1		BEFORE THE	
2	FLORIDA PUI	BLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	
3	In the Matter of	: : DOCKET NO. 9411	.01- <b>E</b> 0
4	Petition for determination	:	
5	plan for ourtailing purch	hanes :	
6	from qualifying facilities minimum load conditions		
7	consistent with Rule 25-2 F.A.C., by FLORIDA POWER	17.086,	
	CORPORATION.		
8			
9	FIRST DAY	Y - AFTERNOON SESSION	
10		VOLUME 2	
11	Page	s 127 through 276	
12	Proceedings:	HEARYNG	
	PROCEEDINGS:	REARING	
13	BEFORE:	CHAIRMAN SUSAN F. CLARK COMMISSIONER J. TERRY DEAS	ON
14		COMMISSIONER JULIA P. JOHN	SON
15		COMMISSIONER DIANE K. KIES COMMISSIONER JOE GARCIA	LING
16	DATE:	Monday, May 8, 1995	
17	TIME:	Commenced at 9:30 a.m.	
18	PLACE:	FPSC Hearing Room 106	
19		Fletcher Building 101 East Gaines Street	
**		Tallahassee, Plorida	
20	REPORTED BY:	SYDNEY C. SILVA, CSR, RPR	and
21	ALLOWIED BI.	ROWENA NASH HACKNEY	
22		Official Commission Report	ers
	A DODA DA NADO -		
23	APPEARANCES:		
24	(As heretofore	noted.)	
25			1
1			س ما

04763 95 May 17 1993

#### WITMESSES - VOLUME 2 MAKE PAGE NO. ROBERT D. DOLAN Cross Examination By Mr. Wright Cross Examination By Ms. Brown Redirect Examination By Mr. Fama CHARLES J. HARPER Direct Examination By Mr. Fama Prefiled Direct Testimony Inserted Cross Examination By Mr. Presnell Cross Examination By Mr. Wright Redirect Examination By Mr. Tenpas EXHIBITS - VOLUME 2 MUMBER IDENTIFIED ADMITTED (Dolan) Curtailments avoided by Tiger Bay output reductions (Harper) CJH-1, CJH-2 (Harper) FPC's Response to Interrogatory 12 Propounded by Orlando CoGen, Ltd. (Harper) Late-Filed Deposition Exhibits to Deposition of Henry I. Southwick, Initialed C.J.H.

PROCEEDINGS 2 (Mearing reconvened at 1:23 p.m.) (Transcript continues in sequence from Volume 1.) 3 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Reconvene the hearing. 5 Mr. Wright? 6 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Madam Chairman. 7 ROBERT D. DOLAN 8 resumed the stand as a witness on behalf of Florida Power 9 Corporation and, having been previously sworn, testified as 10 follows: 11 CROSS EXAMINATION 12 BY MR. WRIGHT: 13 Q Mr. Dolan, as I indicated before the lunch break, I would like to have you walk through and illustrate what 15 happens vis-a-vis the priority groups identified in Florida Power Corporation's curtailment plan as the Company moves 17 through low load conditions of increasing depth or increase -conditions that in the Company's mind require increasingly 18 greater curtailments. Can we do that? 19 20 A Yes. 21 I'll start with some questions, and you can feel 22 free to go with narrative if and when you think it's 23 appropriate.

that some of the Group A NUGs who have commitments to reduce

The first thing that happens on a daily basis is

24

25

their output on a daily basis do so everyday regardless of 2 whether it's a low load day or not? 3 That's correct. 0 And isn't it true that some of those actually have 5 as part of their agreement with Power Corp that if you all ask them to stay at a higher output level because you need the 6 7 power to save money, that they'll do so? 8 That's correct. 9 Now, I think for the rest of the discussion we can 10 talk about a low load condition. 11 When you are approaching a low load condition, how much of the Group A committed capacity will have come off line by virtue of these automatic arrangements? 13 14 Now, this is a quick calculation, Schef, but I think it's 225 megawatts is the nightly reduction and that includes 15 Orange, which is going commercial May 18th, so --17 0 Just so I can be clear, that includes Orange CoGen. Does it include Lake Cogen? 18 19 Yeah. It included Auburndale for 31 megawatts, Tiger Bay for 48 megawatts, Lake Cogen for 15 megawatts. 21 Mulberry, right now, is 100, but it's fixing to go to 110. And Orange would be 87. At that point in an event, would those Group A NUGs, 23

who have some additional capacity that they sell on an

as-available basis to Plorida Power, also have taken that

25

as-available capacity off line?

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

131

15

17

18

19

22

231

25

Yes. In their nightly reductions, they go well below their committed capacities. So, they, on their nightly basis, already have taken off their as-available.

What number did I give you a minute ago?

- Q 275, I believe.
- A Yeah, that's close enough.
- Q Now, if Florida Power believes it needs additional output reductions, what's the next thing it will do?

Well, we have some discretionary rights that we can curtail some others by megawatts if we notify them by noon of the preceding day, which noon gives you about 12 hours notice because a minimum load event usually occurs between 12:00 and 1 o'clock of the next day.

And on that we can take Auburndale from 100 megawatts to zero ten times a year. We can reduce Ridge Generating by 12 megawatts 50 times a year, and Dade County from 17 megawatts 30 times a year.

- I notice that Pasco Resources Recovery and Pinellas Resources Recovery are also in Group A. Do they come into 21 play at this point in an event?
  - No. What we got with them was long-term scheduling rights, and we arrange with them to do their maintenance where -- both facilities have three boilers. And they would take one boiler off; I think it is for eight days, and then

another boiler off for eight days, and another boiler off for eight days. And then we schedule that in the periods that we expect minimum loads to be -- minimum load problems to be their greatest, such as the April time frame or the October/November time frame. When we do that we also look at the scheduling of our own units to try to schedule them so that we prevent minimum load events from occurring, plus the QF scheduling rights.

- Q Okay. Leaving out then Pasco and Pinellas Resource Recovery units, but assuming that you invoke the additional Group A curtailments available from Dade, Auburndale, and Ridge, what's the total megawatts then available to FPC for curtailment?
  - A You would get 129 megawatts additional.
  - Q So that adding that to the 275, I got 404 megawatts?
- 16 A Yeah.

- Q What does this represent as a percentage of those facilities committed capacity pursuant to their contracts?
  - A I believe their committed capacity is 685 megawatts.
- Now, if you want to get more precise, you know, I'm adding it up. Auburndale is 131.18. Tiger Bay is 218.75.

  Lake is 110. Mulberry right now is 100. Orange is 74. Ridge is 39.6, and Dade is 43. Pinellas is 55.75 and Pasco is 23, so it's 795 magawatts.
  - Q Okay. As I said, I thought that for this analysis I

think that we should leave Pasco and Pinellas Research & 2 Recovery out since they're advanced scheduling and not on a 3 per-event basis. I'll tell you, let's do the calculations both ways. 5 A If you leave them out it's 716. 6 Q So is it 404 out of 716? 7 Yeah. 8 So that's 56.4%? Q 9 A Yeah. Yes, sir. 10 And if you put Pasco and Pinellas in, what's the 0 additional megawatts to be curtailed, and what percentage does 11 12 the new total represent of that 795 megawatts you mentioned? 13 λ Well, again, it would be 404 megawatts over 795 and 14 that's 51%. 15 Okay. What would happen next in a low load event? Which group or groups would be asked to curtail next? 16 17 A Well, the nightly reductions that already occurred 18 and any reductions we called for by 12 --19 Right. Q 20 -- we then would curtail the Group C by 100%. And Group C includes strictly as-available generation from, like, 21 22 the phosphates or whomever, plus any capacity that the firm guys are delivering above their committed capacity or what we 23 24 call excess generation. That would be curtailed by 100%.

And about how many megawatts is that?

25

Q

1 A I think we've got it in here. 3 At that point most of it's already gone. There's 3 probably another 10 megawatts or so. Then if additional curtailments were required, would Q Florida Power then ask the Group B NUGs to curtail? 5 6 That's correct. 7 Okay. And by how much could they be asked to В curtail as a percentage of their committed capacity before any additional curtailments are requested of the Group A NUGs? 9 10 By up to 50%. 11 Suppose still more curtailments are required, what would happen next? If more curtailments were required, we would go to 13 each individual member in Group A and ask for them, if they'd hadn't already done it, to curtail up to 50% of their 15 16 committed capacity. 17 Q So just so we're clear, at that point, the Group A's, if you would invoke the rights you have under the Dade. Auburndale, and Ridge arrangements, the Group A's would 19 already be as a group at 51%, and you would then go to each 20 individual Group A NUG who was below 50% and ask them for 21 22 additional curtailments; is that right? That was generating above 50% and ask them to go to 23

50% -- up to 50%. We would only ask for as many megawatts as

25

we needed.

1	Q Okay. And about how many more megawatts of
2	curtailment would you get from those remaining Group A NUGs
3	before you asked for any more curtailment from the Group B
4	NUGE?
5	A I think it's around 197 megawatts.
6	Q 197 more megawatts?
7	A More megawatts.
8	Q Before you asked Group B to go above 50%, if that
9	were necessary; is that right?
LO	A Well, except, I think, in your example we'd already
1	turned off Auburndale?
L2	Q Yes, sir.
1.3	A So it would be 162 megawatts.
L4	Q And just so I'm completely clear on your answer,
L <b>5</b>	that's another 162 megawatts from the remaining Group A NUGS
١6	before you would ask for additional curtailments from Group B?
١7	A Before we would go back and ask for additional
18	curtailments from Group B.
۱9	Q Correct. And then if there were additional
20	curtailments required, you would ask for those on an equal
21	percentage basis from the remaining Group A and Group B NUGs?
22	A That's correct.
23	Q If you know, as a percentage of total megawatts
	hours curtailed during the seven actual curtailments events

25 we've had so far, how much was curtailed from Group A and how

much from Group B?

A Schef, we could get that for you; I don't have it here. I mean we could do that as a late-filed exhibit or something, but, I mean, I just don't --

I think, too, you're, you know, I know, missing a lot of value the Group A's are giving, because you can look at their contributions for the seven events, but there may have been 30 other events if it hadn't have been for the Group A's. And that's an important distinction between even just looking at an event of what megawatts got contributed by each class, but how many events did the Group A's -- just there not be a minimum load event that the Group B's got the benefit of.

Q Right. Well, you did anticipate my next question in your response there. You said there may have been as many as 30. Do you have a better estimate of that or a specific estimate that you can give the Commission as to how many events that would have affected the Group B NUGS, did not by operation of your arrangements with Group A NUGS?

A I think Tiger Bay's arrangements that we worked out in 1994 probably prevented 10 curtailment events that would have occurred in October and November.

Tiger Bay being off line for two consecutive weeks in March and two consecutive weeks in April definitely contributed to a number of what I would call \*not events.\*

Q Do you have an approximation or approximate estimate

of how many of those events you're talking about in the 2 March/April time period? 3 It could have been as high as ten, maybe as low as five to ten. The invoking of the Auburndale curtailment 5 agreement to shut them off, I think, prevented one event from 6 happening, of being able to turn them to zero. 7 In developing the estimates that you just gave to the Commission, did you do so in any kind of a written way? В 9 Do you have a worksheet that would show those? 10i The last one I did on the two-week outages was more 11 of an estimation of knowing how many weekends we had low loads in, but we did try and go back in record and see the -- being able to call Tiger Bay up at night and having them to turn off. Prior to them going commercial, actually went through and did some detail calculations and came up with the ten. 16 Is there a document reflecting those calculations 0 that we could obtain? 17 18 Yeah, I believe there is. 19 Okay. I would like to request that as a late-filed 20 exhibit, please. 21 A Okay. 22 MR. WRIGHT: That will be 2, I believe, Madam 23 Chairman. 24 CHAIRMAN CLARK: That will be Exhibit 2. And the

25

title, do you know?

1 MR. WRIGHT: Curtailments avoided by Tiger Bay 2 output reductions. 3 (Late-Filed Exhibit No. 2 identified.) CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okav. 5 Q (By Mr. Brown) Mr. Dolan, I understand from 6 reviewing Mr. Harper's exhibits that, I believe, on a daily or 7 near daily basis, Florida Power Corporation completes, I think you all call it a minimum load emergency curtailment worksheet 8 9 or something like that? 10 Yeah. I think Chuck would probably be the better --11 Mr. Harper would probably be the better witness to --12 Q I was just going to ask whether those worksheets might also illustrate the effects of when you all called on Tiger Bay. And, if so, I would ask that they be included as part of the exhibit. 15 16 I don't know. 17 Okay. Q 18 They may or may not help. I haven't looked at those A 19 worksheets. 20 MR. WRIGHT: I'll let that qo. 21 And that's all I have, thank you. 22 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Wright. 23 Are there any other intervenors that have questions to ask? Staff? 25

#### CROSS EXAMINATION

#### BY MS. BROWN:

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

25

Mr. Dolan, we just have a very few questions for you.

Do you have Rule 25-17.086 in front of you?

- λ I can get it.
- Q Got it?
- F. Yep.
- Now, the first part of that rule has been cited to Q the Commission a couple of times already today. I'd like you to take a look at the second part of the rule. Starting -actually, it's the next to the last sentence that starts, "In either event\* --
  - A Right.
    - Q Do you see that? Could you read that, please?
- "In either event the utility shall notify the A Commission, and the Commission Staff shall, upon request of the affected qualifying facilities, investigate the utility's 19 claim."
  - Q Okay. Do you understand that provision to mean, Mr. Dolan, that even if the Commission adopts your plan for curtailing, Florida Power Corporation will still have the responsibility to justify the implementation of that plan in any future curtailment events that would occur?
    - That's my understanding. And I think we talk about A

that in the plan, and that we'll provide you notice and create a file that will substantiate that the curtailment was a proper event.

Q And a QF at that point would have the opportunity to object to the implementation of any further curtailments, correct?

A That's correct.

- Q Either by objecting to the Staff or filing something formal with the Commission?
  - A That's my understanding.
- Q Okay. You were asked several questions by

  Mr. Watson and Mr. Wright regarding the scope of Florida Power

  Corporation's low load problems, primarily in terms of the

  duration of them, whether they are going to last five or six

  years. Do you remember that?
  - A Yes, ma'am.
- Q I don't want to go back over that, but I have a couple of scope questions that I want to ask you as well.

Do the curtailment agreements that you've signed with the QFs' contemplate, generally speaking, a much larger number of curtailments in, say, a year curtailment period than have actually occurred so far?

A The curtailment agreements, I guess two of you mentioned, had that we could turn them down 30 times and one 50 times. And we have had fewer curtailment events than we

had anticipated.

You know, I think we were looking more at the at least 30 range or more. And I think I mentioned that it's a high likelihood that Tiger Bay's voluntary actions may have eliminated up to 15 to 20 curtailment events.

- Q Well, now that you have those curtailment agreements in place, which year in that five-year period you were talking about, I assume you mean, like, to the year 2000 perhaps, 2002, which of the years at this point do you anticipate to be the most severe in terms of Power Corp's low load problems?
- A Assuming the load continues to grow, probably this fall. If we get more QF capacity that comes on line, such as Panda comes on line, that could be the worst year, the first year that Panda's on line with their facility according to what arrangements we make with or without Panda on minimum load effect. We only have one contract left that has not become or is not about to become commercial, and that's the Panda contract.
  - Q Do you have a curtailment agreement with them?
  - A No, we do not.
    - Q Are you negotiating one?
- A We had discussions may six months or a year ago about it and nothing's really come about.
- Q So if you can negotiate a curtailment agreement with Panda, you expect this next fall to be the worst year for

minimum load problems?

- A That's probably right, next fall or next spring.
- Q And, thereafter, we're talking '96 now, '96-'97.

  Thereafter, in like '97-'98, the problem would diminish further?
- A In a general sense it would diminish further, but it's a little hard to quantify at that because a QF being off line or not off line, or one of our units being off line or not off line, either makes an event or prevents an event. So it's kind of like rolling the dice. You know, if we have a forced outage or they have a forced outage, all of a sudden what would have been an event is no longer an event.
- Q But can you generally predict that if you anticipated anywhere between 50 and 30 curtailment events in this year and you actually only had seven, that at least in the years to come, the curtailment events that you will have may be considerably less than 30 or 50 as you anticipated?
- A That's a potential. But if Florida Power does something with the maintenance of its coal plants, lengthens the duration between maintenance outages of the coal plants, that could change what happens in the future versus what had happened in '93 and '94.

And I think I need to emphasize that in '94 we worked out a voluntary arrangement with Tiger Bay where we could call them up by noon. Because their project hadn't

become commercial, their gas commitments hadn't become take or pay. And we'd say, "Hey, we're having problems on our system, could you shut off," and they did that ten times. That will not happen in the future. It was just a verbal agreement we made over the phone that they would take their 220-megawatt facility to zero, and that occurred, I think, ten times in 194.

Q So you can't say with certainty or any measurable degree of certainty that the minimum load condition that Florida Power Corporation has experienced in these years will diminish over the remaining seven years?

A Common sense tells you it should diminish. We've had trouble getting our models to predict these phenomenous because it's such a discrete -- items that create a curtailment are not a curtailment.

Q All right.

A And we have had people working for many months trying to do exactly what you are talking about, is what is the best guess of the number of curtailments in 1996. What's the best guess in '97. And nobody has ever felt comfortable with any of the numbers that have come out of them.

Q Well, let me ask it this way then and then we'll move on. Do you expect the number of curtailments to increase above between 30 and 50 as contemplated in some of your contracts in the next five years?

1 A I would, as I said, common sense tells me they 2 should decrease from the 30 to 50 as the load grows. 3 So that's a no? That's no. 5 0 Okay. 6 But you could have bad luck in one year and create a 7 bunch of events. Just like gambling at the casino. you know, overall you end up losing when you go to the casino. but, you know, one year you can win and one year you can lose. And minimum load events are probabilistic events. So one year 10 11 you could have a lot more events than you expected, and one year you could have a lot less. 13 Q You mentioned earlier that Pasco Cogen had increased its committed capacity from 102 megawatts to 109 megawatts. 14 Do you remember that? 15 That's correct. 16 How many QFs have increased their committed capacity 17 18 over what was originally contracted for? Almost all of them have. It may be easier to go 19 A 20 through the one's that didn't. Cargill didn't, which was the 21 old Seminole Pertilizer; Timber Energy didn't. Pinellas County didn't, and Mulberry hasn't done it yet but they are 22 23 contemplating it once the Orange Co facility comes on line, they'll increase it at that point.

That's from 100 to 110?

