MCWHIRTER REEVES

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

TAMPA OFFICE: 400 N. TAMPA STREET, SUITE 2450 TAMPA, FLORIDA 13602 P.O. BOX 3350, TAMPA, FL 33601-3350 (812) 224-0806 (813) 221-1854 FAX

PLEASE REPLY TO: TALLAHASSEE TALESIASSEE OFFICE: 117 SOLTH GADSDES TALE OFFICE PLOTIES 12:101 ARAO 222-2525 2:18:50-222-2500 FAX

JAYICINAL

September 30, 1998

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Blanca S. Bayo, Director Florida Public Service Commission Division of Records and Reporting Gunter Building 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0870

Re: Docket No. 980693-EI

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Enclosed for filing and distribution are the original and fifteen copies of the Florida Industrial Power Users Group's Post-Hearing Statement in the above docket. I have also enclosed a disk containing the document in WordPerfect 5.1 format.

Please acknowledge receipt of the above on the extra copy enclosed herein and return it to me. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

C

.W.

Di

Ulli Gordon Layman

Vicki Gordon Kaufman

VGK/pw Encls.

V. D. S. FILED

hour

READ OF RECORDS

McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin, Davidson, Decker, Kaufman, Arnold & Steen PA 30 8

114 1

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

•	'	G.	
		11	
			91

13

In re: Petition by Tampa Electric Company)	
for Approval of Cost Recovery for a New)	Docket No. 980693-E1
Environmental Program, the Big Bend Units)	
1 and 2 Flue Gas Desulfurization System.)	Filed: September 30, 1998
	4	83

THE FLORIDA INDUSTRIAL POWER USERS GROUP'S POST-HEARING STATEMENT OF ISSUES AND POSITIONS

Pursuant to rule 25-22.056(3)(a), Florida Administrative Code, the Florida Industrial Power Users Group (FIPUG) files its Post-Hearing Statement of Issues and Positions. In addition to this Post-Hearing Statement, FIPUG will file a post-hearing brief, in which the positions set forth herein are developed and supported more fully. FIPUG has included in this Statement (and in its Post-Hearing Brief) discussion only of those issues on which FIPUG has a position and which were not disposed of by stipulation.

Summary of FIPUG's Position

Neither the law TECo seeks to invoke, which says, "... costs recovered in base rates may not also be recovered in the environmental cost recovery clause" i. good judgment would permit a utility to surcharge its customers to pay for a plant addition when the utility's revenue from base rates exceeds the return approved by the Commission. TECo's case is mortally flawed because it failed to submit any proof that when cost recovery commences base rates will be inadequate to cover the cost of the project.

ISSUES

Issue 1: Has Tampa Electric Company (TECo) adequately explored alternatives to the construction of a Flue Gas Desulfurization (FGD) system on Big Bend Units 1 and 2?

W. L. Ku

- No. TECo's filing came after construction of the project began. The filing omits information required by law and gives insufficient time for the Commission to give meaningful consideration to any alternatives other than those TECo promoted.
- Is the fuel price forecast used by TECo in its selection of a CAAA Phase II Compliance plan reasonable?
- * No. The cost savings between the high sulphur tuel TECo will burn and alternative fuels must be large enough to offset operating inefficiency and capital costs. TECo supplied no independent fuel forecasts, omitted the cost of other environmental standards and failed to disclose the operating experience of Big Bend 3 and 4's FGD.
- Issue 3: Are the economic and financial assumptions used by TECo in its selection of a CAAA Phase II Compliance plan reasonable?
- No. The financial assumptions TECo used for the FGD are higher than prudence would allow. The comparative cost for the natural gas alternative was even higher. The information supplied on the fuel switching alternative previously chosen and used by other utilities was inadequate.
- Issue 4: Did TECo reasonably consider the environmental compliance costs for all regulated air, water and land pollutants in ...s selection of the proposed FGD system on Big Bend Units 1 and 2 for sulfur dioxide (SO₂) compliance purposes?
- * No. TECo omitted a detailed Nox removal plan and other major environmental costs from its filing.*
- Issue 5: Has TECo demonstrated that its proposed FGD system on Big Bend Units 1 and 2 for SO₂ compliance purposes is the most cost-effective alternative available?
- * No. FGD construction is currently in progress. Other expensive environmental issues are not addressed as required by §388.825, Florida Statutes. It is too late for the Commission to second guess the utility's decision on even this single compliance issue in time to meet the compliance deadline. *
- Issue 6: Should the Commission approve TECo's request to accrue allowance for funds used during construction (AFUDC) for the proposed FGD system on Big Bend Units 1 and 2?

- No. Rule 25-6.0141 doesn't allow it. Further, prudency dictates review of the possibility of low cost bond financing, use of overearnings collected from customers, or CWIP allowed in the last rate case in lieu of AFUDC. The AFUDC determination should be considered in the deferred portion of this docket.
- Issue 7: Should TECo's petition for cost recovery of a FGD system on Big Bend Units 1 and 2 through the Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) be granted?
- * No. Base rates are sufficient to cover the carrying cost of TECo's selected compliance plan. The surcharge will not apply to economy wholesale sales and will give TECo an advantage over other Florida utilities in the competitive wholesale market at the expense of TECo's retail customers.*
- Issue 8: Should this docket be closed?
- Yes. TECo's petitic 1 should be denied and this docket should be closed.

John W. McWhirter, Jr.

McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin, Davidson, Decker, Kaufman, Arnold & Steen, P.A. 100 North Tampa Street, Suite 2800 Post Office Box 3350

Tampa, Florida 33601-3350

Joseph A. McGlothlin
Vicki Gordon Kaufman
McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin, Davidson,
Decker, Kaufman, Arnold & Steen, P.A.
117 South Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Attorneys for the Florida Industrial Power Users Group

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of FIPUG's foregoing Post-Hearing Statement was furnished by hand delivery (*) or U.S. Mail to the following this 30th day of September, 1998:

Grace A. Jaye*
Florida Public Service Commission
Division of Legal Services
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Gerald L. Gunter Building, Room 390Q
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

John Roger Howe Office of Public Counsel c/o The Florida Legislature 111 West Madison Street, Room 812 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400

Gail Kamaras, Director Energy Advocacy Program Legal Environmental Assistance Foundation 1114-E Thomasville Road Tallahassee, Florida 32303-6290

Lee L. Willis James Beasley Ausley & McMullen 227 South Calhoun Street (32301) Post Office Box 391 Tallahassee, Florida 32302

Harry W. Long, Jr. TECo Energy, Inc. Post Office Box 111 Tampa, Florida 33601-0111

Wicki Gordon Kaufman