

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Joint Petition for Determination)
of Need for an Electrical Power Plant)
in Volusia County by the Utilities)
Commission, City of New Smyrna Beach,)
Florida, and Duke Energy New Smyrna)
Beach Power Company, Ltd., L.L.P.)
_____)

Docket No. 981042-EM

Filed: December 21, 1998

ORIGINAL

LEAF POST-HEARING STATEMENT

The Legal Environmental Assistance Foundation, Inc. (LEAF) files its Post-Hearing Statement pursuant to Order No. PSC-98-1183-PCO-EM and Order No. PSC-98-1221-PCO-EM.

Appearances:

Gail Kamaras/Debra Swim, 1114 Thomasville Road, Suite E, Tallahassee, FL 32303

On behalf of LEAF

Statement of Basic Position

UCNSB has committed to implement a 150 kW solar generation green pricing program as part of the project. The proposed power plant is a cleaner, more efficient alternative than most existing generation dispatched into the grid. LEAF support the project to the extent that it increases the use of clean renewable energy resources in Florida and provides more environmental benefits than existing supply resources.

ACK _____

AFA 4 Factual Issues

APP _____
CAF _____ Issue 1:

Is there a need for the proposed power plant, taking into account the need for electric system reliability and integrity, as this criterion is used in Section 403.519, Florida Statutes?

CMU _____

CTR _____

EAG 4 _____

LEAF: Yes. Florida needs some levels of additional electric power supply and cleaner, efficient supplies should be preferred over other supplies.

LEG 2 _____

LIN 5 Issue 2:

Does Duke New Smyrna have an agreement in place with the Utilities Commission, New Smyrna Beach ("UCNSB") and, if so, do its terms meet the UCNSB's needs in accordance with the statute?

OPC _____

RCH _____

SEC 1 _____

WAS _____

OTU _____

DOCUMENT FILED DATE

14338 DEC 21 98

001742

LEAF: No position.

Issue 3: Does the Commission have sufficient information to assess the need for the proposed power plant under the criteria set forth in Section 403.519, Fla. Statutes?

LEAF: Yes.

Issue 4: Does Duke New Smyrna have a need by 2001 for the 484 MW of capacity (476 MW summer and 548 MW winter less 30 MW) represented by the proposed facility?

LEAF: Yes.

Issue 5: Can or should the capacity of the proposed project be properly included when calculating the reserve margin of an individual Florida utility or the state as a whole?

LEAF: Yes. The capacity should be included at least in calculating peninsular or statewide reserve.

Issue 6: What transmission improvements and other facilities are required in conjunction with the construction of the proposed facility, and were their costs adequately considered?

LEAF: No position.

Issue 7: Is there a need for the proposed power plant, taking into account the need for adequate electricity at a reasonable cost, as this criterion is used in Section 403.519, Florida Statutes?

LEAF: Yes.

Issue 8: Is the proposed power plant the most cost-effective alternative available, as this criterion is used in Section 403.519?

LEAF: Yes. It is a cost-effective supply alternative.

Issue 9: Has Duke New Smyrna provided adequate assurances regarding available primary and secondary fuel to serve the proposed power plant on a long and short-term basis?

LEAF: No position.

Issue 10: What impact, if any, will the proposed power plant have on natural gas

supply or transportation resources on State regulated power producers?

LEAF: No position.

Issue 11: Will the proposed project result in the uneconomic duplication of transmission and generation facilities?

LEAF: No position.

Issue 12: Is the identified need for power of the Utilities Commission, New Smyrna Beach ("UCNSB") which is set forth in the Joint Petition met by the power plant proposed by Florida Municipal Power Association in Docket No. 980802-EM?

LEAF: No position.

Issue 13: Are there any conservation measures taken by or reasonably available to the petitioners which might mitigate the need for the proposed power plant?

LEAF: No. LEAF recognizes the primarily wholesale nature of the project and agrees that Petitioners' conservation obligations are limited. Also, to the extent that UCNSB is committed to add 150 kW of solar generation, the project meets the goals of state conservation policies.

Legal issues

Issue 14: Does the Florida Public Service Commission have the statutory authority to render a determination of need under Section 403.519, Florida Statutes, for a project that consists in whole or in part of a merchant plant (i.e., a plant that does not have as to the merchant component of the project an agreement in place for the sale of firm capacity and energy to a utility for resale to retail customers in Florida)?

LEAF: Yes, the Commission has authority to render a determination.

Issue 15: Does the Public Service Commission have jurisdiction under the Power Plant Siting Act, Sections 403.501-403.518, and Section 403.519, Florida Statutes, to determine "applicant" status?

LEAF: Yes.

Issue 16: As to its project's merchant capacity, does Duke New Smyrna have a statutory or other legally enforceable obligation to meet the need of any electric utility in Peninsular Florida for additional generating capacity?

LEAF: No position.

Issue 17: As to the project's merchant capacity, is either Duke New Smyrna or UCNSB an "applicant" or "electric utility" within the meaning of the Siting Act and Section 403.519, Florida Statutes?

LEAF: Yes.

