č
1101001000

FLOR	BEFORE THE	
	IDA FODEIC SERVICE COMMISSION	
	DUED CORDONATIONIC DOCKET NO 000004 ET	
FARNINGS INCLUDING E	EFFECTS OF	
CORPORATION BY CAROL	INA POWER & LIGHT.	
CORPORATION THE FOR	RMATION OF A FLORIDA	
POWER & LIGHT'S RETA	AIL RATES.	
GRIDFLORIDA, A FLOR	IDA TRANSMISSION	
CUMPANY, UN TECU 5 I	RETAIL RATEPATERS.	
THE OFF:	ICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING.	
THE .PDF VI	(8700 to 123)	_
	PAGES 958 THROUGH 1021	
PROCEEDINGS:	HEARING	
BEFORE:	CHAIRMAN E. LEON JACOBS COMMISSIONER J. TERRY DEASON	
	COMMISSIONER LILA A. JABER	
	COMMISSIONER MICHAEL A. PALECKI	į
DATE:	Friday, October 5, 2001	
TIME:	Commenced at 8:30 a.m.	10
PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center	8-11
	4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida	2739 0CI-8
REPORTED RV.	JANE FAIROT RPR	73
KLFOKILD DI.	Official FPSC Reporter	7
	In the Matter of:  REVIEW OF FLORIDA POEARNINGS INCLUDING BEROPOSED ACQUISITION CORPORATION BY CAROUSTON BY CAROUSTON BY CAROUSTON BY CAROUSTON BY CAROUSTON BY COMPANY'S PROPOSED NOTRANSCO, AND THE FORTRANSCO, AND THEIR BEVIEW OF TAMPA ELECTRONI A COMPANY, ON TECO'S BELECTRONI A CONTINE OFFITTHE .PDF VIEW DATE:  DATE:  TIME:	FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  In the Matter of:  REVIEW OF FLORIDA POWER CORPORATION'S DOCKET NO. 000824-EI EARNINGS INCLUDING EFFECTS OF PROPOSED ACQUISITION OF FLORIDA POWER CORPORATION BY CAROLINA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY'S PROPOSED MERGER WITH ENTERGY CORPORATION, THE FORMATION OF A FLORIDA TRANSCO, AND THEIR EFFECT ON FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT'S RETAIL RATES.  REVIEW OF TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY AND DOCKET NO. 010577-EI IMPACT OF ITS PARTICIPATION IN GRIDFLORIDA, A FLORIDA TRANSMISSION COMPANY, ON TECO'S RETAIL RATEPAYERS.  ELECTRONIC VERSIONS OF THIS TRANSCRIPT ARE A CONVENIENCE COPY ONLY AND ARE NOT THE OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING, THE .PDF VERSION INCLUDES PREFILED TESTIMONY  VOLUME 8 PAGES 958 THROUGH 1021  PROCEEDINGS: HEARING  BEFORE: CHAIRMAN E. LEON JACOBS COMMISSIONER J. TERRY DEASON COMMISSIONER BRAULIO L. BAEZ COMMISSIONER BRAULIO L. BAEZ COMMISSIONER BRAULIO L. BAEZ COMMISSIONER MICHAEL A. PALECKI  DATE: Friday, October 5, 2001  TIME: Commenced at 8:30 a.m.  PLACE: Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148 4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida  REPORTED BY: JANE FAUROT, RPR

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

					960
1		EX	HIBITS		
2	NUMBER:			ID.	ADMTD.
3		es to Staff Data	Poquosts		981
4	3	s to Stair Data	Requests	981	
5	1				982 1005
6	16				1005
7					1005
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16	:				
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
		FLORIDA PUBLIC	SERVICE	COMMISSION	
	ıı				

1		PROCEEDINGS
2		(Transcript continues in sequence from
3	Volume 7.	)
4		CHAIRMAN JACOBS: We'll go back on the record.
5		Mr. Childs.
6		MR. CHILDS: Commissioners, the next witness is Mr.
7	Mennes.	
8		C. MARTIN MENNES
9	was calle	d as a witness on behalf of Florida Power and Light
10		nd, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:
11		DIRECT EXAMINATION
12	BY MR. CH	ILDS:
13	Q	Will you state your name and address, please?
14	A	My name is C. Martin Mennes, my address is 4200 West
15	Flagler S	treet, Miami, Florida.
16	Q	And you have previously testified in this docket?
17	Α	Yes, I did.
18	Q	Actually when you testified before you testified in
19	all three	dockets, correct?
20	А	Correct.
21	Q	Do you have before you a document entitled testimony
22	of C. Mar	tin Mennes in Docket Number 001148-EI?
23	A	Yes, I do.
24	Q	Is that your testimony for this proceeding?
25	A	Yes, it is.

1	Q	Do you have any changes to make to it?
2	Α	No, I do not.
3	Q	Do you adopt it as your testimony?
4	А	Yes.
5		MR. CHILDS: Commissioners, we ask that the prepared
6	testimony	of Mr. Mennes be inserted into the record as though
7	read.	
8		CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Without objection, show Mr. Mennes'
9	testimony	is entered into the record as though read.
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

#### BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Review of Florida Power & Light Company's proposed merger with Entergy Corporation, the formation of a Florida transmission company ("Florida transco"), and their effect on FPL's retail rates.

**DOCKET NO. 001148-EI** 

### TESTIMONY OF C. MARTIN MENNES

1	Q.	Please state your name and occupation.
2	A.	My name is C. Martin Mennes. I am Vice President, Transmission, Operations and
3		Planning of Florida Power & Light Company ("FPL").
4	Q.	Please briefly describe your educational and business experience.
5	A.	I graduated with Honors from the University of Florida. I have a Post Graduate
6		Certificate of Proficiency in Electrical Engineering from the University of Miami and
7		completed the Program for Management Development from the Harvard University
8		Graduate School of Business.
9		I began working at FPL in 1968 in the area of protective relay and control
10		systems. Since then I have held the positions of Manager of System Protections,
11		Manager of System Operations, Manager of Bulk Power Markets, and Director of
12		Power Supply. In February 2000 I assumed my present position.
13		I am a registered Professional Engineer in the State of Florida. My industry
14		related activities outside of Florida include serving as chairman of the following:

1		North American Electric Reliability Council ("NERC") Performance Subcommittee,
2		NERC Security Coordinator Subcommittee, and Southeastern Electric Reliability
3		Council ("SERC") Operating Committee. I am presently serving as vice chairman for
4		the NERC Market Interface Committee and I am on the NERC Technical Steering
5		Committee.
6	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?
7	A.	I am presenting testimony addressing two issues on behalf of FPL. First, I will
8		address FPL's decision to transfer ownership of its transmission assets to GridFlorida.
9		Second, I will address what Mr. Holcombe describes in his testimony as FPL's "cost
10		off-sets" (which are included in his Exhibit BLH-3). In his testimony, Mr. Holcombe
11		addresses the reasonableness of the estimated start up costs and preliminary annual
12		operating budget for GridFlorida, and the amount of these costs properly considered
13		to be additional costs associated with GridFlorida's establishment. The "cost off-sets"
14		in Mr. Holcombe's testimony represent those costs that would have been incurred by
15		the GridFlorida Companies (FPL, Tampa Electric Company, and Florida Power
16		Corporation) even without GridFlorida formation, as well as those costs the Compa-
17		nies will no longer incur after GridFlorida commences operations. To determine the
18		additional cost associated with GridFlorida, Mr. Holcombe reduces the total costs of
19		GridFlorida by the cost off-sets.
20		These matters relate to Issues 4 and 5 in Prehearing Order No. PSC-01-1485-
21		PSCO-EI.

Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits to your direct testimony?

1	Α.	NO.
2		I. <u>DECISION TO TRANSFER OWNERSHIP OF TRANSMISSION</u>
3	ASSI	<u>ets</u>
4	Q.	Please explain why FPL participated in the development of a Regional Transmis-
5		sion Organization ("RTO").
6	A.	As explained by Messrs. Hoecker and Naeve, the Federal Energy Regulatory Com-
7		mission ("FERC") in Order No. 2000 required FPL to join a FERC-approved RTO
8		under the timetable included in that Order. Shortly after FERC issued Order No.
9		2000, FPL began analyzing the options available to it to comply with FERC's require-
10		ments. FPL concluded that there are a number of benefits to active participation in
11		RTO development, including the ability to provide meaningful and timely input
12		during the formation process to help ensure that the RTO would benefit FPL custom-
13		ers.
14	Q.	Were there alternative approaches available to FPL?
15	A.	The alternative to active participation was to take a wait-and-see approach to RTO
16		formation. This approach, however, would result in substantial risk that FERC would
17		require FPL to join an RTO developed by others without regard to Florida's specific
18		circumstances and needs. FPL did not consider this as a viable alternative, as it
19		would not benefit FPL's customers.
20	Q.	What factors did FPL consider when developing an RTO?
21	A.	First and foremost, FPL was concerned that any RTO in which it would participate
22		would benefit FPL's customers. That is, FPL wanted to ensure that the RTO would be

