PEOPLES GAS SYSTEM

BEFORE THE

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Docket No. 080318-GU

In Re: Petition for rate increase by Peoples Gas System

> Submitted for Filing: August 11, 2008

DIRECT TESTIMONY

GORDON L. GILLETTE On Behalf of Peoples Gas System

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

07037 AUG 11 8

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

1 Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS,

OCCUPATION AND EMPLOYER.

2

A. My name is Gordon L. Gillette. My business address is 702 N. Franklin
Street, Tampa, Florida 33602. I am Senior Vice President and Chief
Financial Officer of Peoples Gas System ("Peoples" or "Company"), a
division of Tampa Electric Company ("Tampa Electric") and Executive
Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of TECO Energy, Inc. ("TECO
Energy").

9 Q. PLEASE PROVIDE A BRIEF OUTLINE OF YOUR

10 EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND BUSINESS EXPERIENCE.

A. I received a Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering in 1981 and a
Master of Science in Engineering Management in 1985 from the
University of South Florida. In 2007, I completed the Advanced
Management Program at Harvard Business School. I am a registered
professional engineer in the state of Florida.

16I joined Tampa Electric in 1981 as an engineer and worked in the17production and planning areas. I was promoted to Manager of Generation18Planning in May 1986 and later served as Manager of Bulk Power and19Generation Planning. I then became Director of Project Services for20TECO Power Services ("TPS"), responsible for fuel procurement,21environmental permitting and compliance, and power sales contract22administration.

In November 1994, I was promoted to Vice President of
 Regulatory Affairs for Tampa Electric, and in November 1995, was named
 Vice President of Regulatory and Business Strategy for Tampa Electric.

1		In March 1998, I was appointed Vice President of Finance and Chief
2		Financial Officer of TECO Energy and Tampa Electric. In 2001, I was
3		appointed Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer for TECO
4		Energy.
5		I was promoted to my current position of Executive Vice President
6		and Chief Financial Officer of TECO Energy in July 2004. I also serve as
7		the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of Tampa Electric.
8		As Chief Financial Officer, I am responsible for financial planning and
9		reporting, financing strategies and activities, and contact with the financial
10		community, including investors and rating agencies.
11	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
12	Α.	The purpose of my direct testimony is to describe how Peoples' need for
13		capital for system expansion will impact the need for external capital. I
14		explain the Company's capital structure and financial targets along with
15		why a parent company debt adjustment is unwarranted.
16	Q.	ARE YOU SPONSORING OR CO-SPONSORING ANY MINIMUM
17		FILING REQUIREMENTS?
18	A.	Yes, I am sponsoring Schedules C-26 (Parent(s) Debt Information) and
19		D-12 (Applicant's Market Data) of the Minimum Filing Requirements,
20		each of which was prepared under my supervision.
21	Q.	WHAT ARE SOME OF THE SIGNIFICANT BUSINESS DRIVERS
22		THAT HAVE IMPACTED PEOPLES SINCE ITS LAST RATE?
23	Α.	Since the Company's last rate case filing in 2002, there have been
24		numerous challenges to the gas industry and to Peoples specifically. They
25		include a decline in per customer gas usage, increasing costs for materials,

labor, and operations and maintenance, and enhanced reliability and safety
 regulations. At the same time, there is a growing need to expand the
 natural gas infrastructure within Florida to help reduce greenhouse gas
 emissions and improve consumers' carbon footprints. These trends are
 described in more detail in the direct testimony of Bill Cantrell.

6 Q. WHY IS PEOPLES REQUESTING A BASE RATE INCREASE?

A. Since the Company's last base rate proceeding, Peoples has added
approximately 100,000 new customers. To serve this demand, the
Company has installed or replaced more than 1,500 miles of gas main in
the more than 200 communities it serves. The Company has also faced
increased requirements for maintenance capital expenditures, including
significant amounts for relocation of facilities due to rapid expansion of
highways and roads throughout the State.

Despite the initiatives and efforts the Company has undertaken to 14 manage costs, these actions are no longer sufficient to cover expenditures 15 to provide safe and reliable service. For 2008, the Company filed a 16 forecasted Surveillance Report with the Commission with an expected 17 return on equity ("ROE") of 9.30 percent. For 2009, without the revenue 18 requirements being sought, the Company's ROE is expected to be 5.61 19 20 percent. These returns are well below the bottom of Peoples' allowed ROE range and are unsustainable. Peoples needs to be able to earn a fair 21 22 return on invested capital to be able to continue to access the capital markets so that existing and new customers can continue to be served 23 reliably. 24

25 Q. WHAT IS THE COMPANY'S REQUESTED REVENUE

2

REQUIREMENT INCREASE, AND WHAT ARE THE KEY

COMPONENTS OF THE INCREASE?

