Tel 850.444.6111

DISTRIBUTION CENTER

02 MAR 29 AM 9: CO

ORIGINAL



March 28, 2002

Ms. Blanca S. Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee FL 32399-0870

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Enclosed for official filing in Docket No. 020007-El are an original and ten copies of the following:

- 1. Prepared direct testimony of J. O. Vick. 03586-02
- 2. Prepared direct testimony and exhibit of S. D. Ritenour. 03587-02

Sincerely,

Susan D. Ritenour

Assistant Secretary and Assistant Treasurer

Susan D. Riterou (lw)

Jw

Enclosures

AUS ___ cc: Beggs and Lane Jeffrey A. Stone, Esquire COM Store GCL ___ OPC ___ MMS SEC __ OTH ___ P

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Environmental Cost Recovery)	
Clause)	Docket No. 020007-E
)	-

Certificate of Service

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing has been furnished this <u>ast</u> day of March 2002 by U.S. Mail or hand delivery to the following:

Marlene Stern, Esquire Staff Counsel FL Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee FL 32399-0863

John T. Butler, Esquire Steel, Hector & Davis LLP 200 S. Biscayne Blvd., Ste 4000 Miami FL 33131-2398

John Roger Howe, Esquire
Office of Public Counsel
c/o The Florida Legislature
111 W. Madison St., Room 812
Tallahassee FL 32399-1400

Lee L. Willis, Esquire Ausley & McMullen P. O. Box 391 Tallahassee FL 32302 Joseph A. McGlothlin, Esquire McWhirter Reeves, P.A. 117 S. Gadsden Street Tallahassee FL 32301

John W. McWhirter, Esquire McWhirter Reeves, P.A. 400 N Tampa St Suite 2450 Tampa FL 33602

Ms. Debra Swim LEAF 1114 Thomasville Rd, Suite E Tallahassee FL 32303

JEFFREY A. STONE
Florida Bar No. 325953
RUSSELL A. BADDERS
Florida Bar No. 0007455
Beggs & Lane
P. O. Box 12950
Pensacola FL 32576
850 432-2451
Attorneys for Gulf Power Company

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

ENVIRONMENTAL COST RECOVERY CLAUSE

DOCKET NO. 020007-EI

PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY
OF
JAMES O. VICK

FINAL TRUE-UP FILING FOR THE PERIOD

JANUARY 2001 - DECEMBER 2001

APRIL 1, 2002



DOCUMENT NUMBER PATE

0.3586 MAR 298

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

1		GULF POWER COMPANY
2 3 4 5 6 7		Before the Florida Public Service Commission Prepared Direct Testimony of James O. Vick Docket No. 020007-EI April 1, 2002
8	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
10	Α,	My name is James O. Vick and my business address is One Energy
11	, .,	Place, Pensacola, Florida, 32520.
12		
13	Q.	By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
14	A.	I am employed by Gulf Power Company as the Manager of
15		Environmental Affairs.
16		
17	Q.	Mr. Vick, will you please describe your education and experience?
18	A.	I graduated from Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, in 1975
19		with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Marine Biology. I also hold a
20		Bachelor's Degree in Civil Engineering from the University of South
21		Florida in Tampa, Florida. In addition, I have a Masters of Science
22		Degree in Management from Troy State University, Pensacola, Florida.
23		I joined Gulf Power Company in August 1978 as an Associate Engineer.
24		I have since held various engineering positions such as Air Quality
25		Engineer and Senior Environmental Licensing Engineer. In 1996, I

- 3 Q. What are your responsibilities with Gulf Power Company?
- A. As Manager of Environmental Affairs, my primary responsibility is
 overseeing the activities of the Environmental Affairs section to ensure
 the Company is, and remains, in compliance with environmental laws
 and regulations, i.e., both existing laws and such laws and regulations
- function, I have the responsibility for numerous environmental activities.

that may be enacted or amended in the future. In performing this

10

8

- 11 Q. Are you the same James O. Vick who has previously testified before 12 this Commission on various environmental matters?
- 13 A. Yes.

14

- 15 Q. Mr. Vick, what is the purpose of your testimony?
- 16 A. The purpose of my testimony is to support Gulf Power Company's true-17 up filing for the period from January 2001 through December 2001 and 18 to explain any significant variances in Gulf's recoverable environmental 19 projects.

- 21 Q. Mr. Vick, please compare Gulf's recoverable environmental capital 22 costs included in the final true-up calculation for the period January 1, 23 2001 through December 31, 2001 with approved estimated true-up 24 amounts.
- 25 A. As reflected in Ms. Ritenour's Schedule 6A, the actual recoverable

1		capital costs total \$8,141,208, as compared to the estimated true-up
2		amount of \$8,152,424. This results in a variance of (\$11,216). I will
3		discuss the major variances below.
4		
5	Q.	Please explain the variance in recoverable costs for the CEMS project
6		(Line Item 1.5).
7	A.	The CEMS project reflects a variance of (\$9,760) for the year.
8		Upgrades are taking place at Plants Crist, Smith, and Scholz. Some of
9		these projects are running behind schedule.
10		
11	Q.	Please explain the variance of (\$1,518) in the capital category entitled
12		Substation Contamination Mobile Groundwater Treatment System (Line
13		Item 1.6).
14	A.	The variance in the Mobile Groundwater Treatment system project is
15		due to expenditures occuring one month later than expected.
16		
17	Q.	How do the actual O&M expenses for the period January 1, 2001 to
18		December 31, 2001 compare to the estimated true-up?
19	A.	Ms. Ritenour's Schedule 4A reflects that Gulf's actual recoverable
20		environmental O&M expenses 2001 were \$2,169,025, as compared to
21		the estimated true-up amount of \$2,428,250. This results in a year-end
22		variance of (\$259,225). I will address eleven O&M projects and
23		programs that contribute to this variance.

