

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

**COREY ZEIGLER**

ON BEHALF OF

PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA

DOCKET NO. 100007-EI

April 1, 2010

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

A. My name is Corey Zeigler. 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 (PEF) as Manager, Environmental Permitting & Compliance.

**Q. What are your responsibilities in that position?**

A. Currently, my responsibilities include managing environmental permitting and compliance activities for Energy Delivery Florida. Energy Delivery Florida is part of the Florida Distribution Business unit of which I support the Distribution and Transmission Operation and Planning Department.

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

2 A. I received a Bachelors of Science degree in General Business Administration  
3 and Management from the University of South Florida. Prior to holding this  
4 role I was the Health and Safety Manager for Progress Energy Florida  
5 Transmission and Delivery. I have 18 years experience in the utility industry  
6 holding various operational, supervisor and managerial roles at Progress Energy.

7

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

9 A. The purpose of my testimony is to explain material variances between the actual  
10 project expenditures versus the Estimated/Actual project expenditures for  
11 environmental compliance costs associated with PEF's Substation  
12 Environmental Investigation, Remediation, and Pollution Prevention Program  
13 (Project 1 & 1a) and the Distribution System Environmental Investigation,  
14 Remediation, and Pollution Prevention Program (Project 2).

15

16 **Q. How did actual O&M expenditures for January 2009 through December  
17 2009 compare with PEF's Estimated/Actual projections as presented in  
18 previous testimony and exhibits for the Substation System Program?**

19 A. The project expenditure variance for the Substation System Program was  
20 \$1,715,483 or 42% higher than projected. This increase is primarily attributable  
21 to higher amounts of subsurface contamination encountered during remediation  
22 of substations that was not evident during the preliminary environmental  
23 inspections.

1 **Q. How did actual O&M expenditures for January 2009 through December**  
2 **2009 compare with PEF's estimated / actual projections as presented in**  
3 **previous testimony and exhibits for the Distribution System Program?**

4 **A.** The project expenditure variance for the Distribution System Program was  
5 \$746,703 or 9% higher than projected. This increase is driven by a higher unit  
6 cost associated with remediation sites that took longer than one day (as  
7 originally projected) to complete because of soil conditions or extent of the  
8 contamination.

9  
10 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

11 **A.** Yes.