ORIGINAL

1		GULF POWER COMPANY
2		Before the Florida Public Service Commission Supplemental Direct Testimony of
3		Robert G. Moore Docket No. 990325-EI
4		Date of Filing: May 17, 1999
5		
6	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
7	Α.	My name is Robert G. Moore, and my business address
8		is One Energy Place, Pensacola, Florida 32520.
9		
10	Q.	Have you previously filed direct testimony in this
11		docket?
12	Α.	Yes.
13		
14	Q.	What is the purpose of your supplemental direct
15		testimony?
16	Α.	Since the Need Study was filed, Gulf has continued to
17		refine the engineering design for Smith Unit 3 in an
18		effort to achieve the best overall value. The
19		purpose of this testimony is to describe the design
20		changes that Gulf has made, and to update the
21		construction cost estimate for the unit.
22		
23	Q.	Have you prepared an exhibit that contains
24		information on these updates?
	Docł	Cet No. 990325-EI DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE Witness: R.G. Moore U 6246 MAY 17 8
		FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

•••

÷ .

1	Α.	Yes. I have an exhibit consisting of one schedule
2		that was prepared under my supervision and direction.
3		Counsel: We ask that Mr. Moore's
4		Schedule 3 be marked as
5		Exhibit (RGM-2).
6		
7	Q.	What changes has Gulf made in the unit's design since
8		the Need Study was filed?
9	Α.	Gulf has made changes to the steam fired portion of
10		the combined cycle unit that allow it to produce a
11		higher mass steam flow through the steam turbine.
12		
13	Q.	What is the effect of these changes?
13 14	Q. A.	What is the effect of these changes? As a result of these changes, the summer peak
14		As a result of these changes, the summer peak
14 15		As a result of these changes, the summer peak capacity of the unit has increased by 34 MW, from
14 15 16		As a result of these changes, the summer peak capacity of the unit has increased by 34 MW, from approximately 540 MW to approximately 574 MW. The
14 15 16 17		As a result of these changes, the summer peak capacity of the unit has increased by 34 MW, from approximately 540 MW to approximately 574 MW. The changes associated with this 6.3% increase in maximum
14 15 16 17 18		As a result of these changes, the summer peak capacity of the unit has increased by 34 MW, from approximately 540 MW to approximately 574 MW. The changes associated with this 6.3% increase in maximum unit capability result in a slight reduction in the
14 15 16 17 18 19		As a result of these changes, the summer peak capacity of the unit has increased by 34 MW, from approximately 540 MW to approximately 574 MW. The changes associated with this 6.3% increase in maximum unit capability result in a slight reduction in the average annual output of the unit, from 521 MW to 519
14 15 16 17 18 19 20		As a result of these changes, the summer peak capacity of the unit has increased by 34 MW, from approximately 540 MW to approximately 574 MW. The changes associated with this 6.3% increase in maximum unit capability result in a slight reduction in the average annual output of the unit, from 521 MW to 519 MW. They also result in a slight increase in the
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		As a result of these changes, the summer peak capacity of the unit has increased by 34 MW, from approximately 540 MW to approximately 574 MW. The changes associated with this 6.3% increase in maximum unit capability result in a slight reduction in the average annual output of the unit, from 521 MW to 519 MW. They also result in a slight increase in the average annual heat rate for the unit from 6,741

Docket No. 990325-EI

_

-

2

Witness: R.G. Moore

Q. Please describe the change in the total installed
 cost estimate for Smith Unit 3.

A. The total nominal cost estimate for Smith Unit 3 has
increased by \$9,670,000 to \$196,922,000. On a per KW
basis, the estimated total nominal cost has decreased
from approximately \$347/KW to approximately \$343/KW.
A breakdown of the updated cost estimate is shown on
Schedule 3.

9

Q. Has Gulf analyzed the effect of these design and cost
changes on the overall cost-effectiveness of the
project?

13 Yes. Our analysis shows that these design changes Α. 14 provide additional benefits to Gulf and its 15 customers. Ms. Burke will provide the details of 16 this analysis. Based on this analysis, we are asking 17 the Commission to find that Gulf has a need for the 18 574 MW represented by Smith Unit 3, and that this project is the most cost-effective alternative 19 20 available.

21

22 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

23 A. Yes.

Docket No. 990325-EI

3

Florida Public Service Commission Docket No. 990325-EI GULF POWER COMPANY Witness: Robert G. Moore Exhibit _____ (RGM-2) Schedule 3

INSTALLED COST ESTIMATE FOR SMITH UNIT 3

DESCRIPTION:	AMOUNT (2002\$)
Indirects	\$ 25,661,966
Site, General	6,701,846
Heat Recovery Steam Generator Area	39,741,570
Turbine & Generator Area	91,143,505
Fuel Facilities (metering only)	856,111
Plant Water Systems	13,443,351
Electrical Distribution & Switchyard	12,847,183
Plant Instrumentation & Controls	2,591,303
Other	3,936,065
mom » I	C106 022 000

TOTAL

\$196,922,900

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF FLORIDA)) COUNTY OF ESCAMBIA)

Docket No. 990325-EI

Before me the undersigned authority, personally appeared Robert G. Moore, who being first duly sworn, deposes, and says that he is the Vice President of Power Generation and Transmission of Gulf Power Company, a Maine corporation, that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief. He is personally known to me.

Robert G. Moore Vice President - Power Generation and Transmission

1.

Sworn to	and subscribed before n , 1999.	ne this _/// day
Notary Public, Stat	e of Florida at Large	OFFICIAL SEAL JEFFREY A. STONE MY COMMISSION EXPIRES APRIL 22, 2000 Comm. No. CC 525231