Susan D. Ritenour Secretary and Treasurer and Regulatory Manager One Energy Place Pensacola, Florida 32520-0781

Tel 850.444.6231 Fax 850.444.6026 SDRITENO@southernco.com



August 21, 2006

Ms. Blanca S. Bayo, Director Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee FL 32399-0870

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Enclosed for official filing in Docket No. 060001-El are an original and ten copies of the following:

Prepared direct testimony of L. S. Noack addressing the proposed Generating Performance Incentive Factor reward/penalty criteria modifications as outlined in the "Petition of Citizens of the State of Florida for Modification of Reward/Penalty Criteria of Generating Performance Incentive Factor Mechanism."

Sincerely, SusanD. Ritenous

bh

Enclosures

cc: Beggs & Lane Jeffrey A. Stone, Esq.

07585 AUG 22 8

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERI

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

IN RE: Fuel and Purchased Power Cost) Recovery Clause with Generating) Performance Incentive Factor)

Docket No.: 060001-EI

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing was furnished by U. S. mail or hand delivery this $2/5^7$ day of August, 2006, on the following:

Patricia Ann Christensen, Esq. Charles J. Beck, Esq. Joseph A. McGlothlin, Esq. Office of Public Counsel 111 W. Madison St., Room 812 Tallahassee FL 32399-1400

John T. Burnett, Esq. Progress Energy Service Co. P. O. Box 14042 St. Petersburg FL 33733-4042

Paul Lewis, Jr. Progress Energy Florida, Inc. 106 E. College Ave., Ste. 800 Tallahassee FL 32301

John T. Butler, Senior Attorney Florida Power & Light Company LAW/JB 700 Universe Boulevard Juno Beach FL 33408-0420

R. Wade Litchfield, Esq. Assoc. General Counsel 700 Universe Boulevard Juno Beach FL 33408-0420

William G. Walker, III Vice President Florida Power & Light Co. 215 S. Monroe Street, Ste. 810 Tallahassee, FL 32301-1859 Karen S. White, Lt. Col., USAF Damund E. Williams, Capt., USAF AFCESA/ULT 139 Barnes Drive, Suite 1 Tyndall AFB, FL 32403-5319

Cheryl Martin Florida Public Utilities Co. P. O. Box 3395 West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3395

Lee L. Willis, Esq. James D. Beasley, Esq. Ausley & McMullen P. O. Box 391 Tallahassee FL 32302

Timothy J. Perry, Esq. McWhirter Reeves & Davidson 117 S. Gadsden Street Tallahassee FL 32301

Michael B. Twomey A.A.R.P. P. O. Box 5256 Tallahassee FL 32314-5256 Robert Scheffel Wright, Esq. John T. LaVia, III, Esq. Young van Assenderp, P.A. 225 S. Adams St., Suite 200 Tallahassee, FL 32301

Lisa Bennett, Esq. FL Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee FL 32399-0863

Angela Llewellyn Regulatory Coordination Tampa Electric Company P. O. Box 111 Tampa, FL 33601

John W. McWhirter, Jr., Esq. McWhirter Reeves & Davidson 400 N Tampa St., Suite 2450 Tampa FL 33602

Norman H. Horton, Jr., Esq. Messer, Caparello & Self, P.A. P. O. Box 1876 Tallahassee FL 32302-1876

JEFFREYNA.

Florida Bar No. 325953 RUSSELL A. BADDERS Florida Bar No. 0007455 STEVEN R. GRIFFIN Florida Bar No. 0627569 BEGGS & LANE P. O. Box 12950 Pensacola FL 32591-2950 (850) 432-2451 Attorneys for Gulf Power Company BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Docket No. 060001-EI

PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

L. S. NOACK

GENERATING PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE FACTOR

AUGUST 21, 2006



DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

1		GULF POWER COMPANY
2		Before the Florida Public Service Commission
3		Direct Testimony of
4		Lonzelle S. Noack
5		Docket No. 060001-EI
6		Date Filed: August 21, 2006
7		
8	Q.	Please state your name, business address, and occupation.
9	A.	My name is Lonzelle S. Noack. My business address is One Energy Place,
10		Pensacola, Florida 32520-0335. My current job position is Power Generation
11		Specialist, Senior for Gulf Power Company.
12		
13	Q.	Please describe your educational and business background.
14	A.	I received my Bachelor of Science degree in Environmental Engineering from the
15		University of Florida in 1995 and received my Master of Business Administration
16		degree from the University of West Florida in 2000. I joined Gulf Power in 1995
17		as an Environmental Engineer and served in that role with increasing levels of
18		responsibility for over six years. Major responsibilities included coordination of
19		federal and state air-related compliance testing for all Gulf Power generating units,
20		management of the Continuous Emission Monitoring (CEM) System program at
21		each of the Company's generating facilities, and coordination of the Company's air
22		compliance reporting to state and federal regulatory agencies. I was also
23		responsible for serving as Gulf's Environmental Subject Matter Expert on
24		Company and system-wide compliance teams. As previously mentioned in my
25		testimony, my current job position is Power Generation Specialist, Senior at Gulf

1 2 Power Company. In this position, I am responsible for preparing all GPIF filings as well as other generating plant reliability and heat rate performance reporting.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to address the proposed GPIF reward/penalty criteria modifications as outlined in the Petition of Citizens of the State of Florida for Modification of Reward/Penalty Criteria of Generating Performance Incentive Factor and in the Prepared Direct Testimony of James A. Ross on behalf of the Florida Office of Public Counsel.