1		structured to ensure that it would continue to provide reliable service and make proper
2		short- and long-term decisions that minimize costs consistent with the need to
3		maintain reliability. This includes ensuring that the RTO would plan for necessary
4		facilities to meet future needs and take all steps necessary such that those facilities
5		would be constructed.
6	Q.	Did the specific goals included in Order No. 2000 affect the Company's evalua-
7		tion?
8	A.	Yes. As a general matter, FERC's goals in Order No. 2000 are consistent with those I
9		just enunciated, i.e., ensuring reliable service at reasonable cost. Order No. 2000's
10		goals thus reinforced the goals that FPL felt must be satisfied in forming an RTO.
11	Q.	Did these goals influence FPL's decision regarding a proper structure for an
12		RTO?
13	A.	Yes. Once it determined the goals it was trying to accomplish, FPL analyzed the two
14		basic approaches to RTO formation to determine how best to satisfy those goals: A
15		for-profit transmission company ("Transco") and a non-profit independent system
16		operator ("ISO"). FPL determined that a for-profit Transco is the best way to meet
17		the goals of efficiency and reliability that would benefit FPL's customers.
18	Q.	Why did FPL determine that a for-profit Transco is a better option than a non-
19		profit ISO?
20	A.	After analyzing the poor performance of and high costs associated with most ISOs
21		developed in other regions of the country, most notably California, New York, and
22		New England, FPL believed, and continues to believe, that a for-profit Transco is the

most efficient structure for satisfying Order No. 2000. Based on these other experiences, FPL believes that ISOs, which are not accountable to anyone and have no interest in ensuring that costs are efficiently incurred, do not have proper incentives to operate efficiently or attempt to reduce costs. A for-profit Transco, on the other hand, will seek to meet its earnings projections, and thus will have proper incentives to minimize costs to do so. Also, a for-profit Transco can have proper incentives to efficiently operate the transmission system. Finally, a Transco that owns assets will have greater financial strength, and thus will have access to capital when it needs it and at lower cost than a non-profit ISO. These attributes of a for-profit Transco ultimately benefit customers through low cost, reliable service.

## Q. Why did FPL decide that it would transfer ownership of its transmission facilities to GridFlorida?

A.

FPL had a serious concern that without its assets a Transco in Florida would not be successful, as FPL owns approximately half the transmission facilities in the State. One reason for FPL's concern was its belief that a Transco will need to own significant assets for a successful Initial Public Offering ("IPO"), as investors in a company are buying a piece of that company, and thus want to ensure that the company has sufficient assets to operate efficiently. An IPO is important because it will provide funds the Transco needs and increase the accountability of the directors and officers of the Transco (and thus independence).

#### Q. Was this decision premised on a particular structure for the Transco?

Yes. FPL's decision was premised on the expected structure of GridFlorida as filed
with, and approved by, FERC. In particular, FPL's decision was premised on transferring ownership of its assets to a Transco in Florida that will be the RTO. If a structure
or RTO is adopted that is different than GridFlorida as approved by FERC, and FPL
is encouraged or required to participate, FPL will need to re-analyze whether transferring ownership of its facilities continues to be appropriate.

#### II. <u>COST OFF-SETS</u>

7

19

20

21

22

A.

- Q. Please describe the "cost off-sets" used by Mr. Holcombe in his testimony to
   develop the costs properly attributed to GridFlorida.
- As I explain above, the "cost off-sets" in Mr. Holcombe's testimony represent those 10 A. 11 costs that would have been incurred by the GridFlorida Companies even without 12 GridFlorida formation, as well as those costs the Companies will no longer incur after 13 GridFlorida commences operations. The cost off-sets are used by Mr. Holcombe to 14 determine the additional cost associated with GridFlorida, i.e., Mr. Holcombe reduces 15 the estimated total costs of GridFlorida by the cost off-sets to determine the incremen-16 tal costs associated with GridFlorida. The cost off-sets are included in Exhibit BLH-17 3, Tables 1 and 2.

#### 18 Q. Please explain the rationale for the costs off-sets.

A useful analogy is to consider how one determines the additional operating costs of a new car. One cannot simply look at the fact that the new car will require \$20 a week in gasoline and assume that the new automobile results in an additional fuel cost each week of \$20. If it used to cost \$15 a week in gas for the old car, the additional cost of

the new car is only \$5. Similarly, if the old car on average required \$3 a week in maintenance costs, but the new car is under warranty and thus will not have any out-of-pocket maintenance costs, that amount should be deducted from the total cost of the new car to determine the car's additional cost. As this example shows, costs that would have been incurred with the old car, as well as those costs that no longer will be incurred, must be considered when determining the additional costs associated with the new car.

#### A. Incremental Start-Up Costs

- Q. Please describe generally where the FPL estimated cost off-sets are included in
   Table 1 to Exhibit No. BLH-3.
- 11 A. The FPL estimated costs Mr. Holcombe uses as off-sets to GridFlorida start-up costs
  12 are included in columns 7 and 10 of BLH-3, Table 1. Column 7 describes the FPL
  13 estimated costs associated with retail load, and column 10 represents estimated costs
  14 associated with wholesale load (all of which in Table 1 represents FPL costs).
- Q. Please explain GridFlorida Facilities Project costs, and the FPL off-set thereto,
   included in Mr. Holcombe's testimony.
  - A. GridFlorida's Facilities Project costs, which are included at column 1, line 3 of Table 1, represent GridFlorida's costs associated with building spaces, e.g., the costs associated with procuring and managing headquarter facilities, back-up facilities, and a control center. The FPL offset of \$635,000 (\$588,000 associated with retail load, included in column 7, line 3 of the Table, and \$47,000 associated with wholesale load included in column 10, line 3) consists of the estimated cost to GridFlorida associated

1		with the lease by GridFlorida of three FPL facilities prior to commercial operations.
2		The costs are off-sets because they do not represent an additional cost above what
3		FPL's effective costs for the building spaces would have been even if GridFlorida was
4		not formed. That is, these are costs that FPL would have incurred absent GridFlorida,
5		but effectively is avoiding as a result of the lease payments.
6	Q.	What are the three leases included in the FPL off-set to GridFlorida's Facilities
7		Project costs?
8	A.	The FPL off-set is associated with the following leases:
9		• \$107,607 for building lease fees associated with leasing 11,000 sq. ft. of the
10		FPL control center. This figure represents the cost to GridFlorida to lease the
11		facility for 90 days prior to commercial operations, with the remainder in-
12		cluded in the annual lease costs.
13		• \$495,000 for building lease fees associated with leasing office space at the
14		FPL control center for 12 months prior to commercial operations. This figure
15		assumes 50 project personnel, with an average of 250 sq. ft. per person at an
16		estimated cost of \$39.13 per sq. ft., plus approximately \$6,000 to lease 50
17		workstations.
18		• \$32,400 for building lease fees to lease the disaster control facility for 12
19		months prior to commercial operations. This figure is based on a 1,200 sq. ft.
20		facility at the FPL Customer Service Center East at \$27 per sq. ft.
21	Q.	Please explain the FPL estimated cost off-set associated with System Operations.

1	A.	System Operations costs are included at line 4 of Table 1. The off-set for FPL
2		estimated costs is \$10,985,000 (\$10,171,000 in column 7 and \$814,000 in column
3		10). This figure represents an estimate of the allocation of costs for FPL's EMS
4		system to GridFlorida. Like the leases, this cost is an offset because it is not a new
5		cost that results from establishing GridFlorida. Instead, it represents an allocation of
6		costs FPL would be incurring whether or not GridFlorida was established.
7	Q.	Please describe briefly how those costs were allocated.
8	A.	All applications that will be shared by FPL and GridFlorida were allocated based on
9		the number of SCADA points associated with transmission functions. Licensing
10		costs also were allocated using the same methodology, except to the extent license
11		restrictions prohibit GridFlorida from using such license.
12		B. Incremental Operating Expenses
13	Q.	Please describe generally where the FPL estimated cost off-sets are included in
14		Table 2 to Exhibit No. BLH-3.
15	A.	Like Table 1, the FPL estimated costs Mr. Holcombe uses as off-sets to GridFlorida
16		operating expenses are included in columns 7 and 10 of BLH-3, Table 2. Again,
17		column 7 describes the FPL estimated costs associated with retail load, and column
18		10 represents estimated costs associated with wholesale load (some or all of which are
19		associated with FPL).
20	Q.	Please explain the FPL estimated cost off-set associated with O&M for FPL
21		transferred assets.