25

1	A From 100 to 110.
2	Q So how many megawatts are we talking about of an
3	increase? Just generally, a ballpark figure.
4	A It's probably close to 100; maybe 90 to a 100
5	megawatts.
6	Q 90 to 100 additional megawatts?
7	A Yeah. And that's probably a little high.
8	Q From the increased capacity that the QFs have
9	A Most of the contracts increase their committed
10	capacity by 10%.
11	Q Has that contributed to Plorida Power Corporation's
12	minimum load problem?
13	A What
14	Q Yes?
15	A Yeah, when they built bigger facilities than the
16	original contract contemplated, yes. But even more so than
17	that, they built facilities, some of them bigger than the 10%.
18	COMMISSIONER GARCIA: But wouldn't you have still
19	had to purchase according to those contracts?
20	MR. DOLAN: Even if the contracts hadn't had an
21	increase in the percentage, we still would have had to have
22	purchased under the as-available rules.
23	Q (By Ms. Brown) I just have one more question just
24	to clarify in my own mind.
25	When you filed this plan, you included several

curtailment agreements that you had negotiated and indicated 2 that you were negotiating more. And it's my understanding 3 since this case began, you have negotiated additional curtailment agreements: is that correct? 5 A Well, we signed an agreement with Lake Cogen at some 6 date that may have been after we announced to the QPs, the 7 grouping. It was November 3rd. We filed the plan about R October 17th. 9 O I'm not sure if it's not --10 We also superseded a curtailment agreement with 11 Auburndale with the agreement that was executed last Wednesday 12 or May 3rd. 13 Well, let's go through it. In your curtailment plan Q at Appendix B, Page 1 of 1, you list the different groups of cogenerators. 15 16 A Yes. 17 Q And the B Group includes Orlando, Cargill, Pasco, 18 Timber, Lake Cogen, Lake Resource Recovery, Bay County, Orange 19 and Panda? 20 A Right. 21 And you just said that you had negotiated an 22 agreement with Lake Cogen now? 23 A Yes. And also Orange CoGen. 24 And also Orange. Are those the only two additional? Q

Those are the only two we have finalized agreements

25

A

with. We have talked about finalizing agreements with both 2 Lake Resource Recovery and Cargill but have not executed them 3 yet. Both parties hadn't executed them. Q Now, what about the Timber Energy one, though? 5 What about Timber Energy? 6 Q Yes. 7 This Timber Energy is a different one than the 8 Timber Energy that was discussed earlier. 9 Q Okay. 10 This is the Timber Energy that's the actual project 11 over in Telogia, 13-megawatt contract. 12 Q Okay? 13 And we have not finalized an agreement with them. 14 All right. So presently you do not have a 15 curtailment agreement with one, two, three, four, five, six, seven of your QFs? 17 Well -- and U.S. Ag in Group C down there, they 18 executed a standard offer a number of months ago, so they, I guess, would then have moved up to Group B. 20 Q Okay. So it's eight all together? 21 A Eight, yeah. We have a quasi agreement with Cargill 22 that says Cargill will do what they can when they can and we won't penalize them. But they did not agree to any definitive 23 curtailments. So we have an agreement with them that they'll

do what they can when they can, but we didn't view that as a

25

1	definitive agreement to allow the move into Group A. And we
2	have not finalized a more definitive agreement with them.
3	Q Have they done anything?
4	A Have they done anything
5	Q Have they done anything?
6	A to help in the past?
7	Q During curtailment periods?
8	A Yes, when they can. You know, they're more process
9	oriented so if they have to get out some fertilizers, they
10	don't help in the minimum load situation, but if they can
11	rearrange their fertilizer schedule, they do.
12	MS. BROWN: All right. We have no further
13	questions.
14	CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you. Redirect?
15	Excuse me.
16	MR. FAMA: Just a couple of questions.
17	CHAIRMAN CLARK: Excuse me just a minute.
18	Commissioners, are there any questions?
19	Go ahead, redirect.
20	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
21	BY MR. FAMA:
22	Q Mr. Dolan, Mr. Watson asked you a series of
23	questions about Pasco who was in Group B, but has certain
24	informal agreements to help out in curtailment situations. Do
25	you recall those questions?

1	A That's correct.
2	Q Okay. Has Pasco had several opportunities to sign
3	agreements and move up to Group A?
4	A Yes, they have. Once we formally more formalized
5	that we were going to have a Group C-B-A curtailment plan, we
6	approached Pasco Cogen and said, you know, you all have been
7	doing some noncontractual voluntary reductions most of the
8	time and almost always get below their committed capacity, we
9	need to formalize our agreement with you to move you into
10	Group A to recognize those contributions. And Pasco chose not
11	to formalize those informal voluntary reductions.
12	Q Do you know of any operational reason why they
13	wouldn't want to formalize the agreement and move up to A?
14	A No. And I can only speculate it could have
15	something to do with the other court case that's going on with
16	Pasco.
17	Q The antitrust case?
18	A Yes, the antitrust case.
19	MR. FAMA: That's all I have.
20	CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Dolan.
21	MR. DOLAN: Thank you.
22	(Witness Dolan excused.)
23	
24	MR. FAMA: Chairman Clark, I'd move for the
25	admission into evidence of Exhibit 1.

1	CHAIRMAN CLARK: Exhibit 1 will be admitted in the
2	record without objection.
3	(Exhibit No. 1 received in evidence.)
4	MR. WRIGHT: I move Exhibit 2, subject to the
5	parties' rights to object once it's filed.
6	CHAIRMAN CLARK: Well, I can't remember how we do
7	that. I think we don't admit it.
8	MR. WRIGHT: I'm just covering the base to make sure
9	it's moved
10	CHAIRMAN CLARK: if we have no objection
11	MR. WRIGHT: it will come in if there's no
12	objection.
13	CHAIRMAN CLARK: It will come in if there's no
14	objection to it.
15	Mr. Harper?
16	You were sworn in, were you not?
17	WITNESS HARPER: Yes, ma'am.
18	CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay.
19	We will just take five minutes right here.
20	(Brief recess.)
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CHARLES J. HARPER
2	was called as a witness on behalf of Florida Power Corporation
3	and, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY MR. FAMA:
6	Q Mr. Harper, state your name and position with
7	Florida Power?
8	A Charles Harper, Manager of System Control.
9	Q Are you the same Chuck Harper who sponsored prefiled
ro	direct testimony and exhibits in this proceeding?
11	λ Yes.
12	Q Are there any corrections to your prefiled testimony
13	that you need to make?
14	A No, there are not.
15	Q If I were to ask you today the same questions that
16	appear in your testimony, would you give the same answers?
17	A Yes, I would.
18	MR. FAMA: Commissioners, I would move to have the
19	prefiled testimony inserted into the record as though read.
20	CHAIRMAN CLARK: The prefiled direct testimony of
21	Mr. Charles Harper will be inserted in the record as though
22	read.
23	Q (By Mr. Fama) Mr. Harper, are you sponsoring
24	Prefiled Exhibits CJH-1 and CJH-2?
25	A Yes, I am.

1	MR. FAMA: Madam Chair, I would like to have Mr.
2	Harper's Exhibit CJH-1 and 2 marked as a composite exhibit.
3	CHAIRMAN CLARK: They'll be marked as Composite
4	Exhibit 3.
5	(Composite Exhibit No. 3 marked for identification.)
6	MR. FAMA: Thank you.
7	Q (By Mr. Fama) Mr. Harper, are there any corrections
8	to those exhibits that you need to make at this time?
9	A No corrections.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## FLORIDA POWER CORPORATION DOCKET NO. 941101-EQ

#### DIRECT TESTIMONY OF CHARLES J. HARPER

#### I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS

. .

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Charles J. Harper and 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 as Manager of System Control for Florida Power Corporation ("Florida Power" or "the Company").
- Q. Please describe your education and business experience.
- A. I graduated from the United States Navy Nuclear School seventh in my class and have a Bachelor of Science Degree in Mechanical Engineering from Thomas Edison State College. I worked in the United States Navy Nuclear program and Diplomatic Service between 1963 and 1967. After working for the Largo Sentinel Newspaper from 1967 to 1969 and the Royal Typewriter Company from 1969-1971, I joined Florida Power Corporation in 1971. I have held a variety of positions of increasing responsibility at Florida Power, including serving as a Substation Maintenance Electrician, Substation Construction Electrician, Energy

1

3

4

5

6

7

9

8

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 -21

22

23 24 Control System Dispatcher, Energy Control System Supervisor and Supervisor of System Control. I currently serve as the Manager of System Control.

## Q. What are your responsibilities as Manager of System Control?

I have responsibility for the 24 hour a day operation of Florida Power's bulk power system, to ensure safe, reliable and economic operation of the system. I have direct responsibility for the Company's generation/interchangedispatchers and transmission dispatchers. Under my supervision, the system dispatchers and assistant dispatchers work with plant personnel to ensure that daily plans for scheduling generating unit start-up, shut-down and hourly loadings optimize economic efficiency while ensuring adequate on-line generating capacity. Also under my supervision, the transmission dispatchers ensure that system security is maintained when transmission and substation clearances and switching orders are issued. My responsibilities also include coordinating Florida Power's system operations with those of the other interconnected systems in Florida. This involves overseeing the Company's hourly Florida/Energy Broker and interchange transactions and directing all of Florida Power's bulk power dispatching activities during system disturbances and emergencies. Finally, I have a variety of administrative responsibilities that range from maintaining accurate records of system operations to preparing budgets and managing employees.

## \_

#### 3

# 4 5

## 6

#### 7

### 8

### 9

#### 10

#### 11

#### 12

#### 13

## 14

## 15

## 16

### 17

### 18

### 19

## 20

# 21

## 23

### 24

#### 25

## 26

## II. PURPOSES AND ORGANIZATION OF TESTIMONY

#### Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

- The purpose of my testimony is to describe the mechanics of Florida Power's October 12, 1994 "Generation Curtailment Plan For Minimum Load Conditions" ("the Curtailment Plan"), which is being sponsored as Florida Power's Exhibit No. / (RDD-1) with Mr. Dolan's testimony. First, I will describe the procedures and instructions to system operating personnel, as set forth in Appendix C of the Curtailment Plan. Second. I will describe the Company's first experience operating under the Curtailment Plan when curtailments became necessary on October 19, 1994. Next, I will explain some additional measures the Company has been able to take in order to help keep QF curtailments to an absolute minimum. Because of the Company's continuing efforts to mitigate curtailments, it has only been necessary to implement involuntary curtailments once in 1994 and a handful of times so far in 1995. Finally, I will show that the few problems experienced on October 19, 1994 were effectively eliminated during the January, 1995 curtailments.
- Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits with your testimony?
- A. Yes. I am sponsoring Exhibit No. 3 (CJH-1) which are the summary operating logs and related materials documenting the steps that were taken in anticipation of, during and after the minimum load conditions experienced on October 18-19, 1994, and in January, 1995; and Exhibit

 No. 3 (CJH-2) which includes representative examples of a newly developed minimum load worksheet designed to assist in the daily planning process.

- Are you testifying in this proceeding as a policy witness for the Company?
- A. No, I am not. My testimony is intended only to describe the plan and the actions taken by Florida Power's system operating personnel in response to minimum load conditions. Mr. Henry Southwick is the Company's principle policy witness in this docket.

#### III. OVERVIEW OF THE CURTAILMENT PLAN

- Q. Please begin with a short overview of the Curtailment Plan's structure.
- A. The Curtailment Plan has four parts. The first and longest part contains an explanation of the Pian's background and objectives. These portions are described extensively in the testimony of Messrs. Dolan and Southwick. Also included in this first part is a general description of how curtailments actually will be implemented and how the Company will seek to enforce compliance with the Plan if enforcement becomes necessary.

The remaining parts of the Plan consist of three appendices which are available to the Company's system operating personnel as they make

the day-to-day decisions necessary to match the system's available resources to its instantaneous loads.

Appendix A summarizes the voluntary QF output reduction plans which the Company has negotiated. Mr. Dolan generally describes these plans and is sponsoring an exhibit which updates Appendix A to include all currently-available plans (Exhibit No. \_\_\_\_(RDD-3)). By including these summaries as a part of the Curtailment Plan, the system operating personnel have a useful tool available to plan ahead for QF output reductions (as, for example, by scheduling maintenance or exercising discretionary output reduction options during anticipated periods of lowest load). The summaries also give the system operators more immediate information, such as the ability to call on the QFs for specific megawatt output reductions during certain hours of the day.

Appendix B (which is updated in Mr. Dolan's Exhibit No. 1 (RDD-4)) sets forth the three curtailment priority groups into which the Plan places Florida Power's QF suppliers. Group A includes all QFs who supply firm capacity to the Company and have agreed in writing to a specific output reduction plan. Any QFs who supply firm capacity, but have not agreed to a written output reduction plan, are placed in Group B. The Group C QFs are those who sell as-available energy to the Company. This group includes COG-1 Rate Schedule purchases and all purchases in excess of the Committed Capacities set forth in firm purchase contracts.

 Appendix C to the Curtailment Plan contains the specific step-by-step procedures which are to be followed by the Company's system operating personnel when minimum load conditions appear to be imminent. In effect, the whole balance of the Curtailment Plan lays the foundation for these specific operating procedures. From the system operators' perspective, Appendix C is the heart of the Curtailment Plan.

## IV. THE PLAN's APPENDIX C MINIMUM LOAD EMERGENCY CURTAILMENT PROCEDURES

- Q. Do the Appendix C procedures contemplate a lot of last minute decisionmaking?
- A. Actually, they seek to minimize last minute uncertainty. They do this first by developing a strategy for handling minimum load conditions well in advance of a potential minimum load emergency. In addition, they anticipate that this strategy will be reviewed and updated regularly and adjusted as necessary to minimize any need for QF curtailments. When curtailments nonetheless become necessary, the procedures attempt to avoid last minute discretionary decisionmaking as much as possible by prescribing standardized curtailment priorities.
- Q. Does the advance planning and regular updating of operating strategies parallel the way in which Florida Power operates its own equipment?
- A. Absolutely. Our Energy Control Center ("ECC") is manned 24 hours a day. Changing system operating conditions require continuous updating of operating strategies.

Q. How is this updating concept built into the Appendix C procedures?

A. Appendix C treats the approach of a minimum load emergency somewhat like the way the National Weather Service treats the approach of a dangerous weather condition. The Appendix C procedures describe four status levels culminating in a minimum load emergency — these are: Level 1 Minimum Load Alert; Level 2 Preliminary Dispatcher Review; Level 3 Minimum Load Warning; and Level 4 Minimum Load Emergency. Specific instructions are provided to the Company's operating personnel for each separate level. In addition, the procedures establish a fifth level — Level 5 Reporting — which occurs following the conclusion of a minimum load emergency and includes appropriate notification to this Commission.

Q. Please describe what happens during a Level 1 Minimum Load Alert.

A. A Level 1 Minimum Load Alert is declared on or before noon of any business day on which the forecasted minimum load is expected to be 2,500 MW or lower and the system generation level is expected to exceed the forecasted load level. This analysis takes into account all known information and expected conditions relating to customer loads, forecasted power purchases and sales, and both Company and QF generating units.

Q. Can the declaration cover more than one succeeding day?

A. Yes, in the case of a weekend or holiday, the system operating personnel normally would make their preliminary load and resource

. 

evaluations before the extended non-business period and may provide notices that look ahead more than one day. If this practice is followed, then the potentially affected QFs would receive more rather than less advance notice of a possible curtailment situation.

- Q. How is the Level 1 Minimum Load Alert communicated to affected QFs?
- A. All affected QFs will be notified by facsimile notices sent to their plant operating personnel.
- Q. What special steps has Florida Power taken to ensure that its QF suppliers receive notices promptly under the Curtailment Plan?
- A. The Company has arranged to use an expedited multi-party facsimile service called "Sprint Fax" which provides for simultaneous facsimile delivery of important operating instructions to all QF suppliers. As long as the QFs' plant operators have ready access to receiving facsimile machines, this system allows for almost immediate distribution of information.
- Q. What information is provided to the QF suppliers in a Level 1 Minimum Load Alert notice?
- A. The notice will state that a minimum load condition may be imminent and it will identify the time period during which the condition is expected to occur. In addition, the notice will contain at least the following information:

Į,

Salar San Carrier

- (1) A warning to QFs with voluntary output reduction plans that they will be expected to implement their agreed-upon reductions; and
- (2) A request to these and all other QFs to communicate their willingness to make further voluntary output reductions before curtailments are made.
- Q. After a Level 1 elect is issued, what initial actions does Appendix C instruct the Company's personnel to take?
- A. The Company's Power Supply personnel are first instructed to gather the following information:
  - (1) Estimated amounts of QF energy, including scheduled maintenance and voluntary daily/hourly QF output reductions;
  - (2) Additional amounts of QF energy which could be reduced, if needed, according to discretionary output reduction options available to the Company under negotiated output reduction plans; and
  - (3) The minimum levels at which the Company will be able to operate its own units and the minimum amounts to which the Company can reduce its energy purchases from other utilities.

The Power Supply staff next are instructed to develop a strategy for handling the minimum load situation considering all of the information that has been gathered. The strategy is to be documented and shared with appropriate ECC System Control personnel. Thereafter, ongoing review of system conditions continues.

- Q. When will the Company proceed from a Level 1 condition to a Level 2 condition?
- A. The alert condition will proceed more or less automatically from Level1 to Level 2 as the minimum load period gets closer in time. As I have

 noted already, review of system conditions is ongoing at this point. However, by about 7:00 p.m., which typically will be about four hours before the beginning of the minimum load period, the Manager of System Control and/or the generation dispatcher will specifically review the strategy and documentation prepared by the Power Supply personnel. Also, the Company's plant operators will be contacted in order to verify and update the data and assumptions previously collected. Throughout this period, in addition to verifying information and modifying the minimum load strategy as needed, the generation dispatcher will attempt to arrange economic off-system sales.

- Q. Is this the point at which a Level 3 Minimum Load Warning is issued?
- A. The Minimum Load Warning is not issued until additional mitigation efforts have been made.
- Q. Please describe those efforts.
- A. As the minimum load period gets nearer -- generally between about 9:00 p.m. and 11:00 p.m. -- if it still appears that generation will exceed load, the generation dispatcher will make additional efforts to bring the generation and load into balance. Specifically, the dispatcher will:
  - (1) Continue attempts to make additional economic off-system sales;
  - (2) Reduce the Company's own baseload coal units to normal minimum operating levels, to the extent that plant and system conditions allow:
  - (3) Communicate with plant operators to determine if it is feasible to run any of the baseload coal units at lower "emergency" operating levels to meet the low load conditions;

12

15 16

17

19

18

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28 (4) Reduce all utility purchases to minimum amounts permitted by contract or by communications with the other utility, if not already done previously; and

(5) Cycle off any remaining intermediate and peaking units, again to the extent that plant and system conditions permit (by now, all or most of these units would likely be scheduled off-line aiready).

### What happens next under the Appendix C procedures?

- A. After all the previously described measures have been taken, the generation dispatcher will make a final system evaluation. If a Minimum Load Emergency still appears imminent, the dispatcher will notify an appropriate manager and then issue a Minimum Load Warning Message to all QF suppliers, advising them that curtailments are expected and again asking for compliance with QF output reduction plans and other voluntary reductions. When the generation dispatcher determines that the system generation no longer can match the system load, a Level 4 -Minimum Load Emergency is declared.
- Please describe what steps will be taken in a Level 4 condition.
- Level 4 will involve curtailment of QF purchases beyond those that previously had been made voluntarily. These curtallments will occur according to the curtailment priority groupings shown on Appendix B of the Curtailment Plan.
- How will the generation dispatchers determine how much curtailment a. is required and from which curtailment group or groups?

