

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

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

COREY ZEIGLER

ON BEHALF OF

PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA

DOCKET NO. 130007-EI

April 1, 2013

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 the Environmental Health and Safety Manager for Transmission and Distribution.

Q. What are your responsibilities in that position?

A. Currently, my responsibilities include providing oversight and subject matter expert resources to the Transmission and Distribution Business Units for managing Environmental Health and Safety (EH&S) compliance.

Q. Please describe your educational background and professional experience.

COM 5
AFD 1
APA 1
ECO 1
ENG 4
GCL 1
IDM
TEL
CLK 1-Ct Rep

1 A. I received a Bachelors of Science degree in General Business Administration
2 and Management from the University of South Florida. Prior to my current
3 EH&S Manager role, I was the Environmental Permitting and Compliance
4 Manager for Energy Delivery. I have 22 years experience in the utility industry
5 holding various operational, supervisor and managerial roles at PEF.

6
7 **Q. Have you previously filed testimony before this Commission in connection**
8 **with Progress Energy Florida's Environmental Cost Recovery Clause**
9 **(ECRC)?**

10 A. Yes.

11
12 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

13 A. The purpose of my testimony is to explain material variances between actual and
14 estimated/actual project expenditures for environmental compliance costs
15 associated with PEF's Substation Environmental Investigation, Remediation,
16 and Pollution Prevention Program (Project 1 & 1a), Distribution System
17 Environmental Investigation, Remediation, and Pollution Prevention Program
18 (Project 2) and Sea Turtle Coastal Street Lighting Program (Project 9) for the
19 period January 2012 through December 2012.

20

21 **Q. How did actual O&M expenditures for January 2012 through December**
22 **2012 compare with PEF's estimated/actual projections as presented in**
23 **previous testimony and exhibits for the Substation System Program?**

1 A. The project expenditure variance for the Substation System Program is
2 \$1,472,647 or 28% lower than projected. This variance is attributable to the
3 inability to conduct scheduled remediation at some substation sites during the
4 course of 2012 for one of three reasons: (1) inability to take an outage for
5 load/reliability reasons; (2) need to purchase/obtain additional parts to complete
6 the repairs; and (3) unusually high rain events which precluded returning to
7 several substation sites for further remediation. The substation primarily
8 responsible for this variance is Windermere, where remediation work was
9 ceased for an entire month during 2012 due to high water tables.

10

11 **Q. How did actual O&M expenditures for January 2012 through December**
12 **2012 compare with PEF's estimated/actual projections as presented in**
13 **previous testimony and exhibits for the Distribution System Program?**

14 A. The project expenditure variance for the Distribution System Program is
15 \$146,745 or 28% lower than projected. A total of 13 transformer sites were
16 scheduled for abatement work in 2012. The variance is attributable to the
17 determination that no further action was necessary at 9 sites due to clean
18 deviation sampling lab results, and the delay of further action at 4 contaminated
19 sites until 2013. The 4 sites will be re-sampled or monitored quarterly
20 throughout 2013 to determine if additional remediation is required.

21

22 **Q. How did actual O&M expenditures for January 2012 through December**
23 **2012 compare with PEF's estimated/actual projections as presented in**

1 **previous testimony and exhibits for the Sea Turtle Coastal Street Lighting**
2 **Program?**

3 A. The project expenditure variance for the Sea Turtle Coastal Street Lighting
4 Program is \$2,304 or 92% lower than projected. This variance is due to delay
5 with the University of Florida and PEF performing additional testing of Florida
6 Wildlife Commission's recommended LED technology for new installations
7 which is considered turtle compliant.

8
9 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

10 A. Yes.