1	A.	Estimated Oxivi costs associated with FPL transferred assets, included at fine 1 of
2		Table 2, are made up of three elements: O&M on the fixed assets to be transferred,
3		estimated property tax on tangible assets, and cost-based leases for operating facilities
4		and shared equipment. The cost-offset, which FPL no longer will incur, totals
5		approximately \$57 million (\$52.882 million dollars associated with retail load
6		included in column 7 and \$4.231 million dollars associated with wholesale load
7		included in column 10). It consists of the following:
8		• \$34.113 million in O&M on FPL's transferred assets, which is based on
9		estimated 2001 O&M expenses adjusted to year 2003;
10		• \$20 million for estimated property tax on tangible property, poles, and wires,
11		estimated based on 1999 data; and
12		• \$3 million for leases for offices, services centers, and shared station equip-
13		ment that is owned by FPL.
14	Q.	Please explain the FPL estimated cost off-set associated with Salaries and
15		Benefits.
16	A.	This offset, included at line 3, is associated with reduced personnel that currently
17		perform functions FPL no longer will perform after GridFlorida begins operations.
18		FPL estimates a reduction in 27 employees. The estimated annual salary and benefits
19		for each of these employees, \$101,250 per employee per year, comes from the
20		assumptions used to develop the Accenture Blueprint. The total of this off-set for
21		FPL is \$2.733 million (\$2.531 million included in column 7 and approximately
22		\$202,000, representing FPL's share of the total included in column 10).

1	Q.	Please explain the FPL estimated cost off-set associated with Lease	
2		Back Arrangements –FPL.	
3	A.	Because FPL is not transferring land and land rights to GridFlorida, FPL and	
4		GridFlorida will enter in a land use agreement to allow GridFlorida access to its	
5		facilities. The \$19.444 million included in line 5, column 7 and the \$1.556 million	
6		included in line 5, column 10 represent the estimated cost of FPL's land use fees.	
7	Q.	Please explain the FPL estimated cost off-set associated with Control Center	
8		Facilities and Building Services.	
9	A.	This cost off-set is found at line 8, and totals \$1.796 million (the amount included in	
10		column 7 and the entire amount included in column 10). It represents the estimated	
11		cost to GridFlorida to lease the necessary space at FPL's control center to plan,	
12		operate, and control the transmission system. It is based on a lease for 45,000 square	
13		ft. at an estimated \$39.13 per sq. ft., plus an annual inflation factor of 2 percent to	
14		estimate the year 2003 lease cost.	
15	Q.	Please explain the FPL estimated cost off-set associated with Disaster Recovery	
16		Facility.	
17	A.	The \$31,000 included in line 10, column 7 and the \$2,000 included in line 10, column	
18		10 represent the estimated cost to GridFlorida to lease FPL's disaster recovery	
19		facility. The total is based on an annual lease for 12,000 sq. ft in FPL's existing	
20		disaster recovery facility at an estimated \$27.00 per sq. ft., plus an annual inflation	
21		factor of 2 percent to estimate the year 2003 lease cost.	
22	Ο.	Please explain the FPL estimated cost off-set associated with Storm Fund.	

1	A.	The \$4.259 million included in line 13, column 7 and the \$341,000 included in line
2		13, column 10 represents the cost off-set to FPL's forecasted storm fund accrual as a
3		result of FPL transferring its transmission assets.

#### O. Please explain the FPL estimated cost off-set associated with

#### 5 Telecommunications.

A.

- GridFlorida's expected cost for Telecommunications is included at line 15 of Table 2.

  This is an operating expense associated with the voice and data communications lines needed by GridFlorida. FPL's off-set to the total expected cost for GridFlorida is estimated at \$750,000 (the amount included in column 7 plus the total amount included in column 10), representing the estimated telecommunications costs FPL would have incurred had GridFlorida not commenced operations, but will avoid after GridFlorida becomes operational. The \$750,000 is made-up largely of an allocation of telephone bills associated with transmission operations that FPL no longer will be responsible for when GridFlorida commences operations.
- 15 Q. Please explain the FPL estimated cost off-set associated with Meetings, Travel,

  16 and Seminars on Line 17 and Employee Training Budget included on Line 22.

  17 A. These figures, totaling \$71,000 and \$39,000 respectively, represent estimates of
  - These figures, totaling \$71,000 and \$39,000 respectively, represent estimates of avoided costs for meetings, travel, and seminars and training for the 27 employee reductions at FPL identified above. The figure for meetings, travel, and seminars is based on an estimated annual expense of \$2,632 per employee and the figure for training is based on an estimated annual expense of \$1,421 per employee. These calculations were based on assumptions used to develop the Accenture Blueprint.

- 1 Q. Please explain the FPL estimated cost off-set associated with FERC Fees.
- 2 A. This figure is equal to FPL's load ratio share of the \$1 million estimate for
- 3 GridFlorida's FERC fees included in the Accenture Blueprint. It represents costs FPL
- 4 would have incurred had GridFlorida not commenced operations.
- 5 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 6 A. Yes.

BY MR. CHILDS:

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Would you please summarize your testimony, Mr. Mennes.

Yes, thank you. My testimony addresses two distinct subjects. First, I explain FPL's decision to propose a for-profit transmission company, or transco, as the regional transmission organization, and why FPL decided to transfer its transmission assets to the transco. Given its belief that it would ultimately be forced by FERC to join an RTO, FPL decided it was best to take a proactive approach and develop an appropriate RTO structure rather than wait and be forced into an RTO designed by someone else.

FPL further decided that a transco structure for an RTO is superior to a nonprofit ISO structure because a transco has stronger incentives to provide innovative and cost-effective service and because a transco is more likely than an ISO to be held accountable for the way that it provides service. FPL decided it would divest its transmission assets to the transco in order to ensure that the transco has the significant assets necessary to become a financially strong company. FPL also wanted to align the ownership and operation of its transmission facilities into one company.

The second purpose of my testimony is to support the cost offsets described in Mr. Holcombe's testimony with respect to costs associated with FPL. These are costs associated with

1	the estimate of the total GridFlorida costs that would have		
2	been incurred by FPL absent GridFlorida, or which can be		
3	avoided by FPL because of GridFlorida's operations. It is		
4	necessary to subtract these costs from the estimate of total		
5	GridFlorida costs in order to derive an estimate for the		
6	incremental costs that would be incurred as a result of		
7	GridFlorida.		
8	Q That concludes your summary?		
9	A Yes, it does.		
10	MR. CHILDS: We tender the witness for cross		
11	examination.		
12	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Very well. Mr. McGlothlin.		
13	MR. McGLOTHLIN: No cross.		
14	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Ms. Paugh.		
15	MS. PAUGH: No questions.		
16	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Mr. Howe.		
17	MR. HOWE: No questions.		
18	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Mr. Twomey.		
19	MR. TWOMEY: No questions.		
20	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Staff.		
21	CROSS EXAMINATION		
22	BY MR. KEATING:		
23	Q Mr. Mennes, is it your belief that FPL will achieve		
24	benefits as a result of its participation in GridFlorida?		
25	A My testimony really doesn't go to the benefit area,		

1	but right now it's hard to say. I do think that in the
2	long-term there will be benefits as a result of an RTO. You
3	know, and I think they would be the same benefits that were
4	basically addressed in the Hoecker and Naeve testimonies.
5	Q Did you say and I missed part of that did you
6	say in the long-term there would be net benefits?
7	A Yes. I think as addressed by Hoecker and Naeve. You
8	know, again, it would be speculative, but, yes.
9	Q And FPL has not well, has FPL attempted to
10	quantify those benefits?
11	A No, FPL has not.
12	Q Can you offer any estimate on when net savings to FPI
13	would be realized?
14	A No.
15	Q Do you believe that FPL's ratepayers would see any
16	benefit from its participation in GridFlorida before net
17	savings are realized?
18	MR. CHILDS: Just as an observation, I think he has
19	said this is not his area of testimony that he is offering.
20	MR. KEATING: Let me just ask a couple of more
21	questions. And this may be something that is outside of your
22	area of expertise; and if so, let me know.
23	BY MR. KEATING:
24	Q Would the excess deferred taxes associated with the
25	assets transferred to GridFlorida be adjusted on FPL's books

1	when the transfer occurs?
2	A I'm letting you know.
3	(Laughter.)
4	Q Thank you. Do you know if the deferred tax reserves
5	associated with the assets transferred to GridFlorida will be
6	adjusted on FPL's books when the transfer occurs?
7	A I do not know the answer to that.
8	Q Okay. And do you know if investment tax credits
9	associated with the assets transferred to GridFlorida will be
10	adjusted on FPL's books when the transfer occurs?
11	A I don't know the answer to that.
12	Q Okay. Will GridFlorida record assets on the same
13	basis as they are transferred by Florida Power and Light?
14	A Will they record assets on the same basis.
15	Q Well, let me step back. Is Florida Power and Light
16	transferring assets at net book value?
17	A Yes. That was the original plan was to transfer at
18	net book value.
19	Q Do you know if GridFlorida will record those assets
20	on the same basis?
21	A That would only be speculation, but I would assume
22	they would.
23	Q Is there any way if Florida Power and Light divests
24	its assets into GridFlorida and later is dissatisfied with
25	GridFlorida, other than buying back the assets, that it could

1	regain ownership of the assets?		
2	A That sounds like an issue to keep Washington, D.C.		
3	employed, but I would doubt it. Not that I know of.		
4	MR. KEATING: Thank you. That's all the questions I		
5	have.		
6	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Commissioners. Redirect.		
7	MR. KEATING: I'm sorry, before I finish, I had		
8	handed out to the parties yesterday and to and provided a		
9	copy to the Commissioners this morning of an exhibit that is		
10	identified as described as responses to staff data requests		
11	And at this time I would like to have that marked. Staff has		
12	no specific questions on this, and, again, this is similar to		
13	the packet of interrogatory responses. It's something that		
14	staff approached the parties with the hope that it could be		
15	stipulated into the record.		
16	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Show that marked as Exhibit 24.		
17	MR. CHILDS: Is that a composite of all companies or		
18	just		
19	MR. KEATING: No, this is only it's the packet		
20	with the cover sheet Witness C. Martin Mennes, description,		
21	responses to staff data requests. And I believe this is just		
22	Florida Power and Light.		
23	MR. CHILDS: We have no objection to that.		
24	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Redirect.		
25	MR. CHILDS: No.		

CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Very well. Without objection, show Exhibit 24 is admitted. Thank you, you are excused, Mr. Mennes.

(Exhibit 24 marked for identification and admitted into the record.)

CHAIRMAN JACOBS: And Mr. Southwick.

MR. KEATING: I'm sorry, Chairman, I had one other exhibit I wished to move in. I wasn't sure that the questioning was done.

CHAIRMAN JACOBS: That was exhibit -- which one, 2 or 3?

MR. KEATING: And that is the exhibit that was marked as Number 3 on Wednesday. Again, this is a packet that was provided to the parties at the hearing on Wednesday with the hopes that this could be stipulated into the record, and it is comprised of certain responses to staff interrogatories from FPL and responses to document requests. I would make a clarification that since the exhibit was handed out Wednesday, staff has decided to remove about four or five of the items that were listed on the cover sheet with the original packet. We have distributed a revised cover sheet that shows specifically the items that we wish to have included in this exhibit.

I guess, to avoid the time and the paper of making 30 more copies of this, pulling those individual interrogatory and

1	document requests out, I would just like to go through those
2	five on the record to make sure that they are still included
3	in the packet, but we do not wish to offer them for purposes o
4	the record, and I want to
5	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Does everybody have a copy of this
6	MR. KEATING: I believe so.
7	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Do we need to go through it then?
8	I'm happy with it if you are.
9	MR. CHILDS: It might be just as easy if you would
10	agree, Cochran, to simply put a date on the cover sheet of
11	today and make it clear that that is the identification of wha
12	you are offering.
13	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Revised cover.
14	MR. CHILDS: Right.
15	MR. KEATING: That would be fine. I just wanted to
16	make clear that the specific discovery material that we have
17	agreed to remove or to not include as part of what we wish to
18	have in the record is still physically in this packet.
19	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Very well.
20	MR. CHILDS: We do not object.
21	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Very well. This is in essence,
22	then Exhibit 3 is admitted as revised. Okay.
23	(Exhibit 3 admitted into the record.)
24	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Now, on Exhibit 24, I had thought
25	that this was a copy of it. Did you pass out copies of that?

1		MR. KEATING: Yes, we did.
2		CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Okay. I didn't have one. I will
3	just get	a copy later then.
4		MR. KEATING: I believe this morning I may have left
5	one at yo	ur chair.
6		CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Okay.
7		MR. KEATING: And I have additional copies if you
8	need one.	
9		CHAIRMAN JACOBS: We can get it later. And the title
10	was FPL r	esponses to staff's
11		MR. KEATING: Responses to staff data requests.
12		CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Very well. Thank you. Mr. Fama.
13		HENRY I. SOUTHWICK
14	was calle	d as a witness on behalf of Florida Power Corporation
15	and, havi	ng been duly sworn, testified as follows:
16		DIRECT EXAMINATION
17	BY MR. FAI	MA:
18	Q	Mr. Southwick, you have appeared previously in this
19	hearing?	
20	А	Yes, I have.
21	Q	And on whose behalf are you appearing at this time?
22	A	Florida Power Corporation.
23	Q	I call your attention to your prefiled testimony on
24	behalf of	Florida Power.
25		MR. FAMA: That testimony has no exhibits, but I will

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

mention that Florida Power inputted some information and data 1 into Mr. Holcombe's Exhibit BLH-3, which is Exhibit 16. And 2 3 Mr. Southwick is available to answer questions on that exhibit. 4 and we will move for that at the end of this witness' 5 testimony. CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Very well. 6 7 BY MR. FAMA: Mr. Southwick, was the prefiled testimony prepared 8 9 under your direction and control? 10 Yes, it was. Α Do you have any corrections you need to make to that 11 Q 12 testimony? 13 No. sir. Α And do you adopt that testimony as your own today? 14 Q 15 Α Yes. MR. FAMA: I ask for the testimony to be inserted 16 into the record as though read. 17 18 CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Without objection, show Mr. 19 Southwick's testimony is entered into the testimony as though read. 20 21 22 23 24 25

# FLORIDA POWER CORPORATION DOCKET NO. 000824-EI (GRINFLORIDA REVIEW)

### DIRECT TESTIMONY OF HENRY I. SOUTHWICK ON BEHALF OF FLORIDA POWER CORPORATION

#### INTRODUCTION

2

1

\_

3

.

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

1415

16

17

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Henry I. Southwick. My business address is Post Office Box 14042,St. Petersburg, Florida 33733.

Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

- A. I am employed by Florida Power Corporation ("FPC") as Manager, Regional Transmission Organization Development.
- Q. Please provide a brief outline of your educational background and business experience.
- A. Please see a description of my educational background and business experience in my direct testimony on behalf of the GridFlorida Companies, concerning the interim development and management of GridFlorida, in this docket.
- Q. What is the purpose of your direct testimony?

. 9

 Α.

A. I will first address Issue 5 in the Prehearing Order No. PSC-01-1485-PCO-EI in Docket No. 000824-EI, which concerns the appropriateness of FPC's decision to transfer operational control of its transmission facilities of 69kV and above to GridFlorida while retaining ownership of such transmission facilities. I will also address Issue 4, which concerns the estimated costs to FPC's retail customers of FPC's participation in GridFlorida. Finally, my testimony addresses different aspects of Issue 6, which concerns the prudence of FPC's decision to participate in GridFlorida.

#### Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits to your direct testimony?

A. No.

#### <u>Transfer of Control of Transmission Facilities</u>

#### Q. Why has FPC decided to participate in GridFlorida?

As discussed by GridFlorida Companies' Witnesses C. M. Naeve and J. Hoecker, FPC was required to join a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC")-approved RTO in accordance with Order No. 2000. Moreover, FPC was required to do so in accordance with the deadlines established in Order No. 2000, as well as those dictated by FPC's commitment to FERC in connection with FPC's merger with Carolina Power & Light Company. FPC also took into consideration the benefits to early RTO participation, also discussed by Mr. Naeve, which include, particularly, FPC's ability to provide meaningful and timely input during the process of formation of GridFlorida. FPC's participation permitted the creation of an RTO that is the product of the negotiation of all

6

Α.

10

21

23

Florida stakeholders and resulted in the formulation of an RTO proposal that is tailored to Florida's special needs and protects the interests of FPC's consumers.

### Q. Why has FPC decided to transfer control but not ownership of its transmission facilities ("Controlled Facilities")?

RTO participation requires transfer of either control or ownership of transmission facilities. FPC views this choice as a business decision, not as a question of utility operations. FPC has been successfully engaged in the transmission business for many years. At this point in time, FPC sees no business reason to exit the transmission business. Divesting facilities to GridFlorida would be a significant restructuring involving the exchange of \$509 million of FPC transmission facilities (net plant in service at the end of year 2000) in return for an equity interest in GridFlorida. The ultimate return on such an investment depends on an initial public offering ("IPO") of GridFlorida equity and other events that will unfold over the next several years, all of which are uncertain. FPC believes that it is in its best business interest to retain transmission ownership at this time. Also, FPC has the option to divest its transmission facilities to Grid Florida in the future, as the documents governing Grid Florida allow this. As discussed below, all transmission facilities, whether owned or controlled by GridFlorida, will be operated in a non-discriminatory manner, pursuant to a uniform set of standards and requirements. Hence, FPC's facilities will be operated at the same level of efficiency, reliability, and safety, and FPC will receive the same high quality transmission service, whether or not it divests its transmission facilities.

Q. Why has FPC designated 69 kV and above facilities as those for which control will be transferred to GridFlorida?

A. This issue is discussed in the joint testimony of GridFlorida Companies' Witnesses C. M. Naeve, C. M. Mennes, G. J. Ramon, and myself (the "Panel Testimony").

### Q. What are the circumstances under which FPC will be transferring control of the Controlled Facilities?

A. FPC will transfer operational control of the Controlled Facilities pursuant to the Participating Owners Management Agreement (the "POMA") and GridFlorida's Operating and Planning Protocols. These documents are attached to document 33 of Exhibit No. \_\_\_ (CMN-1) attached to the direct testimony of GridFlorida Companies' Witness C. M. Naeve. The provisions of these protocols constitute part of the POMA contract, and can be found in Attachments O and N of the GridFlorida Open Access Transmission Tariff ("OATT"), respectively. The POMA and the protocols have been filed with the FERC. Any amendments to these documents also will be subject to FERC review.

