are planning

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 5

projects in FPL's northern service area. One of these, Falcon Seaboard, has an "in que" standard offer contract with FPL. Unless FPL participates in the construction of additional transmission capacity or wheeling arrangements can be made with other utilities, these projects can not be developed.

5. The Jacksonville Electric Authority has not fully subscribed its allocation of the state's transmission import capability. For the period of January through May, 1993, JEA has 434 MW of transmission capacity available. From June, 1993 through May, 1994, JEA's available transmission capacity increases to 608 MW. In June, 1994, over 800 MW of transmission capacity is available from JEA. (See Table 4)

Thus, from a statewide perspective, the transmission grid appears sufficient to transfer current and anticipated firm committed purchases of power to load centers in central and south Florida. However, the transmission grid does not have sufficient capacity to transfer all available but, as yet, uncommitted firm power purchases from the Southern Company and from planned and proposed Qualifying Facilities in north Florida.

ISSUE 2: Are improvements to existing transmission facilities and/or additional transmission facilities needed to increase the import capability and transmission capacity from north Florida to central and south Florida?

As previously discussed, both FPC and FPL have fully subscribed their allocation of the state's transmission import capability. Together, however, there are Qualifying Facilities with a gross aggregate capacity of 1201 MW which are planning to locate and interconnect with FPC and FPL in north Florida through the mid 1990's. When the impact of these Qualifying Facilities on transmission load flows in Florida is considered, approximately 1030 MW of additional transmission capacity is needed by FPC and FPL to facilitate the development of these projects. (See Table 5(b)) From a statewide perspective, from 600 to 800 MW of uncommitted transmission capacity may be available from JEA. Depending on the viability of each of the Qualifying Facility projects and some may not materialize, it may be possible for the remaining projects to acquire transmission wheeling from JEA. However, this prospect is complicated by the fact that both FPC and FPL have Early Purchase Options under their 1988 UPS contracts with

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 6

the Southern Company. Depending on the economic attractiveness of exercising these options, there may be stiff competition for wheeling services from JEA. This may or may not be a problem as all Early Purchase Options with the Southern Company expire after 1994.

In his direct testimony, Mr. Stillwagon (FPC) identified the economic benefits that could be expected from the construction of additional transmission capacity on the FPC system. These benefits are as follows:

1. The avoidance of new generating capacity. The tie-line's additional import capacity will significantly enhance the generation reliability of FPC's system.

2. Savings from additional short-term economic purchases that the new tie-line will enable FPC to receive.

3. The opportunity to enter into future long-term purchases, such as FPC's current Southern UPS contract, that offer a lower overall revenue requirement to the Company's ratepayers than other available alternatives.

4. The revenues from additional wheeling services that the new line will allow FPC to provide to other utilities for their economy purchases.

Mr. Adjemian (FPL) testified that FPL was also exploring the need for additional transmission line construction on the FPL system. On cross examination by Commission Gunter, Mr. Adjemian admitted: "In the case of FPL, I would agree that we need to, especially if we do follow through and we do commit with Scherer 4, FPL needs to require additional transmission and expand its transmission capability into the state."

Thus, it appears that transmission improvements are needed. Of particular concern are the service areas of FPC and FPL since they both appear to have fully subscribed their allocation of Florida/Southern transfer capability through the year 2010.

ISSUE 3: What additional transmission facilities should be evaluated to increase the import capability and transmission capacity from north Florida to central and south Florida?

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 7

The prehearing order in this docket provided that at a minimum, the following transmission lines should be evaluated:

1. An additional 500 KV transmission line or lines from the Southern system at Plant Hatch or the Tifton substation to Florida's Central Florida to Kathleen to Orange River substations.
2. An additional 500 KV transmission line or lines along the east coast from the Southern system to central and south Florida paralleling the existing 500 KV transmission system along the east coast.
3. An additional 500 KV transmission line or lines from Caryville plant site in northwest Florida to the Central Florida to Kathleen to Orange River substations.

Each of these candidate routes were discussed during the hearing.