10

11

Q. What is the objective of the GPIF program?

A. The GPIF was incorporated into the Fuel and Purchased Power Cost Recovery Clause in 1980 to provide an incentive for the efficient operation of base load generating units. The intent of this incentive is to reward utilities for performance that exceeds reasonably expected performance and to penalize utilities for performance that is less than reasonably expected.

17

18

Q. Does the GPIF program achieve this objective?

A. Yes. As outlined in the GPIF Implementation Manual, the GPIF process
 establishes equivalent availability and heat rate performance targets for base load
 units for each period encompassed by the projected fuel adjustment clause. These
 targets are a reflection of how each unit is expected to perform during the period
 based on historical performance data and projected operating parameters such as
 planned outages and expected average loads. For each target, a maximum
 reasonably attainable range for improving and decreasing performance is

determined. Maximum fuel savings and losses are determined for each range and 1 then weighting factors are calculated for each range that reflect the percent 2 contribution of that target range to the total potential system fuel savings at 3 maximum improvement. At the end of the fuel adjustment period, actual unit 4 performance is compared to the targets, and rewards or penalties are assessed based 5 on this comparison. The maximum reward or penalty is limited to 25 basis points 6 of the utility's average common equity for the period and does not exceed the gross 7 amount of any fuel savings or loss experienced during the period. 8

10 Q. Are you familia

Are you familiar with the proposed modifications to the GPIF

Reward/Penalty Criteria that are being made by the Florida Office of Public Counsel (OPC)?

A. Yes. The OPC is recommending two modifications to the GPIF Reward/Penalty Criteria. The first recommendation is to establish a Generating Performance Incentive Points (GPIP) dead band. Within this point dead band, utilities would not be assessed either a reward or a penalty. The second recommendation is to establish absolute system weighted equivalent availability factor (EAF) and heat rate (HR) targets for each utility.

19

9

11

12

Q. Is the OPC proposed recommendation to establish a GPIP dead band reasonable?

A. No. The GPIP dead band proposed by OPC is not reasonable. The proposed dead
band range is skewed and does not treat rewards and penalties fairly. The proposed
upper limit on the dead band range is no less than +5.0 and no greater than +7.5
points, while the proposed lower limit on the dead band range is -2.5 to -3.5. This

Page 3

skewed dead band is contradictory to the intent of the GPIF program and does not provide an equitable incentive.

3...

1

2

4

5

Q. Do you agree with the recommendation to establish an absolute system weighted EAF and HR targets for each utility?

No. Establishing absolute system weighted EAF and HR targets is not feasible and 6 Α. does not follow the intent of the GPIF program. There are many uncontrollable 7 factors that affect unit performance such as weather conditions, environmental 8 restrictions, changes in fuel quality, load factors, etc. GPIF was not intended to 9 unfairly reward or penalize utilities for these types of uncontrollable and often 10 times unpredictable conditions. Setting absolute targets would result in unfair 11 rewards and penalties and would not provide the intended incentive for utilities to 12 focus on controllable unit improvements. The current GPIF process accounts for 13 these uncontrollable conditions in the target setting process by using actual 14 historical data to set targets and by adjusting these targets to incorporate actual 15 operating conditions such as planned outages, reserved shutdowns, and average 16 unit loads. 17

- 18
- 19

Q. Would you please summarize your testimony?

A. Yes. The purpose of the GPIF program is to promote the efficient operation of base load units. The program achieves this through an incentive mechanism that provides rewards for achieving greater than reasonably expected improvements in unit performance and by providing penalties for achieving less than reasonably expected performance. The expected performance targets that are set using the current GPIF methodology are both reasonable and challenging. Because the targets are based on historical data, fluctuations of uncontrollable parameters affecting performance are accounted for in the targets. This allows for net rewards and penalties over time to be reflective of controllable changes in unit performance.

The GPIF criteria modifications as proposed by OPC are not reasonable and would not achieve the desired intent of the GPIF program. The GPIP dead band range is unfairly skewed and does not provide for equitable incentives. This GPIP dead band should, therefore, not be implemented as proposed. Establishing absolute heat rate and availability targets is also not reasonable and not feasible. Setting absolute targets would not take into account unforeseeable and uncontrollable conditions that can occur over time and would not provide the intended incentive for utilities to achieve controllable unit improvements.

13

14

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

15 A.

Yes.

16 17

21

22

24

23

25

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF ESCAMBIA

Docket No. 060001-EI

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared Lonzelle S. Noack, who being first duly sworn, deposes, and says that she is the Power Generation Specialist, Senior, for Gulf Power Company, a Florida corporation, and that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of her knowledge, information and belief. She is personally known to me.

Lonzelle S. Noack

Power Generation Specialist, Senior

Sworn to and subscribed before me this $2/2^{m}$ day of August, 2006.

Brame here Holsigen Notary Public, State of Florida at Large

Commission Number:

Commission Expires:

