

ORIGINAL

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

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

LISA LOHSS

ON BEHALF OF

PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA

DOCKET NO. 070007-EI

AUGUST 3, 2007

**Q. Please state your name and business address.**

**A.** My name is Lisa Lohss. My business address is 299 First Avenue North, St. Petersburg, Florida 33701.

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

**A.** I am employed by Progress Energy Florida as Supervisor, Distribution Component Performance.

**Q. What is the scope of your duties?**

**A.** Currently, my responsibilities include supervising Distribution component life cycle and maintenance activities for the Energy Delivery Florida organization.

**Q. Please describe your educational background and professional experience.**

**A.** I received a Bachelors of Science degree in Electrical Engineering and a Masters of Business Administration degree from University of South Florida. In

1 addition, I hold an EIT from the Florida Board of Professional Regulation.  
2 Currently I hold the position of Supervisor, Distribution Component  
3 Performance. Prior to my current assignment, I held several engineering  
4 positions with Progress Energy Florida (PEF).

5

6 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

7 A. The purpose of my testimony is to explain material variances between the  
8 Estimated/Actual project expenditures versus the original cost projections for  
9 environmental compliance costs associated with Progress Energy Florida's  
10 Distribution System Environmental Investigation, Remediation, and Pollution  
11 Prevention Programs for the period January 2007 through December 2007.

12

13 **Q. Please explain the variance between the Estimated/Actual project  
14 expenditures and the original projections for the Distribution System  
15 Program for the period January 2007 to December 2007.**

16 A. O&M project expenditures for the Distribution System Program are estimated to  
17 be \$1,010,677 higher than originally projected. This increase is primarily  
18 attributable to the projected completion of a greater number of sites than were  
19 originally planned, including carryover from the 2006 workplan.

20

21 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

22 A. Yes.