Based on the testimony, we believe the Caryville-Central Florida-Kathleen-Orange River route can be dropped from consideration at this time. Although Gulf Power holds a parcel of land near the Caryville area as a future site for a new power plant, this site has no bulk transmission source in place at this time. In order to ensure that power flows along such a line to the load centers in central and south Florida, additional lines into the Caryville area would need to be built in order to provide a source sufficiently strong to move bulk power south. This disadvantage related to the Caryville proposal does not exist for either of the other two lines identified for evaluation. Furthermore, a 500 KV line to central Florida originating at the Farley Nuclear Plant, as is presently being considered by FPC is comparable to the Caryville alternative and does not have the disadvantage presented at Caryville due to the present lack of bulk power transmission facilities at the site.

Of the two remaining alternatives, the west coast route from the Southern Company at Farley or Tifton to Central Florida and Kathleen to Orange River appears to have the most merit. Florida Power Corporation has already developed preliminary plans to construct a 500 KV tie-line with Southern along this route. Based on these plans, FPC would construct a new 500 KV interconnection with Southern and the FPC Central Florida substation. Construction

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 8

would proceed in two phases. The first phase would extend from the Southern system to a mid-point substation, with a preliminary completion date in December, 1995. According to studies performed by FPC this would provide an additional 600 MWs of transmission capacity to central Florida. The second phase would complete the remainder of the line to FPC's existing Central Florida substation and would tentatively be completed by December, 1996. Florida Power anticipates that completion of the full line would increase the state's import capability by a total of 1300 MW.

Although apparently not as far along in the planning process as FPC, FPL is evaluating two alternative expansions to their transmission system. One is an additional 500 KV line along the east coast of the state. The other is a cross-state extension from FPC's Kathleen substation to FPL's Orange River substation. This later alternative would be constructed in conjunction with FPC's planned expansion from Southern to Central Florida. Although FPL's technical studies are not expected to be fully completed until the end of this year, during cross examination, FPL witness Adjemian stated that the west coast alternative, Kathleen to Orange River, was FPL's leading alternative at this time. In his rebuttal testimony, Mr. Adjemian also contends that FPL's expansion from Kathleen to Orange River is necessary to ensure that the line being planned by FPC will safely and reliably increase the state's import capability by 1300 MW.

In addition to the transmission alternatives offered for consideration by the staff, during the hearing Alabama Electric Cooperative witness Clausen proposed a new 230 KV transmission intertie between AEC and FPC. Alabama Electric Cooperative has transmission lines now within less than ten miles of FPC's existing 230 KV system in northwest Florida. AEC proposes to make upgrades to its existing 115 KV system in the area and construct a new 230 KV intertie with FPC. The primary purpose of this intertie would be to establish a contract path between AEC and FPC thereby allowing AEC more economical access to the Florida Broker system. During his testimony, Mr. Clausen stated that this proposed line would not, in and of itself, improve the state's import capability. In fact, because of the current limitations on the north-south transfer of power in Florida, economy transactions over the line would be limited to off-peak hours. As such, staff does not

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 9

believe that further consideration of this proposed line should be given in this docket. We do not, however, wish to limit in any way AEC's right to pursue this issue in another docket. (See Issue 4)

Based on the record in this case it is evident that both FPC and FPL are in the advance stages of planning transmission lines which would improve the state's import capability. We believe that FPC and FPL should continue to pursue the development of a 500 KV transmission line(s) from the Southern Company to Central Florida and from Kathleen to Orange River. In order to ensure progress toward this end, we require FPC and FPL to provide a status report on this project no later than March 1, 1991. This docket should remain open pending further action or the timely of filing a Petition for Transmission Line Siting and Certification of Need.

ISSUE 4: How should the Commission address the issues of joint transmission planning, access, and allocation raised by SEC, FMPA, and AEC?

At the August 27 Prehearing Conference FMPA, SEC, and AEC sought to raise certain issues pertaining to the joint planning, access, and allocation of transmission facilities in Florida. Commissioner Gunter, as the prehearing officer, ruled that these issues were not germane to the proceedings at hand. Nonetheless, we would like to comment on the question of whether or not we should address these matters in a separate proceeding.

The basic position of FMPA, SEC, and AEC is that all electric utilities in the state should be, or have the opportunity to be, involved in statewide transmission system planning and operation. Access to a jointly planned, developed, coordinated and operated transmission grid should be made available to all electric utilities without discrimination. The Florida Public Service Commission should ensure that transmission services are properly planned and available to all electric utilities on a non-discriminatory basis. In order to implement this position, FMPA, SEC, and AEC advocate Commission adoption of certain general principals governing the planning and operation of the statewide transmission grid. These principals are outlined in the prefiled direct testimony of FMPA witness Robert C. Williams (Pages 11-13) and Exhibit #23 of Seminole witness Timothy S. Woodbury.

