

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Petition for) DOCKET NO. 931212-EC
determination of need for) ORDER NO. PSC-94-0358-PHO-EC
proposed electrical power plant) ISSUED: March 29, 1994
to be located in Hardee and Polk)
Counties by Seminole Electric)
Cooperative, Inc.)
_____)

Pursuant to Notice, a Prehearing Conference was held on March 10, 1994 and March 22, 1994, in Tallahassee, Florida, before Commissioner Julia L. Johnson, as Prehearing Officer.

APPEARANCES:

RICHARD D. MELSON, Esquire, CHERYL G. STUART, Esquire,
and JONATHAN T. JOHNSON, Esquire, Hopping, Boyd, Green &
Sams, Post Office Box 6526, Tallahassee, Florida 32314.
On behalf of Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc.

ROBERT V. ELIAS, Esquire, Florida Public Service
Commission, 101 E. Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida
32399-0863
On behalf of the Commission Staff.

David E. Smith, Esquire, and Prentice P. Pruitt, Esquire,
Florida Public Service Commission, 101 E. Gaines Street,
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0862
On behalf of the Commissioners.

PREHEARING ORDER

I. CASE BACKGROUND

Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc. is the generating and transmission supplier for eleven of Florida's rural electric cooperatives. The eleven cooperatives are currently within FPC's and FPL's control areas. Seminole currently owns and operates two coal-fired base load generating plants located in Palatka which produce approximately 625 megawatts each. Seminole also has an ownership interest in FPC's Crystal River Unit No. 3 plant which provides approximately 13 megawatts for Seminole's member cooperatives. Seminole also has a contractual agreement with TECO Power Services, Inc. for back up resources for these units with power generated at Big Bend Unit 4 and Hardee Power Station Units 1 and 2. The balance of the system needs are supplied through

DOCUMENT NUMBER DATE

02939 MAR 29 1994

FPC-REGULATORY REPORTING

partial requirements contracts with FPC and FPL. The partial requirements contract with FPL requires that Seminole give seven years notice of its intent to reduce the amount of Seminole's needs supplied by FPL.

Based on its analysis of future needs and costs, Seminole advised Florida Power and Light Company in December of 1991 that, beginning January 1, 1999, Seminole would increase its obligation (and thereby reduce the purchases from FPL) pursuant to the contract by 440 MW.

Seminole proposes to meet that need by constructing, under a turn key contract with a Black and Veatch/Westinghouse joint venture, a 440 megawatt advanced combined cycle plant to be located at Hardee Power Station on the border of Polk and Hardee counties. The proposed plant would consist of two 150 MW advanced combustion turbines and two heat recovery steam generators that will drive a 140 MW steam turbine. The proposed unit would be primarily fueled by natural gas. The proposed unit is also capable of burning distillate fuel oil, and, if it becomes economically feasible, could be modified to utilize gasified coal.

On December 17, 1993, Seminole filed, pursuant to Section 403.519, Florida Statutes (1993), its Petition to Determine Need for Electric Power Plant. The applicant waived, to the extent applicable, the time requirements in the Power Plant Siting Act and Florida Administrative Code, to permit a Commission decision at a May 26, 1994 special agenda conference.

No other party has intervened in the docket. The final hearing is set for March 30, 31 and April 1, 1994.

II. PROCEDURE FOR HANDLING CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

A. Any information provided pursuant to a discovery request for which proprietary confidential business information status is requested shall be treated by the Commission and the parties as confidential. The information shall be exempt from Section 119.07(1), Florida Statutes, pending a formal ruling on such request by the Commission, or upon the return of the information to the person providing the information. If no determination of confidentiality has been made and the information has not been used in the proceeding, it shall be returned expeditiously to the person providing the information. If a determination of confidentiality has been made and the information was not entered into the record of the proceeding, it shall be returned to the person providing the

information within the time periods set forth in Section 366.093(2), Florida Statutes.

B. It is the policy of the Florida Public Service Commission that all Commission hearings be open to the public at all times. The Commission also recognizes its obligation pursuant to Section 366.093, Florida Statutes, to protect proprietary confidential business information from disclosure outside the proceeding.