#### Q. Please describe the purposes of the POMA.

A. The POMA governs the relationship between GridFlorida and FPC and any other Participating Owner ("PO"), and their respective obligations arising in connection with the transfer of operational control of Controlled Facilities to GridFlorida. The POMA contains specific provisions that ensure that GridFlorida's operations and practices will meet a high standard of safety, reliability, and efficiency. The POMA also ensures that FPC and other POs will be afforded an opportunity to

of Controlled Facilities. Finally, the POMA is designed to adequately protect FPC's (and other POs') investors or members from liability arising from the operation of Controlled Facilities by GridFlorida.

collect the revenue requirement and other costs associated with their ownership

#### Q. When does FPC intend to sign the POMA?

A. FPC intends to sign the POMA on the date that GridFlorida becomes operational.

#### Q. Are there any preconditions to FPC's execution of the POMA?

 A. Yes. The POMA will only become effective upon the certification by GridFlorida that a number of conditions have been met. The conditions are related to regulatory approvals, and certain capabilities necessary to perform under the

#### Q. Please describe the conditions.

POMA.

Α.

FERC also must have issued an order authorizing the formation and operations of GridFlorida. GridFlorida and the POs executing the POMA must have entered into agency agreements for the provision of transmission service through non-Controlled Facilities owned by such POs. GridFlorida and the POs must have in place all means necessary to carry out their respective obligations under the POMA, including completion of necessary testing and verification. GridFlorida must also have in place the necessary physical facilities, personnel, hardware and software required to carry out its obligations.

Before the POMA becomes effective, FERC must have approved the transfer of

control of Controlled Facilities and allowed the POMA to become effective.

Q. Will FPC be the only transmission owning utility to sign the POMA?

A. As of today, FPC is the only transmission owning utility that has openly expressed an interest in executing the POMA at the time GridFlorida commences operations. Under Section 10 of the POMA, additional transmission owning utilities may execute the POMA at any time, provided that the conditions discussed above, with respect to regulatory approvals and technical capabilities, are met.

Q. Please describe the POMA provisions that govern the operation of the Controlled Facilities.

A. Under the POMA, GridFlorida is responsible for providing non-discriminatory open access transmission service over the Controlled Facilities, pursuant to an open access transmission tariff approved by FERC, and in accordance with the requirements of Order No. 2000. GridFlorida has sole responsibility and authority with regard to the operation of the Controlled Facilities, except in the event of an emergency. An emergency is defined as a situation in which a PO's electric facilities are in danger of suffering physical damage or there is a risk of injury to persons or property. The POs will develop local operating rules to address emergency situations.

The POs are responsible for maintaining their Controlled Facilities and must follow the directions of GridFlorida with regard to scheduling of maintenance.

GridFlorida is responsible for the short-term reliability of the Controlled Facilities, for planning and directing the expansion of the Controlled Facilities and for

receiving and processing interconnection requests from generators. During a transition period, POs will provide Local Area Planning Services, pursuant to terms and conditions to be defined. A PO will have the option but not the obligation to construct additional facilities identified by GridFlorida that interconnect with the PO's Controlled Facilities. GridFlorida will take all prudent steps to renegotiate existing interconnection agreements to conform such agreements to GridFlorida's operational requirements.

GridFlorida will be entitled to obtain from POs all information and access rights necessary to carry out its obligations.

GridFlorida will also be entitled to request a PO to transfer control of additional transmission facilities if it determines that those are required for the reliable operation of GridFlorida or to provide transmission service to an eligible customer. These rights are subject to limitations on transfers of control resulting from tax and other considerations.

GridFlorida will operate the OASIS and provide ancillary services in accordance with the OATT and FERC requirements. GridFlorida is responsible for publishing the Operating and Planning protocols and other GridFlorida documents in its internet site (or otherwise making them available to POs upon request), for complying and causing its directors, officers, employees and agents to comply with a FERC-approved Code of Conduct, and for complying with the orders of FERC and other state and federal regulatory agencies with jurisdiction.

Q. Please describe the POMA provisions that govern the collection and distribution of revenues associated with the Controlled Facilities.

GridFlorida and its directors, officers, employees, and agents are required to avoid damage to Controlled Facilities or any property of a PO affected by GridFlorida's activities. Similarly, POs are required to avoid damage to GridFlorida's facilities.

GridFlorida also must employ and enforce credit standards to minimize or avoid loss of revenues. GridFlorida and POs must exercise their respective rights and obligations in conformity with good utility practice, and shall conform to applicable reliability guidelines, policies, standards, rules, regulations and other requirements of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the National Electric Reliability Counsel, the Florida Reliability Coordinating Counsel, among other authorities with jurisdiction. Finally, GridFlorida is required to maximize the efficient use of the Controlled Facilities.

#### Q. Please describe the Operating and Planning Protocols and their purpose.

A. The protocols provide further detail with respect to the operations and planning of Controlled Facilities, to further ensure that GridFlorida's practices meet a high standard of reliability, efficiency, and quality of service. The protocols are described in greater detail in the Panel Testimony. The protocols apply to all transmission facilities regardless of whether they are directly owned or controlled by GridFlorida pursuant to the POMA. Therefore, GridFlorida is required to provide transmission service in a uniform manner.

A. GridFlorida is required to collect, through its rate schedules, and distribute, in accordance with the provisions of the OATT, the POs' revenue requirement and other amounts associated with the POs' ownership of the Controlled Facilities. The POs will maintain the sole authority to make filings to establish the revenue requirement and any other amounts associated with their Controlled Facilities.

- Q. Please describe the POMA provisions that govern the allocation of liability among GridFlorida and the POs and the parties' respective insurance requirements.
- A. The POMA requires GridFlorida and the POs to carry adequate insurance (or self insure) and to indemnify each other for liabilities and claims arising out of each party's performance under the POMA. The POMA also limits the POs' liability under certain circumstances.
- Q. Will FPC be able to withdraw its Controlled Facilities from GridFlorida after it executes the POMA?
- A. Yes. The POMA allows POs to withdraw all or a portion of their Controlled Facilities and terminate the agency agreement. The withdrawal becomes effective at the later of twelve months or the effective date of all regulatory approvals. The twelve month notice period will not apply in the event of the divestiture of Controlled Facilities to GridFlorida or in the event of an adverse tax consequence arising out of GridFlorida's control of a PO's Controlled Facilities. Withdrawal will not impact service pursuant to transmission contracts entered prior to the notice of withdrawal, unless a modification is required by FERC or

7

11

10

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

20

19

22

21

24

23

25

mutually agreed to by the parties to the transmission contract. Other obligations between GridFlorida and the withdrawing PO shall be renegotiated.

### Q. Please describe what changes, if any, may be made to the POMA in the future?

Α. Two provisions in the POMA were not accepted by the FERC. FPC, Florida Power & Light Company (FPL) and Tampa Electric Company (TECO) filed a request for rehearing requesting that the FERC reinstate such provisions. These provisions refer to the allocation of consequential and indirect damages liability between GridFlorida and the POs and the limitation of liability of a non-sovereign PO in connection with claims made by sovereign POs. The request for rehearing is currently pending.

#### Q. Do you expect any other future changes to the POMA?

Α. Yes. I expect that there will be amendments to the POMA which take into account the provisions of future "contribution" agreements pursuant to which FPL, TECO, and perhaps others will divest their facilities to GridFlorida. These conforming changes will assure that Participating Owners are treated comparably to Divesting Owners ("DO" or "DOs").

For example, at the time of divestiture, GridFlorida may not have the ability to perform all of the functions then being performed by a DO on the particular facilities being divested. In order to be sure that the DO receives the same level of service after the divestiture, the DO temporarily may have to perform certain services on behalf of GridFlorida with respect to the facilities divested. To the

extent that a contribution agreement grants a DO the right to provide such services, and to the extent a PO has a similar situation, the PO will have the same right to perform the same sort of services. This will keep the PO on an equivalent basis as the DO.

Access to transmission facilities is another area where it may be necessary to conform the POMA to a DO agreement. In addition, just as the DOs must be sure that divestiture does not violate their bond indenture, the POMA also must provide that transfer of operational control must be done in a manner that is consistent with investor owned utility indentures. The POMA already contains provisions protecting tax exempt debt. It is my understanding that we will examine whether the POMA needs a provision protecting the indentures of investor-owned POs such as Florida Power. Finally, the allocation of risk contained in contribution agreements may cause the liability provisions of the POMA to be revisited. Again, revisitation would be done to maintain the PO and DO in comparable positions. In order to become effective, all of the POMA changes I have been discussing would need to be filed and accepted by FERC.