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 10

FMPA, SEC, and AEC contend that the Commission has the authority to adopt their joint transmission planning, ownership, and operation proposal under the Florida Grid Bill. Specifically, they cite Section 366.04(5), F.S., Jurisdiction of Commission, which states: "The commission shall further have jurisdiction over the planning, development, and maintenance of a coordinated electric power grid throughout Florida to assure an adequate and reliable source of energy for operational and emergency purposes in Florida and the avoidance of further uneconomic duplication of generation, transmission, and distribution facilities."

A further reading of the statute is required. With respect to transmission access, the Florida statutes do permit the Commission to require utilities to transmit electricity over their transmission lines from one utility to another or as part of the total energy supply of the entire grid where such transmission wheeling is necessary to assure the efficient and reliable operation of the state energy grid. (Section 366.055(3), F.S.) Where such transmission service is required by the Commission, the utility for which electricity is wheeled must compensate the wheeling utility for the use of its transmission system. (Section 366.055(2), F.S.) The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) has exclusive jurisdiction over the rates charged and the terms and conditions governing such transmission wheeling transactions.

We are not aware of any unresolved instance where utility-to-utility transmission wheeling has been denied by a Florida utility. No formal or informal complaints involving utility-to-utility wheeling have been filed or are currently before the Commission. One such complaint involving a request for transmission wheeling by the City of Key West was brought to the Commission several years ago and was successfully resolved. Should other transmission wheeling complaints exist which cannot be resolved through the normal process of negotiation, we see no reason that they cannot be brought before this Commission for resolution.

With respect to joint transmission ownership, we draw our power to implement a coordinated grid in Florida from Section 366.05(8), F.S. This statute states, in part: "If the commission determines that there is probable cause to believe that inadequacies exist with respect to the energy grids developed by the electric utility industry, it shall have the power, after

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 11

proceedings as provided by law, and after a finding that mutual benefits will accrue to the electric utilities involved, to require installation or repair of necessary facilities, including generating plants and transmission facilities, with the costs to be distributed in proportion to the benefits received, and to take all necessary steps to ensure compliance." (emphasis added)

Therefore, in order to mandate joint ownership of transmission facilities in Florida, we must first establish probable cause that the lack of joint transmission ownership constitutes a deficiency in the State's transmission grid and then determine, through evidentiary hearings, that mutual benefits will accrue to the joint owners of the transmission facilities. We do not believe that simply wanting joint transmission ownership constitutes the "probable cause" required by the Florida statutes.

Joint transmission ownership is not necessarily a prerequisite to coordinated transmission planning. The planning, development, and operation of the transmission grid in Florida is currently coordinated through existing guidelines and procedures established by the Florida Electric Power Coordinating Group (FCG). Through the FCG organization, of which FMPA, SEC, and AEC are members, Florida's electric utilities perform joint transmission studies to determine whether improvements to existing transmission lines and/or additional transmission lines are needed in the State. The FCG also has established operating guidelines and criteria to ensure the efficient and reliable use of the statewide transmission grid. While it is true that, because of its voluntary nature, the FCG does not dictate who will construct and own transmission facilities within the state, once the need for transmission improvements or additions is determined the affected utilities are free to negotiate ownership arrangements.

We are of the opinion that FMPA, SEC, and AEC have not, as yet, demonstrated that mandatory joint transmission ownership is more cost-effective from a statewide perspective than the current system of coordinated planning which takes place in Florida. While the transmission principles they advocate have a certain appeal from an equity standpoint, FMPA, SEC, and AEC have yet to demonstrate that the adoption and implementation of these principles will result in any material benefits to anyone but FMPA, SEC, and AEC. In order to pursue these issues further, we invite FMPA, SEC, and AEC to file an engineering study quantifying and

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 12

allocating the benefits that are likely to be achieved from the practical application of the Transmission Principles they advocate. If the results of such study show that all affected utilities are likely to benefit, then proceedings to adopt and implement their proposal pursuant to our authority under the Grid Bill should be initiated.

ISSUE 5: Does the Commission have the jurisdiction to address the issues of joint transmission planning, access, and allocation raised by SEC, FMPA, and AEC?