In the event it becomes necessary to use confidential information during the hearing, the following procedures will be observed:

- 1) Any party wishing to use any proprietary confidential business information, as that term is defined in Section 366.093, Florida Statutes, shall notify the Prehearing Officer and all parties of record by the time of the Prehearing Conference, or if not known at that time, no later than seven (7) days prior to the beginning of the hearing. The notice shall include a procedure to assure that the confidential nature of the information is preserved as required by statute.
- 2) Failure of any party to comply with 1) above shall be grounds to deny the party the opportunity to present evidence which is proprietary confidential business information.
- 3) When confidential information is used in the hearing, parties must have copies for the Commissioners, necessary staff, and the Court Reporter, in envelopes clearly marked with the nature of the contents. Any party wishing to examine the confidential material that is not subject to an order granting confidentiality shall be provided a copy in the same fashion as provided to the Commissioners, subject to execution of any appropriate protective agreement with the owner of the material.
- 4) Counsel and witnesses are cautioned to avoid verbalizing confidential information in such a way that would compromise the confidential information. Therefore, confidential information should be presented by written exhibit when reasonably possible to do so.

- 5) At the conclusion of that portion of the hearing that involves confidential information, all copies of confidential exhibits shall be returned to the proffering party. If a confidential exhibit has been admitted into evidence, the copy provided to the Court Reporter shall be retained in the Commission Clerk's confidential files.

Post-hearing procedures

Rule 25-22.056(3), Florida Administrative Code, requires each party to file a post-hearing statement of issues and positions. A summary of each position of no more than 50 words, set off with asterisks, shall be included in that statement. If a party's position has not changed since the issuance of the prehearing order, the post-hearing statement may simply restate the prehearing position; however, if the prehearing position is longer than 50 words, it must be reduced to no more than 50 words. The rule also provides that if a party fails to file a post-hearing statement in conformance with the rule, that party shall have waived all issues and may be dismissed from the proceeding.

A party's proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, if any, statement of issues and positions, and brief, shall together total no more than 60 pages, and shall be filed at the same time. The prehearing officer may modify the page limit for good cause shown. Please see Rule 25-22.056, Florida Administrative Code, for other requirements pertaining to post-hearing filings.

III. PREFILED TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS; WITNESSES

Testimony of all witnesses to be sponsored by the parties has been prefiled. All testimony which has been prefiled in this case will be inserted into the record as though read after the witness has taken the stand and affirmed the correctness of the testimony and associated exhibits. All testimony remains subject to appropriate objections. Each witness will have the opportunity to orally summarize his or her testimony at the time he or she takes the stand. Upon insertion of a witness' testimony, exhibits appended thereto may be marked for identification. After all parties and Staff have had the opportunity to object and cross-examine, the exhibit may be moved into the record. All other exhibits may be similarly identified and entered into the record at the appropriate time during the hearing.

Witnesses are reminded that, on cross-examination, responses to questions calling for a simple yes or no answer shall be so answered first, after which the witness may explain his or her answer.

The Commission frequently administers the testimonial oath to more than one witness at a time. Therefore, when a witness takes the stand to testify, the attorney calling the witness is directed to ask the witness to affirm whether he or she has been sworn.

IV. ORDER OF WITNESSES

<u>Witness</u>	<u>Appearing For</u>	<u>Issues #</u>
William C. Walbridge	SEMINOLE	3,4
Timothy S. Woodbury	SEMINOLE	3,4,12,14,15
Garl S. Zimmerman	SEMINOLE	3,4,12,13,18
Diane C. Huis	SEMINOLE	3,4,6,8,13,14, 15,17,19
F. Joe Welborn	SEMINOLE	11,12,18
John R. Twitchell	SEMINOLE	16
Daniel E. Suh	SEMINOLE	1,2
Robert L. Woodall	SEMINOLE	7,9,10
John W. Geeraerts	SEMINOLE	12
Michael P. Opalinski	SEMINOLE	8,11,12
Richard J. Midulla	SEMINOLE	5,6
*Samuel S. Waters	STAFF	4,13,14,15,17,19
*Karabet Adjemian	STAFF	12,17,18
*Russell A. Wheeler, Jr.	STAFF	13,14,15,19

* By agreement of the parties, witnesses Waters, Adjemian and Wheeler will have their depositions inserted into the record, cross

examination waived, and be excused from appearing at the hearing.

