ORIGINAL

Kay Flynn

 From:
 on behalf of Filings@psc.state.fl.us

 To:
 ftaylor@mac-law.com

 Subject:
 RE: Docket No. 020233-El, FIPUG's Response to Applicants' Draft Positions Market Design Issues

This has been received. I am sending a manual acknowledgment in the event you have not yet received the automatic response from the e-mail system.

Kay Flynn PSC 413-6744

-----Original Message-----From: Flora Taylor [mailto:ftaylor@mac-law.com] Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2004 4:20 PM To: Filings@psc.state.fl.us Cc: Vicki Gordon Kaufman; Jennifer Brubaker Subject: Docket No. 020233-EI, FIPUG's Response to Applicants' Draft Positions Market Design Issues

Submitted for electronic filing is FIPUG's Response to Applicants' Draft Positions Market Design Issues in Docket No. 020233-EI. The document has 8 pages.

Signed for Vicki Gordon Kaufman McWhirter Reeves McGlothlin Davidson Kaufman & Arnold, P.A. 117 South Gadsden Street Tallahassee, Florida 32301 (850) 222-2525 (850) 222-5606 (fax)

05570 MAY 13 3 FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Review of GridFlorida Regional Transmission Organization Proposal

÷,

Docket No. 020233-EI Filed: May 13, 2004

Response to Applicants' Draft Positio

FIPUG's Response to Applicants' Draft Positions Market Design Issues

The Florida Industrial Power Users Group (FIPUG) provides its responses to the Issues raised in Staff's memorandum of April 6, 2004, Market Design Issues, and comments on the Applicants' filing.

Issue 1: Market design and congestion management

The Applicants' numerous sub-issues, set out in their Issue Matrix, are illustrative of the many complex issues that must be addressed in attempting to arrive at a workable and appropriate market design. In devising the appropriate market design, the Commission must ensure that all market participants have equal access to the market, so that the market is not skewed to the benefit of those with market power. The ultimate goal of any market design should be to provide lower cost service to retail end users. The market design selected must protect retail consumers from the potential for market manipulation which will result in the assessment of unreasonable charges to end users.

It is currently unclear what pricing mechanism, if any, the Applicants propose. FIPUG supports the "get what you bid" approach previously approved by the Commission.¹ As the Commission noted, the "get what you bid" approach is preferable, at least at this point in time, to protect retail ratepayers.² The Commission said: "[W]e think that the "get what you bid" alternative is preferable for all transactions until the

¹ Order No. PSC-02-1199-PAA-EI.

² Id. at 69.

GridFlorida Companies can demonstrate that sufficient participants exist and that localized market power has been adequately addressed."³ Nothing has changed since the Commission made these pronouncements.

^c FIPUG continues to be concerned with suggestions that a market clearing price should be used. Such a mechanism has the potential to harm retail consumers. It may permit purchasing utilities to flow through high price wholesale purchases to retail customers and provides no incentive for the construction of new capacity. Such perverse incentives are inconsistent the Commission's statutory mandates in section 366.04, Florida Statutes. As FIPUG has previously noted in this docket, until market power is eliminated and all bidders submit market-based bids, the Commission must protect retail customers from higher rates which have the potential to result from the market clearing mechanism.

In addition, FIPUG is opposed to locational marginal pricing (LMP) as it will lead to higher prices for consumers in areas where capacity is constrained. LMP will not be viable until there is a viable wholesale market, including independent power producers, and all participants have equal access to the transmission grid.

Issue 2: Market power monitoring and mitigation

It is critical that strict market power monitoring and mitigation procedures be in place for GridFlorida. FIPUG recommends that the Florida Public Service Commission assume that role. The Commission has the authority to do so pursuant to the Grid Bill. As the Commission noted in Order No. PSC-02-1199-PAA-EI at 72: "... the Grid Bill, provides this Commission with jurisdiction over, among other things, the planning,

2

³ Order No. PSC-02-1199-PAA-EI at 69.

development, and maintenance of a coordinated electric power grid throughout Florida." The role of market monitor enable the Commission to carry out its statutory obligations. To protect retail ratepayers and ensure an adequate transmission grid and power supply to end users, the Commission must be actively involved in market activities. It can best do this in the role of an independent market monitor.