The Commission's Grid Bill authority may be used to explore the relative merits of the Transmission Principles advocated by FMPA, SEC, and AEC. However, in order to implement these Transmission Principles we may need to seek approval from the FERC. Recent cases before the FERC indicate that FERC may have exclusive jurisdiction over the issues of transmission access and allocation.

In Docket EL89-40-000, electric utilities operating in the state of Wisconsin petitioned the FERC for a declaratory order determining that an order of the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin exceeded the State agency's jurisdiction. Specifically, the Wisconsin Commission seeks to impose certain Transmission System Use and Cost Sharing Principles on the electric utilities within its statewide jurisdiction. These transmission use and cost sharing principles are not unlike those being advocated in Florida by FMPA, SEC, and AEC. The Florida Commission has intervened in the Wisconsin case and has cautioned FERC about potential intrusions into the State rights to pursue adequate, reliable electrical service at the lowest practical cost. However, the case remains active before FERC and, while no decision has yet been made, FERC's assumption of jurisdiction highlights the Federal/State jurisdictional hurdles that must be faced.

Closer to home, in Docket No. ER90-399-000, FERC has recently approved the transmission interface allocation agreement between Florida Power Corporation (FPC), Florida Power & Light (FPL), the Jacksonville Electric Authority (JEA), and the City of Tallahassee. This agreement provides for the allocation of transmission capability used to import power into the Florida peninsula.

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 13

Seminole and AEC, as well as this Commission, intervened in the FERC docket. In their filing, AEC stated that it is currently exploring interchange arrangements with various utilities in peninsular Florida and requested that FERC approval of the filing be made with the understanding that the Allocation Agreement will not be used to block the proper growth of AEC's system in Florida, to exclude AEC from studies leading to increased transmission coordination in the area, or to block AEC participation in agreements shared by other utilities in the panhandle Florida area. Seminole requested that FERC specifically reject the Allocation Agreement because, among other complaints, the Allocation Agreement fails to explicitly provide for nondiscriminatory access to the intertie for nonowners of transmission interconnection facilities.

On July 30, 1990, the FERC approved the Allocation Agreement between FPC, FPL, JEA, and Tallahassee. The agreement was approved without a hearing and the objections raised by AEC and SEC were summarily dismissed. In its final order, the FERC stated:

"Seminole and Alabama Cooperative argue generally that they will be adversely affected by the Agreement. In Vermont Electric the Commission rejected the claims of intervenors who sought to modify the allocation procedures provided for in the filed agreement. The intervenors argued that different allocations would provide them with greater benefits--primarily greater trade opportunities--than the allocation agreement agreed to by interface owners. The Commission denied these arguments, noting that an outside party has no right to demand how a transmission owner uses its facilities. In this regard, pursuant to our decision in Vermont Electric, we find that the argument of Seminole and Alabama Cooperative similarly lack merit."

Thus, the extent of our jurisdiction to address the issues of joint transmission planning, access, and allocation raised by SEC, FMPA, and AEC is not clear. FERC also has jurisdiction over issues relating to the use of transmission which affects interstate commerce and may have exclusive jurisdiction over transmission access and allocation. While we may wish to explore the relative merits of the SEC/FMPA/AEC proposal pursuant to our authority under the Grid Bill, implementation may require FERC approval.

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 14

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that Florida Power Corporation and Florida Power & Light Company provide a status report to this Commission on or before March 1, 1991, regarding the development of a 500 KV transmission line(s) from the Southern Company to Central Florida and from Kathleen to Orange River. It is further

ORDERED that this docket shall remain open pending further action or the timely filing of a Petition for Transmission Line Siting and Certification of Need.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission, this
20th day of DECEMBER, 1990.



STEVE TRIBBLE Director
Division of Records and Reporting

(S E A L)

MAP:bmi
890799Z.bmi

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.59(4), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 15

Any party adversely affected by the Commission's final action in this matter may request: 1) reconsideration of the decision by filing a motion for reconsideration with the Director, Division of Records and Reporting within fifteen (15) days of the issuance of this order in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code; or 2) judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility or the First District Court of Appeal in the case of a water or sewer utility by filing a notice of appeal with the Director, Division of Records and Reporting and filing a copy of the notice of appeal and the filing fee with the appropriate court. This filing must be completed within thirty (30) days after the issuance of this order, pursuant to Rule 9.110, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure. The notice of appeal must be in the form specified in Rule 9.900 (a), Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.