Issue 18: If the Commission were to grant an affirmative determination of need to Duke New Smyrna as herein requested, when the utilities in peninsular Florida had plans in place to meet reliability criteria, would the Commission be meeting its responsibility to avoid uneconomic duplication of facilities?

LEAF: Yes.

Issue 19: Does the Joint Petition meet the pleading requirements of Rule 25-22.081, Florida Administrative Code?

LEAF: No position.

Issue 20: Does the Joint Petition state a cause of action by not alleging that the proposed power plant meets the statutory need criteria and instead alleging that the proposed power plant is "consistent with" Peninsular Florida's need for power?

LEAF: No position.

Issue 21: If the Commission were to permit Duke New Smyrna to demonstrate need on a "Peninsular Florida" basis and not require Duke New Smyrna to have a contract with purchasing utilities for its merchant plant capacity, would the more demanding requirements on Qfs, other non-utility generators and electric utilities afford Duke New Smyrna special status?

LEAF: No position.

Policy issues

Issue 22: If Duke New Smyrna premises its determination of need upon Peninsular Florida without contracts from individual purchasing utilities, how would the Commission's affirmative determination of need affect subsequent determinations of need by utilities petitioning to meet their own need?

LEAF: No position.

Issue 23: Stipulated

Issue 24: Will granting a determination of need as herein requested create a risk that past and future investments made to provide service may not be recovered and thereby increase the overall cost of providing electric service and/or future service reliability?

LEAF: No. This issue is inappropriate, especially as to alleged non-recovery of investments not yet made.

Issue 25: If Duke New Smyrna premises its determination of need upon Peninsular Florida without contracts from individual purchasing utilities, how would the Commission's affirmative determination of need affect subsequent determinations of need by Qfs and other non-utility generators petitioning to meet utility specific needs?

LEAF: No position.

Issue 26: If the Commission abandons its interpretation that the statutory need criteria are "utility and unit specific" how will the commission ensure the maintenance of grid reliability and avoid uneconomic duplication of facilities in need determination proceedings?

LEAF: No position.

Issue 27: Will granting a determination of need as herein requested result in electric utilities being authorized to similarly establish need for additional generating capacity by reference to potential additional capacity needs which the electric utility has no statutory or contractual obligation to serve?

LEAF: No position.

Issue 28: What effect, if any, would granting a determination of need as herein requested have on the level of reasonably achievable cost-effective conservation measures in Florida?

LEAF: None. As noted above, the wholesale nature of the project and the solar generation commitment by UCNSB satisfy this concern.

Issue 29: Would granting the determination of need requested by the joint petitioners be consistent with the public interest and the best interests of electric customers in Florida?

LEAF: Yes.

Issue 30: Would granting the determination of need requested by the joint petitioners be consistent with the State's need for a robust competitive wholesale power supply market?

LEAF: Yes.

Issue 31: Would granting the determination of need requested by the joint petitioners be consistent with state and federal energy policy?

LEAF: Yes.

Issue 32: Based on the resolution of the foregoing issues, should the petition of UCNSB and Duke New Smyrna for determination of need for the New Smyrna Beach Power Project be granted?

LEAF: Yes.

Issue 33: Should this docket be closed?

LEAF: Yes.

Respectfully submitted:



Gail Kamaras, Esq.
Legal Environmental Assistance Fdn.
1114 Thomasville Road, Suite E
Tallahassee, FL 32303-6290
(850) 681-2591
(850) 224-1275 (fax)

001747

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
Docket No. 981042-EM

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the Legal Environmental Assistance Foundation, Inc. (LEAF) Post-Hearing Statement has been served by hand delivery (*) or by US Mail on December 21, 1998 to the following:

Leslie J. Paugh, Esq*.
Grace Jaye, Esq.
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

William Willingham, Esq.
Michelle Hershel, Esq.
FECA
PO Box 590
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Robert Scheffel Wright, Esq.
John LaVia III, Esq.
Landers & Parsons
PO Box 271
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Gary Sasso, Esq.
Carlton Fields
PO Box 2861
St. Petersburg, FL 33733

Ronald L. Vaden, Utilities Director
Utilities Commission
City of New Smyrna Beach
PO Box 100
New Smyrna Beach, FL 32170-0100

Susan D. Ritenour
Asst. Secretary & Asst. Treasurer
Gulf Power Co.
One Energy Place
Pensacola, FL 32520-0780

Kelly J. O'Brien, Manager
Structured Transactions
Duke Energy Power Services LLC
5400 Westheimer Court
Houston, TX 77056


Jeffrey Stone, Esq.
Beggs & Lane
PO Box 12950
Pensacola, FL 32576-2950

Lee Willis, Esq.
James Beasley, Esq.
Macfarlane Ausley
PO Box 391
Tallahassee, FL 32302

Terry L Kammer
John Schantzen
System Council U-4 IBEW
3944 Florida Blvd., Suite 202
Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410

Charles Guyton, Esq.
Steel Hector & Davis
215 S. Monroe St., Suite 601
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Jon Moyle, Jr.
Moyle, Flanigan
210 S. Monroe Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301

By: 
Gail Kamaras

001748