LAW OFFICES

MESSER, VICKERS, CAPARELLO, MADSEN, GOLDMAN & METZ

A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION

SUITE 701 215 SOUTH MONROE STREET POST OFFICE BOX 1876 TALLAHASSKE, FLORIDA 32302-1876 TELEPHONE (804) 222-0720 TELECOPIER (904) 224-4359

January 17, 1995

## HAND DELIVERY

Ms. Blanca Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 101 East Gaines Street Tallahassee, FL 32301

Re: Florida Public Utilities Company; Docket No. 950003-GU

Dear Ms Bayo:

ACK

Enclosed for filing on behalf of Florida Public Utilities Company in connection with the hearings scheduled to begin March 8, 1995 in this docket are the original and 15 copies of the following:

1) Petition for Approval of Florida Public Utilities Company's Purchased Gas Cost Recovery Factors;

 Direct Testimony of George Bachman and Marc L. Schneidermann; and

3) Schedules E-1, E-1R, E-2, E-3, E-4 and E-5.

Makin -3 Note Please acknowledge receipt of these documents by stamping the enclosed extra copy of this letter.

00601 JAN 17 8

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Norman H. Horton, Jr.

NHH/amb Enclosures cc: Parties of Record Mr. George Bachman

DOCUMENT NUMBER - DATEDOCUMENT NUM

RDS

(1) /3 mm

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING PSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

00602 JAN 17 8

URIGINAL

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION FILE COPY DOCKET NO. 950003-GU DETERMINATION OF PURCHASED GAS/COST RECOVERY FACTOR

Direct Testimony of Marc L. Schneidermann on Behalf of Florida Public Utilities Company

| 1  | Q. | Please state your name and business address.       |
|----|----|--|
| 2  | Α. | Marc L. Schneidermann, 401 South Dixie Highway,    |
| 3  | 8  | West Palm Beach, FL 33402.                         |
| 4  | Q. | By whom are you employed and in what capacity?     |
| 5  | Α. | I am employed by Florida Public Utilities Company  |
| 6  |    | as the Manager of Engineering and Gas Supply.      |
| 7  | Q. | How long have you been employed by Florida Public  |
| 8  |    | Utilities Company?                                 |
| 9  | Α. | Since February 1989.                               |
| 10 | Q. | - Have you previously testified before this        |
| 11 |    | Commission?  |
| 12 | Α. | Yes, I testified in the Purchased Gas Cost         |
| 13 |    | Recovery Dockets Numbers 940003-GU, 930003-GU,     |
| 14 |    | 920003-GU and 910003-GU as well as Docket Numbers  |
| 15 |    | 940620-GU and 900151-GU, the most recent filings   |
| 16 |    | for rate relief for the Company's gas operations.  |
| 17 | Q. | What are the subject matters of your testimony in  |
| 18 |    | this proceeding?                                   |
| 19 | Α. | My testimony will relate to three specific         |
| 20 |    | matters. First, I am responsible for the           |
| 21 |    | forecasting of the Company's natural gas sales for |
|    |    | DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE                               |
|    |    | 00603 JAN 17 8                                     |
|    |    | FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING                             |

| 1  |    | the twelve month projection period of April 1995   |
|----|----|--|
| 2  |    | through March 1996. Second, I am also responsible  |
| 3  |    | for forecasting the demand, transportation and     |
| 4  |    | commodity costs of gas to be purchased by the      |
| 5  |    | Company. Third, I am also responsible for          |
| 6  |    | developing the projected weighted average cost of  |
| 7  |    | gas for the Company's traditional non-             |
| 8  |    | transportation firm and interruptible classes of   |
| 9  |    | customers.   |
| 10 | Q. | Please generally describe how the estimates of gas |
| 11 |    | sales were developed for the projection period.    |
| 12 | Α. | Florida Public Utilities developed its gas sales   |
| 13 |    | projections based on a January 1990 through April  |
| 14 |    | 1994 study period. The Company compiled a          |
| 15 |    | database, sorted by rate classifications, which    |
| 16 |    | consisted of the historical monthly customer       |
| 17 |    | consumption and the historical monthly customer    |
| 18 |    | count experienced during the study period.         |
| 19 |    | Detailed analyses were performed on the database.  |
| 20 |    | From these data, projections of customer counts    |
| 21 |    | were constructed by applying the historical        |
| 22 |    | average monthly rates of customer growth to the    |
| 23 |    | actual April 1994 customer count. The historical   |
| 24 |    | average monthly consumption per customer, by rate  |
| 25 |    | classification, was computed as part of this       |
| 26 |    | study.   |
|    |    |  |