ORDER NO.23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 16

ATTACHMENT 1

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 17

TABLE 1
COMMITTED FIRM POWER PURCHASES

PENINSULAR FLORIDA EXCLUDING TALLAHASSEE	(1) Total Import Capability (MW)	(2) - (3) Southern UPS (MW)		(4) Scherer (MW)	(5) Cogen (MW)	(6) SEPA (MW)	(7) Available Import Capability (MW)
		Firm	Early Option				
'91 Jan - May	3,200	2,480	0	300	11	5	404
Jun - Dec	3,200	2,476	0	300	11	5	408
'92 Jan - May	3,200	2,474	0	300	11	5	410
Jun - Dec	3,200	2,483	0	300	11	5	401
'93 Jan - May	3,200	2,058	0	300	11	5	826
Jun - Dec	3,200	1,805	0	566	11	5	813
'94 Jan - May	3,200	1,804	0	566	11	5	814
Jun - Dec	3,200	1,418	0	706	11	5	1,060
'95 Jan - May	3,200	1,617	0	706	11	5	861
Jun - Dec	3,200	1,513	0	846	11	5	825
'96 Jan-May 2010	3,200	1,513	0	846	11	5	825
2010 Jun and on	3,200	0	0	846	11	5	2,338

NOTES AND SOURCES:

Column (1): Tr. 30, 85, 140, 226, and 355
 Column (2): Ex. #6 and Lfx #'s 15, 18, and 21
 Column (3): Tr. 206, 234-235, and 349-352
 Column (4): Ex. #12
 Column (5): Tr. 141
 Column (6): Tr. 141
 Column (7) = Column (1) - Columns (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6)

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 18

TABLE 2
COMMITTED FIRM POWER PURCHASES

FLORIDA POWER CORPORATION	(1) Allocation of Import Capability (MW)	(2) Southern UPS (MW)		(3) Bay County (MW)	(4) SEPA (MW)	(5) Available Allocation (MW)
		Firm	Early Option			
'91 Jan - May	416	0	0	11	5	400
Jun - Dec	416	0	0	11	5	400
'92 Jan - May	416	0	0	11	5	400
Jun - Dec	416	0	0	11	5	400
'93 Jan - May	416	0	0	11	5	400
Jun - Dec	416	0	0	11	5	400
'94 Jan - May	416	200	0	11	5	200
Jun - Dec	416	200	0	11	5	200
'95 Jan - May	416	400	0	11	5	0
Jun - Dec	416	400	0	11	5	0
'96 Jan-May 2010	416	400	0	11	5	0
2010 Jun and on	416	0	0	11	5	400

NOTES AND SOURCES:

Column (1): Tr. 140

Column (2): Ex. #6

Column (3): Tr. 206

Column (4): Tr. 141

Column (5): Tr. 141

Column (6) = Column (1) - Columns (2), (3), (4), and (5)

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 19

TABLE 3
COMMITTED FIRM POWER PURCHASES

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY	(1)	(2)	(3)		(4)	(5)	(6)
	Allocation of Import Capability (MW)		Southern UPS (MW)		Scherer (MW)	Available Allocation (MW)	
	FPL	From JEA	Firm	Early Option			
'91 Jan - May	1,492	876	2,216	0	150	2	
Jun - Dec	1,492	876	2,212	0	150	6	
'92 Jan - May	1,492	876	2,210	0	150	8	
Jun - Dec	1,492	876	2,219	0	150	-1	
'93 Jan - May	1,492	500	1,850	0	150	-8	
Jun - Dec	1,492	334	1,405	0	416	5	
'94 Jan - May	1,492	334	1,404	0	416	6	
Jun - Dec	1,492	69	1,006	0	556	-1	
'95 Jan - May	1,492	69	1,005	0	556	0	
Jun - Dec	1,492	54	913	0	646	-13	
'96 Jan-May 2010	1,492	54	913	0	646	-13	
2010 Jun and on	1,492	0	0	0	646	846	

NOTES AND SOURCES:

Columns (1) and (2): Lfx #21

Column (3): Lfx #'s 15 and 18

Column (4): Tr. 234-235

Column (5): Ex. #12

Column (6) = Column (1) + Column (2) - Columns (3), (4), and (5)