V. BASIC POSITIONS

SEMINOLE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC. (SEMINOLE): The proposed 440 MW advanced combined cycle power plant to be constructed for Seminole under a turnkey contract with Black & Veatch/Westinghouse is the most cost-effective alternative available to Seminole to meet the power supply requirements of its members while maintaining adequate reliability and meeting Seminole's strategic goals. The project, known as Hardee Power Station Unit #3 (HPS #3) is needed by January 1, 1999 in order to displace more expensive partial requirements purchases from Florida Power & Light Company (FPL). The project will provide first year savings of \$20 million and will produce total savings of approximately \$299 million in present worth of revenue requirements (PWRR) over the 30 year study period, compared to a continuation of an equivalent amount of partial requirements purchases. The project was selected through a bidding process in which Seminole solicited proposals both for purchased power and for turnkey construction of a unit to be owned and operated by Seminole. In addition to providing significant cost savings to Seminole and its members, HPS #3 will enhance the reliability of Seminole's system, defer its need to add combustion turbine units for reliability purposes, and reduce Seminole's dependance on outside sources to meet its power supply needs.

STAFF: Staff's positions are preliminary and based on materials filed by the parties and on discovery. The preliminary positions are offered to assist the parties in preparing for the hearing. Staff's final positions will be based upon all the evidence in the record and may differ from the preliminary positions.

VI. ISSUES AND POSITIONS

ISSUE 1: Is the load forecast used by Seminole reasonable for planning purposes?

SEMINOLE: Yes. Seminole's load forecast is an aggregation of separate forecasts for each of its eleven member systems. Seminole considers factors such as population growth trends, numbers of consumers, other demographic data and weather, and uses both econometric and end-use modeling techniques to produce a high quality demand and sales forecast. It should be noted that Seminole's need for Hardee Power Station Unit #3 (HPS #3) is not driven by load forecast assumptions but by the fact that Seminole can more economically serve a portion of its members'

load through new generation rather than through continued partial requirements purchases. (Suh)

STAFF: Seminole's load forecast appears reasonable at this time, pending further review of discovery the responses to cross examination questions.

ISSUE 2: Are the effects of conservation and demand side management appropriately reflected in Seminole's load forecast?

SEMINOLE: Yes. The results of conservation are implicitly included in the forecast as a result of Seminole's forecast methodology. An explicit adjustment is made to the forecast to reflect the projected effects of load management. (Suh)

STAFF: Seminole's load forecast appears to have appropriately incorporated the effects of conservation and demand side management, pending further review of discovery and the responses to cross examination questions.

ISSUE 3: As a utility interconnected with the statewide grid, does Seminole have a need for 440 MW of additional capacity in 1999?

SEMINOLE: Yes. In December, 1991, Seminole gave the required seven years' advance notice to Florida Power & Light Company that Seminole would assume the responsibility to serve an additional 440 MW increment of capacity previously served by partial requirements purchases effective January 1, 1999. Therefore, Seminole must add HPS #3 by January 1, 1999, in order to continue to meet its reliability criterion and to economically serve its eleven member systems without dependance on uncommitted outside resources. (Walbridge, Woodbury, Zimmerman, Huis)

STAFF: Pending further review of discovery and the responses to cross examination questions, staff believes the answer is yes. Seminole's need for this capacity is not driven solely to maintain reliability, but is based upon an economic analysis that Seminole alleges shows HPS #3 will be a less costly alternative than continuing to purchase the same amount of power through its partial requirements contract with Florida Power and Light Company.

ISSUE 4: Is the proposed combined cycle unit needed in the 1999 time frame to contribute to the reliability and integrity of the electric system of Seminole and the State of Florida?

SEMINOLE: Yes. In December, 1991, Seminole gave the required seven years' advance notice to Florida Power & Light Company that Seminole would assume the responsibility to serve an additional 440 MW increment of capacity previously served by partial requirements purchases effective January 1, 1999. In addition to enabling Seminole to meet the obligation it assumed to serve this additional 440 MW increment of capacity, HPS #3 will improve the reliability of Seminole's system, defer the need for additional combustion turbine capacity, and satisfy a portion of the state's need for additional capacity in this time frame. (Walbridge, Woodbury, Zimmerman, Huis)

STAFF: No. Seminole is presently purchasing 440 MW of partial requirements (PR) capacity and energy from Florida Power and Light Company. But as a result of Seminole's 1989 generation planning studies and 1991 base case update, Seminole believes it would be cost-effective to displace PR purchases from FPL by adding its own generation.

ISSUE 5: Is the timing of Seminole's petition to determine need for its proposed combined cycle unit appropriate?