- 1 Q. Please explain the \$2,497 variance in the activity entitled Sulfur (Line ltem 1.1).
- A. The amount of sulfur used at Plant Crist is based on the available coal supply. The necessity for sulfur was more than what was anticipated for the recovery period.

- Please explain the \$103,157 variance in the Air Emission Fees category

 (Line Item 1.2).
- 9 A. 2001 was the first year for Gulf Power to pay emission fees for several
 10 sources previously exempt from these fees. Fee projections are based
 11 on generation projections for future years using projected fuel quality
 12 while the actual fees are calculated based upon emissions from the
 13 previous year. Variances between projected and actual fees can be
 14 attributed to electricity demand and fuel quality.

15

- 16 Q. Please explain the variance of (\$2,742) in Asbestos Fees (Line Item 1.4).
- 17 A. This variance is explained by the fact that Gulf's generating plants had
 18 less asbestos abatement in 2001 than was anticipated. The projected
 19 expenses for this project were based on Gulf's history of abatement in
 20 previous years.

21

- Please explain the variance of (\$31,592) in Emission Monitoring (Line Item 1.5).
- A. Some of the projected expenses have not been incurred due to

 Compliance Assurance Monitoring (CAM) testing being cancelled as a

Docket No. 020007-EI Page 4 Witness: James O. Vick

1		result of equipment failure at Plant Crist. Until the equipment needed
2		for the test is replaced, the results of the CAM tests would not produce
3		meaningful information. The testing will be rescheduled pending
4		equipment replacement and availability of the equipment contractor.
5		
6	Q.	Please explain the variance of (\$87,295) in General Water Quality (Line
7		Item 1.6).
8	A.	The variance of (\$87,295) is related to three projects consisting of the
9		Soil Contamination Studies, Groundwater Monitoring, and Surface
10		Water Studies. The Soil Contamination Studies were under budget this
11		year due to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP)
12		continuing to review our request for "No Further Action with
13		Restrictions". In the event that this request is approved, then Gulf will
14		have expenses for the removal of equipment and abandonment of
15		wells. These activities did not occur during 2001.
16		
17		The Groundwater Monitoring activity was reduced slightly due to
18		resampling activities not being required during NPDES sampling events.
19		For groundwater purposes, we only had one re-sampling event for
20		confirmation purposes.
21		
22		Surface Water Studies were under budget for 2001. This was a result of
23		cost saving measures which were implemented by Gulf Power
24		Company. The cost saving measures included utilization of new
25		technology. In addition, weather delays were not a problem during

1	the	/ear	200	1
1	1110	/ C UI	200	1

- Q. Please explain the variance of (\$54,763) in Groundwater Monitoring
 Investigation (Line Item 1.7).
- 5 A. The (6.3%) variance in this project was due to delays in gaining
 6 approval of the Remedial Action Plan for the Beach Haven Substation
 7 site from the FDEP.

8

- 9 Q. Please explain the variance of \$34,585 in State NPDES Administration (Line Item 1.8).
- 11 A. The 2002 NPDES administration fees for Gulf's facilities were paid during 12 the 2001 projection period.

13

- 14 Q. Please explain the variance of (\$6,390) in Line Item 1.9, Lead and Copper Rule.
- 16 A. This variance is due to chemical usage at Plants Crist and Scholz that
 17 was much less than what was anticipated. In addition, Plant Smith
 18 inadvertently charged their year 2000 expenses for this program to a
 19 non-ECRC account. This error was detected after the books were
 20 closed for 2000. The expenses were recovered during 2001, partially
 21 offsetting the under-recovery described above.

- Q. Please explain the variance of (\$2,607) in Environmental Auditing/ Assessment (Line Item 1.10)
- 25 A. This variance is due to the the fact that the scope of audits conducted

1		during the period focused less on environmental activities than what
2		was originally anticipated.
3		
4	Q.	Please explain the variance of (\$73,230) in Line Item 1.11, General Solid
5		& Hazardous Waste.
6	A.	This variance is due to the fact that less waste was generated at Gulf's
7		facilities than was originally anticipated. Each of the Company's four
8		locations that generate solid and hazardous waste were under budget
9		for the recovery period, which cumulatively reflect the (\$73,230)
10		variance.
11		
12	Q.	Please explain the variance of (\$140,055) in Line Item 1.17, Gulf Coast
13		Ozone Study (GCOS).
14	A.	The expected completion date for the GCOS project was extended
15		due to a delay in the final rule development by EPA. At the time of the
16		estimated true-up Gulf anticipated spending \$185,145 for the ongoing
17		modeling and analysis associated with this project in 2001, but only a
18		portion of the modeling has been completed.
19		
20	Q.	Does this conclude your testimony?
21	A.	Yes.
22		
23		
24		

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF FLORIDA

Docket No. 020007-El

COUNTY OF ESCAMBIA

Before me the undersigned authority, personally appeared James O. Vick, who being first duly sworn, deposes, and says that he is the Environmental Affairs Manager 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.

James Ø. Vick

Environmental Affairs Manager

Sworn to and subscribed before me this <u>37th</u> day of <u>March</u> 2002.

Notary Public, State of Florida at Large

Notary Public-Sta Romm. Exp: May 3 Comm. No: CC 7