- A. The Company has developed a computer program which reflects the Appendix B curtailment groupings and the appropriate stacking order of curtailments as described in the Curtailment Plan. If "X" MW of curtailments are needed in order to match the system load, the computer program tells the dispatcher exactly how to apportion "X" MW among the various QFs as a percentage of their contractual Committed Capacities. The same can be done for any specified megawatt level of required curtailments.
- Q. Please explain how the curtailment priority groups will be affected in a Level 4 emergency.
- A. Based on the results of the computer analysis, the generation dispatcher will take the following successive steps until the condition is abated:
  - (1) Notify Group C QFs to reduce as-available deliveries to Florida Power by up to 100 percent;
  - (2) Notify Group B QFs to reduce deliveries by a stated percentage amount up to 50 percent of Committed Capacity:
  - (3) Notify Group A QFs to reduce deliveries by a stated percentage up to 50 percent of Committed Capacity (as explained in Mr. Dolan's testimony, and as reflected in Appendix C of the Curtailment Plan, the Dade County Resource Recovery facility is treated differently for 1995 only); and then, if necessary,
  - (4) Notify all QFs to reduce deliveries by up to 100 percent.
- Q. What happens when the load begins to increase again?
- A. As the load increases, the curtailment steps which I just listed will be followed in reverse order. When the Minimum Load Emergency has ended, all QFs will be given a notification to that effect.

Q. Please describe your Exhibit No. 3 (CJH-1).

You stated earlier that Appendix C also includes a reporting phase as
 Level 5. Please describe that phase.

A. The Company will give prompt notice to this Commission whenever a Minimum Load Emergency results in QF curtailments. In addition, after such a condition has ended, the Manager of System Control and the Manager of Power Supply will gather all available documentation prepared during the minimum load period and will prepare a summary curtailment report which will be made available to any QF upon request.

## IV. THE COMPANY'S INITIAL CURTAILMENT EXPERIENCE

- Q. You have testified that the Curtailment Plan was first put into motion on October 18-19, 1994. Could the Company have avoided curtailments on that occasion?
- A. No. The operating personnel at ECC took every measure available to avoid QF curtailments while maintaining system integrity and reliable operation of the grid. Beyond those measures there was no way short of curtailments to balance the system's loads and resources. I was personally present at ECC throughout the late night and early morning hours on October 18-19, 1994. When it became absolutely necessary to initiate curtailments, I helped to ensure that the proper steps were taken under the Curtailment Plan and that appropriate documentation was prepared.

 A. That exhibit includes a copy of the ECC "Curtailment Summary Documentation" which documents the steps taken on October 18-19, 1994 before and during the Company's first minimum load curtailments. In addition, the exhibit contains a brief summary of each QF's response to Florida Power's curtailment instructions. The exhibit also contains comparable information for the later curtailments which were required in January, 1995.

- Q. Did the Company enticipate a minimum load problem early in the day on October 18, 1994?
- A. Yes. In fact, during that part of October, ECC personnel had been carefully monitoring loads and resources nightly in anticipation of extremely low load conditions.
  - Please summarize the significant steps that were taken and information that was gathered on the morning of October 18, 1994 in anticipation of a potential minimum load problem.
- A. As the log in Exhibit 3 (CJH-1) indicates, during the morning of October 18th, Power Supply personnel conferred with the Company's plant operators to determine the status of the various generating units and their ability to be cycled to accommodate minimum load conditions. This investigation revealed that Crystal River Units 1 and 2 could not be taken below their normal minimum generation levels (120 MW and 140 MW, respectively) without significant risk that the boilers would trip off. In fact, Crystal River 2 had experienced operating problems on the

 previous night and had tripped off-line when attempting to go below 140 MW. When these baseload units are off-line, there is a substantial adverse reliability impact and significant additional costs are incurred to meet the rising morning loads. Therefore, it was determined that the normal minimum generation levels would be maintained.

Also in the morning of October 18th, it was determined that Bartow Unit 2 could not be cycled off as contemplated by the Curtailment Plan because one generator breaker on the unit was in need of repair and the second unit breaker was out of service. There was significant risk that if the unit was cycled off, it would not have been possible to reclose the breaker. As a consequence, the unit would not have been available as needed on the following morning to meet the Pinelias County loads and avoid overloading transmission lines into the Suncoast Region.

## Q. What happened next?

A. Based upon all available information, a Level 1 Minimum Load Aigri, was declared shortly before noon on October 18th. At that time, it appeared that the nighttime load would fall to about 2,160 MW, while the anticipated minimum system generation would be about 2,313 MW. Thus, curtailments on the order of about 160 MW appeared likely. In fact, this is almost exactly how much curtailment was actually required on the morning of October 19th.

Q. What other important information was collected during the afternoon of October 18, 1994?

- A. During the afternoon, several QFs telephoned the ECC staff to confirm receipt of the Minimum Load Alert. In addition, Power Supply personnel communicated further with the plant operators at the University of Florida cogeneration unit and at Anclote. Cycling problems were identified at both of those locations.
- Q. What problem was Identified at the University of Florida unit?
- A. The plant operator reported that the unit's backup boiler was inoperable because of a tube leak. As a result, if the unit were cycled off, the plant would have been unable to supply needed steam to its thermal energy host the Shands Hospital. This was viewed as an unacceptable potential risk to public health and safety. Therefore, it was determined that the unit would be operated at its minimum generation level, but would not be cycled off entirely that evening.
- Q. What was the nature of the operational problem at Anciote?
- A. In mid-afternoon on October 18th, Power Supply personnel were informed that Anclote Unit 2 could not be cycled off because it was experiencing severe turbine shaft vibration problems. Fortunately, the unit was scheduled for routine maintenance about one week later, and the vibration problem was corrected at that time. However, like the situation at Bartow Unit 2, this transitory equipment problem created a substantial likelihood that removing Anclote 2 from service would have

 prevented the unit from being restarted and brought into service when needed to meet the next day's Pinellas County loads. This presented an unacceptable system reliability risk

- Q. Please continue by describing the events that took place into the evening of October 18, 1994.
- A. Throughout the afternoon and evening of October 18th, the generation dispatcher followed the procedures called for under Level 2 of the Curtailment Plan, including monitoring system conditions and attempting to make economic off-system sales. For example, Southern Company Services, Inc. and Oglethorpe Power Corporation were contacted in an effort to sell energy. In addition, the dispatcher made hourly quotes on the Florida Broker System, and issued the following notice to all parties on the Florida Messaging System:

FPC TO ALL CO.

FPC SHOULD HAVE SOME POWER TO SELL OFF BROKER IN THE 14-15 DOLLAR RANGE FOR HRS ENDING 0100-0500 ON WED. 10-19 . . . DGJ. . .

These efforts to sell power continued up to and during the period of QF

Q. When was a Level 3 condition reached?

curtailments on October 19, 1994.

A. The Level 3 Minimum Load Warning was issued on October 19th at

12:11 a.m.

Q. Was this warning issued using the Sprint Fax system you described earlier?

A. Yes. However, during the day, we were told that several QFs had not immediately received the earlier Minimum Load Alert because their facsimile equipment was not accessible to the plant operators. Also, a few QF plant operators had not yet been familiarized with the Curtailment Plan procedures by their principals. Therefore, in order to ensure clear and timely notice to everyone involved, we separately telephoned each QF to confirm receipt of the Minimum Load Warning.

#### Q. What else was occurring at ECC during this period?

A. Several additional measures were being taken to mitigate potential curtailments. Numerous telephone calls were made to Southern Company Services, Inc. to determine Florida Power's minimum take requirements from the Southern Companies. As it turned out, no such purchases were made. The generation dispatcher also aggressively continued his efforts to sell energy both on and off the Florida Energy Broker System.

Q. Did the QFs take any actions in this timeframe which affected the need for curtailments?

A. Actually, the Tiger Bay facility had been off-line all day. Instead of remaining off-line, Tiger Bay came <u>on-line</u> at about 12:15 a.m.. Had it not been for that unit's deliveries of up to 156 MW, all or most of the

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

150 MW of curtaliments on October 19, 1994 would have been averted.

#### When was the Level 4 condition declared?

A. At 1:40 a.m. on October 19th, a Level 4 Minimum Load Emergency was Sprint Faxed to all QFs. Based upon the on-line information available to me and the generation dispatcher and the computer model which ! discussed earlier, the Group A and B QFs were instructed to reduce deliveries to 50 percent of their Committed Capacity levels and the Group C QFs were told to cease all as-available energy deliveries. These percentages were established to achieve a 150 MW total reduction as of 2:00 a.m. to match the falling load.

In light of the earlier communication problem, we again telephoned each QF to confirm receipt of the curtailment notices. This process was completed before 1:45 a.m.

## Q. Please describe what happened next.

A. A number of QFs informed us either that they would or would not comply. Some offered reasons; others just refused; some asked for additional time to comply.

Curiously, instead of ramping down, the Tiger Bay unit increased its Pasco County Resource Recovery kept its output about output.

 A. I was extremely proud of the hard work done by my colleagues at ECC and the cooperative efforts shown by many of the QF operators. As I said previously, the requested curtailments were necessary under the circumstances. They were also held to the lowest practicable level given the unit and system conditions at the time.

Overall, the events on October 18-19, 1994 went smoothly. There were some initial communication glitches, but steps have been taken to correct those. There also were a few instances of QF failures to follow the Curtailment Plan, but they do not appear to be continuing.

# V. ADDITIONAL MEASURES FOR DEALING WITH CURTAILMENTS

- Q. Since the October 19, 1994 curtailments, what additional procedures has Florida Power developed to facilitate implementation of the Curtailment Plan?
- A. In the short time since October 19, 1994, the ECC staff has better equipped itself to foresee and deal with minimum load emergencies. Perhaps the most significant improvement has been the development of a computerized spreadsheet which contains detailed information about resources, loads and unusual system conditions. Samples of this spreadsheet are included in my Exhibit No. \$\times (CJH-2).

3

4 5

7

8

6

9 10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

22

21

23

Exhibit No. 3 (CJH-2) includes one spreadsheet dated October 19, 1994 and another dated December 8, 1994. Were they developed in the same way?

- The two sample spreadsheets contain comparable information for the two days noted. However, the format was developed after October 19, 1994. Thus, the October 19, 1994 spreadsheet shows historic data, whereas the December 8, 1994 spreadsheet contains projected data. The December 8, 1994 spreadsheet was prepared in the morning of December 7, 1994, and it projects load and resource data for the early morning hours of December 8, 1994. Now that this tool is available, a comparable spreadsheet is being compiled each morning to forecast the loads and resources for that night and the following morning. This analysis provides up-to-date information about unit operating conditions, required purchases, QF status, and projected loads. The spreadsheet offers valuable support to the ECC staff as they develop and implement daily minimum load strategies.
- Q. If this improved spreadsheet format had been available to the Company on October 18-19, 1994, could the curtailments which occurred have been avoided?
- No. The spreadsheet assists greatly in the decisionmaking process, but would not have changed the ultimate decisions on October 18-19, 1994.

Q. Has the Company taken any other actions to improve implementation of the Curtailment Plan?

- A. Yes. The system operating personnel have made a concerted effort to communicate regularly with the QF operators to identify their daily operating conditions. Additionally, we have maintained close coordination with the Company's own plant operators in order to develop efficient and effective minimum load responses. Because we have been threatened repeatedly since mid-October with potential minimum load emergency conditions, the ECC staff has been devoting about two to three manhours daily to the task of understanding the current options and developing strategies for coping with minimum load conditions.
- Q. Has the Company had any close calls since October 18, 1994, where curtailments ultimately were avoided?
- A. Yes, this has occurred repeatedly.
- Q. Please provide some examples of the circumstances that helped to avoid curtailments.
- A. On several occasions, as contemplated by the Curtailment Plan, a decision was made that unit and system conditions were such as to justify bringing Crystal River Unit 1 to a lower "emergency" operating level of 70 MW instead of its "normal" minimum operating level of 120 MW. This cannot be done consistently, nor would it be good for the unit. However, we took this extraordinary step to help avert

1 2 3

curtailments because other units had to remain on-line because of operating problems. Having these units on-line for system security purposes provided justification for reducing Crystal River Unit 1 temporarily to a lower operating level.

On another occasion, we were able to slow the Crystal River 3 start-up rate while returning from a maintenance outage to help avoid a curtaliment condition. Also Crystal River 2 happened to have been off-line during December of 1994 for scheduled maintenance. The Company also has made aggressive efforts to market power to third parties. Two good examples are a 142 MW per hour sale to the Southeastern Power Administration's Carter Pumping Station for five nights in December 1994, and a longer-term contract providing Florida Power with an opportunity to sell up to 300 MW during nighttime hours to Oglethorpe Power Cooperative for its Rocky Mountain Pumped Storage Project.

In addition, the Company has continued its efforts to reach agreed-upon output reduction arrangements with QFs. Tiger Bay, for example, agreed to shut down its unit each night upon request through the end of 1994 and we made that request on several occasions. A 175 MW reduction of this type goes a long way toward curing the minimum load problem. If other QFs were willing to shut down from time to time in this manner, then involuntary curtailments could be reduced accordingly.

#### VI. IMPROVED CURTAILMENT EXPERIENCE IN JANUARY, 1995

- Q. Between October 19, 1994 and the end of January 1995, how many additional curtailment events have occurred?
- A. The Company made it through the rest of October, November and December without any involuntary curtailments. In January, 1995, curtailment events occurred on January 1, 2, 7, 8, 14 and 30. I will refer to these collectively as the "January 1995 curtailments."
- Q. During the seven curtailment events between October and the end of January, was each of the QFs curtailed to the maximum extent called for by the Curtailment Plan?
- A. No. The Group B QFs were curtailed by less than 50 percent on three occasions January 8, 14 and 30, 1995. Group A curtailments were avoided entirely on January 8, 14, and 30, 1995, and were held to only 47 percent of committed capacity on January 2, 1995. During the January 1, 1995 curtailment event, when 11 percent reductions would have been called for from the Group A QFs under the Curtailment Plan, each of these suppliers already was operating below the 11 percent level, so no curtailments were requested from them. In sum, out of seven curtailment events, the Group A QFs were only affected by three, and one of those three curtailments was held to less than 50 percent.
- Q. Are the events that took place during the January 1995 curtailments documented in any of your exhibits?

A. Yes. The summary curtailment log sheets for those days are included in my Exhibit No. 3 (CJH-1) as are the curtailment notices that were supplied to the Commission.

- Q. During the January 1995 curtailments, did the Company experience problems with Anciote Unit 2, Bartow Unit 2 or the University of Florida Unit similar to those that occurred on October 19, 1994?
- A. With one exception, these units all were cycled off during the January curtailment events as anticipated by the Curtailment Plan before any QF curtailments were ordered. The single exception relates to January 14, 1995, when problems with the gas regulators to the back-up boilers at the University of Florida Unit prevented that unit from cycling off. The unit was kept on-line on that occasion to continue meeting the steam supply needs of the Shands Hospital.
- Q. During the January 1995 curtailments, was the Company required to purchase the Southern Companies' Miller or Scherer unit output?
- A. On January 1, 1995, Florida Power was not required to purchase any unit power from Southern. On January 2, 1995, we were required to accept 23 MW of power from Scherer Unit 3. On January 7 and 8, 1995, the minimum purchases ranged between 109 and 132 MW. On January 14, 1995, the hourly purchases were 96 MW or less. The Southern purchases ranged from 8 to 95 MW during the January 30, 1995 curtailment period. In each instance, the QF curtailments were adjusted accordingly.

- Q. During the January 1995 curtailments, did Florida Power experience any of the communication problems that occurred on October 19, 1994?
- A. We have experienced some minor problems in sending Sprint Fax messages. For example, Timber Energy still does not have receiving facsimile equipment available to its plant operator. Therefore, as an extra precaution, each plant operator has been contacted directly by telephone. It appears that everyone is receiving timely curtailment information, but we would prefer to phase out individual telephone calls because this is an enormous time commitment at a time when running the system requires the system operators' careful attention.
- Q. During the January 1995 curtailment events, did Florida Power experience any of the QF compliance problems that occurred on October 19, 1994?
- A. No. I am pleased to say that the affected QFs complied with the Company's curtailment instructions and that output was reduced to the levels requested.
- Q. What conclusions do you draw about the Company's experience to date in dealing with minimum load curtailments?
- A. Florida Power's Curtailment Plan and implementation practices both reflect aggressive, ongoing efforts to mitigate QF curtailments. The ECC staff is working diligently to achieve that objective. As a result, involuntary curtailments to date have been held to a bare minimum. The experience during the January 1995 curtailment events indicates that

5

6

the few initial problems experienced on October 19, 1994 have been largely remedied. The cooperation currently being put forth by our QF suppliers is encouraging.

- Q. Does this conclude your testimony, Mr. Harper?
- A. Yes.

Q (By Mr. Fama) Thank you. Mr. Harper, could you please summarize your prefiled testimony?

A Okay. In my testimony I summarize the responsibilities that I have as System Control Manager and go through a typical day, October the 19th, or the date of our first curtailment.

Summarizing that, I have responsibility for the day-to-day operation of the System Control Center as far as transmission, interchange and generation considerations go.

It's my duty to operate the system in a safe, economical and reliable fashion at all times within the guidelines of the electric utility business.

Summarizing what the curtailment plan does, how we've implemented it so far, the results of that implementation on the seven curtailments and the daily overall planning that goes into our daily work process is my testimony.

The final area actually dealt with October 19th.

I'll go through that summary of that account, keeping in mind that the curtailment of October 19th was not a whole lot different than any of the other curtailment periods, nor a whole lot different than our typical daytime operation and how we plan the system and how we reach conclusions on where we're going during the day.

So, once again, while I'm reading from the October

18th-October 19th curtailment event, they pretty much summarize our daily activities.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Typically, in the morning, and at Pnergy Control, the Power Supply Department and the System Control Department talk to the different power plants, see what happened during the night. We talk to the dispatchers that were on duty, read their notes from the previous night, gain information from the QFs by faxes that have been sent in on their proposed megawatt amounts for the next night. At the same time engineering technicians are looking at the load forecast for the next -oh, excuse me, the weather forecast for the next day and any other significant events that would place how we run the system the next day.

Once we gain all that information, we feed or place that -- the projected load forecast and any unit limitations into a program called "unit commit." Once we get the unit commitment output runs, which gives us an economic outlook of how we should run the system -- and I stress that is an economic output, not a regulation or reliability output -- we make many recommendations based on our next day's planning based on regulation control, system security and economics.

So we get the output of unit commit, place that data on a daily worksheet where we examine all the different criteria that go into the coming day's events. From the 25# worksheet it gives us a very good idea of whether we'll be

into a low load situation that night and how we are going to handle it and what will be required.

Once again, like I say, we've already contacted our units, so we know pretty much what our units can do. And at this point we know pretty much what the QFs can do.

If, as on October the 18th, we saw that we would have excess generation compared to our load, we made efforts to try to sell power off-broker. We called around to different locations in the state of Florida, as well as the southeast. We contacted Southern Company at that time to see if we have to take the Southern must-take. They were not able give us an answer that soon, that early in the day. As it turned out, we did not have to.