SEMINOLE: Yes. Seminole's petition was filed in accordance with the Commission's rules which permit utilities to file a need determination petition in advance of the site certification application. As a practical matter, Seminole could not have filed its petition prior to the completion of the bidding process and entry of a contract with the winning bidder. Any significant delay in filing would delay the overall licensing and financing approval process, and could delay the in-service date of the unit. Such a delay would force Seminole to resort to more expensive temporary measures to obtain the necessary capacity in order to continue to provide reliable service to its members. (Midulla)

STAFF: Yes. Given that Seminole gave FPL seven years notice that Seminole would increase its capacity commitment in 1999, the timing of this petition is appropriate. The project schedule submitted by Seminole which includes

permitting, pre-construction, and construction appears to be reasonable.

ISSUE 6: What, if any, are the adverse consequences to Seminole, its members and their customers if the proposed combined cycle unit is not completed in the time frame requested by Seminole?

SEMINOLE: If Seminole does not add HPS #3 by 1999, it would be dependant on uncommitted outside resources to serve the equivalent of 12.5 days per year of its load (equal to 3.42% of its total energy sales), which would be an unacceptable level of reliability for its members. Seminole would therefore be forced to resort to more expensive purchases of power from other sources (if power were available) or to construct shorter lead time combustion turbine units. Either of these would result in higher rates to the consumers served by Seminole's member systems. (Huis, Midulla)

STAFF: If HPS #3 is not completed in the time frame requested, Seminole, its member cooperatives, and their customers face the risk of potentially more costly replacement power.

ISSUE 7: Is the fuel price forecast used by Seminole reasonable for planning purposes?

SEMINOLE: Yes. Seminole's fuel price forecast is a reasonable projection of fuel prices for its system. Seminole's base case forecast is based on realistic expectations of future market conditions. Seminole also prepared high and low fuel forecasts to test the sensitivity of its plan to other, less likely, future fuel market conditions. (Woodall)

STAFF: Pending further review of discovery and the responses to cross examination questions, the fuel price forecast appears reasonable for planning purposes.

ISSUE 8: Will Seminole's proposed combined cycle unit contribute to fuel diversity for Seminole's system and for peninsular Florida?

SEMINOLE: Yes. HPS #3 will be an advanced combined cycle unit which will utilize natural gas as its primary fuel. Seminole's current system is heavily dependent on generating capacity from two coal-fired units. By adding 440 MW of gas-fired capacity, HPS #3 will diversify Seminole's fuel mix and will contribute to continued diversity on a statewide basis. Furthermore, the HPS site could accommodate the construction of a coal gasification plant if future fuel prices or fuel supply limitations warrant such an addition. (Huis, Opalinski)

STAFF: Yes. Seminole's proposed combined cycle unit will contribute fuel diversity on Seminole's system and for peninsular Florida.

ISSUE 9: Have adequate assurances been provided regarding available primary and secondary fuel to serve the proposed combined cycle unit on a long and short term basis at a reasonable cost?

SEMINOLE: Yes. Both the primary fuel, natural gas, and the secondary fuel, distillate oil, are in abundant supply and Seminole anticipates no difficulty in obtaining sufficient supplies to meet the fuel requirements of HPS #3 at a reasonable cost. (Woodall)

STAFF: Pending further review of discovery and the responses to cross examination questions, adequate assurances concerning the availability of primary and secondary fuel have been provided.

ISSUE 10: Has Seminole provided adequate assurances that sufficient natural gas pipeline capacity will be available to transport natural gas to the proposed combined cycle unit?

SEMINOLE: Yes. Florida Gas Transmission Company already serves the Hardee Power Station site. SunShine Pipeline Company has a need certified pipeline that may also be extended to serve the site. Either of these pipelines could supply the full natural gas requirements of the project. Seminole is working with a natural gas industry consultant on a comprehensive evaluation of gas supply alternatives and will enter into gas purchase and

transportation arrangements at an appropriate stage in the development of the project. (Woodall)

STAFF: Pending further review of discovery and the responses to cross examination questions, adequate assurances concerning the availability fuel transportation have been provided.

ISSUE 11: Have the reasonably anticipated costs to Seminole of environmental compliance of the proposed unit been properly considered by Seminole?

SEMINOLE: Yes. HPS #3 has been designed to operate in compliance with anticipated state and federal environmental requirements and the cost of such requirements is included in the turnkey contract cost. Airborne emissions and consumptive water use will be limited by the selection of natural gas and by the utilization of advanced combustion control technologies. The impacts of the project will generally fit with the envelope previously approved in connection with the certification of the site for 660 MW of ultimate site capacity. (Opalinski, Welborn)

STAFF: Pending further review of discovery and the responses to cross examination questions, Seminole appears to have reasonably considered the costs of environmental compliance.