A. The Company is requesting an increase of \$26,488,091 in base revenues. 3 The requested increase represents the amount necessary to raise the 4 Company's projected 2009 net operating income ("NOI") level to the 5 required amount of \$50,060,255. The required NOI is based on the 6 Company's projected 2009 13-month average jurisdictional adjusted rate 7 8 base of \$563.6 million and a weighted average cost of capital of 8.88 percent. The weighted cost of capital assumes a jurisdictional adjusted 13-9 10 month average capital structure consisting of 54.7 percent equity. It also includes a ROE of 11.50 percent, a long-term debt rate of 7.2 percent, and 11 12 a short-term debt rate of 4.5 percent. Dr. Donald Murry provides the support for the Company's requested ROE, and Paul Higgins' direct 13 14 testimony explains the details of the Company's revenue requirement 15 based on the 2009 test year as well as the budget process used to develop 16 sound and reliable projected test year financial statements.

0. WHAT IS THE COMPANY'S FINANCIAL OBJECTIVE? 17

Α. Peoples' principal objective is to maintain its financial integrity at a level 18 sufficient to be able to raise debt capital, and to maintain fair returns on 19 equity to be able to attract equity capital. 20

Q. WHAT CREDIT RATING IS PEOPLES TARGETING IN THE 21 **FUTURE AND WHY?** 22

23 Α. Peoples is targeting ratings in the single "A" range. This rating is required 24 since Peoples is facing higher capital spending requirements combined 25 with significant economic challenges such as declining customer usage,

1		lower customer growth due to the distressed housing market, and higher
2		materials and labor costs to serve customers, all of which add additional
3		risk for the company. Debt ratings in the single "A" range would ensure
4		that Peoples has adequate credit quality to raise the capital necessary to
5		meet these challenges and fund the necessary capital requirements. We
6		believe that maintaining the equity ratio at this level should produce credit
7		ratings parameters for the Company that are in the single "A" range.
8	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE THE EARNINGS BEFORE INTEREST AND
9		TAXES TO INTEREST (EBIT/INTEREST) COVERAGE RATIOS
10		AS REPORTED IN MFR SCHEDULES G-3, PAGE 9, AND D-11.
11	Α.	Peoples' coverage ratio for EBIT/Interest has been declining and is
12		projected to be 2.3 times in 2009. This same coverage ratio averaged
13		approximately 4.0 times in 2004 through 2006 before starting to decline in
14		2007. The 2.3 times represents an unacceptable level and is expected to
15		continue to decline without rate relief. The Company believes that a more
16		appropriate coverage ratio for 2009 is in the range of 4 times, which can
17		be achieved by a grant of the Company's requested rate relief.
18	Q.	HOW DOES THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED 54.7 PERCENT
19		EQUITY RATIO COMPARE WITH THE ALLOWED CAPITAL
20		STRUCTURE IN PEOPLES' PREVIOUS BASE RATE FILING?
21	Α.	The proposed 54.7 percent equity ratio is very reasonable when compared
22		with the Commission's decision in the 2002 base rate proceeding
23		approving an equity ratio of 57.4 percent.
24	Q.	GIVEN THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED CAPITAL STRUCTURE
25		OF 54.7 PERCENT EQUITY, WHAT ARE THE EQUITY

~	1		INFUSIONS FROM TECO ENERGY FOR 2008 AND 2009 THAT
	2		ARE NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE THIS CAPITAL STRUCTURE?
	3	A.	No equity infusions are deemed necessary in 2008, and the 2009 planned
	4		equity infusion from TECO Energy to Peoples is \$25 million.
	5	Q.	DID PEOPLES MAKE A PARENT COMPANY DEBT
	6		ADJUSTMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH FLORIDA
	7		ADMINISTRATIVE CODE RULE 25-14.004?
	8	A.	No. Although the TECO Energy parent company currently has \$400
·	9		million of long-term debt, this debt is related to TECO Energy's
	10		investments in its failed TPS merchant power projects. TECO Energy
	11		did not raise debt to invest in Peoples, nor did it invest the proceeds of
	1 2		the debt it did raise as equity in Peoples. Therefore, a parent company
	13		debt adjustment is not appropriate.
	14	Q.	PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR TESTIMONY.
	15	A.	Since its last base rate case, Peoples has had numerous challenges
	16		including declining per-customer gas usage, increasing costs, and
	17		enhanced reliability and safety regulations. While managing these
•	18		challenges, Peoples recognizes that there is a need to grow the natural gas
	19		infrastructure within Florida to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions and
	20		reduce consumers' carbon footprints. The Company has added
	21		approximately 100,000 new customers and installed or replaced more than
	22		1,500 miles of gas main to serve these customers. Maintenance capital
	23		expenditures have increased as well partially as a result of the relocation
$\widehat{}$	24		of facilities due to rapid expansion of highways and roads throughout the
	25		State.

1		Peoples is requesting a base revenue increase of \$26,488,091. The
2		financial basis for this revenue requirement is a weighted cost of capital of
3		8.88 percent, which includes an 11.50 percent ROE and a financial equity
4		ratio of 54.7 percent. The requested ROE and equity ratio are important
5		for the Company to maintain and enhance its financial position to target
6		debt ratings in the single "A" range to ensure uninterrupted access to
. 7		reasonably priced debt capital. Finally, a parent company debt adjustment
8		is inappropriate since the \$400 million of existing parent debt was raised
9		on behalf of TPS and was not used to fund any equity infusions to
10		Peoples.
11	Q.	DOES THIS COMPLETE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?
12	Α.	Yes.
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		