

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

VOTE SHEET

DATE: November 2, 1990

RE: DOCKET NO. 900004-EU - Planning Hearings on Load Forecasts, Generation Expansion Plans and Cogeneration Pricing for Peninsula Florida's Electric Utilities.

Issue 1: What is the purpose and effect of the subscription limit?
Recommendation: The purpose and effect of the subscription limit is to place a maximum limit of 500 MW on the amount of capacity Florida's investor owned utilities are required to purchase pursuant to standard offer contracts.

APPROVED

Issue 2: What is the effect of queuing contracts for subscription limit purposes?
Recommendation: The effect of queuing contracts for subscription limit purposes is to lock in a price pending further review in a contract approval and need determination proceeding as to whether the proposed project is the most cost-effective alternative to the purchasing utility. The placement of a contract in the que does not create a presumption of need.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED: Full Commission

COMMISSIONERS' VOTES

<u>APPROVED</u>	<u>APPROVED WITH MODIFICATIONS</u>	<u>DISAPPROVED</u>	<u>DEFER</u>
<i>J. J. [Signature]</i>			
<i>[Signature]</i>			
<i>[Signature]</i>			
<i>Betty Casley</i>			

REMARKS/DISSENTING COMMENTS:

TO:

PSC/RAR33 (5/90)

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

09846 NOV-2 1990

PSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

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

Recommendation: As a matter of law the 1996 500 MW statewide avoided unit was not designated at the time the Indiantown Cogeneration L.P. (ICL) contract was executed. The ICL project was not negotiated against the 1996 statewide avoided unit and therefore should not be considered a candidate for filling the 500 MW subscription limit as a matter of law. The Commission stated its intentions regarding the applicability of contracts applying to the subscription limit at the May 25, 1990 agenda conference. It was made quite clear that the use of the 1996 500 MW subscription limit would apply to contracts on a prospective basis from the day of the Commission vote.

APPROVED

Issue 4: On what basis should the contracts to fill the 500 MW subscription limit be selected (merits, execution date, or other basis)?

Recommendation: Contracts should be selected based on their execution date.

APPROVED

Commissioner Beard dissented

Issue 5: What is the order of priority of these contracts currently before the Commission.

Recommendation: Based on the staff's position in Issues Nos. 3 and 4, the priority of the contracts before the Commission should be as follows:

- 1) Nassau Power Corporation (435 MW)
- 2) Cypress I (180 MW)
- 3) Cypress II (180 MW)
- 4) Panda Energy (230 MW)
- 5) Mockingbird Energy (220 MW)
- 6) Indeck Lakeland (185 MW)
- 7) Indeck Frostproof (185 MW)
- 8) Telluride I (75 MW)
- 9) Telluride II (75 MW)

Since the subscription limit would be exceeded by 115 MW if both Nassau and Cypress I contracts are allowed. The Commission should limit the queue to Nassau Power Corporation's 435 MW and allow the remaining 65MW to go to the Cypress I project.

APPROVED

Commissioner Beard dissented.