By about 11 o'clock on October the 18th we determined we would be into a low load situation, and we issued the first Level 1 minimum load alert. It was faxed out by means of a fax system that sends them out simultaneously to the all the QFs and our own power plants so that everyone is notified at the same time of the minimum load alert.

As the day progressed we went into what we call a Level 2 of the plan that Mr. Dolan described, where the dispatchers and the power supply engineering staff watch and monitor the system to see if it's proceeding on as we had forecast.

In the case of October the 18th, it was. The load

was following the forecast exactly, right on into the evening hours. During that time our dispatchers continued to try to sell power off-broker. And I'm talking about trying to sell power to other companies in terms of from 0100 to 0600, in that time frame, trying to get us through the eventual low load period.

б

As we approached 11:30, 2330 at night, the dispatchers notified me, and I came back to the control center. We made a determination at that time since the loads continued to fall and it was apparent that we were going to have more are generation between the QPs and PPC's own generation than we could handle, we sent out a Level 3 notification shortly after midnight. Level 3, as Mr. Dolan described, is notifying everyone of an imminent curtailment.

At 0140, after continual tries at selling power and, bear in mind, when everyone is in this situation it's very difficult to sell power; we were not able to. And contacting Southern Company, once again trying to determine whether or not we were going to have to take their Southern must-take, we sent out a message at 0140 that we would go into a Level 4 effective at hour 2:00 for hour ending three. And we asked for specific megawatt amounts.

100% of A sales to Florida Power and 50% of B and A committed capacity effective at 2 o'clock for hour ending three.

We followed up each of these messages, the one at noon, Level 1; the one shortly after midnight, the Level 3 and the Level 4. We followed up all those faxes with phone calls to each of the QF suppliers so there would be no doubt in anyone's mind exactly that we wanted, and we explained the situation to them.

2

3

5

6

7

8

q

10

11

12

13 H

15#

17

18

21

22

25

At 2 o'clock our load continued to fall. Many of the QPs responded to us at that time and started curtailing some of their load; some did not. As it turned out, we had asked for 150 megawatts; and we came very close to that 150-megawatt amount.

The curtailment period lasted until 6 o'clock in the morning. At 5:30 we notified everyone that at 6 o'clock they could start ramping their units back up. And at 6 o'clock they did. We sent out a message that the curtailment period was over. The following day we notified the Commission as Level 5 dictates.

The other area of summary in my testimony was what we've done since then. We have initiated a new type of worksheet since then, compared to the very first one that we had where we can analyze things even closer on a computer spreadsheet. We've continued working with our own units to minimize Their levels of operation and maximize their control levels. And we've had very tremendous cooperation from several of the QFs in helping us to alleviate many, many of

1 what were potential curtailments. 2 MR. FAMA: I tender the witness for cross 3 examination. 4 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Ms. Walker? 5 MS. WALKER: We don't have any questions for this 6 witness. 7 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. McGlothlin? 8 MR. McGLOTHLIN: We don't have any questions. 9 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Presnell? 10 MR. PRESNELL: Chairman Clark, I know this may come 11 as a shocker to everyone in the room, but I think that OCL and Florida Power may have reached somewhat of an accord on at 13 least one of the issues in this proceeding. And with the agreement of Florida Power, I will defer my cross examination of Mr. Harper with respect to that particular issue. 15 are not able to resolve it during the evening, then Florida 17 Power has agreed with the Commission's approval that I could 18 recall the witness for the limited purpose of finishing his 19 cross examination. Is that acceptable to the Commission? 20 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Yes. That is acceptable. Thank 21 you. 22 CROSS EXAMINATION 23 BY MR. PRESNELL: 24 Good afternoon, Mr. Harper. As I understand it, as

manager of System Control, you're pretty much on the firing

25 B

line during these curtailment episodes, correct? 2 Yes, sir. 3 You are the one responsible from a hands-on standpoint of doing everything conceivably possible to avoid 5 an actual curtailment event, correct? Two sections of Energy Control are the ones directly 6 7 responsible; the Power Supply Department and my area, yes, 8 sir. 9 Q And the Power Supply Department, they are the people 10 who, based on weather forecasting and generating resources. 11 provide an estimate to you on a daily basis of what generating resources to expect and what load to expect, correct? 13 Correct. 14 And the minimum load situation is primarily a 15 product of weather conditions? 16 Yes, sir, that's correct. 17 And because of the vagaries of whether you have 0 18 maybe a one or two day advanced warning of a possible 19 curtailment episode? 20 Typically, one day; sometimes two at the very most. So your window of planning is basically 48 hours? 21 0 22 At the most for a -- we can get a broad view looking 23 out several days as to what we could be getting into. But the closer we get to it, the more assured we are that we'll be 25 into a low load situation.

1	Q Now, as I understand it, you have basically two
2	responsibilities in order to try to alleviate a curtailment.
3	The first is to bring down your own units to their absolute
4	mimimum operating level including the voluntary QF reductions.
5	Is that an accurate statement?
6	A We bring down our own units to the minimum operating
7	levels, taking into consideration control regulation, AGC,
8	that type of thing and potential security on the system.
9	CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Harper, AGC?
10	WITNESS HARPER: Automatic generation control.
11	That's the ability to follow load.
12	CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay.
13	Q (By Mr. Presnell) And in addition to that, you
14	endeavor to the extent reasonably possible and we'll talk
15	about the reasonableness aspect of this to sell surplus
16	power, correct?
17	A Yes, sir, we do.
18	Q For example, if your minimum generating resources
19	are at 2,200 megawatts, including your AGC requirement, and
20	you are anticipating a load of 2,000 megawatts, then you have
21	a 200-megawatt surplus to deal with, correct?
22	A Correct.
23	Q And theoretically there are two ways to deal with
24	that. You can at that point curtail the QFs, or you can

25 attempt to sell that 200 megawatts off-system, right?

1	A Correct.
2	Q Now, with respect to the October 19th episode, let'
3	talk about that for a minute. As I understand your testimony
4	the way it's formatted in your exhibits, there's a tab, Tabs
5	through 7 which correspond to each of the curtailment episode
6	that have been experienced to date?
7	A Yes, that's correct.
8	Q And if we turn to Tab 1, then that would give us a
9	summary of the documentation pertaining to the October 19th
10	episode?
11	A Right.
12	Q And several pages into it and I know they are no
13	numbered but there's a chart that says "FPC Energy Control
14	Center, Power Supply, Minimum Load Emergency Curtailment
15	Summary. * Do you see that?
16	A Yes, sir.
17	Q Is that a summary by hour beginning at 1 o'clock on
18	the morning of the 19th with respect to the generation output
19	of each of the facilities reflected on that list?
20	A Yes, it is. This summary, however, was done
21	Q This was done after the fact?
22	A This was done after the fact. This particular
23	spreadsheet was not available to us during the first
24	curtailment episode.

Q Is this the new worksheet that you've indicated in

1	your testimony you've since developed for the new		
2	curtailments?		
3	A No. There's a worksheet further on in here, and		
4	then later on in the other ones, this is the summary of events		
5	that happened; the worksheet we used going into the		
6	curtailment period in the morning.		
7	Q But this is an accurate portrayal of the actual		
8	generation levels of all these units during the October 19th		
9	episode?		
10	A I did not make this, but I would say, yes, it is.		
11	Q Well, you're sponsoring the exhibit. You don't have		
12	any reason to believe it's not accurate, do you?		
13	A No, I have no reason to believe it's not accurate.		
14	I'm just saying I did not particularly do this spreadsheet.		
15	Q And Florida Power's units are listed in the bottom		
16	part of this chart?		
17	A Correct.		
18	Q Now, I notice, for example, Crystal River Unit		
19	No. 3, that's your nuclear unit, correct?		
20	A Yes, sir.		
21	Q And it has a minimal operating level of 800		
22	megawatts?		
23	A Right.		
24	Q And during the January curtailments, you brought		
25	that unit down to 800 megawatts?		

A The Crystal River 3 nuclear unit remains steady at 800 megawatts at all times. That's a net figure after participants. Total output of the unit is somewhere around 870 typically, and there's partial ownership by several other owners. So the 800 is actually the gross amount on to our system after we give the portion that belongs to the other people.

19.

Q Well, if you go over to the right it indicates that that unit was operating during the curtailment period at around 845 megawatts?

A That's the net amount. You also have to take into consideration, the auxiliaries on the unit. So there's actually -- in different testimony you'll see a figure of 800, you'll see a number 880 and 755 at different places. Those are all just different ways of saying you're either giving to the co-owners the auxiliaries and the gross or the net on to our system.

Q Well, was the additional 45 megawatts generated as reflected on the -- during the curtailment period? Is that the portion that went to the other owners of the unit?

A I don't know what the gross -- the actual gross output was that night. It was probably around 870, and what we were giving to the other participants was probably 35 or 40 megawatts at that time. It also could have been derated that night for some particular reason. I'm not sure. I don't

remember right now.

9.

Q Well, wouldn't you agree with me, Mr. Harper, that on October 19th you did not bring your nuclear plant down as low as it could go?

A I have no options in reducing the output of the nuclear unit at all for any reason other than an extreme system emergency. It's a policy decision of Plorida Power that the output of CR-3, the nuclear unit, will stay at its same load at all times. In other words, the maximum is the minimum at all times.

Q Well, let me ask you the question this way: During the January curtailment episodes, wasn't the nuclear plant taken down to a level below that which it was taken on October 19th?

A The nuclear unit was never taken down as a result of the low load situation. At one time during one of the curtailments, it was down for maintenance, had come off-line for several days. And as it was coming back on line during one of the curtailments periods -- actually, it was not during one of the curtailment periods, it was prior to one -- we slowed the megawatt output of the nuclear unit as it came back from 4 or 5 megawatts a minute to, I think, 2 megawatts a minute. By them doing that, we avoided a curtailment.

- Q Mr. Harper, turn to the last page of your exhibit.
- A The last -- where at?

1	Q The absolute last page	
2	A In the total exhibit?	
3	Q of your exhibit which is the last page under Tab	
4	7. Now, that's a similar summary for what period?	
5	MR. FAMA: Craig, I'm sorry, are you in the I	
6	think that might be Exhibit 2. Is there a green insert page	
7	before it?	
8	MR. PRESNELL: Well, all I know is it's just	
9	prefiled testimony and it's the last page beyond Tab 7.	
10	MR. FAMA: I think you are in the last page of his	
11	prefiled which is not behind tab can you read just what's	
12	at the bottom right?	
13	MR. PRESNELL: It is says "FPC Witness Harper,	
1.4	Exhibit No. 'blank,' CJH 2, Page 202."	
15	Q (By Mr. Presnell) Are you with me, Mr. Harper?	
16	A I'm there.	
17	Q Now, there it shows Crystal River Plant on the	
18	left-hand side with a committed capacity of 800 that was	
19	actually operated at 800, correct, during the evening hours	
20	and early morning hours?	
21	A That's exactly right. That's showing	
22	Q Now, why was your Crystal River nuclear plant turned	
23	down to 800 megawatts on that episode, but not turned down to	
24	800 megawatts on the morning of October 19th?	

A As I say, I'm not sure why that 845 number is in

there. I think at the time these spreadsheets were just being developed during that first curtailment period, the worksheets and the summary sheets, the minimum value on the nuclear unit during the CR-3 episode -- excuse me, during the October 19th episode -- and if you'll excuse me one moment while I look back. Okay.

The actual gross output -- and I'll get back to this last page in just a moment.

On Wednesday the 19th of October, the actual gross output of CR-3 to the system was 881 to 880 megawatts during the entire 0100 to 0700 time period. Why the 845 is showing on the one sheet, I'm not certain at this time. But I can guarantee you that the actual output to the system, net minus the participants, was approximately 800 megawatts during each of the curtailment periods.

Q So you are telling the Commission that despite what these exhibits show, the nuclear unit remained at 800 during all of the curtailment episodes?

A I cannot answer the 845 on that one specific page, but I can back it up by looking at the actual generation steam -- generation output found under October 19th, and it shows exactly under CR-3 what the gross output of the unit was.

- Q The gross output was 880?
- A 880.

1	Q And how much of that was delivered, either used or		
2	delivered to the other owners?		
3	A Approximately 80 megawatts.		
4	CHAIRMAN CLARK: So I think the answer to his		
5	question is, yes, it was the same both in October and January;		
6	is that correct?		
7	WITNESS HARPER: Yes, ma'am, that's correct.		
8	CHAIRMAN CLARK: And you have a difference in what		
9	you were adding into that amount in terms of participants?		
10	WITNESS HARPER: I'm not sure what that 45 number is		
11	just right offhand right now.		
12	CHAIRMAN CLARK: But you are sure it was generating		
13	at the same amount?		
14	WITNESS HARPER: Yes, ma'am. And that's shown in		
15	our logs within the same exhibit.		
16	Q (By Er. Presnell) Well, can you explain then why the		
17	exhibit indicates it was generating at 845 net during the		
18	curtailment hours? Is that simply a mistake in your exhibit?		
19	A Let me just take one moment to look at it again.		
20	(Pause)		
21	I would say what this is, is when this sheet was		
22	made, this is showing minus the auxiliaries of the unit, which		
23	would be approximately 40 megawatts hourly. And this is not		
24	showing as you mentioned a few moments ago, I mentioned		
25	that you could see three different amounts: Approximately		

800. 880 and 755. I believe it is. I believe this is the net amount minus auxiliaries, or those -- the pumps and the type 2 3 of thing that it takes to run the power plant, and then it is not showing the participants on this particular chart. I've ran through and scanned all the other ones and 5 6 it appeared that they're 800 on all the other charts. 7 So the bottom line is, there's no ability as you 8 understand it to turn the nuclear plant down at all in order 9 to help alleviate a minimum load situation? 10 Yes, sir, that's correct. 11 O. Not even one megawatt? 12 A Not even one megawatt. 13 Q Right. Now, you would agree with me that your plan does contemplate, however, that you would turn off all your intermiate and peaking units, correct? 16 A That is the plan as best we can, yes, short of any problems at those units or security needs. 17 18 And in looking, again, at your summary of your 19 October 19th episode under the FPC units, Anclote No. 2, 20 that's an immediate oil-fired unit? 21 A Yes, sir. And you would agree with me that you didn't cycle 22 that unit off, did you? 23 24 A That's correct.

And so there are some 25 to 30 megawatts of power

25

Q

1	being gene	erated by Anclote Unit No. 2 which contributed to the
2	minimum lo	pad problem that evening, correct?
3	A	Yes, sir. It was on line.
4	Q	And, also, Bartow Unit No. 2 stayed on line, did it
5	not?	
6	A	Yes, sir.
7	Q	And so between 19 and 35 megawatts, I guess 19 to 20
8	megawatts	of power generated by that unit of Plorida Power's
9	contribute	ed to its own curtailment problem that evening,
ſΟ	correct?	
11	λ	That's correct.
12	Q	And then under that it shows UFCOG. That refers to
13	the University of Plorida Cogen?	
14	λ	Right.
15	Q	And that's a 40-megawatt unit in Gainesville?
16	A	Approximately 40 megawatts.
17	Ω	And under your curtailment plan, you're supposed to
18	turn that	unit off, right?
19	A	The plan calls for us to turn those units off, yes.
20	Q	And you will agree with me that on the 19th you
21	didn't tu	on that unit off either?
22	λ	That's correct. As to the Anclote unit, that
23	evening -	- that afternoon when we were in contact with the
24	operation	people at Anclote, the unit had turbine vibration.
25	Q	Well, wait a minute, sir. There's no question

pending on Anclote. 2 Anclote 2 you asked me about; why did we keep it on. 3 No, I'm sorry. I said the University of Florida project. I'm sorry if I said Anclote. 5 A I was going to summarize the Anclote, the Bartow and 6 the University of Florida unit, why they were all on line. 7 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Harper, as I recall, that was 8 in your direct testimony as to why that was on or somebody's 9 direct testimony. 10 WITNESS HARPER: It was in mine, yes, ma'am. 11 CHAIRMAN CLARK: And your attorney will have the 12 opportunity to ask you redirect. 13 WITNESS HARPER: Okay. 14 (By Mr. Presnell) I'm simply trying to establish, Q 15 Mr. Harper, that there was 15 megawatts of power being generated by Florida Power's own cogeneration unit at the 17 University of Florida which contributed to its curtailment 18 problem that evening, correct? 19 λ That's correct. 20 So between Anclote, Bartow and the University of 21 Florida, there's about 60 megawatts of the problem right there 22 within your own system, right? 23 A Correct. 24 And that's because Florida Power has operational

problems turning some of its units off, right?

25

A On occasion.

- Q And it's because Florida Power has steam host requirements with respect to its cogeneration contract, right?

  Is that the reason?
  - A That is the reason that night, right, ves, sir.
- Q And you would agree that QFs also have operational conditions and steam host requirements that might give them problems in terms of cycling their units down or off during the curtailment period. correct?
- A Yes, Bir. I would recognize that QFs do have operational temporary problems. And, in fact, I've issued a letter to the operations people at ECC stating that if a QF would call and say they had a short-term operational problem with a unit, that we will recognize that problem and fully allow that unit to stay on during a situation, too.
- Q Okay. So you were looking for 150 megawatts. In other words, that's the surplus you were faced with that evening as a dispatcher, correct?
  - A Correct.
- Q And if 60 of those were attributable to your own units, we then have 90 megawatts to talk about for purposes of my questioning. And the next level, I guess, of effort would be to get the voluntary NUGs to reduce their power by the amount that they had agreed or committed to reduce? Is that part of your job as the dispatcher?

1	A Keeping in mind that the 60 megawatts of our units
2	that were on line would still call for 150 megawatts total,
3	the Level 1 alert that went out at noon would notify the QPs
4	of voluntary curtailments, that we would be placing them into
5	effect.
6	Q Okay. Well, my question was assuming that you were
7	able to turn off the units that Florida Power continued to
8	operate through the curtailment episode, then you would have
9	only needed 90 megawatts that evening, correct?
10	A That's correct.
11	Q Then did you have 90 megawatts of commitments from
12	the voluntary QFs?
13	A That would have been over and above the 150 that we
14	requested.
15	Q So if the Group A NUGs had just done what they said
16	they would have done, done what they had committed to do,
17	there would have been no necessity at all on the evening of
18	the 19th to curtail the Group B NUGs, correct?
19	A All our negotiated agreements were in effect and
30	carried out.
21	Q Well, they were?
22	A When we went into the Level 4, yes, sir.
23	Q No. I'm talking about the voluntary commitments;
24	that is the commitments made by the Group A NUGs to voluntary
25	turn down. If all of those NUGs had turned town to the extent

And the street of Same

1	they had p	promised to turn down, would a Group B curtailment
2	have been	necessary at all?
3	λ	Excuse me just a moment while I look at the chart
4	and see wi	nich ones did and didn't.
5	Q	For the Commission's benefit, let's refer them under
6	Tab 1 to 1	the what, the third page there is what you're
7	talking al	pout, the Power Supply Notes Cog Curtailment Quick
8	Summary?	Do you see that?
9	λ	Yes, sir.
10	Q	Is that a summary of what the Group A NUGs or
11	actually a	all the NUGs did that evening?
12	λ	Yes, it is.
13	Q	Well, why don't we just go down and break the the
14	first one	is Auburndale?
15	λ	Do you want to take it, or do you want me to?
16	Q	Is the first one Auburndale?
17	λ	Auburndale, yes.
18	Q	And according to that note, they had agreed to
19	reduce to	98.5, correct?
20	λ	That's correct.
21	Q	But they refused to comply with their commitment and
22	they only	came down to 105; is that correct? (Pause)
23	A	I'm looking one other place. That's correct.
24	Q	So they were six and-a-half megawatts short of their
25	commitment	t?