ISSUE 12: Has Seminole provided sufficient information on the site, design, engineering characteristics, and transmission requirements of its proposed combined cycle unit to evaluate its proposal?

SEMINOLE: Yes. Seminole is proposing to construct the 440 MW of advanced combined cycle capacity at its existing site in Hardee and Polk counties. Seminole has provided detailed information regarding the site, design, and engineering characteristics of HPS #3, the turnkey construction contract under which the unit will be built, the transmission requirements for the project, and Seminole's ability to finance the proposed unit. (Welborn, Opalinski, Zimmerman, Woodbury, Geeraerts)

STAFF: Yes.

ISSUE 13: Did Seminole adequately explore and evaluate alternative Seminole-owned supply side sources of capacity?

SEMINOLE: Yes. Seminole used information on generating technologies from the FCG to identify a group of promising technologies for economic evaluation. Seminole's studies showed that combined cycle technology was the preferred option for a utility-owned alternative, and Seminole solicited turnkey bids for construction of such a unit. This technology choice was confirmed by the fact that the most attractive purchased power bids were also based on combined cycle technology, although Seminole did not limit the technology that could be used by such bidders. (Zimmerman, Huis)

STAFF: Yes, pending further review of discovery and the responses to cross examination questions, Seminole's bidding process, which included a request for proposals (RFP), sought out turnkey projects which Seminole would own upon commercial in-service, such as HPS #3 appears to have adequately evaluated the proposals. Staff is concerned that Seminole's updated solicitation in 1992 was confined to the bidders who responded to the initial RFP.

ISSUE 14: Has Seminole adequately explored and evaluated the availability of purchased power?

SEMINOLE: Yes. Seminole conducted a bidding process which sought purchased power alternatives from both utility and nonutility sources, as well as bids for turnkey construction of a combined cycle project. That solicitation received national publicity and resulted in significant competition in both the purchased power and turnkey construction segments of the supply market. A number of parties responded to Seminole's RFP for purchased power bids, although none of them ultimately proved to be as cost-effective as the turnkey proposal from Black & Veatch/Westinghouse for construction of HPS #3. (Woodbury, Huis)

STAFF: Seminole, through its RFP in 1990, sought out bids for purchased power alternatives. Pending further review of discovery and the responses to cross examination questions, Seminole appears to have adequately evaluated the proposals received. Staff is concerned that

Seminole's updated solicitation in 1992 was confined to the bidders who responded to the initial RFP.

ISSUE 15: Was the evaluation process used by Seminole in the selection of the 440 MW combined cycle unit project appropriate?

SEMINOLE: Yes. Seminole used a four phase evaluation process to select a power supply alternative. Negotiations with four short list bidders representing two power purchase proposals and two turnkey construction proposals led to the selection of Black & Veatch/Westinghouse as the best proposal. Although Seminole is not subject to the Commission's recently adopted bidding rule, the bidding process employed by Seminole tracks that rule in many key respects. It should be noted that in 1988 Seminole was the first utility in Florida, and the first generation and transmission cooperative in the nation, to utilize a power supply solicitation. (Huis, Woodbury)

STAFF: Pending further review of discovery and the responses to cross examination questions, it appears that Seminole conducted an appropriate evaluation of the proposals submitted.

ISSUE 16: What conservation measures taken by or reasonably available to Seminole might mitigate the need for all or part of Seminole's proposed combine cycle unit?

SEMINOLE: There are no conservation measures reasonably available to Seminole that would mitigate the need for all or part of the proposed combined cycle unit. Seminole's members engage in a variety of conservation and demand side management programs. Because of the unique characteristics of the Seminole system such programs do not directly affect the need for the proposed capacity. The need for HPS #3 is driven by the savings which will result from the replacement of some partial requirements purchases with new generating capacity. HPS #3 will be used to increase the fixed maximum load served by Seminole; however, there will still be peak demands that must be met by partial requirements purchases from others. While Seminole's members' DSM and conservation efforts will continue to reduce these peaks, and thereby reduce Seminole's purchased power costs, sensitivity studies performed by Seminole show that additional DSM

and conservation would not reduce or eliminate the need for HPS #3. (Twitchell)

STAFF: Pending further review of discovery and the responses to cross examination questions, there does not appear to be sufficient conservation available which could mitigate the need for HPS #3, given the nature of Seminole's power supply arrangements. Staff is concerned about the level of effort placed on conservation by several of the member cooperatives, and will thoroughly investigate this issue in the upcoming goals dockets for the FEECA cooperatives.