As market monitor, the Commission must ensure that it has the authority and ability to act quickly to correct market abuses. Thus, it must do more than simply "monitor" and report. It must be able to take action to curb any abuses it uncovers.

Issue 3: Resource adequacy

Pursuant to the Grid Bill, the Commission has clear jurisdiction to ensure that capacity and transmission resources are adequate to serve Floridians. The Commission should continue to exercise and enforce this authority.

Issue 4: Treatment of capacity benefit margin

For the reasons discussed in Issue 3, the Commission has authority to establish and evaluate the capacity benefit margin. The Commission should not permit undue reliance of one utility on the resources of another.

Issue 5: Continued review of RTO costs and benefits

At the prior workshop, Applicants presented a proposal by ICF to study the cost and benefits of a Florida RTO. Applicants volunteered to "fund" the study, but when pressed noted that such "funding" would be recovered from ratepayers through GridFlorida's start up costs. No cost for the study was provided but this is information which should be made available before the study goes forward.

3

Substantively, if the study proceeds, it is critical that appropriate assumptions, which reflect conditions in Florida, be used. As just one example, the ICF proposal notes: "All cases will assume rational and competitive markets."⁴ This currently is not the case in Florida and will not be the case until there are major reforms and such reforms have had time to be reflected in the wholesale market (note the inability of independent power producers to build capacity in the state of Florida). Any study that "assumes" these conditions will be biased from the outset and of no value.

As FIPUG noted at the first workshop, it does not appear that any analysis is being done to assess the costs and benefits that the RTO will visit upon <u>retail ratepayers</u>, who will ultimately pay for the RTO's start up and operation, despite the fact that the ICF materials note that ICF will "conduct an independent analysis of the cost and benefits of forming an RTO on peninsular Florida."⁵ In determining costs and benefits, the effect on retail ratepayers must be determined.

ICF should analyze the transmission revenues embedded in retail rates versus the new rates which should be defined as the sum of the zone rates. ICF must also analyze the RTO's O&M costs and any RTO start up costs related to the RTO's creation. ICF should include an analysis of how much retail rates will be reduced so that ratepayers do not pay for the same transmission facilities twice.⁶ Only if this type of analysis is provided can costs and benefits truly be assessed. FIPUG urges that either the Staff or ICF conduct such an analysis before the RTO goes forward.

⁴ March 18, 2004 ICF Proposal at 12.

⁵ Id. at 9.

⁶ ICF provided a "Project Description" on May 7, 2004. It does not appear that FIPUG's concerns are addressed.

Issue 6: Review of current regulatory/legislative environment

No comment at this time.

ŝ

John W. McWhirter, Jr. McWhirter Reeves McGlothlin Davidson Decker Kaufman & Arnold, P.A. 400 North Tampa Street, Suite 2450 Tampa, Florida 33602 (813) 224-0866 jmcwhirter@mac-law.com

Vicki Gordon Kaufman McWhirter Reeves McGlothlin Davidson Decker Kaufman & Arnold, P.A. 117 South Gadsden Street Tallahassee, Florida 32301 (850) 222-2525 vkaufman@mac-law.com

Attorneys for the Florida Industrial Power Users Group

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing FIPUG's Response to Applicants' Draft Positions Market Design Issues has been furnished by electronic mail (*) and U.S. Mail to the following this 13th day of May 2004:

(*) Jennifer Brubaker Division of Legal Services Public Service Commission 2540 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Mark Sundback Kenneth Wiseman 1701 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Suite 300 Washington, DC 20006

Thomas W. Kaslow The Pilot House, 2nd Floor Lewis Wharf Boston, MA 02110

Lee E. Barrett Duke Energy North America 5400 Westheimer Court Houston, TX 77056-5310

James Beasley Lee Willis Ausley Law Firm P.O. Box 391 Tallahassee, FL 32301

David L. Cruthirds Dynegy, Inc. 1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5800 Houston, TX 77002-5050

Frederick M. Bryant Florida Municipal Power Agency 2061-2 Delta Way Tallahassee, FL 32303 Kenneth A. Hoffman Rutledge, Ecenia, Purnell & Hoffman, PA P.O. Box 551 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Thomas J. Maida N. Wes Strickland 106 East College Avenue, Suite 900 Tallahassee, FL 32301-7732

Ron LaFace Seann M. Frazier Greenberg, Traurig Law Firm 101 E. College Avenue Tallahassee, FL 32301

Leslie J. Paugh, P.A. P.O. Box 16069 Tallahassee, FL 32317-6069

Bill Bryant, Jr. Katz Kutter Law Firm 106 E. College Avenue, 12th Floor Tallahassee, FL 32301

Robert S. Wright Landers Law Firm 310 W. College Avenue Tallahassee, FL 32301

James Fama LeBoeuf Law Firm 1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1200 Washington, DC 20009 Daniel E. Frank Sutherland Asbill & Brennan LLP 1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20004-2415

Thomas A. Cloud Gray, Harris & Robinson, P.A. 301 East Pine Street, Suite 1400 Post Office Box 3068 Orlando, Florida 32801

Charles J. Beck c/o The Florida Legislature 111 West Madison Street, Room 812 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400

Jon C. Moyle, Jr. Moyle Law Firm The Perkins House 118 North Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301

Timothy Woodbury Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc. 16313 N. Dale Mabry Highway Tampa, FL 33688-2000

Russell S. Kent Sutherland Asbill & Brennan LLP 2282 Killearn Center Blvd Tallahassee, FL 32308-3561

Michael Twomey PO Box 5256 Tallahassee, FL 32314-5256

Melissa Lavinson PG&E Energy Group Company 7500 Old Georgetown Road Bethesda, MD 20814

Publix Super Markets, Inc. John Attaway P.O. Box 32015 Lakeland, FL 33802-2018 Spiegel & McDiarmid Cynthia Bogoraid David Pomper J. Schwarz 1350 New York Ave, NW, Suite 1100 Washington, DC 20005

Lee Schmudde Walt Disney World Co 1375 Lake Buena Drive Fourth Floor North Lake Buena Vista, FL 32820

Suzanne Brownless Suzanne Brownless, P.A. 1975 Burford Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32308

City of Tallahassee Pete Koikos 100 W. Virginia Street, Fifth Floor Tallahassee, FL 32301

Dick Basford & Associates, Inc. 5616 Ft. Sumter Road Jacksonville, FL 32210

Douglas F. John Matthew T. Rick John & Hengerer 1200 17th Street, NW, Suite 600 Washington, DC 20036 Gainesville Regional Utilities City of Gainesville

Ed Regan P.O. Box 147117, Station A136 Gainesville, FL 32614-7117

JEA P. G. Para 21 West Church Street Jacksonville, FL 32202-3139 Mr. Robert Miller Kissimmee Utility Authority 1701 West Carroll Street Kissimmee, Florida 32746

Paul Efwing Lakeland Electric 501 E. Lemon Street Lakeland, Florida 33801-5079

Michael Wedner 117 West Duval Street Suite 480 Jacksonville, Florida 32202

Reedy Creek Improvement District Post Office Box 10170 Lake Buena Vista, Florida 32830

Michael Briggs Reliant Energy Power Generation, Inc. 801 Pennsylvania Avenue, Suite 520 Washington, DC 20004

William T. Miller C/o Miller Law Firm Seminole Member Systems 1140 19th Street, NW, Suite 700 Washington, DC 20036

Vicki Gordon Kaufman