1	A That's correct.
2	Q All right. DCRR complied. What about LCL, is that
3	Lake?
4	A That's Lake, yes.
5	Q And that indicates that Lake refused to reduce its
6	load?
7	A That's correct.
8	Q And did you have an agreement with Lake at that
9	time?
ιo	A I'm not sure. I'm not certain whether we did or not
11	at that time. I believe we did.
12	Q Okay. Do you know what deficiency there was in
L3	Lakes' commitment to curtail in that episode? (Pause)
14	A We anticipated them to come to 95 megawatts.
15	Q And what were they at?
16	A This shows they okay. This says that they stayed
17	at their forecasted load. Now, their forecasted load very
18	well could have been 95. And this chart on the next page
19	shows that they did stay at 95. I don't know what their
20	forecasted load was. I presume it was 95.
21	Q Well, doesn't this summary connote that Lake did not
22	reduce its load to the point that Florida Power expected?
23	A What we're talking about on this note now is the
24	Level 4 notification to reduce further.
Ī	

Q I see. So even though you issued a Level 4 demand

1	that they	reduce, they refused to do so?
2	A	They refused to come below the 95, right.
3	Q	All right. What about PSRR? Who is that?
4	λ	That's Pasco Resource Recovery.
5	Q	Now, they have an agreement, do they not, they are a
6	Group A N	UG?
7	λ	Okay
8	Q	Or they were at the time?
9	A	Yes, sir. And their negotiated minimum output was
10	23, and the	hey came down to an average of about 16 or 17 for the
11	night.	
12	Q	So they were 6 megawatts short; is that correct?
13	λ	Let me find Pasco again. I'm flipping back and
14	forth bet	ween this and the other page.
15		Pasco County Resource, their committed capacity is
16	23, and t	hey were about six short.
17	Q	Okay. What about PCRR? That's Pasco County
18	Resource	Recovery?
19	A	This one's Pinellas County Resource Recovery. They
20	did not r	educe load.
21	Q	And they had a commitment to reduce?
22	A	Yes, they did; and I'm not sure of the megawatt
23	amount.	
24	Q	But there was a deficit, basically, in their
25	voluntary	commitment correct?

1	A I'm not sure. I don't know. I don't know on that
2	one.
3	Q Well, if they had a commitment to reduce load and
4	according to your note they didn't reduce the load, wouldn't
5	that say to you that they didn't do what they said they were
6	going to do?
7	A I don't know the value that they were supposed to
8	decrease.
9	Q I understand that, but you would admit that there is
10	some value by which they were short?
11	A Yes, they were short.
12	Q Then we get let's go down to TIGC. That's Tiger
13	Bay?
14	A Tiger Bay.
15	Q And they had committed to do what on a voluntary
16	basis?
17	A Tiger Bay at that time was in their start-up mode.
18	They were not commercial onto our system yet.
19	One of the things going into that evening, had that
20	unit not been on line, we would have avoided a curtailment.
21	We didn't know when the unit was coming on line. As it turned
22	out, it came on right around midnight.
23	Q Didn't you have a commitment from Tiger Bay not to
24	provide any test energy during that evening?
25	A Not that I'm aware of. In fact, we had made contact

with them several times during the day, and they told us they were coming on line.

Q So Tiger Bay, even though they were not in service and was only in the testing phase, ramped up and came on line despite your request or despite your advice that that would cause serious problems with respect to your curtailment, correct?

A I do not have the authority to tell a unit not to come on line to a QF. We were in touch with them several times during the day, the Power Supply Department, trying to ascertain whether or not they were going to be coming on line, but we certainly in no way told them to not come on line.

- Q Did you ask them not to come on line?
- A I'm not certain. I did not personally.
- Q Well, did you instruct your dispatchers to tell them that?

A The dispatchers were not the ones making the phone call. The Power Supply Department was. I don't know whether -- they don't report to me. I'm not sure whether they asked that question or not. I know it was probably in the topic of conversation.

Q Well, you would agree with me that if Tiger Bay had simply honored a request not to deliver test energy on the early morning hours of October 19th, there would have been no curtailment; is that right?

1	A If Tiger Bay had not come on line, there would have
2	been no curtailment.
3	CHAIRMAN CLARK: Just so I'm clear, Tiger Bay had
4	not at that time become a Group A cogenerator, had they?
5	WITNESS HARPER: To the best of my knowledge, it was
6	not. It was still in the test mode.
7	MR. PRESNELL: They already had an agreement,
8	though.
9	CHAIRMAN CLARK: That's what I'm really asking. If
10	Tiger Bay had an agreement, a side agreement, to curtail
11	during the October 19th
12	WITNESS HARPER: I'm not certain as to the date
13	whether they did or not. Mr. Dolan could tell us that, but I
14	don't know.
15	CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay.
16	Q (By Mr. Presnell) With respect to Tiger Bay
17	also, if you'll turn the page there to the Energy Control
	Power Supply Summary that we're talking about.
19	A Right.
20	Q It shows Tiger Bay's committed capacity of 217.75?
21	A Right.
22	Q Now, would you agree with me that Tiger Bay did not
23	become commercially in-service until January of '95?
24 25	A I believe they keep in mind I'm not the contract
	- LOCATOLICA DILLA A CIMALIMUM TOM TARRA NAMBAA AA 46644 44444 4444 4444 4444 4444

1	effective January 1st. I think another phase of their
2	contract was effective in the late fall.
3	Q Well, let me ask it this way and maybe refresh your
4	recollection. Isn't it true that all portions of the contract
5	except the Avon Park came on line in January, and that 40
6	megawatts of that unit will not become commercially in service
7	until July of this year?
8	A That could be. I'm not certain.
9	Q And if that's true, their committed capacity as of
10	today is somewhat is 40 megawatts less than 217, correct?
11	A I would not be the person that could comment on
12	that.
13	Q And looking further at your power supply notes,
14	LCPR?
15	A Lake County Resource Recovery.
16	Q They apparently didn't comply with their voluntary
L7	commitment either, did they?
L8	A They did not.
19	Q Now, the next one is Orlando CoGen?
20	A Right.
21	Q And Orlando CoGen did comply with your request, did
22	they not?
23	A Orlando CoGen called. In fact, they talked to one
24	of the dispatchers, and they referred it to me, and said that
25	they had an air compliance problem. I believe it was and said

they could not comply to the full amount of the request, and 1 they would have to come off line. So they more than helped. 2 3 Basically, Orlando made up for the -- almost made up for the Tiger Bay energy that was delivered, correct? No. They provided 98 megawatts of the total amount 5 A 6 needed. 7 And does Florida Power in its cogeneration plan have 8 any procedure or methodology for compensating OCL for the 9 overage it supplied on that occasion? 10 No. We have no plans such as -- for anything like λ 11 that. 12 Q You will agree with me that under the curtailment plan, since Orlando CoGen was a Group B NUG, they would have 14 been required to curtail it 50%, correct? That's what we requested. 15 16 And because of their operational situations, Q situations similar to what Florida Power has operating its own 17 units, they had to turn their unit off entirely, correct, and 18 19 reduce to 100%. Right? 20 I'm not a power plant person. It's my understanding A that OCL's problem was not a short-term problem but rather a 21 22 long-term and would not be able to do that at anytime, where our unit problems were short term. 24 Q You understood that there was a level below which

Orlando cannot operate and comply with its environmental air

permits, correct?

- A That's my understanding, right.
- Q So even though Orlando was forced by your curtailment plan to give 100% rather than 50, there's no mechanism to equal up or even up curtailments over time so that Orlando is not penalized by its own operational or air permitting concerns?
- A No, we have no plan nor do we have a plan for our own units which go beyond the scope of the plan.
- Q Now, in addition to trying to bring your own generation facilities down to a minimum, if you do that and you still have an excess of, say, 150 megawatts which you had on the 19th, you then have the option of attempting to sell power off-system, correct?
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q And I take it that during the day on the 18th when you were facing the possibility of a curtailment episode, you made efforts to sell power off-system, right?
  - A That's correct.
- Q And on Page 17 of your testimony, you reflect the message that went out on what's called the Bulletin Board?
  - A It went out on the Florida Messaging System.
  - Q And who does that go to?
- A That particular message went out to all the operating companies in the state of Florida.

-	d wan now many or those are there?
2	A I believe there are 23.
3	Q When was this message first sent?
4	A This message was sent out sometime in the afternoon
5	of the 18th.
6	Q And when it indicates "FPC should have some power to
7	sell, * how much power at that point in time were you offering
8	to sell?
9	A At that time we were talking in terms of 200 to 300
10	megawatts.
11	Q And was that included in your bulletin board
12	message?
13	A That's the entire message that went out. However,
14	phone calls were made to other companies and to many of the
15	Florida companies and to several companies in the southeast
16	where we gave megawatt amounts.
17	Q So you sent different messages, some with and some
18	without the megawatts that you were willing to sell?
19	A That's correct.
20	Q Why was that?
21	A When we call people specifically, we wouldn't call,
22	for example, Gainesville and tell them we have 300 megawatts
23	to sell; but we would call FPL, Plorida Power & Light, and
24	tell them we have 300. We try to sell power according to who
25	we're calling. It's the ability of a company to purchase

power. Well, couldn't you send a message indicating to all 2 3 the utilities that you were interested in selling 200 to 300 megawatts of power and anyone interested in purchasing all or a portion of it should let you know? 5 We could. On an operational basis, however, most of 7 these people, in fact, all of them, would know what we were talking about. 8 Now, you indicate that you're offering to sell in 9 Q the \$14 to \$15 range. Now, how was that price determined? 11 That price was determined in mid-afternoon by anticipating where our units would be and what load level we 12 would be at, and we looked at our hourly pricing sheet and 13 came up with a price based on those criteria, based on that 15 critaria. Who determines the price that will be offered on these off-broker sales? dispatchers on -- the generation dispatcher.

This particular price was determined by the

- That would be your people? Q
- A My people.

10

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q And how do they make that determination?
- They make that determination from a pricing sheet A which is generated from the unit commit program.
  - Is that price essentially what you estimate your Q

1	as-available price will be during that period of time; that is
2	between 1 a.m. and 5 a.m. on the 19th?
3	A I don't know.
4	Q Did you receive any responses to your offer to sell
5	power in the \$14 to \$15 range on the afternoon of October
6	18th?
7	A No. As a matter of fact, we did not; and that
8	prompted even more phone calls. The typical answer was:
9	"We're in the same situation you are, and the last thing we
10	want is more power."
11	Q You would agree with me, Mr. Harper, that
12	electricity is fungible. Your power is no better than Florida
13	Power & Light's?
14	A As a very prejudiced person, I would have yes,
15	sir, I agree with you.
16	Q And that the only distinction in terms of the market
17	for electricity is delivered cost, correct?
18	A Would you repeat that again?
19	Q Well, in the market for purchasing electricity, the
20	only real factor is price, delivered price?
21	A Delivered price depending upon the delivery point,
22	yes.
23	Q So, for example, if the City of Gainesville needs
24	power and you're offering to sell them power at, say, a
25	delivered price of 14, and Florida Power & Light can sell it

to them at 13, they are going to buy it from Florida Power & 1 2 Light, correct? 3 Yes, sir. All right. So what effort did you make on the 5 afternoon of the 18th to lower your price in order to become competitive? 6 7 We don't make efforts to lower our prices based upon a -- how can I say this -- based upon a used car salesman's 8 mentality. We base our prices based upon strict limitations 9 of incremental pricing. 10 11 You make no effort to compete with the other utilities at the wholesale level by pricing your energy lower 12 than the others, correct. 13 14 MR. FAMA: I'm going to object. I don't think that 15 was his testimony. 16 MR. PRESNELL: Well, he can tell me. 17 (By Mr. Presnell) Do you make any effort to compete Q 18 by price with any of the other utilities with respect to 19 wholesale sales? 20 Are you talking wholesale sales in the terminology of what we would put on the broker or sell off broker. 21 22 Off broker. 23 λ We do not --24 You've got 150 megawatts of surplus power. You've 25 got a real problem; you need to get rid of it. Rather than

curtail the QFs, what I want to know is whether you make any effort to compete with the other utilities in Florida by pricing your energy at a level sufficient to sell it?

A The only way we are allowed to compete is by quoting prices that we can back up from a cost pricing sheet. Once again, we are not allowed to, at this point in our history anyway, go out and peddle power.

Q And who told you that you?

A For broker sales, for example, it's in the FCG broker manual.

Q off --

A For off broker sales, it's part of our training process. It has been handed down. It's an industry standard.

I'm not sure of anyone in the industry, in my knowledge anyway, that markets power at this time, on October the 19th, on a free-market based sale.

Q So it's your understanding that if your computer model comes up with a price of 15, based on your unit commit computer model, you have no flexibility in attempting to lower that price in order to make a sale?

A The only flexibility I have is within the guides that allow for where the units are located on the incremental price scale. And our unit commit program typically shows that.

Q Is what you're saying that you believe Florida Power

1	is required to quote a price equal to its incremental cost?
2	A We quote prices based on the next incremental
3	megawatt of power.
4	Q Now, do you quote those in 50 megawatt blocks?
5	A We have the ability to quote those typically in
6	hundreds, but in any megawatt block.
7	Q You would agree with me the price would be different
8	depending on the size of the block?
9	A Yes.
10	Q What block was being used to price the \$14 to \$15
11	range that you put in your off broker bulletin on the 18th?
12	A The reason we had \$14 to \$15 was, once again,
13	because it was for a 200 to 300 megawatt block of power. And
14	we had the dispatcher just average the first three blocks of
15	power, and it came out actually around between \$14 and \$15.
16	Q So it's your testimony that whatever the computer
17	model shows, that's the price you have to charge?
18	MR. FAMA: Are you saying that Gregory, are you
19	asking for what Plorida Power has to charge as a matter of
20	law?
21	MR. PRESNELL: No.
22	MR. FAMA: Or his understanding as an operator as to
23	what he has to do?
24	Q (By Mr. Presnell) No. You're understanding as an
25	operator. Whatever that price sheet comes up with, you have

1	no flexibility charging offering energy for more or less,
2	correct?
3	A As I said earlier, it's the incremental pricing
4	based on where the units are loaded. If our units fall below
5	a certain level, we have other mechanisms that we can price
6	from. But it's all based on incremental pricing.
7	Q Well, let's take the situation that existed on the
8	morning of October 19th. What was the generating level you
9	were faced with and the load level? I know there's 150
10	megawatt difference, but what were those levels?
11	A Loads that night got down to around 2160. 2147, I
12	believe, was the actual low load, which would have put our
13	units pretty much according to that curtailment summary
14	loading. Crystal River 1 at 120, No. 2 at 140, No. 3 at
15	around 800, 4 at 150 and 5 at 300.
L6	CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Presnell, when you get to a
17	convenient point, we need to take a break.
L8	MR. PRESNELL: Sure. Anytime is fine.
۱9	CHAIRMAN CLARK: We'll take a 10-minute break.
20	(Brief recess.)
21	
22	CHAIRMAN CLARK: Go ahead, Mr. Presnell.
23	MR. PRESNELL: Thank you, Chairman Clark.
4	Q (By Mr. Presnell) Mr. Harper, to get back on track
5	here, as I understand, on the 18th you made afforts to sell

ALL CARREST AND ALL MARKET SEE AND ARTHUR SEE AND ALL MARKETS AND ARTHUR SEE AND ALL CONTROL OF THE ARTHUR SEE

1 power off-broker in anticipation of the minimum load problems but were not able to find any buyers? 2 3 Correct. And, of course, you don't know whether you could 5 have found buyers had you been able to lower your price? As I said earlier, when we contacted people, no one 6 7 seemed interested in buying power because they were telling us they were in the same situation we were, too much generation, 8 too little load. 9 Well, are you saying there were no buyers out there 10 at any price, or that there were no buyers interested in power 11 12 at your price? 13 A There was no buyers at our price. However, as the night progressed, in watching the broker sheets, it became 14 15 evident there was no buyers at any price. Okay. Well, I'm going to hold you to that statement 16 Q when we get the the broker part of it, but I'm not quite there 18 yet. 19 I want to try to understand how you price your energy when you're at minimum load. If I could use the chart, 20 Commissioners, I would appreciate it. 21 22 Mr. Harper, what I would like for you to do is assume for me your minimum generation is 2,200 megawatts for 23 the purose of simplicity, that's as low as you can get your --24 25 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Presnell, you should turn on

that last mike there and turn it towards you.

Q (By Mr. Presnell) If you would assume with me for a minute, Mr. Harper, that 2,200 megawatts is the generating capacity at a minimum that you have been able to bring your system down to in order to avoid the possibility of a curtailment but that your load estimate is at 2,000 megawatts, meaning that you have a 200-megawatt surplus of energy; are you with me so far?

A Yes, sir.

Now, would you agree with me, sir, that if your must run level is 2,200 megawatts and your demand is only at 2,000, that, in order to generate between 2,000 and 2,200 megawatts, your incremental cost is zero? (Pause)

A If I was actually generating at 2,200 megawatts, the fuel costs involved in generating each of those megawatts would have a value to it.

Q But in terms of incremental cost and as a matter of logic, Mr. Harper, would you not agree with with me, sir, that if you can go no lower than 2,200 megawatts on your system that the cost of going from 2,000 to 2,200 on an incremental basis is zero?

MR. TENPAS: I'm going to object, I think this is well outside the scope of his direct testimony. This is asking him to draw conclusions on how the power should appropriately be priced. Plorida Power has tendered other

witnesses on that issue. He can explain how in fact Florida

Power does it; but asking him to opine on how it should be

done is a policy issue more appropriately directed to other

Florida Power witnesses.

MR. PRESNELL: If I could respond, Chairman Clark?

This was covered at his deposition. Mr. Harper is the dispatcher responsible for making off-system sales. We're attempting to establish that they can sell their power if they can simply price it at a competitive level.

He indicated he does not have that flexibility, and I'm simply trying to inquire as to how he reaches that conclusion. As a matter of logic, it is patently wrong.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Presnell, what part of his prefiled direct testimony does this relate to?

MR. PRESNELL: It relates to his consistent statements that they aggressively attempt to market power off-broker. My position is --

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Would you show me, Mr. Presnell, if you would show me in the direct testimony and give me the page and the line, that would help me.

MR. PRESNELL: Pirst of all, beginning on Page 17, where he talks about the efforts to sell power on the 18th; and then further on Page 18, in the middle of the page, that middle paragraphs where he says, "The generation dispatcher also aggressively continued his efforts to sell energy both on

21

22

25

and off the Florida energy brokered system. And my cross examination is intended to show there was nothing aggressive about it.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Go ahead, Mr. Presnell.

