

**Matilda Sanders**

---

**From:** Minimushomines@aol.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 04, 2007 1:27 PM  
**To:** Filings@psc.state.fl.us; Jennifer Brubaker  
**Cc:** Wade\_Litchfield@fpl.com; Natalie\_Smith@fpl.com; bill\_walker@fpl.com; Harold Mclean; rollinsmr@bv.com; shaw.stiller@dca.state.fl.us; mike.halpin@dep.state.fl.us; Katherine Fleming; Lorena Holley; Charles Beck; mgross@earthjustice.org; Minimushomines@aol.com  
**Subject:** Prehearing Statement of Bob and Jan Krasowski  
**Attachments:** Prehearing statement.doc

**ORIGINAL**

Dear Ms. Brubaker,

Please find attached prehearing statement.

Thank you,

Bob and Jan Krasowski

---

See what's free at [AOL.com](http://AOL.com).

4/4/2007

DOCUMENT NUMBER - DATE  
02910 APR-4 5  
FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Re: Florida Power and Light Company's  
Petition to Determine Need for FPL Glades  
Power Par Units 1 and 2 Electrical Power Plant

DOCKET NO. 070098-EL

Dated: April 4, 2007

**PERSPECTIVE INTERVENORS BOB AND JAN KRASOWSKI'S  
PREHEARING STATEMENT**

Pursuant to Order No. PSC-07-0120-PCO-EL, issued February 9, 2007, the perspective Intervenors, Bob and Jan Krasowski hereby file their Prehearing Statement.

1. All known Witnesses, none
2. All known exhibits, none
- 3.

**Basic Position Statement**

**The energy needs of Florida have been estimated based on population projections that are now in question.**

**The discussion regarding energy policy and practices in the State of Florida has been ongoing with increasing intensity over the past few years. As a result of the efforts of many, a full array of options to address our current and future energy needs are under analysis. Some perceive the current relationship between energy production and its economic/environmental (environomic) impacts to be a critically important as it relates to our future survival. It is our position that until a clear understanding of all our energy options is achieved, no single project with such far reaching environomic impacts can be permitted.**

**The Florida Legislature, both House and Senate, the members of the Cabinet, the Governor, along with the Florida Solar Energy Center, numerous think-tank researchers, like the American Council for Energy Efficient economy are focused on a wide array of studies relating to our energy program options that until concluded make any action moving the FGPP project or any coal burning power generator of any type forward imprudent and not in the best interests of FPL customers, FPL itself and the peoples of Florida in general.**

DOCUMENT NUMBER - DATE

02910 APR -4 5

Fpsc-COMMISSION CLERK

4.

**Statement of Positions and issues**

**ISSUE 1:** Is there a need for the proposed generating units, taking into account the need for electric system reliability and integrity, as this criterion is used in Section 403.519, Florida Statutes?

**POSITION:** No, there is no demonstrable need for the FPL power generating units since the issues of reliability and integrity have yet to be determined by comparison of the proposed facilities' to a comprehensive application of efficiency measures and other technologies.

**ISSUE 2:** Is there a need for the proposed generating units, taking into account the need for adequate electricity at a reasonable cost, as this criterion is used in Section 403.519, Florida Statute?

**POSITION:** No. There is no valid assessment of need for the proposed facilities' due to a lack of understanding regarding the implementation of efficiency and alternative technologies that would displace the projected need for the FGPP energy.

**ISSUE 3:** Is there a need for the proposed generating units, taking into account the need for fuel diversity and supply reliability, as this criterion is used in Section 403.519, Florida Statutes?

**POSITION:** No. Without a comparative analysis of all power sources, it has not been determined which energy generating scenario actually provides the greatest benefit for fuel diversity and supply reliability. As an example, individual solar hot water applications are more reliable than centralized coal burning in times of natural and man-made disasters. They are also superior in terms of reliability.

**ISSUE 4:** Are there any conservation measures taken by or reasonably available to Florida Power & Light Company which might mitigate the need for the proposed generating units?

**POSITION:** Yes and the fact that a large number of options are being considered by Various legislative bodies and commissions for implementation into a state energy policy demonstrate that a position favorable to moving

forward with this project is premature. Also, to the benefit of the utilities, a number of programs that address financial enhancement of the utilities efforts at profitably promoting conservation are in discussion.

**ISSUE 5:** Has FPL appropriately evaluated the cost of CO2 emission mitigation costs in its economic analysis?

**POSITION:** No. Economic values attributed to CO2 are in constant flux and can not be determined satisfactorily, while protecting the public's interest at this time.

**ISSUE 6:** Do the proposed FGPP generating units include the costs for the environmental controls necessary to meet current state and federal environmental requirements, including mercury, NOx, SO2, and particulate emissions? (Note: Sierra Club proposes adding the phrase, "to meet current and future state and federal..." to Issue 6)

**POSITION:** No position at this time.

**ISSUE 7:** Are the proposed generating units the most cost-effective alternative available, as this criterion is used in Section 403.519, Florida Statutes?

**POSITION:** No. Energy saved through efficiency and conservation is the most cost effective energy resource available. Until a thorough analysis of all available opportunities to maximize efficiency resources no determination can be reasonably made as to the need for this facility.

**ISSUE 8:** Based on the resolution of the foregoing issues, should the Commission grant FPL's petition to determine the need for the proposed generating units?

**POSITION:** If the comparative analysis of all options is concluded and available, and all legislative bodies appointed commissions and the Governor's office have finished their research regarding energy policy in the State of Florida then FPL's petition should be considered. We suggest no action on FPL's request for no less than 3 years.

**ISSUE 9:** Should this docket be closed?

**POSITION:** No position at this time.

5. Stipulated Issues, none

6. Pending motions and other matters upon which action is sought, none
7. Pending claim for confidentiality, none.
8. Objections to witness qualifications as an expert, none.
9. Compliance with Order No, PSC-07-012-PCO-EI, at this time persons who are requesting to be intervenors are unaware of any requirements of the Order Establishing procedure with which they can not comply.

Respectfully submitted this 4<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2007.

s/ Bob Krasowski  
s/ Jan Krasowski  
Bob and Jan Krasowski  
1086 Michigan Ave.  
Naples, FL.34103-3857  
239-434-0786