ISSUE 17: Will Seminole's proposed combined cycle unit contribute to the provision of adequate electricity to Seminole and the State of Florida at a reasonable cost?

SEMINOLE: Yes. HPS #3 will provide adequate electricity to meet the needs of Seminole's member systems and to satisfy Seminole's reliability criteria at the lowest cost of any alternative identified through Seminole's purchased power and turnkey bidding process. The unit will provide significant savings compared to continued dependence upon partial requirements purchases. (Huis)

STAFF: Pending further review of discovery and the responses to cross examination questions, it appears the capacity from HPS #3 will contribute to meeting the needs of Seminole member cooperatives, and contribute to maintaining the reliability of Seminole's system and that of the state. The projected installed cost of HPS#3 appears reasonable. Seminole has forecasted that HPS #3 is less costly than continuing to purchase partial requirements from FPL, and less costly than other alternatives.

ISSUE 18: What associated facilities are required in conjunction with the proposed combined cycle project?

SEMINOLE: No transmission lines or other off-site associated facilities are required in connection with the project. HPS #3 is being constructed on an existing site and will interconnect with three existing 230 kV transmission lines, two of which are owned by Seminole. The existing transmission lines have sufficient capability to accommodate the 440 MW of capacity represented by HPS #3, in addition to the other units existing or planned at the site. (Welborn, Zimmerman)

STAFF: No transmission lines or other off-site associated facilities are required in connection with the project. On site, it appears that additional fuel off loading, storage, metering and pumping facilities are necessary.

ISSUE 19: Will the proposed combined cycle unit be the most cost-effective alternative to Seminole and peninsular Florida?

SEMINOLE: Yes. HPS #3 was selected as the most cost-effective alternative through a comprehensive bidding process. HPS #3 provides savings of \$299 million PWRR compared to continued purchases of partial requirements power under Seminole's base case planning assumptions. Sensitivity analyses show that HPS #3 remains a cost-effective alternative even if there are major changes in key assumptions. The addition of this unit on Seminole's system will also cost-effectively satisfy a portion of the state's need for additional capacity. (Huis)

STAFF: Seminole's evaluation of the bids received through its RFP show that HPS #3 is the most cost-effective alternative. Assuming that Seminole's forecast that HPS #3 is less costly than the cost of partial requirements power from FPL is correct, and assuming that there is insufficient conservation available to avoid this capacity, HPS #3 appears to be the most cost-effective alternative available to Seminole.

ISSUE 20: Based on the resolution of the previous factual and legal issues, should Seminole's petition for determination of need for the proposed combined cycle unit be granted?

SEMINOLE: Yes, the Commission should grant Seminole's request for a determination of need for HPS #3.

STAFF: Pending further review of discovery and the responses to cross examination questions, Staff's preliminary position is that the petition should be granted.

VII. EXHIBIT LIST

<u>Witness</u>	<u>Proffered By</u>	<u>I.D. No.</u>	<u>Description</u>
Walbridge	SEMINOLE	<u>(WCW-1)</u>	Portions of Need Determination Petition • Section 1 Map of Seminole's members service areas
Walbridge	SEMINOLE	<u>(WCW-2)</u>	Power Supply Arrangements Daily Peak Forecast - 1999 - Without HPS #3
Walbridge	SEMINOLE	<u>(WCW-3)</u>	Power Supply Arrangements Daily Peak Forecast - 1999 - With HPS #3
Woodbury	SEMINOLE	<u>(TSW-1)</u>	Portions of Need Determination Petition • Section 2.3 • Section 3.1 to 3.4 • Section 7 Letter re: Change in Capacity Commitment
Zimmerman	SEMINOLE	<u>()</u>	Portions of Need Determination Petition • Section 2 • Section 9 • Section 11.4 • Appendix A-3
Huis	SEMINOLE	<u>(DCH-1)</u>	Portions of Need Determination Petition • Section 3.3 and 3.5 • Section 10 • Section 12.1, 12.2, and 12.4 Preliminary Ranking of Bids