| 1  |    | The product of the projected monthly customer      |
|----|----|--|
| 2  |    | count and historical average monthly consumption,  |
| 3  |    | by rate classification, yielded the Company's      |
| 4  |    | projection of gas requirements. Minor adjustments  |
| 5  |    | were made by the Company's gas division managers   |
| 6  |    | and marketing director for variations in growth    |
| 7  |    | which were not adequately represented by           |
| 8  |    | historical trends. Gas requirements for company    |
| 9  |    | use were based on an historical factor of 0.18% of |
| 10 |    | the Company's total natural gas sales. This        |
| 11 |    | factor was developed by the Company's Accounting   |
| 12 |    | Department. These projections were compiled and    |
| 13 |    | sorted to determine the total projected sales to   |
| 14 |    | the traditional non-transportation firm and the    |
| 15 |    | interruptible classes of customers for the twelve  |
| 16 |    | month period of this filing.                       |
| 17 | Q. | Please describe how the forecasts of gas costs     |
| 18 |    | were developed for the projection period.          |
| 19 | Α. | As of November 1, 1993 Florida Public Utilities    |
| 20 |    | Company converted 100% of its FGT General Service  |
| 21 |    | (Rate G) demand to FGT's Firm Transportation       |
| 22 |    | Service (Rate FTS-1) demand. For the projection    |
| 23 |    | period, the FGT FTS-1, FTS-2, NNTS-1, PTS-1 and    |
| 24 |    | ITS-1 rates were projected to be 110% of the       |
| 25 |    | Florida Gas Transmission Company's tariff rates as |
| 26 |    | listed in FGT's tariff Sheets Nos. 8A and 8D       |

| 1  |    | effective February 1, 1995. Additionally, FPU has  |
|----|----|--|
| 2  |    | nominated certain demand levels from FGT for its   |
| З  |    | Phase III expansion. It is expected that Phase     |
| 4  |    | III will be in service as soon as February 1, 1995 |
| 5  |    | and FPU will be assessed the appropriate Phase III |
| 6  |    | costs. Said costs will be collected by FPU from    |
| 7  |    | its traditional non-transportation firm and        |
| 8  |    | interruptible customers except for demand costs    |
| 9  |    | designated for Lake Worth Utilities. The expected  |
| 10 |    | cost of natural gas purchased by FPU and delivered |
| 11 |    | to FGT, for transportation to the Company and for  |
| 12 |    | FGT's 3.0% compressor fuel use, during the         |
| 13 |    | projection period was assumed to be 125% of the    |
| 14 |    | higher of the historical contract determination    |
| 15 |    | Zone 3 prices as posted in Natural Gas Week (bid   |
| 16 |    | week issue) and Inside FERC Gas Market Report      |
| 17 |    | (first issue of each month) corresponding to the   |
| 18 |    | maximum of the monthly price posted during the     |
| 19 |    | prior year and the next prior year for each        |
| 20 |    | particular projected month.                        |
| 21 | Q. | Please describe how the forecasts of the weighted  |
| 22 |    | average costs of gas were developed for the        |
| 23 |    | projection period.                                 |
| 24 | Α. | Florida Public Utilities Company and its largest   |
| 25 |    | single customer, Lake Worth Utilities, have agreed |
| 26 |    | to have the Company contract for firm              |

transportation services (FTS-1 and FTS-2) demand 1 levels on behalf of Lake Worth Utilities. All 2 demand costs, commodity costs associated with the 3 dedicated firm transportation services demand 4 levels for Lake Worth Utilities are excluded from 5 the Purchase Gas Cost Recovery Factor (PGCRF). 6 Lake Worth Utilities will reimburse the Company 7 for 100% of said actual costs. 8 Absent costs dedicated to transportation 9 customers, FPU's sales to traditional non-10 transportation firm and interruptible customers 11 were allocated all of the monthly pipeline demand 12 costs and were allocated all of the projected 13 pipeline and supplier commodity costs. The sum of 14 these costs were divided by the projected sales 15 level to said customers resulting in the projected 16 weighted average cost of gas for traditional non-17 transportation firm customers and interruptible 18 customers and ultimately the PGCRF shown on 19 Schedule E-1. 20 Capacity shortfalls, if any, would be satisfied 21 with the most economic dispatch combination of 22 acquired FTS-1 and/or FTS-2 demand levels 23 relinquished by another FGT shipper, Rate ITS-1 24 services and/or PTS-1 services whenever required -25

26 and available. Obviously, if other services