# Impact of FPC's Participation in GridFlorida on FPC's Retail Rates

- Q. How will GridFlorida determine the charges for transmission services that are rendered to transmission customers serving load within FPC's service area?
- A. GridFlorida's rate design is described in the direct testimony of GridFlorida Companies' Witness W. Ashburn in this docket. As explained by Mr. Ashburn,

Α.

 GridFlorida's proposal includes a two part rate. Part I consists of the existing transmission facilities in each zone as of December 31, 2000, and will be assessed only on load in that zone for years 1-5. Part II reflects the costs of all new facilities built after December 31, 2000 and will be assessed on all RTO load. Beginning in year 6 and ending in year 10, 20% of the Part I rates for each zone will be added annually to the Part II rates such that at year 10, there will no longer be a Part I rate.

Transmission charges for service to load within FPC's service area (i.e., within FPC's pricing zone) will include: (a) a zonal transmission access charge, based on the cost of FPC's existing transmission facilities (and any cost of existing transmission facilities of Transmission Dependent Utilities ("TDUs") whose loads reside in FPC's pricing zone and choose to participate in GridFlorida, subject to a phase in, as described in Mr. Ashburn's testimony), and (b) a load ratio share of the system wide new facilities cost. In addition, the transmission charges will include a load ratio share of the system wide grid management cost. The grid management cost is recovered through a Grid Management Charge ("GMC"), also discussed in Mr. Ashburn's testimony.

# Q. How will the revenue requirements associated with FPC's transmission facilities be determined?

FPC plans to develop a formula that calculates its total revenue requirements annually associated with all of its transmission facilities. Such a formula would employ cost data from the preceding calendar year and incorporate a true up provision to reflect the actual costs incurred during the year. A formula

mechanism would insure that FPC is neither under-recovering nor overrecovering its transmission facilities' costs.

- Q. How will FPC differentiate its revenue requirements for purposes of GridFlorida charges related to (a) existing facilities and (b) new facilities?
- A. FPC is planning to calculate the revenue requirements associated with the new facilities portion by applying a simple annual carrying charge rate to the accumulated gross new average investment balance each year. The revenue requirements established in this way for new facilities can be subtracted from the revenue requirements calculated by the formula for all of FPC's transmission facilities to derive the portion of revenue requirements related to existing facilities.

# Q. What transmission costs will be supported by FPC's retail load?

A. FPC will take transmission service under the GridFlorida OATT to serve its retail load and certain wholesale load. FPC will take network service to serve its retail load. The access charge for network service is explained in Mr. Ashburn's testimony and consists of the product of (a) the monthly zonal charge based on the revenue requirements for the facilities within the zone (Part I) plus the monthly new facilities charge (Part II) multiplied by (b) the network customer's network service billing determinants for the month. In addition, customers will be assessed a GMC.

FPC's retail load constitutes approximately 75% of the total transmission system loading in FPC's pricing zone and about 22% of the transmission loading of the

entire GridFlorida system. Therefore, FPC's retail load will be responsible for (1) approximately 75% of the cost of existing facilities in the FPC pricing zone, (2) approximately 22% of the new facilities cost of the entire grid, and (3) approximately 22% of the system wide grid management cost.

- Q. Will the cost of obtaining transmission service from GridFlorida to serve

  FPC's retail customers be higher than if FPC had continued providing

  transmission service directly to its customers as it does today?
- A. Yes, more than likely. It is expected that GridFlorida's total charges are likely to be higher as a result of (a) GridFlorida rates that eliminate existing pancaked transmission rates, (b) GridFlorida rates that include the cost recovery of TDU facilities, (c) the transition to grid-wide average rates, and (d) the costs associated with creating and operating the new entity, GridFlorida, which are discussed in the testimony of GridFlorida Companies' Witness B. L. Holcombe.
- Q. Would you describe what you mean by the expectation that charges will be higher as a result of GridFlorida imposing rates that eliminate existing pancaked transmission rates?
- A. Under today's transmission pricing practices, a charge is assessed by each individual transmission system for a power transaction being delivered on or through its system. This practice is referred to as pancaking. When GridFlorida becomes operational, pancaking is eliminated and only one rate charge is applicable for delivery to load or a transaction on or through any of the participating systems of GridFlorida. As a result of eliminating pancaking, rate charges will necessarily be higher since the costs of transmission facilities will be

spread over less billing units. Unless a transmission user is a beneficiary of unpancaking, *i.e.*, the user currently utilizes a number of transmission systems, the user is likely to be subject to greater unit rate charges even though they may be supporting the same facilities. FPC's retail load is served predominately from resources on FPC's existing transmission system, and little transmission pancaking is required. Thus, the elimination of pancaking is likely to result in increased rate charges to FPC retail customers.

- Q. You indicated that FPC's retail customers may incur higher cost responsibility as a result of GridFlorida including the cost recovery of transmission assets of TDUs. Would you explain this further?
- A. Yes. The entities of Seminole Electric Cooperative and its member systems, and the Florida Municipal Power Agency and its member participants have constructed and operate transmission facilities that are interconnected with FPC's transmission system. These entities are TDUs, in that they still are dependent upon FPC's transmission system for delivery of their power needs. In the event that any of these entities participate in GridFlorida by divesting their facilities to GridFlorida or by entering into a POMA with GridFlorida for the operation of their facilities, the entity will be compensated by GridFlorida for the use of such facilities as part of the GridFlorida transmission system. Initially, under zonal pricing, and thereafter under grid-wide pricing, FPC retail customers will be subject to rates from GridFlorida that include the cost recovery for any TDU transmission facilities of participating entities.

9

10

14 15

13

16 17

18

19

Q.

20

21

22

23

24 25 Q. Why do you think the derivation of system-wide average rates will result in higher charges to FPC's retail customers?

A. FPC has lower unit transmission costs than other Florida transmission owners. Under the pricing proposal of GridFlorida, rates will have fully transitioned from zonal rates to system-wide average rates within ten years. This obviously will result in the imposition of higher rates than those currently experienced for FPC retail customers.

#### Q. How significant is the increase in retail rates expected to be?

Α. The transmission component of the average retail rate is in the order of \$3.00 to \$3.50 per 1000 kWh of usage. This compares to a total current billing of \$93.41 for a 1000 kWh monthly residential customer. The estimated increase in transmission costs for an FPC retail customer as a result of obtaining service from GridFlorida is likely to be in the range of \$0.50 to \$0.75 per 1000 kWh of This may be a significant percentage increase in the transmission component of the cost (approximately 20%), but it is still a relatively small percentage increase on a residential customer's total electric bill (less than 1%).

# How does FPC propose to collect the increment in costs described above from FPC's retail ratepayers?

Α. FPC proposes to establish a pass through clause that would be used to collect from retail ratepayers the difference, if any, between the amounts collected from retail ratepayers in its bundled rates and the amounts assessed by GridFlorida to FPC in connection with transmission service provided by GridFlorida to FPC. The procedure that is being proposed is the same as that described in the

testimony of FPL Witness K. M. Dubin. In the phase 2 proceeding in this docket, FPC will identify the transmission cost component contained in its bundled retail rates.

# Q. Do you believe that GridFlorida's pricing structure mitigates the cost increases that FPC's retail load is likely to bear?

- A. Yes. Many of GridFlorida's rate design features were specifically developed to mitigate the impact of cost shifts to FPC's retail customers. For example, the concept of zonal pricing for the first five years preserves to the extent possible the lower unit costs of FPC's existing facilities during this time as the applicable rates to loads in FPC's electric system. The inclusion of cost recovery for TDU facilities in the pricing zone has been designed to be phased in gradually at 20% per year. The concept of phasing out of zonal rates for cost recovery of existing facilities to a system wide rate in increments of 20% per year in years 6 through 10 is also an attempt to gradually impact FPC's retail customers with rates supporting higher grid-wide average costs.
- Q. How will FPC's retail customers realize any cost benefits that offset the transmission cost increases resulting from the creation of GridFlorida?
- A. FPC envisions two potential types of benefits, each of which would flow automatically to ratepayers. The first is in the generation function, where as a result of a more vibrant wholesale market, FPC may engage in more economy transactions that would result in lower fuel costs or additional sales margins. These generation benefits would automatically flow through to customers as a result of FPC's fuel clause. The second type of benefit that GridFlorida may

15 A

afford FPC is its impact on the costs of owning and maintaining FPC's existing transmission system. Initially FPC does not believe that GridFlorida's control of FPC's facilities will significantly reduce FPC's existing transmission costs. However, in the event that FPC is able to eliminate costs as a result of experience with GridFlorida and its impact on FPC's operators, planners, etc., these cost reductions would be reflected in FPC's annual formula calculation of its transmission revenue requirements that GridFlorida must collect. Thus any cost savings automatically flow through GridFlorida's rates to transmission users. Upon approval by the Florida Public Service Commission of the pass through clause for incremental transmission cost recovery, which I proposed earlier in my testimony, any cost savings reflected in GridFlorida rates to FPC would automatically flow through to FPC's retail customers.

## Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?

A. Yes, it does.

1 BY MR. FAMA:

Q Mr. Southwick, do you have a summary that you would like to offer at this time?