<u>Witness</u>	<u>Proffered By</u>	<u>I.D. No.</u>	<u>Description</u>
Huis	SEMINOLE	<u>(DCH-2)</u>	Annual Savings
Huis	SEMINOLE	<u>(DCH-3)</u>	Results of Sensitivity Analysis
Huis	SEMINOLE	<u>(DCH-4)</u>	Capacity Impact of HPS #3 in 1999
Huis	SEMINOLE	<u>(DCH-5)</u>	Energy Impact of HPS #3 in 1999
Welborn	SEMINOLE	<u>(FJW-1)</u>	Portions of Need Determination Petition • Section 11.1, 11.3, 11.6, 11.7, and 11.8 Diagram of HPS #3, 440 MW Combined Cycle Plant
Welborn	SEMINOLE	<u>(FJW-2)</u>	Project Schedule
Suh	SEMINOLE	<u>(DES-1)</u>	Portions of Need Determination Petition • Section 4 • Appendix A-1 History and Forecast Summary
Suh	SEMINOLE	<u>(DES-2)</u>	Seminole Purchases
Twitchell	SEMINOLE	<u>(JRT-1)</u>	Portions of Need Determination Petition • Section 5 History of Controlled Appliances
Twitchell	SEMINOLE	<u>(JRT-2)</u>	Load Management Savings History
Twitchell	SEMINOLE	<u>(JRT-3)</u>	Member Demand Side Management/ Conservation Programs
Woodall	SEMINOLE	<u> </u>	Portions of Need

<u>Witness</u>	<u>Proffered By</u>	<u>I.D. No.</u>	<u>Description</u>
		(RLW-1)	Determination Petition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 6 Appendix A-2 Base Case Delivered Fuel Forecast
Woodall	SEMINOLE	<u>(RLW-2)</u>	Natural Gas Forecast - Wellhead Price
Woodall	SEMINOLE	<u>(RLW-3)</u>	Natural Gas Forecast - Delivered Price
Geeraerts	SEMINOLE	<u>(JWG-1)</u>	Portions of Need Determination Petition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 8 Seminole's Significant Financing Transactions
Geeraerts	SEMINOLE	<u>(JWG-2)</u>	Economic and Financial Assumptions
Opalinski	SEMINOLE	<u>(MPO-1)</u>	Portions of Need Determination Petition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 11.2, 11.5, and 11.9 • Section 12.3 Map of Project Site
Opalinski	SEMINOLE	<u>(MPO-2)</u>	Aerial Photo of Project Site
Opalinski	SEMINOLE	<u>(MPO-3)</u>	Overall Site Arrangement Drawing
Opalinski	SEMINOLE	<u>(MPO-4)</u>	Computer Enhanced Photo of Project Site
Opalinski	SEMINOLE	<u>(MPO-5)</u>	Site Arrangement - Future Coal Gasification
Midulla	SEMINOLE	<u>()</u>	Portions of Need Determination Petition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 13 • Section 14

<u>Witness</u>	<u>Proffered By</u>	<u>I.D. No.</u>	<u>Description</u>
Waters	STAFF	----- ()	FPL Generation Expansion Plan comparative updates: 1991, 1992 and 1993

Parties and Staff reserve the right to identify additional exhibits for the purpose of cross-examination.

VIII. PROPOSED STIPULATIONS

None.


IX. PENDING MOTIONS

None.

It is therefore,

ORDERED by Commissioner Julia L. Johnson, as Prehearing Officer, that this Prehearing Order shall govern the conduct of these proceedings as set forth above unless modified by the Commission.

By ORDER of Commissioner Julia L. Johnson, as Prehearing Officer, this 29th day of March, 1994.



JULIA L. JOHNSON, Commissioner
and Prehearing Officer

(S E A L)
RVE:bmi

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.59(4), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

Any party adversely affected by this order, which is preliminary, procedural or intermediate in nature, may request: 1) reconsideration within 10 days pursuant to Rule 25-22.038(2), Florida Administrative Code, if issued by a Prehearing Officer; 2) reconsideration within 15 days pursuant to Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code, if issued by the Commission; or 3) judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court, in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility, or the First District Court of Appeal, in the case of a water or wastewater utility. A motion for reconsideration shall be filed with the Director, Division of Records and Reporting, in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code. Judicial review of a preliminary, procedural or intermediate ruling or order is available if review of the final action will not provide an adequate remedy. Such review may be requested from the appropriate court, as described above, pursuant to Rule 9.100, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.