Steel Hector & Davis Tallahassee, Florida

Bonnie E. Davis (904) 222-2300



October 24, 1990

Mr. Steve Tribble Director of Records and Recording Florida Public Service Commission 101 East Gaines Street Tallahassee, Florida 32301

RE4 Docket No. 900004-EU

Dear Mr. Tribble:

Enclosed are the original and 15 copies of Florida Power & Light Company's Statement of Issues and Positions in Docket No. 900004-EU. In addition to serving FPL's Statement of Issues and Positions on all parties of record, we have delivered to Michael A. Palecki, Esq., at the Division of Legal Services, a disk containing our statement of issues and positions as discussed at the prehearing conference.

ACA
AFA
APP
COF
CMUBED:do
CTR Enclosures
EAD co+ All Parties of Record
TEG 1
LIN 6
OPC
RCH
SEC _/
WAS

Very truly yours,

Boine 2. Danie

Bonnie E. Davis

DOCUMENT NEWSON DAY

e, FL 32301 - 1804 SK (904) 222-8410

4000 Southeast Financial Center Miami, FL 33131 - 2398 (305) 577 - 2600 Fax: (305) 358-1418

515 North Plagler Drive 1200 Northbridge Centre 1 West Pelm Beach, FL 33401 - 4307 (407) 650-7200 Fax: (407) 655-1509

440 Royal Palm Way Palm Beach, FL 33480 (407) 650-7200

## BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Planning hearing on load forecasts, generation expansion plans, and cogeneration prices for Peninsular Florida's electric utilities

Docket No. 900004-EU

Filed: Oct. 24, 1990

## FPL'S STATEMENT OF ISSUES AND POSITIONS

1. What is the purpose and effect of the subscription limit?

FPL POSITION: The subscription limit was intended to limit the obligation of utilities to purchase QF energy and capacity pursuant to a Standard Offer contract so that no utility would be required to purchase QF power in excess of the utility's individual need for additional power. Adoption of the subscription limit was not intended nor should it be interpreted to fix the need of an individual utility for additional power. The need of an individual utility for additional power must be determined on a case by case basis as individual contracts are considered in the determination of need process. This result is consistent with and required by the Commission's holding in Order No. 22341 as follows:

By this finding, we overrule those previous decisions in which we held that in qualifying facility (QF) need determination cases as long as the negotiated contract price was less than that of the standard offer and fell within the current MW subscription limit both the need for and the cost-effectiveness of the QF power has already been proven. See: In re: Petition of AES Cedar Bay, Inc. and Seminole Kraft Corporation for determination of need for the Cedar Bay Cogeneration Project (AEC), Order No. 21491, issued on June 30, 1989. In so doing we take the position that to the extent that a proposed electric power constructed as a QF is selling its capacity to an electric utility pursuant to a standard offer or negotiated contract, that capacity is meeting the needs of the purchasing utility. As such, that capacity must be evaluated from the purchasing utility's perspective in the need determination proceeding, i.e., a finding must be made that the proposed capacity is the most cost-effective means of meeting purchasing utility X's capacity needs in lieu of other demand and supply side alternatives.

> 09531 DCT 24 ISSO PSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

2. What is the effect of queuing contracts for subscription limit purposes?

FPI POSITION: Since a queue for the subscription limit can have no effect on the determination of need process, no purpose is served by establishing one.

3. Which contracts should be considered candidates for filling the current 500 MW subscription limit?

FPL POSITION: Any contract, whether it is a standard offer or negotiated contract, that would, in fact, defer or avoid the need of an individual utility for additional power that is represented in the subscription limit should be a candidate for filling the 500 MW subscription limit.

4. On what basis should the contracts to fill the 500 MW subscription limit be selected?

FPL POSITION: The contracts to fill the subscription limit should be selected from among those eligible on the basis of their relative merits so as to ensure the utility and its ratepayers the best available generating resources. The criteria used to evaluate the relative merits of competing offers to fill the subscription limit should include factors of value to the utility and its ratepayers. The criteria should include such factors as the impact of a proposed QF's location on the bulk power grid, its proximity to load centers, the availability and reliability of the proposed fuel supply, the operational flexibility of the proposed project, the expertise of the proposed project's developers and operators and their ability to finance the project, the status of its development, and the additional value, if any, of negotiated provisions as to a proposed project's operational performance and/or assurances therefore.

5. What is the order of priority of those contracts currently before the Commission?

FPL POSITION: FPL's negotiated contract with ICL should have first order of priority of those contracts currently before the Commission. The ICL project will supply need capacity to FPL and the contract contains several factors that in the aggregate make it the best QF project available to FPL. Those factors include the project's location, close to FPL's load centers; its dispatchability by FPL; the pay-for-performance contract provisions; the reliability of its fuel supply; and several specific, funded, assurances of design, construction, and operation performance.