A Yes, I do.

Florida Power Corporation was required to join a FERC-approved RTO in accordance with Order No. 2000. We also recognize the benefits of early active RTO participation, and this participation has permitted the creation of an RTO that is a product of the negotiation of all Florida stakeholders and resulted in the formulation of a proposal that is tailored to Florida's special needs and protects the interests of Florida's consumers.

FERC requires transfer of either control or ownership of transmission facilities to an RTO. Florida Power views this choice as a business decision and we see no business reason to exit the transmission business. Therefore, we have chosen to transfer control of our transmission to GridFlorida.

During the stakeholder negotiating process, Florida Power was successful in incorporating certain rate features specifically designed to mitigate the impact of cost shifting to FPC's retail customers. Nonetheless, the cost of obtaining transmission service from GridFlorida to serve FPC's retail customers will likely go up, although the increase to the average residential customer will be less than one percent. This increase will be offset to some degree by any future

1	benefits as a result of lower fuel and purchased power costs.
2	That concludes my summary.
3	MR. FAMA: Thank you. We tender the witness for
4	cross examination.
5	MR. McGLOTHLIN: I have no questions.
6	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Ms. Paugh.
7	MS. PAUGH: No questions.
8	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Mr. Howe.
9	MR. HOWE: No questions.
10	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Mr. Twomey.
11	MR. TWOMEY: Very briefly, Mr. Chairman.
12	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Okay.
13	CROSS EXAMINATION
14	BY MR. TWOMEY:
15	Q Good afternoon, sir.
16	A Good afternoon.
17	Q You said in your summary, Mr. Southwick, if I heard
18	you correctly, that you think your transmission costs will go
19	up something less than one percent, is that what you said?
20	A The impact on the residential customer will be less
21	than one percent.
22	Q And you went on to say that you think didn't you
23	go on to say there likely will be benefits that to some degree
24	will offset those increased costs?
25	Δ That is correct

1	Q Isn't it true, Mr. Southwick, and tell me if it is
2	not, that your testimony doesn't attempt to specify any level,
3	that is, any dollar level of economic benefits that will result
4	from your company's participation in GridFlorida?
5	A That is correct.
6	MR. TWOMEY: Thank you, sir. That's all I have.
7	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Staff.
8	CROSS EXAMINATION
9	BY MR. KEATING:
10	Q Mr. Southwick, is it your belief that Florida Power
11	Corporation will achieve benefits as a result of its
12	participation in GridFlorida?
13	A Yes, I believe we will.
14	Q Has Florida Power Corporation attempted to quantify
15	those benefits?
16	A No, sir.
17	Q Can you offer any estimate on when those benefits
18	will be realized?
19	A I think they would begin to be realized shortly after
20	start up of GridFlorida.
21	Q And specifically what benefits would be realized at
22	that point?
23	A Through the elimination of pancake wheeling rates for
24	transmission there should be benefits that would flow through
25	to our ability to purchase and sell power, both of which flow

through to the customers.

Q Would you agree that perhaps some of the other benefits that have been discussed in this hearing will not be immediately recognized by Florida Power?

A Such as, please?

Q For purposes of moving this along, I'm going to move on and withdraw the last question.

Can you offer any estimate on when net savings to Florida Power Corporation will be realized as a result of its participation in GridFlorida?

A No, sir. We have no idea when or if that might occur.

CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Is it going to be different -well, I guess it probably wouldn't be. If you haven't done an
assessment of when your savings would occur, you certainly
would not have done any for Florida Power and Light. But the
thought occurs to me, do you have any thought of whether or not
they will be different because they are divesting and you are
not?

THE WITNESS: I don't think that would make any difference at all. I've never thought about that, but I don't think that would matter. But there would be differences for other reasons due to cost shifting impacts, and that would create differences in the way the different utilities would be able to measure net benefits or not. And also there would be

	1
1	
2	
3	
4	١
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	Ì
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

differences in utilities in how they are situated with respect to the grid, where their generation purchasing opportunities might be as compared to where their system needs are. And that would be different from utility to utility. I have never attempted to measure what the differences were.

CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Thank you.

### BY MR. KEATING:

Q Mr. Southwick, would Florida Power Corporation's ratepayers see any decrease on their bill before net savings are realized?

A Well, if there are not net savings then I wouldn't expect to see a decrease on the bill.

Q To your knowledge, when does Florida Power Corporation plan to seek recovery of the costs associated with its participation in GridFlorida?

A We would expect to see recovery of the costs when the costs begin to occur.

Q Do you believe that net savings will have been realized by the time that the costs have begun to incur, be incurred?

A I don't know.

Q Has Florida Power Corporation considered any mechanism that would match the timing of cost recovery with the realization of net savings?

A No, I think that the cost recovery should occur when

1	the costs occur. The ability to measure net savings, if ever
2	is possible, I don't know, I don't think those two are
3	connected.
4	Q I have just a couple of questions about the cost
5	information for Florida Power Corporation that is in Exhibit
6	BLH-3.
7	A Yes.
8	Q Do you have that with you?
9	A Yes, I do. Just one second. Okay.
10	Q First, does Florida Power Corporation plan to
11	amortize the start-up costs shown in this exhibit over five
12	years?
13	A Florida Power's start-up costs? This is
14	GridFlorida's start-up costs.
15	Q But I'm referring to Florida Power Corporation's
16	portion of the start-up costs that are shown in Table 1 in
17	Exhibit BLH-3?
18	A What this shows is what Florida Power's piece of the
19	GridFlorida start-up costs would be and we would pay it to
20	GridFlorida as they charged it to us, which it is my
21	understanding that is intended to be over five years.
22	Q Are first year O&M expenses for Florida Power
23	Corporation included in Exhibit BLH-3 in Table 2?
24	A No, Florida Power's expenses are not included.
25	Q And why are they not included?

- A These are GridFlorida's expenses.
- Q But this table does include each of the GridFlorida companies' operating costs as provided to Mr. Holcombe for first year operations, is that correct?

A No, I don't think that is quite correct. These costs are GridFlorida costs. And to the extent that GridFlorida owns these facilities that are now owned by Florida Power and Light, the operating and maintenance costs for those facilities will become GridFlorida's costs, they will no longer be Florida Power and Light's costs. In the case of Florida Power, since we are not divesting our ownership, those costs will not go to GridFlorida, and GridFlorida will never see them.

Q Well, what is shown in Column 5 of Table 2 in Exhibit BLH-3?

A That is an assessment to Florida Power of GridFlorida's costs.

Q Is that an assessment of Florida Power's portion of those costs?

A Yes.

Q Is there any documentation, or are there any work papers that support those costs that are listed in Column 5?

A Well, the costs in Column 5 is an allocation of the costs in Column 1. And the costs in Column 1 was what Mr. Holcombe's testimony supported. And I believe he had an exhibit that was rather lengthy that I believe documented those

figures.

Ŭ

Q But were the costs in Column 5 provided to Mr. Holcombe for his analysis by Florida Power Corporation?

A Well, the costs in Column 9 were. Column 2 refers to an allocation, refers to the appendix which is the next page, which I believe explains how those costs were assessed based on a load ratio of shares between the three pricing zones plus the grid-wide. And other than those that are specifically assigned, such as the current FPL O&M, for example, I believe those numbers all flow right out of that Appendix 1, which is Page 3 of BLH-3.

Q Let me ask, looking at Column 1, do the costs in that column represent a sum of the costs Florida Power and Light, Tampa Electric, and Florida Power Corporation believe are the operating costs for GridFlorida, or their portion of the operating costs?

A Column 1, as I understand it, is the total costs to operate GridFlorida in the first full year.

Q But to arrive at the numbers in Column 1, it was my understanding -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- that Mr. Holcombe used the cost data that was provided by each of the individual companies?

A To some degree he did, and to some degree he developed other numbers himself. Most of the numbers he developed himself. Some of the numbers were provided.

1	
2	-
2	1
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	ì
9	
10	
11	
12	I
13	l
12 13 14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	∦
20	
21	
22	
23	∦

25

Q Do you know which of the numbers in Column 5 related to Florida Power Corporation were provided by Florida Power Corporation?

A I don't believe any of them were. Possibly on Line 24.

- Q Mr. Holcombe, I'm going to -- we are going to hand you a Florida Power Corporation response --
  - A Mr. Holcombe is not here.
  - Q I'm sorry. Did I call you Mr. Holcombe? Okay.

Mr. Southwick, I apologize. I'm going to hand you Florida Power Corporation's response to staff's Request for Production of Documents Number 3. If you could read the request and the response.

A The question is, "Provide all work papers and any other supporting documentation used to prepare Witness Holcombe's Exhibit BLH-3?" The response was, "There is no such supporting documentation. The information provided for FPC in Exhibit Number BLH-3 is based on internal FPC discussions."

Q So based on that, do you know which of the cost estimates provided in BLH-3 were provided by Florida Power Corporation?

