Steel Hector & Davis

Tallahassee, Florida

Charles A. Guyton (904) 222 - 3423

January 9, 1990



Mr. Steve Tribble
Division of Records and Reporting
Florida Public Service Commission
101 East Gaines Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301

RE: Docket No. 890148-EI

Dear Mr. Tribble:

Enclosed for filing is the original and fifteen (15) copies of Florida Power & Light Company's Response to FIPUG's Cross-Motion for Reconsideration in Docket No. 890148-EI.

ACK		Very truly yours,
AFA		
APP		Charles A Guyton
CAF		Charles A. Guyton
CMU CAGA		
CTR Enclosures	5	
EAG CC.	Counsel for all	parties of record
LIN G		4) :-
OPC		
RCH		
SEC	- 3	red Beraki 75 F
WAS	RECEIVED & FILE	α
STH	S &	
	700	E PECORDS

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

Talishasee Office 215 South Monroe Suite 601 Talishasee, FL 32301 - 1804 (904) 222 - 2300 Fax: (804) 222 - 5410

Marri, FL 33131 - 2398 (305) 577 - 2800 Fex: (305) 356 - 1418 515 North Flagler Drive 1200 Northbridge Cartre 1 West Palm Busch, FL 39401 - 4307 (309 65: "300 Fer: (305) = 15 - 1509 440 Ruyal Palm Way Palm Beach, RL 3048 (308) 650-7200 1200 North Federal Highwa Suite 409 Boos Raton, FL 33432 (505) 384-50C0 Fac: (505) 384-4856

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition of the Florida
Industrial Power Users Group to
Discontinue Florida Power & Light
Company's Oil Backout Cost
Recovery Factor

Docket No. 890148-EI

Filed: 1-09-90

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO FIPUG'S CROSS-MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Pursuant to Florida Administrative Code Rules 25-22.060(3)(c) and 25-22.028(4), Florida Power & Light Company ("FPL") responds to FIPUG's Cross-Motion for Reconsideration in this proceeding:

- 1. FIPUG's Cross-Motion for Reconsideration fails to satisfy the Commission's standard for reconsideration. It does not present a mistake, oversight or misapprehension of fact or law that would justify changing the original decision.
- 2. Both aspects of Order No. 22268 for which FIPUG seeks reconsideration were exhaustively litigated before the Commission. FIPUG's arguments for reconsideration are nothing more than restatements of the arguments it raised at trial; they were properly rejected then on the weight of the evidence and cannot form the basis for reconsideration.
- 3. FIPUG's arguments to reconsider the decision not to refund accelerated depreciation because FPL used the original

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

00214 JAN-9 1990

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

cost estimates and in-service dates for the Martin units were fully litigated. The preponderance of the evidence supported FPL's position on this issue See FPL's Posthearing Brief at 22-31.

- 4. FIPUG's argument that the Commission improperly shifted the burden of proof on these issues is simply wrong. First, it is clear that the Commission weighed the conflicting evidence on these issues and found FPL's position more convincing. Second, while FPL had the burden of proof in the original cost recovery proceedings to justify its Martin cost estimates, in this proceeding FIPUG was the petitioner collaterally attacking prior Commission decisions. As the party presenting the affirmative position, FIPUG always had the ultimate burden of persuasion in this proceeding. Order No. 22268 properly concludes that FIPUG failed to carry its burden.
- 5. FIPUG's arguments regarding the recovery of UPS capacity payments through the Oil Backout Cost Recovery Factor were also completely aired at the hearing and in posthearing filings. The evidence in the case supports the Commission's decision to continue the recovery of UPS capacity payments through the Factor. See FPL's Posthearing Statement of Issues and Positions, Issue 5, pp.7-9. Moreover, the recovery of UPS capacity payments through the Factor is not inconsistent with Rule. Oil Backout Id. Finally, in light the Commission's decision in FPL's last rate case to refuse FPL's

request to recover these costs through base rates, it would be manifestly unfair to FPL to discontinue the Oil Backout recovery of these costs when FPL's base rates are clearly not designed to recover these costs.

FIPUG's Cross-Motion stands in stark contrast to FPL's Motion. Unlike FIPUG'S Cross-Motion, FPL's Motion Reconsideration clearly demonstrates that the Commission made a mistake in construing the stipulation between FPL and FIPUG as giving it authority to order a refund of FPL's Oil-Backout return equity for prior periods. Unlike FIPUG's on Cross-Motion, FPL's Motion demonstrates that a refund of an Oil-Backout equity return for prior periods was never raised as FIPUG's issue in the proceeding. Cross-Motion for an Reconsideration should be denied, FPL's Motion for and Reconsideration should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

STEEL HECTOR & DAVIS 215 S. Monroe Street Suite 601 Tallahassee, Florida 32301 (904) 222-2300

Attorneys for Florida Power & Light Company

: Kalls A Surface Charles A. Guyton

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition of the Florida)
Industrial Power Users Group)
to Discontinue Florida Power)
& Light Company's Oil Backout)
Cost Recovery Factor)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 9th day of January, 1990, a true and correct copy of Florida Power & Light Company's Response to FIPUG's Cross-Motion for Reconsideration in Docket No. 890148-EI was served by hand delivery* and by U. S. Mail** on the persons listed below.

Joseph A. McGlothlin, Esq. *
Lawson, McWhirter, Grandoff
& Reeves
522 East Park Avenue
Suite 200
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Gail P. Fels, Esq. **
Assistant County Attorney
Metro-Dade County
111 N.W. First Street
Suite 2810
Miami, Florida 33128-1993

Marsha Rule, Esq. *
Division of Legal Services
Florida Public Service Commission
101 E. Gaines Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399

John Roger Howe, Esq. *
Office of the Public Counsel
111 West Madison Street
Room 801
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Charles A Luyton