MR. PRESNELL: Thank you.

Q (By Mr. Presnell) Could you answer my question with respect to the logic of whether there's any incremental costs in going from 2,000 megawatts to 2,200 if 2,200 is your minimum run condition? (Pause)

A Quite frankly, I, I agree with your statement. The cost of megawatts produced, of course, would be fuel between 2,000 and 2,200. Incrementally, I agree.

Q Okay. And yet that incremental block of power for this 200 megawatts -- which on the 19th was actually 150, but my example -- you're pricing that 200 megawatts at \$14 or \$15 a megawatt-hour, correct?

A The pricing that we put out on the messaging system was between \$14 and \$15 to see if we could get someone interested in power sale. No one came back, even though we tried to call them, too. So that was not a specific price we were trying to sell at, but rather a range.

Q And you made no effort, not having found a buyer at that price, to price this block of energy at any level between 14 and zero, did you?

A I do not have that authority to price it lower than

the incremental pricing that I have off of the price sheet. 1 2 Then your answer is no, you made no effort, correct? 0 I made effort to sell power based on the authority 3 that I have to sell. 5 Q I understand you had no authority, therefore the answer to my question is you made no effort because you had no 6 7 authority, correct? 8 I continue to say I made numerous efforts during the λ evening to sell power. Not using this scenario, necessarily, 9 10 that you're trying to subscribe to. 11 You made no effort to lower your price in order to find a buyer for your power, correct, because you felt you had 12 13 no authority to do so? 14 I have no pricing mechanism to lower. 15 So even though the incremental cost of this block of power is zero to Florida Power, you feel that you had no 16 authority to lower the price in order to make a market for 17 18 that surplus power? 19 Well, as I say again, the power generated did cost 20 Plorida Power money. Obviously, the 200 megawatts costs money. I would have to quote at the 2,200 level. 21 22 Do you price this block of energy -- that is, going from 2,000 to 2,200 -- the same way you would price this block 23 of energy as if you were going 200 megawatts above your must

25

run level? Would you arrive at the same \$14 to \$15 range

regardless of that situation?

б

A In this particular case, if I was pricing between 2,000 and 2,200, I would go to the proper block on our pricing sheet, pick up the first two blocks of energy at 100 megawatts apiece, determine that price range and that's what we would quote.

Q Would you get a different result if you were going from 2,200 and ramping up to 2,400, assuming 2,200 was your minimum generation?

A Yes, you would. It would be a small amount different, but.

- Q But very small?
- A It would be a small amount difference.
- Q In light of the fact you had no authority to quote a lower price, in light of the fact that electricity is fungible, what was aggressive about your marketing efforts in terms of off-broker sales?
  - A First of all, what does "fungible" mean?
- Q Yours is the same as FP&L's and as TECO's, that electricity is electricity.

A Our aggressive efforts to sell power that night up till the time of the curtailment were based on our attempts on the messaging system, our attempts to call people, using, within the price guidelines that we have and the power supply department had, using our price that we have.

Our prices are not necessarily the lowest within the state. Another company did sell power that night.

Q As a matter of fact, on virtually all of your curtailment episodes, other utilities were buying and selling power on the wholesale market during those periods of time,

- A Without looking at them, I couldn't comment.
- Q Well, they're all in here, and I'm sure the Commission doesn't want us to spend the day doing it. But would you not agree with me, Mr. Harper, that with respect to the exhibits contained in your testimony that in virtually every curtailment episode, every hour of every curtailment episode, there were utilities buying and selling power at wholesale on the broker?

A I would go so far as to say that -- without looking at every one of them, if I have to, I will -- that there could have been power sold, energy bought and sold, throughout the curtailment periods, depending on the megawatts we're talking about. Some hours there were no sales.

Q Did you -- did Florida Power make an effort to become more aggressive in its pricing with respect to the Carter's Dam contract?

- A To become more aggressive?
- Q Yes, sir.

weren't they?

A Throughout all of 1994, we would, on Thursdays, bid,

if they asked for one, we would bid on Carter's Dam pricing, 2 Southeastern Electric. 3 That was a weekly bid? They would send us a request on Thursdays if they 5 were going to request power, a bid. And we would bid every week. 6 7 And since that time, have they submitted that 8 request for a bid every week? 9 A Yes. 10 And at some point in time, did Florida Power decide that it needed to become more aggressive in its pricing 11 philosophy in order to try to win that bid? 12 13 A I don't know that you could say we became more aggressive in pricing. We priced our prices based on our 14 15 incremental price. 16 Well, look at Page 24 of your testimony. The first full paragraph there, the third sentence says, "The Company 17 also has made aggressive efforts to market power to third 18 parties. Two good examples are, " and then you mention the 142 19 20 megawatt sale to the SEPA's Carter pumping station; is that 21 correct? 22 A That's correct. 23 COMMISSIONER KIESLING: I'm sorry, I can't find where you are at. Could you say that page number again?

MR. PRESNELL: Page 24, the first full paragraph,

1	third sentence where it says, "The Company also has made
2	aggressive efforts
3	COMMISSIONER RIESLING: I don't have that on my
4	Page 24.
5	MR. PRESNELL: Of his prepared testimony?
6	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Yeah. That's what I'm
7	looking at. Oh, okay, Line 9. Thank you.
8	MR. PRESNELL: I'm sorry, I should have given you
9	all These bifocals, I can't get used to them.
10	COMMISSIONER KIESLING: Thank you.
11	Q (By Mr. Presnell) Now, the Carter, the SEPA Carter
12	pumping station contract, 142 megawatts would be a significant
13	contribution to your curtailment problem, would it not?
14	A Yes, it would.
15	Q So for every week you won the Carter Dam contract
16	you could, if not eliminate, substantially alleviate the
17	necessity of any curtailments during that week, correct?
18	A That would be one of the things that would mitigate
19	the problem.
20	Q All right. Now, if you did not become more
21	aggressive in your pricing, what did you do on the Carter Dam
22	contract to be aggressive other than just submit a bid?
23	A We became more aggressive overall in sales to help
24	reduce the possibilities of curtailments. We aggressively

25 called them; if they, for example, missed sending the quote to

us, we made sure we called them and sent the bid in to them.

We went out to other people, the Rocky Mountain Cooperative, numerous other people.

Each day of the week our power supply department is

Each day of the week our power supply department is contacting other companies throughout Plorida and throughout the Southeast trying to sell power. That's what I mean by we became much more aggressive over the last two years.

- Q But the only thing aggressive about your effort to obtain the Carter Dam contract was to make sure you had an opportunity to bid?
  - A And to make sure that we priced the power correctly.
  - Q Priced it correctly?

- A That we took everything into consideration. We went to a ten-day weather forecasting rather than a five-day so that we could optimize our look ahead as best we could --- bearing in mind a ten-day forecast is a guess at best in many cases. But we did all those efforts that we could do as a Company to look forward to make sure the price we quoted was the correct price.
- Q So as I understood it, you tried to jimmy the assumptions a little bit in your model to get a lower price?
  - MR. TENPAS: I object.
- A No, sir, we did not jimmy. And we do not do that at Florida Power.
  - Q Well, you used different assumptions?

1	A I think I correctly stated we looked ahead as best
2	we can to try to determine the correct price. When you are
3	looking out ten days to come up with a price, it is very
4	difficult anticipating loads and weather.
5	Q Did you come up with a new method for bidding that
6	contract?
7	A We used the same method.
8	Q You used the same method?
9	A To determine the price?
10	Q You did. Look at Tab 2. The fourth page, the front
11	of that, do you see the entry on January 5, 1995?
12	A You're in the curtailment log?
13	Q I'm on the fourth page behind yes, the
14	curtailment log, the last entry on the curtailment log.
1.5	A Is that the one that starts out 0342?
16	Q No, it's 1505. 1-5-95, see that, TLW. What does
17	that TLW stand for?
18	A Tamara Waldmann.
19	Q That's a person?
20	A She is an engineer that works in the power supply
21	department.
22	Q According to Tamara, power supply developed a new
23	method for bidding on the Carter's pumping energy. Is she
24	wrong?
25	A Her termology here ""s now methods is not now a

method for being more competitive or pricing as one could take from reading here. Her methodology is we became more competitive in how we went after the sale.

Q Well --A As I just described.

Q Is it fair to say that power supply was trying to come up with a new method for bidding the Carter's Dam energy by making your price more competitive or lower?

A The price would become more competitive if we made sure based on a ten-day forecast that we were doing everything right. Her new method that she came up with was a spreadsheet that laid out loads and the heat rate curves and that and developed a price from that. It was not a change in pricing, pricing methodology.

Q Well, as a result of this new method were you able to bid the Carter Dam contract on a lower or more competitive basis than you had in the past?

A Because of the refinements that we came up with in staying with the previous criteria that I mentioned, we had been a tad bit more successful. I think so far in '95, I believe we've won the bid four or five times.

Q And you would concede that you may have won it more times if you had just been a little bit more price competitive than this new method produced, correct?

A We try to be as competitive as we can be within the

1 prices that we are allowed to offer. 2 Is it conceivable, Mr. Harper, that you could win the Carter's Dam contract every week if you would price your 3 energy lower than you have? 5 Is it conceivable? 6 Q Yes, sir. 7 I imagine if we were willing to give our power away they would give us that sale every week. 8 9 Q Let's don't be that extreme. You have been winning 10 that contracts at around 14? 11 Somewhere between 12.50 and 14. 12 Q So you would agree if you would price at 10 you 13 would probably get it every week? 14 I have seen the bid given to MEAG at lower than 10. 15 All right. But at some price between zero and 15 you could probably win the bid virtually --17 If our price was low enough, we could probably win A Of course, that's not necessary to say that they 18 the bid. continue that during the week. Many times when we have won 19 that bid we'll go two or three days into selling that power 20 and they'll send it back to us and then don't take it any more for the rest of the week.

Q Flip on through, we're here dealing with the episode on the Tab 2, which is the January 1 episode. I just want to make sure I understand some of these supporting exhibits and

23

the Commission follows along with us.

Do you see the handwritten sheet where it apparently lists some efforts to sell power to other utilities?

- A Where are we at, please?
- Q If you go from where we were, the end of the curtailment log, if you go another three pages, there's some handwritten notes on Florida Power letterhead. Do you see that?
  - A Okay.

- Q And down at the bottom it says, "Power supply tried prearranged sales on 12-30." Are you with me?
  - A Right.
- Q Are these the notes of one of the dispatchers that was calling trying to make sales?
- A This handwriting appears to be and I believe it to be the top portion was once again -- excuse me, the top portion was by Sanford Buckles, I believe. He's an engineering assistant in the power supply department. And I believe that written note is from Tamara Waldmann.
  - Q They're both in the power supply side?
  - A Both in power supply, right.
- Q Okay. Now, if we turn the page, there's a series of what looks like computer messages that relate to Schedule X bulletin board sale. Do you see that?
  - A Yes.

ŧ	
1	Q If you go to the page on the right hand where at the
2	top it says #12-30-94, 14:41. * Do you see that?
3	λ Yes.
4	Q Does that indicate that at 2:41 p.m. on the 30th of
5	December you sent out a message on the bulletin board that
6	Florida Power was seeking to sell 100 megawatts of power
7	between the hours of 1:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m. on January 1?
8	A Yes, it does.
9	Q That is because that afternoon you identified the
10	potential for a low load situation that night, correct?
11	A This was on the 30th, the day before that, for a bid
12	on the 1st, yeah.
13	Q That's right, it's 2:30 in the afternoon of the
14	day
15	A The 31st came next, then the 1st.
16	Q Okay, you're correct. This one you're anticipating
17	two days in advance?
18	A Right.
19	Q And what amount of curtailment were you looking at
20	at that time in terms of what your needs would be?
21	A I was on vacation at that time. I got called in to
22	work from vacation for the curtailment of the late night of
23	the 31st and the morning of the 1st. But when this particular
24	quote was put out, I don't know what we were looking at unless
25	I just look back at the summary, as we all can. I'm not sure

1	where they were at on this particular date.
2	Q Do you have documents that can tell you?
3	A Yeah. Like I said, I could look back and see, I
4	don't know first-hand.
5	Q If you could, I'm just trying to establish a
6	baseline there. (Pause)
7	A It appeared at that time that we were looking at
8	generation in excess of 200, between 200 and 300 megawatts
9	during the night, early morning hours of the 1st.
10	Q If you are looking for 200 to 300 megawatts of
11	curtailment, why are you putting on the broker and offered to
12	sell only 100?
13	MR. TENPAS: Object, I don't think it's been
14	established that there was only an offer to sell 100.
15	MR. PRESNELL: Well, maybe I'm reading it wrong.
16	Q (By Mr. Presnell) Are those three separate offers
17	of 100 for a total of 300? Is that the way you read it?
18	A Those are three separate offers of 100 megawatts
19	each.
20	Q Each one carries a different price?
21	A Yes.
22	Q Why would you calculate the price differently for
23	that block of power?
24	A For each block of power that you sell, your price

25 goes up. This is looking forward now two days out and --

1	Q Even when you are at a minimum load condition and
2	you're talking about curtailing QFs, the price of each block
3	goes up?
4	A Incrementally, each block of power would go up on a
5	price scale, yes, sir.
6	Q Okay. Now these are not brokered quotes, right,
7.	these are what are called the Schedule X bulletin board?
8	A Right, they go out on a messaging system.
9	Q Were you successful on the 30th on selling any power
10	off-broker?
11	A No, we were not.
12	Q And did you make any effort to lower your price
13	during that 48-hour period in order to make a market for the
14	excess?
15	A Like I say, I was not there. I don't believe they
16	did but I'm not sure. They would have sold they would have
17	quoted a price incrementally from a price sheet.
18	Once again, we can't just come up with prices.
19	Q Okay. I want to find an example here of brokered
20	quotes. And maybe the best thing is to go back to Tab 1 on
21	the October 19th. And if you go nine pages in on that,
22	there's some computer information with a C-2 handwritten in
23	the top right-hand corner. Do you see that?
24	A Left-hand page?
25	A You at-

1	
1	A It's 0100. 01.
2	Q This is one for ten-19-94 at 12:44 a.m., on the top,
3	for the schedule hour ending 0200, ten-19-94?
4	A Okay, that's 0200, okay.
5	Q Does that mean that you put out on the broker an
6	offer to sell for the hour ending at 2:00 a.m. on the 19th,
7	and you were offering to sell 5 megawatts?
8	A No, sir. On the previous page you'll see a quote
9	midway through the page that says S1, 100/14.77.
10	Q Yes, sir.
11	A That was our quote for that hour. That means sell
12	one 100 megawatts, 14.77. The next page, where it says 02, is
13	the broker printout sheet this is on the FCG brokering
14	system. It says FPL purchased 5 megawatts, their price was
15	17.28, our price was 14.77, we split it, \$16.03.
16	Q So you would agree with me you're in a curtailment
17	episode at 2:00 a.m. on the 19th, right? You're curtailing
18	the QFs?
19	A We started at 2:00 a.m., right.
20	Q During that hour you sold power to FPL at a profit,
21	right?
22	A 5 megawatts, yes.
23	Q 5 megawatts, but you sold it at a profit, \$16 over
24	your 14.77 sell put?
:5	A That's correct.

1	Q You would agree with me that during the same hour
2	TECO was also selling power?
3	A That's correct.
4	Q As a matter of fact, TECO sold 200 megawatts of
5	power, correct?
6	λ Correct.
7	Q And their sell price was 13.82?
8	A That's right.
9	Q So you would agree with me that if you had dropped
10	your price to 13.50 you could have sold 200 megawatts and
11	avoided a curtailment on that date, right?
12	A Based on these price, if our price had been 13.50,
13	we would have sold the 200.
14	Q TECO and Florida Power and Light, they are able to
15	produce electricity at a lower cost than Florida Power? Is
16	that why you are not making these sales on the broker when
17	these other utilities are?
18	A Obviously, Plorida Power and Light is not producing
19	power at the same price as TECO, since they are the ones that
20	bought it at a much higher price. But I cannot speak to what
21	their prices are, nor how they develop their prices.
22	Q Mr. Harper, during these various curtailment
23	episodes, has Orlando CoGen always complied with Plorida
24	Power's requests?

Yes, they have.

MR. PRESNELL: I think that's all I have, Chairman 1 Clark; I was checking my notes since we have eliminated an 2 3 issue here to make sure. I think that will do it. Thank you very much, Mr. Harper, for your patience 4 5 with me. 6 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Watson? 7 MR. WATSON: No questions. 8 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Ms. Rule? 9 MS. RULE: No questions. 10 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Zambo? 11 MR. ZAMBO: No questions. 12 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Wright? 13 MR. WRIGHT: Yes, ma'am, thank you. 14 CROSS EXAMINATION 15 BY MR. WRIGHT: 16 Good afternoon, Mr. Harper. 17 Before I get into my prepared cross, I wanted to try to clarify part of the discussion you had with Mr. Presnell 18 regarding Lake Cogen's, my client's, actions during the 19 October 19th curtailment event. 20 21 In questioning, I think that you agreed with Mr. Presnell's characterization that Lake refused to reduce its load below a certain level. Do you recall saying that? 24 I believe it was Lake that would not come below the

25

95.

Q Do you have any basis to know whether Lake willfully refused to come below the 95 magawatts?

A Yes, I do. As a matter of fact, and I didn't follow through on that entire questioning. Lake, along with numerous other QFs that night — that was the night of the first curtailment — several of the QFs had not even been notified by their management of the situation, even though we had held a discussion on it in St. Petersburg and had invited numerous of all the companies, the QFs.

There was a lot of confusion. When we called the different operators on duty that night at the power plants, some of them had no idea what we were talking about. We had to identify who we were, what we were trying to accomplish.

Some of them said their management had given them no authority to proceed under conditions like that. So there was just in general a lot of confusion that night and this very well may have been one of them. All that confusion has since gone away.

- Q And again, would you believe that part of that confusion, if not a whole lot of it, was attributable to the fact that it was the first event?
  - A Yes, I do. I attribute most of it to that.
- Q On that occasion, did Lake Cogen go to its committed, its preagreed, committed curtailment level by which it became a Group A NUG?