A Yes. In Column 9, the reference to the \$188,000, which is shown in parentheses there, that's what we are talking about. Maybe it was my deposition, but what that is is our estimate at the beginning that we will able to reduce our work

1 force by two people because of the GridFlorida activity. 2 That's what that number reflects. 3 Were any of the other cost numbers in this table, and 4 llet me qualify that, in Tables 1 or Table 2, provided by 5 Florida Power Corporation, and that would include the start-up costs or first year operating costs? 6 7 Α No. sir. 8 Okay. So based on the response to Document Request 0 9 Number 3 that you read, there are no supporting work papers for 10 the 188.000 that is listed in Column 9 on Table 2? 11 Α No. there is not. 12 And that is the result of internal discussions? 0 13 Yes. Α 14 Can Florida Power Corporation withdraw operational 0 15 control of its transmission assets from GridFlorida at a future 16 date? 17 Α There are provisions to do that under certain 18 conditions, ves. 19 Under what conditions could it do so? 0 20 We would have to have regulatory permission, and we 21 would have to join another RTO. We can't just up and quit and 22 no longer participate in an RTO. 23 Q Would that require approval from FERC? 24 Α I believe it would. 25 0 Do you believe it would require approval from this

1	Commissio	n?
2	Α	I can't I don't know.
3	Q	Can Florida Power Corporation transfer ownership of
4	its trans	mission assets to GridFlorida at a later date?
5	A	Yes, we could.
6	Q	Would that require any regulatory approvals?
7	Α	Yes, it would.
8	Q	Would that require approval from FERC?
9	Α	Yes, it would.
10	Q	Do you believe it would require approval from this
11	Commissio	n?
12	Α	I don't think so. But to the extent that is a legal
13	question,	and I believe it is, I would defer that to the
14	attorneys	
15	Q	Does Florida Power Corporation anticipate
16	reclassif	ying any of its transmission investment to any other
17	FERC plan	t account before it gives operational control to
18	GridFlori	da?
19	А	No, we don't.
20	Q	For those transmission assets that will be under the
21	operation	al control of GridFlorida, will Florida Power
22	Corporati	on make any journal entries when those transmission
23	when the	operational control is turned over to GridFlorida?
24	A	No, sir.
25	Q	Will the company continue to post the continuing

1 property records for those assets? 2 I believe so. Α 3 0 And Florida Power Corporation will continue to 4 maintain the records for those assets that are under the operational control of GridFlorida? 5 6 Α Yes. 7 0 How will Florida Power Corporation distinguish those assets for which they have relinquished operational control 8 9 from those that remain under its control? 10 Α In what respect, distinguish? 11 On Florida Power Corporation's books, how will it 0 12 distinguish the assets that remain under its control from those 13 for which operational control has been given to GridFlorida? 14 I don't believe it will. Α 15 MR. KEATING: Thank you. That's all the questions I 16 have. 17 CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Commissioners. COMMISSIONER DEASON: The assets for which you 18 transfer operational control, you will receive recovery of your 19 revenue requirement by a tariff filing at FERC and then 20 21 subsequent recovery through collection by GridFlorida, is that 22 the way it works? 23 THE WITNESS: Yes. sir. COMMISSIONER DEASON: And that is going to recovery 24 25 100 percent of your revenue requirement for those assets?

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

_	
1	THE WITNESS: For our transmission assets, yes, sir.
2	COMMISSIONER DEASON: So you will not be looking to
3	this Commission then to if there is any shortfall there in
4	recovery, you will not be looking here to make that shortfall
5	up, is that correct?
6	THE WITNESS: That is correct.
7	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Redirect.
8	MR. FAMA: No redirect.
9	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: And we have no exhibits except
10	yours.
11	MR. FAMA: We would move for admission of Exhibit 16.
12	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Oh, yes. Without objection, show
13	Exhibit 16 is admitted. And, Staff, you have Exhibit 1?
14	MR. KEATING: And Staff would move for the admission
15	of Exhibit 1, which is the composite exhibit consisting of
16	discovery material from Florida Power Corporation.
17	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Without objection, show Exhibit 1
18	is admitted.
19	(Composite Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 16 admitted into the
20	record.)
21	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Thank you. You are excused, Mr.
22	Southwick. That seems to take care of all the witnesses.
23	Anything else, staff? Could you outline the process
24	from this point forward?
25	MR. KEATING: Well, from this point forward, we are

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

going faster than we did these last two and a half days.

CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Outstanding.

MR. KEATING: Well, I don't know. It's going to be a tight schedule, but I understand that daily transcripts of this hearing have been made available with the possible exception of Wednesday night where we went a little late.

CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Let me state that because we went over, I specifically would request some latitude in that we have a very challenging process for the court reporters. They are working at their level best to get it done in the time promised, but I would ask the parties to give them some latitude in that.

MR. KEATING: As the post-hearing schedule stands right now, briefs will be filed next Thursday, October 11th, the staff recommendation on Thursday, October 18th, and then the -- which would be considered at the Special Agenda scheduled for October 30th.

CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Questions or issues? Mr. Fama.

MR. FAMA: Chairman Jacobs, would it be possible for the parties to have an extra day for the brief, given that we have a couple of important extra issues to brief that you raised yesterday?

CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Great. And I'm glad you reminded me, because I had asked to get those issues written up, and I had neglected to do that. We will get -- can we work together

1	to get that out to the parties promptly?
2	MR. KEATING: Yes. I want to make sure what issues
3	those are. I understand that
4	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: The two issues that I asked for.
5	MR. KEATING: One was FERC jurisdiction over
6	GridFlorida, is that correct?
7	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: FERC jurisdiction to order
8	companies to mandate participation in GridFlorida. The second
9	one was
10	MR. FAMA: Chairman Jacobs, I think that you're
11	right, the first issue was FERC's authority to mandate RTOs, ir
12	general. I didn't know that you specifically said GridFlorida,
13	but
14	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: No, I think it was in general.
15	MR. FAMA: And I think the second issue was this
16	Commission's jurisdiction over GridFlorida.
17	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Yes. Now, as to the request for ar
18	extra day, does that disrupt the schedule significantly?
19	MR. KEATING: I mean, a day in the schedule we have
20	is disruptive, but I don't know that it could be when we get
21	to October 18th staff will ask for additional time for its
22	recommendation if the Commissioners will accept that.
23	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: You can file the recommendation
24	late, a day or two later.
25	MR. KEATING: I would assume we may ask for

1 add

additional time.

CHAIRMAN JACOBS: I think we can work with that.

COMMISSIONER DEASON: Let me ask a question at this point. I know that this is on an expedited schedule, and I understand that, but to allow staff more time to analyze and to have more time for the briefs, is there some problem just having this as part of the regular agenda for November the 6th?

MR. KEATING: I know that was something that was looked at. I know Bob Elias had taken a role in that. From my understanding there is a telecommunications item on the 6th that could require a quite extensive bit of discussion. I forget exactly what it is, I believe it is reciprocal compensation. And we had looked at that possibility. And all I know was ultimately that the decision, I guess, among staff was it was best to go forward with the October 30th special agenda.

CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Commissioner, I will take a look at that with staff and see if we can --

COMMISSIONER DEASON: I just want to make sure that the parties have sufficient time to brief everything that needs to be briefed, and then obviously for our staff to have sufficient time to do a thorough analysis. If it can all be done by 30th, that's fine.

CHAIRMAN JACOBS: We will take a look at that and come up with something that is acceptable.

1	COMMISSIONER DEASON: Okay.
2	MR. McGLOTHLIN: Was there a ruling on the request
3	for an extra day for the briefs at this point?
4	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Yes. Yes, we will grant that, the
5	one extra day for the briefs. I don't know what that date is,
6	but one extra day.
7	MR. FAMA: That day would be Friday, the 12th.
8	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Okay. Anything else to come before
9	us today?
10	MR. KEATING: I believe there is at least one other
11	matter to resolve, and that is the timing of late-filed
12	exhibits. There are five late-filed exhibits that have been
13	identified, the first one is Exhibit 8, percentage of total
14	transmission system under GridFlorida operational control.
15	Then we have 11, 12, and 13.
16	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: And 19.
17	MR. KEATING: And 19, correct. And I guess I would
18	defer to the parties on what their thoughts are on how soon
19	that can be provided.
20	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: What would you like to do, seven to
21	ten days, correct?
22	MR. KEATING: Sorry?
23	CHAIRMAN JACOBS: We generally go seven to ten days,
24	correct?
25	MR. KEATING: I'm not sure.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

MR. FAMA: We would suggest that the late-filed exhibits be due on the same day as the brief, Friday, the 12th. I think that would be acceptable. MR. KEATING: CHAIRMAN JACOBS: That's okay with the parties, the intervenors? Very well. Show it done. If there is nothing else to come before us today, I want to thank all the parties. This was important, an important docket. I think probably more important than perhaps lwe even realize today. MR. WILLIS: Commissioners, we, too, appreciate very much your attentiveness to this and for doing this on an expedited basis, and we appreciate your consideration. CHAIRMAN JACOBS: Very well. Then we are adjourned. Thank you. (The hearing concluded at 1:35 p.m.)