The ICL contract was executed on May 21, 1990 and the capacity purchased pursuant to it meets FPL's need for additional capacity that was represented in the 500 MW subscription limit.

At the present time there is no basis to establish an order of priority beyond ICL's contract because the information about the entities that have submitted Standard Offer contracts is so incomplete that a final ranking based on their relative merits cannot be performed at this time.

If the Commission decides to rank the contracts it has received notice of on the basis of their execution dates, the Standard Offer contracts received by FPL are incomplete and it should not be presumed they will ultimately be valid. For example, the interconnection agreement proposed by Falcon Seaboard/Nassau Power, Inc. appears to be invalid because, in addition to technical concerns about the proposal, it appears that while the cogeneration facility is to be located in the service territory of Florida Public Utilities Company, Falcon Seaboard proposes a direct interconnection with FPL for both power sales and backup service.

At the present time FPL has not received any complete Standard Offer contracts. FPL has received incomplete Standard Offer contracts from the following entities:

- Falcon Seaboard/Nassau Power, INc. (June 13, 1990 for 435 kW);
- Cypress Energy, Inc./Mission Energy, Inc., Phase I (June 18, 1990 for 180 MW);
- Cypress Energy, Inc./FHN/Mission Energy, Inc., Phase II (June 19, 1990 for 180 MW);
- Mockingbird Energy, Inc. (July 25, 1990 for 220 MW;
- 5. Telluride Power Partners, Inc. (August 24, 1990 for 75 MW)

Because FPL believes there may be questions concerning the validity of the Standard Offer contracts it has received, an opportunity to prove and contest the validity of the contracts should be provided before they are ranked in any order of priority.

Respectfully submitted,

STEEL HECTOR & DAVIS
215 South Monroe Street
Suite 601
Tallahassee, Florida 32301-1804
Attorneys for Florida Power
& Light Company

Bonnie E. Davis

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE DOCKET NO. 900004-EU

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of Florida Power & Light Company's Statement of Issues and Positions has been furnished to the following individuals by Hand Delivery or U. S. Mail on this 24th day of October, 1990.

Michael A. Palecki, Esq. Division of Legal Services Florida Public Service Commission 101 East Gaines Street Tallahassee, FL 32301

Vicki Gordon Kaufman, Esq. 522 East Park Ave Suite 200 Tallahassee, FL 32301

Paul Sexton, Esq. Richard Zambo, P.A. 211 S. Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301

Edison Holland, Jr., Esq. Beggs and Lane P. O. Box 12950 Pensacola, FL 32576

Richard D. Melson, Esq. Hopping, Boyd, Green & Sams P. O. Box 6526 Tallahassee, FL 32314

Jack Shreve, Esq.
Office of Public Counsel
111 W. Madison Street
Room 812
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Fla. Keys Electric Coop. E. M. Grant P. O. Box 377 Tavernier, FL 33070

Edward C. Tannen, Esq. 1300 City Hall Jacksonville, FL 32202 Lee L. Willis, Esq.
James D. Beasley, Esq.
Ausley, McMullen, McGehee
Carothers and Proctor
P. O. Box 391
Tallahassee, FL 32302

James Stanfield, Esq. P. O. Box 14042 St. Petersburg, FL 33733

Frederick M. Bryant, Esq. Moore, Williams & Bryant P. O. Box 1169 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Gainesville Regional Ann Carlin, Esq. P. O. Box 490,St. 52 Gainesville, FL 32602

Ray Maxwell Reedy Creek Utilities Co. P. O. Box 40 Lake Buena Vista, FL 32830

Terry Cole, Esq. Suzanne Brownless, Esq. 2700 Blairstone Road Suite C Tallahassee, FL 32301

Roy Young, Esq. Young, Van Assender, P. O. Box 1833 Tallahassee, FL 32302-1833

Fla. Rural Electric Coop. Yvonne Gsteiger P. O. Box 590 Tallahassee, FL 32302 City of Chattahoochee Attn: Superintendent 115 Lincoln Drive Chattahoochee, FL 32324

Quincy Municipal Electric P. O. Box 941 Quincy, FL 32351

Barney L. Capehart 601 N.W. 35th Way Gainesville, FL 32605

Cogeneration Program Manager Governor's Energy Office 301 Bryant Building Tallahassee, FL 32301

John Blackburn P. O. Box 405 Maitland, FL 32751

E. J. Patterson Fla. Public Utilities Co. P. O. Drawer C West Palm Beach, FL 33402 Gene Tipps Seminole Electric Coop. P. O. Box 272000 Tampa, FL 33688-2000

Guyte P. McCord, III P. O. Box 82 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Lawson Law Firm P. O. Box 3350 Tampa, FL 33601

C. M. Naeve, Esq. Shaheda Sultan, Esq. Skadden, Arps, Slate Meagher & Flom 1440 New York Ave. N.W. Washington, D. C. 20005

Bonnie F Davis