1	A It went down from I believe 105 or 103 down to 95,
2	something like that. Yes, it did.
3	Q So it did comply with its
4	λ Right.
5	Q first cut agreement?
6	A Yes. It did not comply with the second, with the
7	actual curtailment.
8	Q Did you personally talk to anybody at Lake?
9	A I don't believe I did. I believe Tamara Waldmann
10	did.
11	Q I looked in the curtailment log for that event and I
12	could not find any reference to any such communication. Could
13	Aoris
14	A There may be a sheet in here that shows who talked
15	to who. I know they were in some of the later curtailments.
16	Once again, on this first curtailment, we were experiencing a
17	new phenomenon ourselves.
18	No, it is not in this one, so I'm not sure who
19	talked to them. But each company was called, each QF.
20	Q I would like to ask you, if you would, to turn to
21	Tab 2 in your exhibit and turn to the back of the second
22	sheet. It is a curtailment log.
23	I would like to ask you to look at the entry for
24	hour 0018, January 1, 1995. My reading of that is that Lake
25	cogen did not receive a Level 3 fax order and apparently

because the fax sending list that Florida Power was using at 2 least at that time had an incorrect area code. Is that an accurate interpretation of what that 3 savs? 5 Yes, it is. And that's why, because of our experience during the first one, that's why we continued right б 7 on down through the very last curtailment to call everyone for each of the levels. In this case, it was Linda Brousseau who R 9 called. 10 Right. In fact, Lake Cogen called them, did they 0 11 not? Yeah, Lake called, yeah, and talked to her. 12 A 13 I want to continue and follow along a couple of 0 questions that Mr. Presnell posed to you. 15 I was struck by your response that even at minimum load conditions your incremental energy costs are positive for 16 17 each block. 18 MR. WRIGHT: Could I use the flip chart for a minute, Madam Chairman? 19 20 (By Mr. Wright) This will be brief, I'm sure you Q will be able to straighten me right out. If let's say this is the cost to generate in dollars per megawatt-hour and this is 22 23 load on the horizontal axis in megawatts? 24 A Okay. 25 I had been given to understand that there's some Q

level somewhere along this horizontal axis that would be the minimum operating level. And that the heat rate curve, which should translate into a cost curve, has at least some kind of little U shape at the beginning of that level something like that. Is that not right?

A I'm not familiar with that at all, how we develop it.

## Q Okay.

б

with respect to the projections for January 1 and your attempts to sell power off-system, given that you are looking at a minimum load condition with all four -- I'm sorry -- three out of your four coal units at or slightly below their normal minimum operating levels, why were you only offering to sell 300 megawatts of power during that projected 0100 to 0600 hours period?

A That's what they attempted to sell off-broker based upon a load forecast done two days earlier. They also tried to sell on-broker during the curtailments and just prior to the curtailments.

Q If I recall the sheet we were looking at, those quotes were for 100 megawatts also; is that correct?

A Typically, up to the the time of curtailment. Once you go into a curtailment period, you certainly would want to lessen your broker sales so you don't get a yo-yo effect on our units or the cogens.

Right. So my question is why were you only offering Q to sell 300 megawatts off-broker in advance to the anticipated event? I mean it just looks to me like you have a whole lot more, like 1,000 megawatts, counting the excess output available from Crystal River 1, 4 and 5 for that period. λ 300 megawatts was more than a sufficient amount to offer to sell, we didn't sell any of it. Seldom, seldom in my experience during the middle of the night do you see companies buying more than 300 megawatts. It happens on occasion, but not often. discussed briefly regarding your attempts to arrange

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On the handwritten sheet that you and Mr. Presnell prearranged sales December 30, there's a phrase at the top I want to ask about. It says, "Quoted incr with no adders." I assume that means quoted incremental energy costs with no adders?

- That's exactly what that means.
- What would that be? What does that incremental energy cost with no adders mean?
- As I understand it, in the power supply when they quote prices using different schedules, certain schedules call for an adder to be based on to the incremental price. case there was just no adder added on to it. I'm not sure why.
  - In response to some questions by Mr. Presnell, you Q

indicated that I believe Ms. Waldmann had developed an advance spreadsheet scheduling analysis method for attempting to identify lower sale prices for bidding the Carter's Dam pumping power sale. Is that pretty accurate?

R

A She developed a new spreadsheet, not necessarily with the intention of developing lower prices but to make sure that we, I guess you could say, crossed all our T's and dotted our I's and made sure everything was in the right place. That in turn had the potential for making sure we optimized sales.

Q I thought I understood your earlier answer to indicate that the spreadsheet identified a lot of variables over a ten-day forward horizon that enabled the Company to identify its incremental costs at which it could sell to SEPA.

A That's part of what the spreadsheet did, it took into -- like I say, we developed a ten-day weather forecast type thing. That was one of them.

Q My question is: Couldn't you adapt that same spreadsheet method to pricing for other off-broker, off-system sales to Florida utilities?

A As it turns out, our unit commit hourly pricing the dispatchers used for hourly brings us to our minimum pricing category at all times. Beyond that, as I say, they have other, they have other methods but it is all based on unit loading. We can in our pricing go below what the unit commit says, but it is based upon where the units are loaded.

1	Q Well, just to recap, you developed a system that
2	enables you to make better, more competitive, to use
3	Mr. Weldon's phrasing, bids to sell power to the Southeastern
4	Power Administration for Carter's Dam pumping. You have done
5	that by refining your projections of incremental costs over a
6	ten-day planning horizon? Is that about right?
7	A That's looking ahead. That's not (simultaneous

A That's looking ahead. That's not -- (simultaneous conversation) -- I mean versus looking ahead versus hourly or semihourly quoting? By the time we get to the hourly quoting we're right on top of the situation.

Q Of course. And you have to do that for the Carter's

Dam potential sale because you have to bid that on Thursday

for the following whatever it is, the weekend or the next week

or whatever?

A Right.

11.

Q Right? Okay. My question is, couldn't you adapt that ten-day forward-looking pricing method to use in aggressively marketing power off-broker, not hourly but off-broker to other Florida utilities within the same kind of time limit?

- A We do use that method.
- Q Thank you.

Now, if I looked through your extensive exhibits --for example, like the one that you and Mr. Presnell were
discussing about the day-and-a-half-ahead effort to sell 300

-

megawatts in the early morning of January 1, 1995 -- are you telling me that at least after January 5, 1995, that method should be reflected in these prices?

A I think you had better repeat the question. I misunderstood something there.

Q I apologize, it was a long question.

You discussed with Mr. Presnell a Schedule X bulletin board sell of 300 megawatts at three different prices during the 0100 to 0600 period on January 1, 1995. Those prices were quoted about right at a day and a half ahead of the period in which the power was offered for sale.

I read the log as indicating that the pricing method for the Carter's Dam sale was developed on or about January 5, at least that's the day it shows up in the log as having been done.

My question is: If we would look at comparable information to the part of your exhibit that we have been discussing here, would those prices reflect the pricing method that you now use for the Carter's Dam sale and, as you just told me, that you use for pricing other off-broker sales to Florida utilities?

A Since that method wasn't developed until the 5th,
I'm not sure whether these prices that were used on the 30th
would have come up with the same results or not.

Q Well, how about after the 5th?

1	A I don't know whether they would have come up with
2	these prices or not, without running them.
3	Q That's all right. I didn't mean to inquire as to
4	the specific prices, I meant to inquire as to whether the
5	prices reflected in the comparable report for something after
6	the 5th would have been developed using the same
7	forward-looking method and spreadsheet program?
8	A Yes, they would. And once again, not saying what
9	the prices would be.
LΟ	Q Fair enough.
Lı	Could you show us an example, say maybe in Tab
L2	No. 4, 5 or 6 of your exhibit, where that was done?
L3	A Where we used forward-looking pricing?
L4	Q Yes, sir. I just mentioned those as examples,
L5	because those are, as I understand it, respectively the
16	exhibit packages for the January 7, January 8 and January 14
L7	curtailment events.
18	A I'm not sure if there's anything in here like that
9	handwritten page.
20	Q I really wasn't talking about the handwritten page,
21	I was trying to talk about the example of the Schedule X
22	bulletin board sale.
23	A It appears that there's no.
24	If you can find one before me, I'll explain it to
ں ہے ا	

1	Q Okay. (Pause)
2	MR. TENPAS: Sheff?
3	MR. WRIGHT: Yes, sir.
4	MR. TENPAS: If you don't mind, I can offer a
5	suggestion and you can look at it and tell you if that's one.
6	Is that okay with you?
7	MR. WRIGHT: Do you want to come down and show it to
8	him?
9	MR. TENPAS: Yeah, or I can read you the page.
10	MR. WRIGHT: Sure, that's fine, either way.
11	MR. TENPAS: If you are at Tab 6, look at the page
12	at the bottom that's ML24547. You can ask him perhaps if that
13	was one. It's the page that immediately this is about the
14	fourth page in immediately following the big projection sheet.
15	MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Tenpas. That does
16	appear to be an example of that.
17	Q (By Mr. Wright) Is it?
18	A That's an example, yes.
19	Q If I understand this correctly, the bid at the top
20	of that page was offered on January 13 at about 3:00 p.m. for
21	sale on January 14 from 1:00 to 7:00 a.m.; is that accurate?
22	A That's correct.
23	Q And the same thing would be true for the second
24	quote there, and the third one?
25	A Right.

1	Q Would these sheets represent a complete set of that
2	particular type of sales that you attempted to make with
3	respect to this curtailment event?
4	A I don't know how you would term the word "complete"
5	but this was our attempt at off-system sales. There could
6	have been others, but this was the bulletin board attempt.
7	Q When you bid the Carter's Dam sale on Thursday, when
8	is it projected that that sale will begin?
9	A Typically, it starts at hour ending 0100 Sunday
10	morning or Monday morning, the following Sunday or Monday
11	morning and runs for five or six days.
12	Q I missed something. Does it run for five or six
13	days?
14	A It runs typically for five or six days.
15	Q Thank you.
16	A However, on numerous occasions after two or three
17	days they have cancelled the sale.
18	Q Yes, sir, I did understand that from your previous
19	answer.
20	In response to a question by Mr. Presnell, you made:
21	reference to being bound in the prices at which you can sell
22	power by the strict limitations of incremental cost pricing.
23	Do you recall that response?
24	A Yes.
25	O My question for you is: No your incremental costs

reflect any cost savings that Plorida Power may realize if it 1 2 can make a sale? 3 Do our sale -- do our quotes reflect savings? Yes, that is my question. 5 I don't believe so, but I'm not certain. You'd have 6 to ask probably Mr. Southwick that question. 7 Q I shall. 8 In your opinion -- and I'm going to ask you to assume that there are no regulatory impediments to do so -would you agree that it would be prudent for your incremental cost price quotes to reflect such savings if they were 11 12 available? 13 A I don't think I know enough about that subject to have an opinion on that. 15 Okay. Before I go on, do you have a copy of the curtailment summary sheet for the January 30th curtailment event? In your exhibit, I was able to find the work sheet for 17 January 30th, but not a copy of the summary; and I did notice that there was one of each included in your exhibits of every other one.

A I don't. There's probably one in the building. If not -- we do have one?

21

22

23

24

25

MR. TENPAS: Commissioner Clark, it apparently was inadvertently omitted. We have a copy of it here and can make that available.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Do you need that now, Mr. Wright? 1 Can you make it available later and we can go on? 2 3 MR. WRIGHT: Sure. CHAIRMAN CLARK: Do you need it for your question? 5 MR. WRIGHT: I will need it for my questioning before I'm done. 6 7 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Why don't you go ahead, and why 8 don't you get some copies made? 9 MR. TENPAS: Thank you. 10 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. 11 Q (By Mr. Wright) Mr. Harper, I just want to make sure I understand what your exhibits are to make sure we're 12 communicating as well as we can in our questioning. 13 14 You had included a lot of informative documents. 15 The two types that I will probably focus on the most are the minimum load emergency curtailment summary and then the minimum load emergency curtailment work sheet. 18 Do I understand correctly that the work sheet is a preevent work sheet that's designed to help the Company 19 develop a strategy for meeting a low load condition? 21 A That's correct. It's used during the daytime, typically developed mid-morning and used throughout the day. 23 And the curtailment summary, is it true that the curtailment summary is an after-the-fact report of what

actually happened during the curtailment?

25

•
A That's correct.
Q Is it true that Florida Power has routinely cycled
its coal units down to their minimum or approximately their
minimum normal operating levels before and during every
curtailment event?
A Yes, that's true.
Q And is it also true that Florida Power has routinely
cycled its coal units down to near minimum operating levels of
other occasions when it has had relatively low loads, say in
the order of 2,200 to 2,500 megawatts?
A Numerous other occasions.
Q If you know, has Florida Power incurred additional
maintenance costs on those units by doing so?
MR. TENPAS: Objection. I think it's outside the
scope of his direct testimony.
CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Wright? (Pause)
MR. WRIGHT: Madam Chairman, I don't know if I can
find a specific reference to this in his testimony or not. It
is a pretty simple question. He's the chief dispatcher on the
Company's system; if he knows the answer, I think he should be
allowed to answer. It's certainly within your discretion to
permit the inquiry.

Do you know the answer?

24 questions.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Wright, please go on with your

1 WITNESS HARPER: I don't know the technical answer. 2 I have heard some -- I have heard comments that there has been additional costs but I couldn't tell you what or how much. 3 That would be way out of my realm. 5 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Madam Chairman. 6 (By Mr. Wright) Mr. Harper, I understand that Q 7 Plorida Power Corporation has modified its agreement with the 8 Southern Company relative to its unit power sales or purchases from the Southern Company to help mitigate the need to curtail 9 10 QP purchases. Is that accurate? 11 That's correct. 12 Do you know approximately when that arrangement was finalized between Plorida Power and Southern Company or 13 Companies? 14 15 The exact date, no, but it was toward the very end of February of this year. 17 Do you know what effect that arrangement has had 18 between then and now in limiting the number of curtailment 19 events that might otherwise have occurred? 20 One time it definitely avoided a curtailment. A second time -- one time it definitely avoided the curtailment. 21 22 The second time it would not have -- it just we didn't have curtailment.

On Page 27 of your testimony, you make the statement that, "Florida Power prefers to phase out individual telephone

23

24

25

calls because it requires a substantial time commitment." Is that part of you all's plan or is that just something that found its way into your testimony?

A Our plan was to phase out the phone calls and to turn the actual curtailment procedures over to the dispatchers rather than having any one of the numerous supervisors down there during the curtailment periods.

However, since the end of January, we have not had another curtailment. I would imagine that if we were to have the next one, several of us would be down there again and we would continue calling.

The curtailments have not happened that often. It happened six times in January, we have not had one since. So I would think that we would be back there and call again -- at least if they became more active we would phase out of it, but I don't see that happening. I don't see more curtailments happening any time soon.

- Q Okay. Are you asking the Commission to approve a plan whereby you would stop making the phone calls?
  - A Making phone calls is not part of the plan.
  - Q Well, I'll proceed.

Mr. Presnell asked you a question about the Company's capability of reducing and then increasing the output of Crystal River Unit No. 3 to help mitigate curtailments. Do you recall him asking you that question?

1 λ Yes. 2 My notes indicate that your answer was that it is a 3 policy decision of Florida Power Corporation to run Crystal River 3 at its full load. Do you recall making that answer? 5 λ Right. 6 Do you recall that you and I discussed the same 7 issue at your deposition on March 8, I think -- March 9? В I don't recall it. 9 Q Okay. My question to you was, "Can a unit be 10 operated at anything other than full output? For example, could it be -- could its output level be reduced by 200 or 300 11 12 megawatts at a reasonable ramp rate for a reasonable period of

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

be."

time, say 8, 12, 16 or 24 hours, and then brought back up?" Your answer was, "Within the guidelines of the NRC, whatever regulations they have to control the unit's output levels, as far as just the output of the unit, yes, it could

Is that still your answer?

That's correct, based on could the unit -- can the unit move? It can do that. It's a policy decision of Florida Power's upper senior management that Florida Power's nuclear unit will maintain its maximum output level at all times.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Wright, how much more do you have?

> MR. WRIGHT: It's difficult for me to say, Madam

Chairman. Somewhere between ten and 30 minutes. 2 CHAIRMAN CLARK: We'll take a break now for ten 3 minutes. 4 (Brief recess.) 5 6 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Harper? 7 WITNESS HARPER: Right here. I was trying to sneak 8 out. (Laughter) 9 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Go ahead, Mr. Wright. 10 (By Mr. Wright) Mr. Harper, typically as you get toward the end of a curtailment event, I have noticed that 11 several times the Company has been able to make an off-system 12 13 sale in the last hour or two of curtailment events. How far 14 in advance do you know when such sales are going to be made? 15 Are the sales you're talking about on the broker? I can't tell from your exhibits, they may or may not 16 17 be. 18 Typically, those are on-broker sales. As the load 19 starts to come up in the morning, the dispatchers have a very difficult task in front of them. The curtailments that take 20 21 place late Saturday night or early Sunday morning are extremely difficult. We have ended most of the curtailments 22 23 maybe at 6:00, maybe 7:00, one of them. The loads on Sunday morning typically don't start to climb until around 8:00. You

get some variation of loads from 6:00 and then 7:00, but not a

25

whole lot on Sunday mornings, typically, unless there's a cold front coming through.

What the dispatchers will try to do is sell power in anticipation of snother company keeping their units down and allowing one of our control units to pick up load a little bit. So that, for example, if the ourtailment ends at 6100, we not only are ending the ourtailment and a lot of excess power coming back on our system but we also have units, those that Mr. Dolan mentioned, Mulberry and maybe Orange Co, coming on line at 6100. So we have a tremendous influx of power on our system at 6100 in the morning, or at 7100.

So what the dispatchers have tried to do is sell power, once again using correct pricing, and hoping that another company out there is going to keep its units down and buy economical power --- which will allow our coal units to rise. And then as the power comes back in, the coal units will back back down on control.

- Q If I could ask you to look at the curtailment summary for January 8? It's the back of the third sheet into Tab No. 5.
  - A The third sheet?
  - Q Yeah, the third sheet, the back of the page.
  - A Okay.

7

3

Ħ

Õ

7

0

10

12

13

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

Q Is that kind of what happened there? I notice that beginning an hour ending 0300, you were able to make between

52 and 66 megawatts of sales each hour.

A I probably have the broker sheets in here, I can tell you in just a moment.

Q Okay.

A We put on at hour ending 0300, it appears, it is very difficult to read. Let me find something here. (Pause)

Excuse me just a moment while I try to read the pages that I have in the book here. (Pause)

It appears one hour we sold 20 megawatts to

Tallahassee. Tallahassee is a company that will typically
leave their units down in the morning and then buy economical
power. And I believe another morning I saw in here we sold to
Kissimmee. They do the same thing. Those are two of the
smaller companies.

Q I'm also noticing with respect to that particular event that after 0200 Crystal River 1 and 2 were both operating right at their normal minimum operating levels and Crystal River 4 and 5 were both operating at least a moderate amount above their normal minimums, 710 megawatts combined in hour ending 0300, and 732 in hour ending 0400, and 822 combined in hour ending 0500.

Is that an accurate interpretation of your exhibit?

A Yes. And I can explain that. On January 8 -- okay,
yeah. Late in the evening on January 8, a cold front
proceeded through. Our original load predictions on Friday

afternoon -- this was a Sunday -- on Friday afternoon called for southwest winds in our area, service area. When, in fact, late Saturday afternoon the weather service sent through a message to us that said the cold front was coming further south than we thought, winds shift from the southwest to the northwest.

13.

Of course, any of us living in Florida knows what that means. Even though the temperatures don't drop necessarily, the loads certainly increase with northwest winds 10 to 20.

Later on in the day, as a result of that, our units were having to respond to load picking up. We went to 4,000 or 4,500 load that day. 4,400 that morning and then 4,500 that afternoon on the 8th. So it was a case of the loads were low going into curtailment on the 8th, the cold front came through and started shifting, and our loads -- our units starting picking up and we came out of the curtailment.

