## RUTLEDGE, ECENIA, PURNELL & HOFFMAN

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW



STEPHEN A. ECENIA
RICHARD M. ELLIS .
KENNETH A. HOFFMAN
THOMAS W. KONRAD
MICHAEL G. MAIDA
MARTIN P. McDONNELL
J. STEPHEN MENTON

POST OFFICE BOX 551, 32302-0551 215 SOUTH MONROE STREET, SUITE 420 TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301-1841

> TELEPHONE (850) 681-6788 TELECOPIER (850) 681-6515

> > July 1,2004

R. DAVID PRESCOTT HAROLD F. X. PURNELL MARSHA E. RULE GARY R. RUTLEDGE

HAND DELIVERY

GOVERNMENTAL CONSULTANTS
MARGARET A. MENDUNI
M. LANE STEPHENS

Ms. Blanca S. Bayo, Director Commission Clerk and Administrative Services Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Betty Easley Conference Center, Room 110 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 030623-EI

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Enclosed for filing in the above-referenced docket on behalf of Florida Power & Light Company ("FPL") are the original and fifteen copies of FPL's Response to Southeastern Utility Services, Inc.'s Motion for Reconsideration.

Please acknowledgereceipt of these documents by stamping the extra copy of this letter filed and returning the copy to me.

Thank you for your assistance with this filing

manak you for your assistance with this ming.		
CMP	Sincerely,  Kenneth A. Hoffman	
MMS  RCA  SCR  SEC  OTH	RECEIVED & FILED  West  FPSC-BUREAU OF RECORDS	DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE  07219 JUL-18  FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

## BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Complaints by Southeastem Utility Services,)	
Inc. on behalf of various customers, against )	Docket No. 030623-El
Florida Power & Light Company concerning)	
thermal demand meter error	Filed: July 1, 2004
	_)

## FLORIDA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO SOUTHEASTERN UTILITY SERVICES, INC.'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Florida Power & Light Company ("FPL"), by and through its undersigned counsel, and pursuant to Rule 25-22.0376(2), Florida Administrative Code, hereby files this Response to Southeastern Utility Services, Inc.'s ("SUSI") Motion for Reconsideration.' In support of its Response, FPL states as follows

- 1. On June 11, 2004, the Prehearing Officer assigned to this docket issued Order No. PSC-04-0591-PCO-EI dismissing SUSI as a Petitioner from this proceeding and Denying FPL's Motion to Strike ("Prehearing Officer's Order"). On June 21, 2004, SUSI filed its Motion for Reconsideration requesting that the Commission reconsider the portion of the Prehearing Officer's Order dismissing SUSI as a Petitioner.<sup>2</sup>
- 2. The standard of review for a motion for reconsideration is whether the motion identifies a point of fact or law which was overlooked or which the Commission failed to consider

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Rule 25-22.037(2), Florida Administrative Code, allows a party to file a response to a motion for reconsideration within 7 days after service of the motion for reconsideration. Rule 28-106.103, Florida Administrative Code, allows for an additional 5 days to be added to the prescribed period of time to respond when service is made by mail.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Although the date on the front of SUSI's Motion for Reconsideration shows that it was filed on June 18,2004, page 3 of SUSI's Motion shows that the Motion was submitted to the Commission on June 21, 2004. In addition, the attached certificate of service shows that SUSI's Motion was served upon the parties via U.S. Mail on June 21, 2004. Accordingly, FPL must file a response to SUSI's Motion for Reconsideration within 12 days of June 21, 2004. NUMBER-DATE

in rendering its Order. See, Stewart Bonded Warehouse, Inc. v. Bevis, 294 So.2d 3 15 (Fla. 1974); Diamond Cab Co. v. King, 146 So.2d 889 (Fla. 1962); and Pingree v. Quaintance, 394 So.2d 161 (Fla. 1st DCA 1981).

- 3. The basis for the Prehearing Officer's Order dismissing SUSI from this proceeding was that SUSI, as a consulting company representing FPL customers, failed to meet the two-prong standing test set out in Agrico Chemical Co. v. Department of Environmental Regulation, 406 So.2d 478, 482 (Fla. 2<sup>nd</sup> DCA 1981).
  - 4. Specifically, the Prehearing Officer's Order stated:
  - . . . I find that SUSI fails both prongs of the <u>Agrico</u> standing test. SUSI is a representative of the customers, who are the real parties of interest in this proceeding because their refunds are at issue. Since none of the meters in question measure electric service provided to SUSI, SUSI is not a potential candidate for a refund. SUSI can suffer no direct injury as a result of the Commission's decision. . . Moreover, this proceeding addresses the potential refunds to be made to the commercial customers who petitioned the Commission for a hearing. The purpose of the hearing is not to determine what recourse, if any, is available to SUSI who is simply acting as a consultant to the customers.<sup>3</sup>
- 5. SUSI's Motion fails to identify any relevant point of fact or law that the Prehearing Officer overlooked or failed to consider in dismissing SUSI as a Petitioner from this proceeding. Instead, SUSI refers to an informal meeting that was held between Commission staff and the parties six days after the issuance of the Prehearing Officer's Order. According to SUSI, as a result of this informal meeting, SUSI believes that certain generic issues will be addressed in this docket, the resolution of which would, "likely impact parties that are not parties to this docket."<sup>4</sup>
- 6. SUSI further states that it believes that certain issues will be decided that will have application beyond this docket, and as an example, points to an issue that was previously identified

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Prehearing Officer's Order at page 3-4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Paragraph 3 of SUSI's Motion for Reconsideration.

in this docket regarding the appropriate method of calculating customer refunds for the thermal

demand meters which test outside the prescribed tolerance limits.<sup>5</sup>

7. The Commission's decisions in its proceedings routinely have a precedential effect

on similarly situated parties. SUSI's assertion that the Commission's decision in this docket could

have precedential effect is both unremarkable and irrelevant to the true issue at hand — SUSI's lack

of standing to participate as a Petitioner in this docket. SUSI's reference to both the "generic

issues" and specific issues to be addressed in this docket, all of which were raised as far back as the

Commission's PAA Order, is likewise irrelevant to whether SUSI has standing to participate in this

docket.

Wherefore, as SUSI has failed to identify any point of fact or law that the Prehearing Officer

overlooked or failed to consider in dismissing SUSI as Petitioner from this proceeding, FPL

respectfully requests that the Prehearing Officer deny SUSI's Motion for Reconsideration of Order

No. PSC-04-0591-PCO-EI.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth A. Hoffman, Esq.

J. Stephen Menton, Esq.

Rutledge, Ecenia, Purnell & Hoffman, P.A.

**P. O.** Box 551

Tallahassee, Florida 32302

Telephone: 850-681-6788

- - and - -

<sup>5</sup> Paragraph 5 of SUSI's Motion for Reconsideration.

R. Wade Litchfield, Esq. Law Department Florida Power & Light Company 700 Universe Boulevard Juno Beach, Florida 33408-0420 Telephone: 561-691-7101

Attorneys for Florida Power & Light Company

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of Florida Power and Light Company's Response to Southeastern Utility Services, Inc.'s Motion for Reconsideration has been furnished by U. S. Mail this 1<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2004, to the following:

Cochran Keating, Esq.
Office of the General Counsel
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Jon C. Moyle, Jr., Esq.
Diana K. Shuman, Esq.
Moyle, Flanigan, Katz, Raymond & Sheehan, P.A.
The Perkins House
118 North Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Kenneth A. Hoffman, Esq.

I:\FPL-SUSI\response to request for recon.wpd