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 20

TABLE 4
COMMITTED FIRM POWER PURCHASES

JACKSONVILLE ELECTRIC AUTHORITY	(1)	(2)	(3)		(4)	(5)	(6)
	Allocation of Import Capability (MW)		Southern UPS (MW)			Scherer (MW)	Available Allocation (MW)
	JEA	To FPL	Firm	Early Option			
'91 Jan - May	1,292	876	264	0	150	2	
Jun - Dec	1,292	876	264	0	150	2	
'92 Jan - May	1,292	876	264	0	150	2	
Jun - Dec	1,292	876	264	0	150	2	
'93 Jan - May	1,292	500	208	0	150	434	
Jun - Dec	1,292	334	200	0	150	608	
'94 Jan - May	1,292	334	200	0	150	608	
Jun - Dec	1,292	69	212	0	150	861	
'95 Jan - May	1,292	69	212	0	150	861	
Jun - Dec	1,292	54	200	0	200	938	
'96 Jan-May 2010	1,292	54	200	0	200	838	
2010 Jun and on	1,292	0	0	0	200	1,092	

NOTES AND SOURCES:

Columns (1), (2), and (3): Lfx. #21

Column (4): Tr. 349-352

Column (5): Ex. #12

Column (6) = Column (1) + Column (2) - Columns (3), (4), and (5)

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 21

TABLE 5(a)
UNCOMMITTED FIRM POWER PURCHASES
SOUTHERN COMPANY UPS
EARLY PURCHASE OPTIONS

PENINSULAR FLORIDA EXCLUDING TALLAHASSEE	(1) (2) (3) Early Purchase Options (MW)			(2) (3) Scherer (MW)		(4) Net Early Purchase Options (MW)		(7) Total Net Early Purchase Options (MW)
	FPC	FPL	JEA	FPL	JEA	FPL	JEA	
'91 Jan - May	0	0	0	150	150	0	0	0
Jun - Dec	0	0	0	150	150	0	0	0
'92 Jan - May	0	0	0	150	150	0	0	0
Jun - Dec	0	0	0	150	150	0	0	0
'93 Jan - May	400	900	200	150	150	750	50	1,200
Jun - Dec	400	600	125	416	150	184	0	584
'94 Jan - May	200	600	125	416	150	184	0	384
Jun - Dec	200	450	50	556	150	0	0	200
'95 Jan - May	0	450	50	556	150	0	0	0
Jun - Dec	0	0	0	646	150	0	0	0

NOTES AND SOURCES:

Column (1): Ex. #6, Tr. 206

Column (2): Ex. #6, Tr. 234-235

Column (3): Ex. #6, Tr. 349-352

Column (4) and (5): Ex. #12, Tr. 352

Column (6): Absolute value of Column (2) - Column (4), Lfx. #18, Tr. 349-352

Column (7): Absolute value of Column (3) - Column (5), Lfx. #18, Tr. 349-352

Column (8) = Column (1) + (6) + (7)

ORDER NO. 23909
DOCKET NO. 890779-EU
PAGE 22

TABLE 5(b)
UNCOMMITTED FIRM POWER PURCHASES
PLANNED AND PROPOSED QUALIFYING FACILITIES (1)

QUALIFYING FACILITY	UTILITY	PROPOSED IN-SERVICE DATE	MEGAWATTS
Power Projects (2)	FPC	N/A	240
LFC Madison (2),(3)	FPC	N/A	25
LFC Monticello (2),(3)	FPC	N/A	25
Panda Energy (2),(4)	FPC	1996	230
Timber Energy (2),(5)	FPC	1994	6
CFR Biogen (2),(6)	FPC	1992	74
Florida Local Government Services (2)	FPC	N/A	26
QF requesting confidentiality (2)	FPC	N/A	40
TOTAL GROSS FOR FPC			666
NET EFFECT ON IMPORT CAPABILITY			666
AES Cedar Bay (7)	FPL	1994	25
Nassau Power Corp. (8)	FPL	1996	435
Telluride Power (9)	FPL	1996	75
Panda Energy (2),(4)	FPL	1996	230
TOTAL GROSS FOR FPL			765
NET EFFECT ON IMPORT CAPABILITY			600
TOTAL STATEWIDE EFFECT ON IMPORT CAPABILITY (4),(10)			*1036

*Excludes double counting of Panda Energy.