Q My question is, why didn't you terminate the curtailment event earlier than you did, given that your big coal units were operating above their normal operating minimum by more than the amount of curtailment that you had requested?

A The first thing you have to understand is that as an operator on duty during the middle of the night you are now seeing the load fluctuate tremendously from what you had anticipated. The next thing you have to understand, and I'm

speaking as an operator now, is the load going to continue to do that? Is it a fluctuation? Is the load going to turn around? What's happening out there?

б

The load picking up at 3:00 or 4:00 in the morning on a morning that was not supposed to be a cold morning is certainly an abnormality and the dispatchers typically don't see that type of thing.

Once you commit those big units to moving, it's just not a matter of, like I always say, you don't dispatch the system from a spreadsheet, one hour they're here, one hour they're there, it takes a long time to move those large units around, CR-4 and 5.

Were. Hour 400. For example, CR, we talk about the minimum loads on CR-4 and 5 being at 300 megawatts; it was not until hour 5 that both of them had gotten to 400 megawatts. To reduce those back down to 300 at 5:00 in the morning and then to curtailment when you have an hour to go would be a very difficult situation. And then with the dispatcher uncertainty of possibly having to go back and curtail again if the load stops.

I believe that are curtailment ended at -- let me

look back real quick. Curtailment must have ended right at

5:00. So the dispatchers were doing the very best they could,

based upon this load picking up. So at 5:00 they ended the

curtailment.

The units, as I mentioned earlier, now they are both up to 400 megawatts, they're on control, you have about 100 megawatts of control level there. You can bring the curtailment amount back into the system when you have 100 megawatts each on CR-4 and 5 to maneuver the system around.

Q I thought I understood the Company's plan in other documents as reflecting that both units were on control at 300 megawatts with 150 megawatt cushion per unit for automatic carrier control. Did I miss something?

CR-5 has to be at 300 megawatts at all times when CR-3 is on line for security reasons to back up fire and voltage control in the system. That's not mentioned in the curtailment plan; this came about in mid February due to some system studies that we have had done. Since that time, the study of our system you will note the CR-4 has been down in the 150 range numerous times where we have kept CR-5 up to 300 to 350. With a minimum level of 300, that would be its rock bottom on CR-5 on control. To have a control range, you'd have to pick the unit up to, let's say, 350 to have some downward movement on control for AGC.

Q I would like to ask you to look at Page 2 of 6 of the daily plant and interchange report for Sunday, January 8.

It's that much further back in your exhibits, almost to the Tab 6.

λ Okay.

Q I'm looking at the Crystal River site subset there. And it says, "For Unit 4 load control testing 150 megawatts minimum available if needed provided CR-5 is 300 megawatts." CR-5 is at 300 megawatts at one hour, then 298. Why didn't you take CR-4 to 150 or even to 200 that night to mitigate curtailment?

A As I said earlier, we were experiencing a load pickup. Dispatchers were not sure why the load was picking up at that hour of the monring and where it was going to. It would have been very imprudent on the dispatcher's part to end the curtailment with the possibility of having to go back and curtail again.

Q Well, why, if the daily plant and interchange report indicated it was available to go to 150, didn't your work sheet in advance have it going to 150? I didn't notice anything special about the event, like a severe weather emergency that existed in another event, that warranted keeping it at 300.

A When this sheet was published on Friday afternoon, we didn't know that that weather front was coming through early Sunday morning.

Q How far in advance can Florida Power predict low load events?

A That is a very, very hard question. I can look out

right now and tell you that there will be certain days in January of next year when we will have low loads. We get to the point -- we've had seven curtailments. We could probably speak and I can safely say in the range of 50 upwards since the beginning of this year where we have had low loads. And numerous times there has not even been a Level 1 notice sent out. Other times, there's been a Level 1 notice sent out and we've not had to curtail at all.

Florida Power has certainly taken the lead in reducing the load levels of our units to absolute minimum levels.

Q I really tried to ask you a fairly specific question.

Using your ten-day weather forecast and your ten-day production costing forecast, how far in advance can you predict low load events that will result in Level 1, 2, 3 and 4 events under the plan?

A I have to go through this scenario to get to that answer.

Q Okay.

A In lowering our own units, so many times we've gotten to 10 or 15 megawatts out of 2,000 or 2,200 that meant the difference between curtailment or not. It's very difficult to know a curtailment period before you're right on top of it. Some nights it's pretty evident. You know, in

those nights you saw we curtailed 250 megawatts, I think on two different occasions in that range, those we could predict two or three days ahead of time that they were coming and there was pretty good assurance of it. But so many of the other nights where there haven't been curtailments or where there's only like 50 megawatts curtailments on one night, those are very difficult to predict.

Q Mr. Harper, I'm going to hand out two documents I'm going to ask be marked as identification for exhibits. One is an interrogatory response that you prepared the answer to; the other is two of the late-filed exhibits to Mr. Southwick's deposition. They are initialed CKH, which I believe to be your initials, that's why I'm going to ask you to authenticate them. Okay?

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Wright, FPC's Answer to
Interrogatory 12 will be Exhibit 4 and the Deposition Exhibit
will be Exhibit 5.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

(Exhibit Nos. 4 and 5 marked for identification.)

- Q (By Mr. Wright) Mr. Harper, while I have been handing these out, have you had the chance to look at these documents and confirm that they are what I said they are?
  - A Tell me again what you said they are?
- Q What has now been marked for identification as Exhibit No. 4 is Florida Power Corporation's Response to

1	Interrogatory No. 12 propounded by Orlando CoGen Limited? I
2	believe you sponsored that response?
3	A I did so many of them; if my initials are on there,
4	I probably did this one, too.
5	Q Do you recognize this?
6	A I remember requesting this data to be this was a
7	printout of loads for the year 1994.
8	Q I'm sorry, Mr. Harper
9	A I'm sorry, you want No. 4?
10	Q I'm sorry, I think I am confusing about which
11	document is which.
12	A Okay, got you.
13	Q Do you recognize that interrogatory response,
14	Mr. Harper?
15	A You say I did this one?
16	Q Yes, sir.
17	A Where does it say that?
18	Q Well, apparently it says it on the document that I
19	do not have with me, but I believe there was an affidavit
20	attached to the back of it and I apparently inadvertently did
21	not copy it. Maybe your counsel has a copy of the response
22	and can confirm that my recollection is correct.
23	MR. TENPAS: Chairman Clark, we are endeavoring to
24	locate the full answer right now.
25	CHAIRMAN CLARK: Mr. Wright, do you have some

questions on these?

12i

MR. WRIGHT: I do have questions on them, yes, ma'am. Well, on the Exhibit No. 4, I do. I may have a couple on Exhibit No. 5.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: They're looking for it. Go ahead and answer it, if you can.

Q (By Mr. Wright) Do you recall answering the interrogatory, Mr. Harper?

A I don't recall answering it. But like I say, I answered so many of them.

Q Why don't we just pass on that until we have a chance to confirm whether you are in fact the respondent.

Before you move to that, I will ask you one more question about the work sheets and the summaries. I noted that on a couple occasions, perhaps more, Florida Power, from observing the summaries, that Florida Power has gotten more curtailment than it indicated that it needed or than the summary indicates was needed for a given event. Do you recall that happening?

For example, on the January 7, 1995, curtailment, the strategy on the curtailment summary indicates that you needed QFs to reduce to 427 and they actually reduced to between 322 and 368 during the duration of the curtailment event.

A I believe our maximum curtailment that we have asked

for is around 280.

б

B

Q I'm sorry, I was referring to the generation levels to which the QFs as a group reduced procuring the curtailment event when I was reciting those numbers.

- A Give me a specific example.
- Q Sure. Well, if you look at whatever is easiest for you to get to. If you can look at the curtailment summary for January 2, 1995?
  - A Okay.

Q When I said "needed," I was trying to follow the nomenclature on the report there on your table. If you look at the curtailment summary, it says, in the first, second column of the data block, it says, "Request for 0100, 200 megawatts." Down at the bottom there it says, "Needed 496." I interpreted that to mean you needed the QFs to get down to 496.

Is that accurate? And in reading over the hour -the questions for 0230, it indicated you needed the QFs to get
to 439 megawatts.

My observation is that in fact the QFs got well under that, they got to 417 for hour 0300 and then to between 315 and 330 for the remaining hours. So they were approximately, actually, 100 to 130, maybe 125 magawatts below where you needed them to be for the duration of that event.

Is that an accurate interpretation of that table?

A Sure. Let me add that column real quick. I believe that's the total of that column. (Pause)

What that column at the bottom is is the total. For example, hour 0300 is 417, that's the total generation that was being output by the QFs at that hour.

If you add that number plus the curtailment requested, which would have been 278, it appears, it would bring you up to 696 and it would have been the total of cogen on line at the time. Which would have been exactly what we asked for. (Pause)

Q Okay. Then can you tell me why in the second request column it says, "Request for 0230," it says, "Needed 439."

A That's where we needed their total output of their units to be. After the second curtailment amount, the first one was 201 and the second one was 77, that would have had everyone curtailed to the amount shown, that would have brought their units down to 439.

Q And that is how I interpreted it. Then I observed that in the succeeding hours ending 0300 through 0700, they got down to 417 for 0300 and then down to 315 to 330 for the remainder of the period. Okay?

A Okay. If you will look at the notes column on the right-hand side? When they reach that level, you will see Tiger Bay had to come off-line. They could not maintain their

NOX compliance at 115 megawatts?

Q Yes, I see that.

A And OCL loads reflect 35 megawatts of deliveries to Reedy Creek. The big amount, though, was the Tiger Bay coming off line. At the time, they had told us they were going to come back on line, too. Once again, it left the dispatchers in a position of you're at a certain curtailment level and you don't know whether a unit that you have no control over is coming back or not.

- Q Thank you.
- A Okay.
- Q If I could ask you now to look at what has been marked as Exhibit No. 5, the tabular information.
  - A Mine says Exhibit No. 3.
- Q Yeah. At the bottom of the first page, it is going to say Deposition Exhibit 3 Late-Filed. The Chairman has instructed us to put in the blank at the top of the cover sheet to Exhibit No. 5 for the purposes of the hearing.
  - A Okay.
    - Q Did you do these or were these done at your request?
  - A These were done at my request.
- Q Are they what they purport to be, that is, first a schedule of the daily minimum and maximum loads for every day of 1994 and, second, a schedule showing Plorida Power's units and in one case Tiger Bay going below their minimum operating

levels during December of '94 and January 1995 curtailment 2 alerts, warnings and emergencies? 3 Yes, they are. And the information contained herein is true and 5 correct to the best of your information and belief? 6 Yes. 7 I would like to ask you to look at the other 8 interrogatory now. I'm not trying to prolong this, but during 9 the period that you were reviewing the documents I did verify 10 with your counsel that you signed the affidavit accompanying this interrogatory response. 11 12 λ Okay. 13 Are you qualified to talk about it or should I direct my questions about this to Mr. Southwick or Ms. Brousseau? 15 16 A Let me finish reading through it just a second. 17 Q Certainly. (Pause) 18 I believe Ms. Brousseau and I worked on this together. I provided part of the information, she provided 19 the cost information, if I'm remembering this particular one 21 right. 22 Typically, reliability issues are the type of thing 23 that I would handle. We worked together on many of these interrogatories.

I didn't mean to interrupt you, Mr. Harper.

25

I wanted to ask you about the sentence in the second paragraph that reads, "FPC would note that the precise amount of costs cannot be fully known in advance because it is not until the curtailment period had been experienced and actual load level and existing conditions are known that the full extend of such costs are susceptible to determination."

If you want to tell me that some questioning about that would be better directed to Mr. Southwick or Ms. Brousseau, I will move on.

A I would may it would be directed to Mr. Southwick.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, I'm going to ask that this be admitted in that he is the signed affiant who sponsored the interrogatory response.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: I assume that we'll do that at the conclusion of his testimony.

MR. WRIGHT: Of course.

Q (By Mr. Wright) Mr. Harper, do you anticipate that if the Public Service Commission approves Florida Power's plan that Florida Power will try to continue to run its system the way it has been since the plan was promulgated in October of 1994?

A If you determine or if you are saying "as it has been" as meaning that we will exercise all due caution before we use curtailments, then yes, we will curtail only as necessary and only as a last resort when all other mitigation

methods have failed.

2

MR. WRIGHT: You exactly answered my questions.

3

Thank you, that's all I have.

4

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Any other intervenors? Ms. Brown?

5

MS. BROWN: Staff has no questions.

6

•

-

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Commissioners? Redirect?

7

MR. TENPAS: Just a couple of items.

8

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

9

BY MR. TENPAS:

10

Q Mr. Harper, you recall having Mr. Presnell ask you some questions about the effects with respect to the first

12

11

curtailment, the effects of keeping the Anclote, University of

13

Florida and Bartow units on line?

14

λ Yes.

15

Q Do you generally recall that? Can you tell me whether keeping those three units on line and in operation allowed PPC to take any other action with respect to any other

17

18 units?

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A They certainly did. On the October 19th time frame, that was when, as you mentioned, Bartow, Anclote and University of Plorida stayed on line. And those amount to approximately 60 megawatts. The curtailment plan calls for, as Mr. Wright just pointed out, CR-4 and 5 holding at 300 megawatts. Because for security and reliability reasons, because CR-4 -- excuse me, because Anclote, Bartow and the

University of Florida Cogen was on line, we made a decision that night to reduce that unit, CR-4, from 300 megawatts down to 150 megawatts.

So if you use those numbers in reverse order, we, in fact, saved 90 megawatts that night by doing what we did.

We took a risk, a risk to the system. We had a unit on in Pinellas County, actually two units, Anclote and Bartow; we felt fairly secure on our 230 kV grid that it would be okay to go ahead and lower CR-4 from its 300 level to 150 due primarily because those units were on line.

Q Thank you. Do you recall also Mr. Presnell asking you some questions about your message that was sent to the message board on the 19th -- or I guess on the 18th -- with respect to power available to be sold on the 19th?

A Right.

Q Can you explain to us how you would typically expect a transaction to mature out of such a message if that were to happen?

A Certainly. That type of messages go out all the time on the messaging system, bulletin board. It is companies offering power to buy or sell at a given price range. What we are doing, and all other companies are doing the same thing, is just seeing interest out there in anyone buying power. It goes on all the time.

People respond to those messages. To back that up

is why we call all the different companies.

Q You have used the term "AGC," automated generation control, on several occasions. Can you explain to a lay person what AGC is.

A AGC, automatic generation control, is what allows our units that we have on line to meet the moment-to-moment system load.

For example, if the load, every minute of every day, the load fluctuates. It goes up and down depending upon the day. In the morning, the load goes up and sustains a level; in the evening, it starts to come down.

To match the load with our generation, we have to have units what we call on control or on AGC. Those units follow the system load automatically without the dispatchers having to move the load by hand. NERC, the North American Reliability Council, the FCG, the SERC, all demand that every electric utility have units on control to meet to follow the load.

MR. TENPAS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: How many units do you have to have on that automatic control? You don't have to have all of them on there, do you?

WITNESS HARPER: Typically, for a system our size in a daytime, we have five or six units on control. The more units you have on control, the better you are to follow the

load.

Our EMS or energy management system, our compute that runs the load following, the AGC, it bases load following once again on economics so that each of our units that's on control at any given time it will pulse or move that unit in the direction it should go up or down, based on economics.

So, for example, if we had Crystal River 4 and 5, which is our two most economical units, if we had those on control and we had, let's say, two Anclote units on control at the same time, what would happen is the energy management system would automatically try to load up the more economical units first, followed by the more expensive units.

So the more units you have on control, the better able you are to respond to the changing load.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: I really wanted to know if there was like a minimum amount of megawatts that had to be subject to that control.

WITNESS HARPER: There's not a minimum subject to control by any particular rules. We at all times try to keep X number of units on control, though. Typically, 100 megawatts is the minimum we try to allow on our system that's able to respond.

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Okay.

WITNESS HARPER: May I go one step further on that?

CHAIRMAN CLARK: Go ahead.

1 WITNESS HARPER: When I say four or five units on 2 control, that's during the day. Many times during these low 3 load conditions when we bring our units down to minimum levels those are not minimum local control levels, those are minimum 5 operating levels. When we talk about leaving CR-4 or 5 on, 6 that's the only thing available to give the dispatcher any 7 control at all and to respond to reserves. 8 CHAIRMAN CLARK: Go ahead. 9 MR. TENPAS: Thank you. 10 Q (By Mr. Tenpas) You have had some exchange with Mr. Presnell about Tiger Bay and its performance on the 19th. 11 Just to be clear, you don't know what -- you personally don't 12 know what Tiger Bay's contractual status was as of the 19th? 13 14 MR. PRESNELL: Madam Chairman, that's a leading 15 question on redirect, which is improper. CHAIRMAN CLARK: Rephrase your question. 16 17 MR. TENPAS: I'll rephrase. 18 Q (By Mr. Tenpas) Mr. Harper, do you know Tiger Bay's 19 contractual status with respect to the events of the 19th? 20 A As I said earlier, I do not know. 21 Do you know whether any curtailment agreement was in Q 22 place between Florida Power and Tiger Bay on the 19th? 23 A No, I do not.

question about whether Florida Power would be doing anything

You indicated that, in response to Mr. Presnell's

24

25

1	to take account of Orlando CoGen's decision to go to zero
2	megawatts on the 19th, that Florida Power would not be doing
3	anything. In that answer, were you intending to exclude the
4	possibility of PPC honoring agreements between the
5	cogenerators to sometimes overcurtail and sometimes
6	undercurtail in working out the balance themselves?
7	A No, certainly not. We fully encourage the
8	cogenerators to work amongst themselves to come up with any
9	plan that could help the situation.
LO	Q Finally, can you look at Tab 3, the curtailment
.1	summary that Mr. Wright was just directing you to?
L2	A Okay.
L3	Q And you see in the column with respect to the 0100
L 4	curtailments, it says, "Needed," and then under that, "496."
۱5	And in the following three columns there are entries of 693,
16	523 and 516?
17	A Right.
18	Q Does that indicate that the cogenerators continue to
19	produce an amount of energy greater than needed?
20	A Yes, I believe it does.
21	MR. TENPAS: I have nothing further, thank you.
22	CHAIRMAN CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Tenpas. You're
23	excused, Mr. Harper.
24	(Witness Harper excused.)

1	CHAIRMAN CLARK: Tomorrow morning at 9:00, we will
2	start with Mr. Southwick. Okay, 9:00, thank you very much.
3	I'm sorry, I was just reminded we need to admit
4	exhibits?
5	Mr. Tenpas, do you move Exhibit 3?
6	MR. TENPAS: Yes, I do.
7	CHAIRMAN CLARK: Without objection, Exhibit 3 is
8	admitted. Exhibits 4 and 5?
9	MR. WRIGHT: I move them.
10	CHAIRMAN CLARK: Without objection, 4 and 5 are
11	admitted. Thank you.
12	(Exhibit Nos. 3, 4 and 5 received in evidence.)
13	(Thereupon, the hearing adjourned at 5:20 p.m., to
14	reconvene at 9:00 a.m., Tuesday, May 9, 1995, at the same
15	address.)
16	
17	(Transcript continues in sequence in Volume 3.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	